

COMP4161: Advanced Topics in Software Verification

$$\{\mathsf{P}\}\,\ldots\{\mathsf{Q}\}$$

Gerwin Klein, Johannes Åman Pohjola, Christine Rizkallah, Miki Tanaka T3/2020

### **Last Time**

- → Syntax of a simple imperative language
- → Operational semantics
- → Program proof on operational semantics
- → Hoare logic rules
- → Soundness of Hoare logic

### Content

→	Foundations	&	Principles

<ul> <li>Intro, Lambda calculus, natural deduction</li> </ul>	[1,2]
<ul> <li>Higher Order Logic, Isar (part 1)</li> </ul>	$[2,3^a]$
Term rewriting	[3,4]

→ Proof & Specification Techniques

- Inductively defined sets, rule induction, datatype induction, primitive recursion [4,5]
- General recursive functions, termination proofs [7<sup>b</sup>]
- Proof automation, Hoare logic, proofs about programs, invariants [8]
- C verification [9,10]
- Practice, questions, examp prep [10°]

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup>a1 due: <sup>b</sup>a2 due: <sup>c</sup>a3 due

## **Automation?**

**Last time:** Hoare rule application is nicer than using operational semantic.

#### BUT:

- → it's still kind of tedious
- → it seems boring & mechanical

#### **Automation?**

**Problem:** While – need creativity to find right (invariant) *P* 

**Problem:** While – need creativity to find right (invariant) *P* 

#### Solution:

→ annotate program with invariants

**Problem:** While – need creativity to find right (invariant) *P* 

#### **Solution:**

- → annotate program with invariants
- → then, Hoare rules can be applied automatically

**Problem:** While – need creativity to find right (invariant) *P* 

#### Solution:

- → annotate program with invariants
- → then, Hoare rules can be applied automatically

#### **Example:**

```
\{M=0 \land N=0\} WHILE M \neq a INV \{N=M*b\} DO N:=N+b; M:=M+1 OD \{N=a*b\}
```

pre 
$$c$$
  $Q$  = weakest  $P$  such that  $\{P\}$   $c$   $\{Q\}$ 

$$\begin{array}{lll} \operatorname{pre} \operatorname{\mathsf{SKIP}} Q & = & \mathsf{G} \\ \operatorname{\mathsf{pre}} (x := a) \ Q & = & \end{array}$$

pre 
$$c$$
  $Q$  = weakest  $P$  such that  $\{P\}$   $c$   $\{Q\}$ 

```
pre SKIP Q = Q

pre (x := a) Q = \lambda \sigma. Q(\sigma(x := a\sigma))

pre (c_1; c_2) Q =
```

pre 
$$c$$
  $Q$  = weakest  $P$  such that  $\{P\}$   $c$   $\{Q\}$ 

pre c Q = weakest P such that  $\{P\}$  c  $\{Q\}$ 

pre c Q = weakest P such that  $\{P\}$  c  $\{Q\}$ 

 $\{pre\ c\ Q\}\ c\ \{Q\}$  only true under certain conditions

 $\{pre\ c\ Q\}\ c\ \{Q\}$  only true under certain conditions

These are called **verification conditions** vc c Q:

vc SKIP Q = True

 $\{pre\ c\ Q\}\ c\ \{Q\}$  only true under certain conditions

$$\operatorname{vc}\operatorname{SKIP} Q = \operatorname{True}$$
 $\operatorname{vc} (x := a) Q = \operatorname{True}$ 

 $\{pre\ c\ Q\}\ c\ \{Q\}$  only true under certain conditions

 $\{pre\ c\ Q\}\ c\ \{Q\}$  only true under certain conditions

 $\{pre\ c\ Q\}\ c\ \{Q\}$  only true under certain conditions

 $\{pre\ c\ Q\}\ c\ \{Q\}$  only true under certain conditions

$$\operatorname{vc} c Q \wedge (P \Longrightarrow \operatorname{pre} c Q) \Longrightarrow \{P\} c \{Q\}$$

- $\rightarrow$   $x := \lambda \sigma$ . 1 instead of x := 1 sucks
- $\rightarrow$   $\{\lambda\sigma.\ \sigma\ x=n\}$  instead of  $\{x=n\}$  sucks as well

 $ightharpoonup x := \lambda \sigma. \ 1$  instead of x := 1 sucks  $ightharpoonup \{\lambda \sigma. \ \sigma \ x = n\}$  instead of  $\{x = n\}$  sucks as well

Problem: program variables are functions, not values

 $\Rightarrow$   $x := \lambda \sigma$ . 1 instead of x := 1 sucks  $\Rightarrow \{\lambda \sigma. \ \sigma \ x = n\}$  instead of  $\{x = n\}$  sucks as well

Problem: program variables are functions, not values

**Solution:** distinguish program variables syntactically

- $\rightarrow$   $x := \lambda \sigma$ . 1 instead of x := 1 sucks
- →  $\{\lambda\sigma.\ \sigma\ x=n\}$  instead of  $\{x=n\}$  sucks as well

