

Deductive Program Verification: Solutions to Exercise #2

Yu-Fang Chen

Dept. of Information Management, National Taiwan University

FLOLAC 2007: July 2–13, 2007

Note

We assume the binding powers of the various operators decrease in this order: $(\cdot)^n$ (exponentiation), $\{+, -\}$, \neg , $\{=, \geq, \leq\}$, $\{\forall, \exists\}$, $\{\wedge, \vee\}$, \rightarrow , \leftrightarrow , \equiv .

Solutions

1. Prove the total correctness of the following annotated program segment; please present your correctness proof as a proof outline, supplying all intermediate assertions.

```
{m > 0 ∧ n > 0}
x, y := m, n;
while x ≠ 0 ∧ y ≠ 0 do
  if x < y then x, y := y, x fi;
  x := x - y
od
{(x = 0 ∧ y = gcd(m, n)) ∨ (y = 0 ∧ x = gcd(m, n))}
```

(50 points)

Solution.

```
{m > 0 ∧ n > 0}
{m = m ∧ n = n ∧ m ≥ 0 ∧ n > 0}
x, y := m, n;
{x = m ∧ y = n ∧ x ≥ 0 ∧ y > 0}
{invariant : gcd(x, y) = gcd(m, n) ∧ x ≥ 0 ∧ y > 0} {rank function : x + y}
while x ≠ 0 ∧ y ≠ 0 do
  {gcd(x, y) = gcd(m, n) ∧ x ≥ 0 ∧ y > 0 ∧ x ≠ 0 ∧ y ≠ 0}
  {gcd(x, y) = gcd(m, n) ∧ x > 0 ∧ y > 0}
  if x < y then
    {gcd(x, y) = gcd(m, n) ∧ x > 0 ∧ y > 0 ∧ x < y}
```

```

    x, y := y, x
    {gcd(y, x) = gcd(m, n) ∧ y > 0 ∧ x > 0 ∧ y < x}
    {gcd(x, y) = gcd(m, n) ∧ x > 0 ∧ y > 0 ∧ x ≥ y}
    fi;
    {gcd(x, y) = gcd(m, n) ∧ x > 0 ∧ y > 0 ∧ x ≥ y}
    {gcd(x - y, y) = gcd(m, n) ∧ x - y ≥ 0 ∧ y > 0}
    x := x - y
    {gcd(x, y) = gcd(m, n) ∧ x ≥ 0 ∧ y > 0}
od
{gcd(x, y) = gcd(m, n) ∧ x ≥ 0 ∧ y > 0 ∧ ¬(x ≠ 0 ∧ y ≠ 0)}
{(x = 0 ∧ y = gcd(m, n)) ∨ (y = 0 ∧ x = gcd(m, n))}

```

□

2. Annotate the following program segments (of Peterson's two-process mutual exclusion algorithm) such that it is clear mutual exclusion is satisfied. The annotation must be *interference free*. You may need to introduce auxiliary variables.

<pre> // P₀ // Q[0] is <i>false</i> initially ... Q[0] := <i>true</i>; TURN := 0; await ¬Q[1] ∨ TURN ≠ 0; // critical section; Q[0] := <i>false</i>; ... </pre>	<pre> // P₁ // Q[1] is <i>false</i> initially ... Q[1] := <i>true</i>; TURN := 1; await ¬Q[0] ∨ TURN ≠ 1; // critical section; Q[1] := <i>false</i>; ... </pre>
---	---

(50 points)

Solution.

<pre> ... {¬Q[0]} Q[0] := <i>true</i>; {Q[0]} ⟨TURN := 0; X[0] := <i>true</i>;⟩ {Q[0] ∧ X[0]} ⟨await ¬Q[1] ∨ TURN ≠ 0; X[0] := <i>false</i>;⟩ {Q[0] ∧ ¬X[0] ∧ (¬Q[1] ∨ TURN ≠ 0 ∨ X[1])} // critical section; Q[0] := <i>false</i>; {¬Q[0]} ... </pre>	<pre> ... {¬Q[1]} Q[1] := <i>true</i>; {Q[1]} ⟨TURN := 1; X[1] := <i>true</i>;⟩ {Q[1] ∧ X[1]} ⟨await ¬Q[0] ∨ TURN ≠ 1; X[1] := <i>false</i>;⟩ {Q[1] ∧ ¬X[1] ∧ (¬Q[0] ∨ TURN ≠ 1 ∨ X[0])} // critical section; Q[1] := <i>false</i>; {¬Q[1]} ... </pre>
---	---

Because the conjunction of $Q[1] \wedge \neg X[1] \wedge (\neg Q[0] \vee TURN \neq 1 \vee X[0])$ and $Q[0] \wedge \neg X[0] \wedge (\neg Q[1] \vee TURN \neq 0 \vee X[1])$ is *false*. Mutual exclusion is satisfied between these two processes.

To check *interference free*, you have to proof all possible combinations of atomic region R and every assertion r in P_0 and P_1 . Here we only list a few of them:

- (a) Let $r = Q[0] \wedge \neg X[0] \wedge (\neg Q[1] \vee TURN \neq 0 \vee X[1])$,
 $R = Q[1] := true, pre(R) = \neg Q[1]$.

$$\frac{\text{pred. calculus + algebra} \quad \frac{r \rightarrow r[true/Q[1]] \quad \{r[true/Q[1]]\} S_1 \{r\}}{\{r \wedge pre(R)\} R \{r\}} \text{(Assign.)}}{\{r \wedge pre(R)\} R \{r\}} \text{(S. Pre.)}$$

- (b) Let $r = Q[0] \wedge \neg X[0] \wedge (\neg Q[1] \vee TURN \neq 0 \vee X[1])$,
 $R = \langle TURN:=1; X[1] :=true \rangle, pre(R) = Q[1]$.

$$\frac{\pi \quad \frac{\{r[true/X[1]]\} X[1] := true \{r\}}{\{r \wedge pre(R)\} R \{r\}} \text{(Assign.)}}{\{r \wedge pre(R)\} R \{r\}} \text{(Sequence)}$$

π :

$$\frac{\text{pred. calculus + algebra} \quad \frac{r \rightarrow r[true/X[1]][1/TURN] \quad \{r[true/X[1]][1/TURN]\} TURN := 1 \{r[true/X[1]]\}}{\{r \wedge pre(R)\} TURN := 1 \{r[true/X[1]]\}} \text{(Assign.)}}{\{r \wedge pre(R)\} TURN := 1 \{r[true/X[1]]\}} \text{(S. Pre.)}$$

□