



# COMP4161 Advanced Topics in Software Verification

## fun

Gerwin Klein, Miki Tanaka, Johannes Åman Pohjola, Rob Sison T3/2023

#### Content

→ Foundations & Principles Intro. Lambda calculus, natural deduction [1,2]• Higher Order Logic, Isar (part 1)  $[2,3^{a}]$  Term rewriting [3,4] → Proof & Specification Techniques Inductively defined sets, rule induction [4,5] Datatype induction, primitive recursion [5,7] General recursive functions, termination proofs [7] Proof automation, Isar (part 2) [8<sup>b</sup>] Hoare logic, proofs about programs, invariants [8,9] C verification [9,10] Practice, questions, exam prep  $[10^{c}]$ 

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

## **General Recursion**

The Choice

### **General Recursion**

#### The Choice

- → Limited expressiveness, automatic termination
  - primrec
- → High expressiveness, termination proof may fail
  - fun
- → High expressiveness, tweakable, termination proof manual
  - function

## fun — examples

```
fun sep :: "'a \Rightarrow 'a list \Rightarrow 'a list"
where

"sep a (x \# y \# zs) = x \# a \# sep a (y \# zs)" |
"sep a xs = xs"
```

## fun — examples

```
fun sep :: "'a \Rightarrow 'a list \Rightarrow 'a list"
where

"sep a (x \# y \# zs) = x \# a \# sep a (y \# zs)" |
"sep a xs = xs"

fun ack :: "nat \Rightarrow nat \Rightarrow nat"
where

"ack 0 = Suc = n" |
"ack (Suc = m) = 0 = ack = m 1" |
"ack (Suc = m) = 0 = ack = m (ack (Suc = m) = m)"
```

#### fun

- → More permissive than **primrec**:
  - pattern matching in all parameters
  - nested, linear constructor patterns
  - reads equations sequentially like in Haskell (top to bottom)
  - proves termination automatically in many cases (tries lexicographic order)

#### fun

- → More permissive than **primrec**:
  - pattern matching in all parameters
  - nested, linear constructor patterns
  - reads equations sequentially like in Haskell (top to bottom)
  - proves termination automatically in many cases (tries lexicographic order)
- → Generates more theorems than **primrec**

#### fun

- → More permissive than **primrec**:
  - pattern matching in all parameters
  - nested, linear constructor patterns
  - reads equations sequentially like in Haskell (top to bottom)
  - proves termination automatically in many cases (tries lexicographic order)
- → Generates more theorems than **primrec**
- → May fail to prove termination:
  - use function (sequential) instead
  - allows you to prove termination manually

## \_\_\_Demo

## fun — induction principle

→ Each fun definition induces an induction principle

## fun — induction principle

- → Each fun definition induces an induction principle
- → For each equation: show P holds for lhs, provided P holds for each recursive call on rhs

## fun — induction principle

- → Each fun definition induces an induction principle
- → For each equation: show P holds for lhs, provided P holds for each recursive call on rhs
- → Example **sep.induct**:

## Isabelle tries to prove termination automatically

→ For most functions this works with a lexicographic termination relation.

### Isabelle tries to prove termination automatically

- → For most functions this works with a lexicographic termination relation.
- → Sometimes not

#### Isabelle tries to prove termination automatically

- → For most functions this works with a lexicographic termination relation.
- → Sometimes not ⇒ error message with unsolved subgoal

### Isabelle tries to prove termination automatically

- → For most functions this works with a lexicographic termination relation.
- → Sometimes not ⇒ error message with unsolved subgoal
- → You can prove termination separately.

```
function (sequential) quicksort where quicksort [] = [] \mid quicksort (x \# xs) = quicksort [y \leftarrow xs.y \le x]@[x]@ quicksort [y \leftarrow xs.x < y] by pat_completeness auto
```

#### termination

```
by (relation "measure length") (auto simp: less_Suc_eq_le)
```

## \_\_\_Demo

### Recall primrec:

→ defined one recursion operator per datatype D

- → defined one recursion operator per datatype D
- → inductive definition of its graph  $(x, f x) \in D_{-rel}$

- → defined one recursion operator per datatype D
- → inductive definition of its graph  $(x, f x) \in D_{-rel}$
- → prove totality:  $\forall x. \exists y. (x, y) \in D_{-rel}$