Problem: program variables are functions, not values

**Solution:** distinguish program variables syntactically

#### **Choices:**

→ declare program variables with each Hoare triple

- $\rightarrow$   $x := \lambda \sigma$ . 1 instead of x := 1 sucks
- →  $\{\lambda\sigma.\ \sigma\ x=n\}$  instead of  $\{x=n\}$  sucks as well

Problem: program variables are functions, not values

Solution: distinguish program variables syntactically

#### **Choices:**

- → declare program variables with each Hoare triple
  - nice, usual syntax
  - works well if you state full program and only use vcg

- $\rightarrow$   $x := \lambda \sigma$ . 1 instead of x := 1 sucks
- $\rightarrow$   $\{\lambda\sigma.\ \sigma\ x=n\}$  instead of  $\{x=n\}$  sucks as well

Problem: program variables are functions, not values

Solution: distinguish program variables syntactically

#### **Choices:**

- → declare program variables with each Hoare triple
  - nice, usual syntax
  - works well if you state full program and only use vcg
- → separate program variables from Hoare triple (use extensible records), indicate usage as function syntactically

- $\rightarrow$   $x := \lambda \sigma$ . 1 instead of x := 1 sucks
- →  $\{\lambda\sigma.\ \sigma\ x=n\}$  instead of  $\{x=n\}$  sucks as well

Problem: program variables are functions, not values

Solution: distinguish program variables syntactically

#### **Choices:**

- → declare program variables with each Hoare triple
  - nice, usual syntax
  - works well if you state full program and only use vcg
- → separate program variables from Hoare triple (use extensible records), indicate usage as function syntactically
  - more syntactic overhead
  - program pieces compose nicely

# Demo

## **Arrays**

#### Depending on language, model arrays as functions:

→ Array access = function application:

$$a[i] = ai$$

→ Array update = function update:

```
a[i] :== v \quad = \quad a :== a(i := v)
```

## **Arrays**

#### Depending on language, model arrays as functions:

- → Array access = function application:
  - a[i] = ai
- → Array update = function update:

$$a[i] :== v = a :== a(i:= v)$$

#### Use lists to express length:

- → Array access = nth:
  - a[i] = a!i
- → Array update = list update:

$$a[i] :== v \quad = \quad a :== a[i := v]$$

- → Array length = list length:
  - a.length = length a

#### Choice 1

#### Choice 1

```
datatype ref = Ref int | Null
types heap = int ⇒ val
datatype val = Int int | Bool bool | Struct_x int int bool | ...

→ hp :: heap, p :: ref
→ Pointer access: *p = the_Int (hp (the_addr p))
→ Pointer update: *p :== v = hp :== hp ((the_addr p) := v)
```

#### Choice 1

```
datatype ref = Ref int | Null
types heap = int ⇒ val
datatype val = Int int | Bool bool | Struct_x int int bool | ...

→ hp :: heap, p :: ref
→ Pointer access: *p = the_Int (hp (the_addr p))
→ Pointer update: *p :== v = hp :== hp ((the_addr p) := v)

→ a bit klunky
→ gets even worse with structs
```

→ lots of value extraction (the\_Int) in spec and program

```
Choice 2 (Burstall '72, Bornat '00)
```

**Example:** struct with next pointer and element

```
\begin{array}{lll} \textbf{datatype} & \text{ref} & = \text{Ref int} \mid \text{Null} \\ \textbf{types} & \text{next\_hp} & = \text{int} \Rightarrow \text{ref} \\ \textbf{types} & \text{elem\_hp} & = \text{int} \Rightarrow \text{int} \\ \end{array}
```

#### Choice 2 (Burstall '72, Bornat '00)

**Example:** struct with next pointer and element

```
datatype ref = Ref int | Null

types next_hp = int ⇒ ref

types elem_hp = int ⇒ int

→ next :: next_hp, elem :: elem_hp, p :: ref

→ Pointer access: p→next = next (the_addr p)

→ Pointer update: p→next :== v = next :== next ((the_addr p) := v)
```

#### Choice 2 (Burstall '72, Bornat '00)

**Example:** struct with next pointer and element

```
datatype ref = Ref int | Null

types next_hp = int ⇒ ref

types elem_hp = int ⇒ int

→ next :: next_hp, elem :: elem_hp, p :: ref

→ Pointer access: p→next = next (the_addr p)

→ Pointer update: p→next :== v = next :== next ((the_addr p) := v)
```

#### In general:

- → a separate heap for each struct field
- → buys you p $\rightarrow$ next  $\neq$  p $\rightarrow$ elem automatically (aliasing)
- → still assumes type safe language

# Demo

## We have seen today ...

- → Weakest precondition
- → Verification conditions
- → Example program proofs
- → Arrays, pointers