

# **COMP 4161**

**NICTA Advanced Course** 

#### **Advanced Topics in Software Verification**

Gerwin Klein, June Andronick, Toby Murray, Rafal Kolanski



# Content



→ Intro & motivation, getting started	[1]
→ Foundations & Principles	
<ul> <li>Lambda Calculus, natural deduction</li> </ul>	[1,2]
Higher Order Logic	$[3^{a}]$
Term rewriting	[4]
→ Proof & Specification Techniques	
• Isar	[5]
<ul> <li>Inductively defined sets, rule induction</li> </ul>	$[6^b]$
<ul> <li>Datatypes, recursion, induction</li> </ul>	$[7^c, 8]$
<ul> <li>Calculational reasoning, code generation</li> </ul>	[9]
<ul> <li>Hoare logic, proofs about programs</li> </ul>	$[10^d, 11, 12]$

 $<sup>^{</sup>a}$ a1 due;  $^{b}$ a2 due;  $^{c}$ session break;  $^{d}$ a3 due

#### 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 ack :: "nat \Rightarrow nat"

where

"ack 0 n = Suc n" |

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

"ack (Suc m) (Suc n) = ack m (ack (Suc m) n)"
```

#### fun



- The definition:
  - pattern matching in all parameters
  - arbitrary, linear constructor patterns
  - reads equations sequentially like in Haskell (top to bottom)
  - proves termination automatically in many cases (tries lexicographic order)
- → Generates own induction principle
- → May fail to prove termination:
  - use function (sequential) instead
  - allows you to prove termination manually

## 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**:

#### **Termination**



#### 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 automation separately.

function (sequential) quicksort where

quicksort [] = [] |

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)

function is the fully tweakable, manual version of fun



# **DEMO**

#### How does fun/function work?



#### Recall **primrec**:

- → defined one recursion operator per datatype
- $\rightarrow$  inductive definition of its graph  $(x, f x) \in G$
- $\rightarrow$  prove totality:  $\forall x. \; \exists y. \; (x,y) \in G$
- $\rightarrow$  prove uniqueness:  $(x,y) \in G \Rightarrow (x,z) \in G \Rightarrow y=z$
- $\rightarrow$  recursion operator:  $rec \ x = THE \ y. \ (x,y) \in rec$

#### How does fun/function work?



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

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





#### 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
- $\rightarrow f\_dom = acc f\_rel$
- $\rightarrow$  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





#### Command 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 (different automated technique)
- → relation R (manual proof via well-founded relation)

#### 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:

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

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

there are no infinite descending chains, or (equivalent): every nonempty set has a minimal element wrt  $<_r$ 

$$\min r \ Q \ x = \forall y \in Q. \ y \not<_r x$$
 wf 
$$r = (\forall Q \neq \{\}. \ \exists m \in Q. \ \min r \ Q \ m)$$

# Well Founded Orders: Examples



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

More about well founded relations: Term Rewriting and All That



## Extracting 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 |
fib (Suc 0) = 1 |
fib (Suc (Suc n)) = fib n + fib (Suc n)
```

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:  $x \neq 0 \Longrightarrow x \rightsquigarrow x - 1$ 





#### Higher Oder:

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

```
fun treemap :: ('a \Rightarrow 'a) \Rightarrow 'a tree \Rightarrow 'a tree where treemap fn (Leaf n) = Leaf (fn n) | treemap fn (Branch I) = Branch (map (treemap fn) I)
```

**Recursion**:  $x \in \text{set } I \Longrightarrow (\text{fn, Branch I}) \rightsquigarrow (\text{fn, x})$ 

How to extract the context information for the call?





#### Extracting context for equations

 $\Rightarrow$ 

#### 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  $\neg b$ .





The same works for function definitions.

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

Another example (higher-order):

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

**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.

http://www4.in.tum.de/~krauss/diss/krauss\_phd.pdf

# We have seen today ...



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