- → defined one recursion operator per datatype D
- → inductive definition of its graph  $(x, f \ x) \in D_{-rel}$
- → prove totality:  $\forall x$ .  $\exists y$ .  $(x, y) \in D$ \_rel
- → prove uniqueness:  $(x, y) \in D_{-rel} \Rightarrow (x, z) \in D_{-rel} \Rightarrow y = z$

- → defined one recursion operator per datatype D
- → inductive definition of its graph  $(x, f x) \in D_{-rel}$
- → prove totality:  $\forall x$ .  $\exists y$ .  $(x, y) \in D$ \_rel
- → prove uniqueness:  $(x, y) \in D_{-rel} \Rightarrow (x, z) \in D_{-rel} \Rightarrow y = z$
- $\rightarrow$  recursion operator for datatype  $D\_rec$ , defined via THE.

- → defined one recursion operator per datatype D
- → inductive definition of its graph  $(x, f \ x) \in D_{-rel}$
- → prove totality:  $\forall x. \exists y. (x, y) \in D_{-rel}$
- → prove uniqueness:  $(x, y) \in D_{-rel} \Rightarrow (x, z) \in D_{-rel} \Rightarrow y = z$
- $\rightarrow$  recursion operator for datatype  $D_{-rec}$ , defined via THE.
- → primrec: apply datatype recursion operator

### Similar strategy for **fun**:

- → a new inductive definition for each fun f
- → extract *recursion scheme* for equations in *f*
- $\rightarrow$  define graph  $f\_rel$  inductively, encoding recursion scheme
- → prove totality (= termination)
- → prove uniqueness (automatic)
- → derive original equations from f\_rel
- → export induction scheme from f\_rel

function can separate and defer termination proof:

→ skip proof of totality

function can separate and defer termination proof:

- → skip proof of totality
- $\rightarrow$  instead derive equations of the form:  $x \in f\_dom \Rightarrow f \ x = \dots$
- → similarly, conditional induction principle

function can separate and defer termination proof:

- → skip proof of totality
- → instead derive equations of the form:  $x \in f\_dom \Rightarrow f \ x = \dots$
- → similarly, conditional induction principle
- $\rightarrow$   $f\_dom = acc f\_rel$
- $\rightarrow$  acc = accessible part of  $f_{-rel}$
- → the part that can be reached in finitely many steps

## function can separate and defer termination proof:

- → skip proof of totality
- → instead derive equations of the form:  $x \in f\_dom \Rightarrow f \ x = \dots$
- → similarly, conditional induction principle
- $\rightarrow$   $f\_dom = acc f\_rel$
- $\rightarrow$  acc = accessible part of  $f_{-rel}$
- → the part that can be reached in finitely many steps
- $\rightarrow$  termination =  $\forall x. \ x \in f\_dom$
- → still have conditional equations for partial functions

## \_\_\_ Demo

 $\textbf{termination fun\_name} \text{ sets up termination goal } \forall x. \ x \in \textit{fun\_name\_dom}$ 

Three main proof methods:

1

**termination fun\_name** sets up termination goal  $\forall x. \ x \in fun\_name\_dom$ 

Three main proof methods:

→ lexicographic\_order (default tried by fun)

1

**termination fun\_name** sets up termination goal  $\forall x. \ x \in fun\_name\_dom$ 

Three main proof methods:

- → lexicographic\_order (default tried by fun)
- → size\_change (automated translation to simpler size-change graph¹)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>C.S. Lee, N.D. Jones, A.M. Ben-Amram, The Size-change Principle for Program Termination, POPL 2001.

**termination fun\_name** sets up termination goal  $\forall x. \ x \in fun\_name\_dom$ 

Three main proof methods:

- → lexicographic\_order (default tried by fun)
- → size\_change (automated translation to simpler size-change graph¹)
- → relation R (manual proof via well-founded relation)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>C.S. Lee, N.D. Jones, A.M. Ben-Amram,

The Size-change Principle for Program Termination, POPL 2001.

### **Well Founded Orders**

#### Definition

 $<_r$  is well founded if well founded induction holds  $wf(<_r) \equiv \forall P. \ (\forall x. \ (\forall y <_r x.P \ y) \longrightarrow P \ x) \longrightarrow (\forall x. \ P \ x)$ 

#### **Well Founded Orders**

#### Definition

$$<_r$$
 is well founded if well founded induction holds  $wf(<_r) \equiv \forall P. \ (\forall x. \ (\forall y <_r x.P \ y) \longrightarrow P \ x) \longrightarrow (\forall x. \ P \ x)$ 

#### Well founded induction rule:

$$\frac{\operatorname{wf}(<_r) \quad \bigwedge x. \ (\forall y <_r x. \ P \ y) \Longrightarrow P \ x}{P \ a}$$

#### **Well Founded Orders**

#### Definition

$$<_r$$
 is well founded if well founded induction holds  $wf(<_r) \equiv \forall P. \ (\forall x. \ (\forall y <_r x.P \ y) \longrightarrow P \ x) \longrightarrow (\forall x. \ P \ x)$ 

#### Well founded induction rule:

$$\frac{\operatorname{wf}(<_r) \quad \bigwedge x. \ (\forall y <_r x. \ P \ y) \Longrightarrow P \ x}{P \ a}$$

#### **Alternative definition** (equivalent):

there are no infinite descending chains, or (equivalent): every nonempty set has a minimal element wrt  $<_r$  min  $(<_r)$  Q x  $\equiv$   $\forall y \in Q$ .  $y \not<_r x$  wf  $(<_r)$  =  $(\forall Q \neq \{\}, \exists m \in Q, \min r, Q, m)$ 

igle < on  ${\mathbb N}$  is well founded well founded induction = complete induction

- $ightharpoonup < on \ \mathbb{N}$  is well founded well founded induction = complete induction
- $\Rightarrow$  > and  $\leq$  on  $\mathbb N$  are **not** well founded

- → < on N is well founded well founded induction = complete induction
- $\rightarrow$  > and < on  $\mathbb N$  are **not** well founded
- →  $x <_r y = x$  dvd  $y \land x \neq 1$  on  $\mathbb N$  is well founded the minimal elements are the prime numbers

- → < on N is well founded well founded induction = complete induction
- $\Rightarrow$  > and < on  $\mathbb{N}$  are **not** well founded
- →  $x <_r y = x \text{ dvd } y \land x \neq 1 \text{ on } \mathbb{N}$  is well founded the minimal elements are the prime numbers
- →  $(a,b) <_r (x,y) = a <_1 x \lor a = x \land b <_2 y$  is well founded if  $<_1$  and  $<_2$  are well founded

- → < on N is well founded well founded induction = complete induction
- $\Rightarrow$  > and < on  $\mathbb{N}$  are **not** well founded
- →  $x <_r y = x \text{ dvd } y \land x \neq 1 \text{ on } \mathbb{N}$  is well founded the minimal elements are the prime numbers
- →  $(a,b) <_r (x,y) = a <_1 x \lor a = x \land b <_2 y$  is well founded if  $<_1$  and  $<_2$  are well founded
- →  $A <_r B = A \subset B \land \text{finite } B \text{ is well founded}$

- → < on N is well founded well founded induction = complete induction
- $\Rightarrow$  > and < on  $\mathbb{N}$  are **not** well founded
- →  $x <_r y = x \text{ dvd } y \land x \neq 1 \text{ on } \mathbb{N}$  is well founded the minimal elements are the prime numbers
- →  $(a,b) <_r (x,y) = a <_1 x \lor a = x \land b <_2 y$  is well founded if  $<_1$  and  $<_2$  are well founded
- →  $A <_r B = A \subset B \land \text{finite } B \text{ is well founded}$
- ightharpoonup  $\subseteq$  and  $\subset$  in general are **not** well founded

More about well founded relations: Term Rewriting and All That

So far for termination. What about the recursion scheme?

So far for termination. What about the recursion scheme? Not fixed anymore as in **primrec**.

#### Examples:

```
→ fun fib where

fib 0 = 1 \mid

fib (Suc 0) = 1 \mid

fib (Suc (Suc n)) = fib n + fib (Suc n)
```

So far for termination. What about the recursion scheme? Not fixed anymore as in **primrec**.

#### Examples:

```
→ fun fib where

fib 0 = 1 |

fib (Suc 0) = 1 |

fib (Suc (Suc n)) = fib n + fib (Suc n)

Recursion: Suc (Suc n) \rightsquigarrow n, Suc (Suc n) \rightsquigarrow Suc n
```

So far for termination. What about the recursion scheme? Not fixed anymore as in **primrec**.

#### Examples:

```
fun fib where
fib 0 = 1 |
fib (Suc\ 0) = 1 |
fib (Suc\ (Suc\ n)) = fib\ n + fib\ (Suc\ n)

Recursion: Suc (Suc\ n) \rightsquigarrow n, Suc (Suc\ n) \rightsquigarrow Suc\ n

fun f where f x = (if x = 0 then 0 else f (x - 1) * 2)
```

So far for termination. What about the recursion scheme? Not fixed anymore as in **primrec**.

#### Examples:

→ fun fib where

```
 \begin{array}{l} \mbox{fib } 0 = 1 \mid \\ \mbox{fib } (\mbox{Suc } 0) = 1 \mid \\ \mbox{fib } (\mbox{Suc } (\mbox{Suc } n)) = \mbox{fib } n + \mbox{fib } (\mbox{Suc } n) \end{array}
```

Recursion: Suc (Suc n)  $\sim$  n, Suc (Suc n)  $\sim$  Suc n

 $\rightarrow$  fun f where f x = (if x = 0 then 0 else f (x - 1) \* 2)

```
Recursion: x \neq 0 \Longrightarrow x \leadsto x - 1
```

#### Higher Order:

→ datatype 'a tree = Leaf 'a | Branch 'a tree list

fun treemap :: ('a ⇒ 'a) ⇒ 'a tree ⇒ 'a tree where

treemap fn (Leaf n) = Leaf (fn n) |

treemap fn (Branch I) = Branch (map (treemap fn) I)

#### Higher Order:

```
→ datatype 'a tree = Leaf 'a | Branch 'a tree list
fun treemap :: ('a ⇒ 'a) ⇒ 'a tree ⇒ 'a tree where
treemap fn (Leaf n) = Leaf (fn n) |
treemap fn (Branch I) = Branch (map (treemap fn) I)
Recursion: x ∈ set I ⇒ (fn, Branch I) ~ (fn, x)
```

#### Higher Order:

→ datatype 'a tree = Leaf 'a | Branch 'a tree list fun treemap :: ('a ⇒ 'a) ⇒ 'a tree ⇒ 'a tree where treemap fn (Leaf n) = Leaf (fn n) | treemap fn (Branch I) = Branch (map (treemap fn) I) Recursion: x ∈ set I ⇒ (fn, Branch I) ~ (fn, x)

How does Isabelle extract context information for the call?

Extracting context for equations

Extracting context for equations

 $\Rightarrow$ 

Congruence Rules!

Extracting context for equations

Congruence Rules!

Recall rule **if\_cong**:

$$[|\ b=c;\ c\Longrightarrow x=u;\ \neg\ c\Longrightarrow y=v\ |]\Longrightarrow$$
 (if b then x else y) = (if c then u else v)

**Read:** for transforming x, use b as context information, for y use  $\neg b$ .

Extracting context for equations

Congruence Rules!

Recall rule **if\_cong**:

[| b = c; c 
$$\Longrightarrow$$
 x = u;  $\neg$  c  $\Longrightarrow$  y = v |]  $\Longrightarrow$  (if b then x else y) = (if c then u else v)

**Read:** for transforming x, use b as context information, for y use  $\neg b$ . In fun\_def: for recursion in x, use b as context, for y use  $\neg b$ .

# Congruence Rules for fun\_defs

The same works for function definitions. **declare** my\_rule[fundef\_cong]

## Congruence Rules for fun\_defs

The same works for function definitions.

declare my\_rule[fundef\_cong]
(if\_cong already added by default)

Another example (higher-order):

$$[|xs = ys; \land x. x \in set ys \Longrightarrow f x = g x |] \Longrightarrow map f xs = map g ys$$

#### Congruence Rules for fun\_defs

The same works for function definitions.

declare my\_rule[fundef\_cong]
(if\_cong already added by default)

Another example (higher-order):

$$[\mid xs = ys; \ \bigwedge\! x. \ x \in \mathsf{set} \ ys \Longrightarrow \mathsf{f} \ x = \mathsf{g} \ x \mid] \Longrightarrow \mathsf{map} \ \mathsf{f} \ xs = \mathsf{map} \ \mathsf{g} \ \mathsf{ys}$$

**Read:** for recursive calls in f, f is called with elements of xs

# \_\_\_Demo

#### **Further Reading**

Alexander Krauss, Automating Recursive Definitions and Termination Proofs in Higher-Order Logic. PhD thesis, TU Munich, 2009.

https://www21.in.tum.de/~krauss/papers/krauss-thesis.pdf

#### We have seen today ...

- → General recursion with fun/function
- → Induction over recursive functions
- → How fun works
- → Termination, partial functions, congruence rules