

Homework 1 (due Friday, February 1)

1. (Propositional Calculus - 10 points)

 Let P, Q, R range over state predicates of some program.
 Prove or disprove the following:

- a) $P \vee (P \wedge Q) \equiv P$
- b) $P \wedge (Q \vee R) \equiv (P \vee Q) \wedge (P \vee R)$
- c) $\neg(P \equiv Q) \equiv \neg P \equiv \neg Q$
- d) $P \equiv Q \equiv (P \vee Q) \equiv (P \wedge Q)$

2. (More Propositional Calculus - 6 points)

-
- a) Prove $\neg\neg P \equiv P$
 - b) Prove the identity of \vee , $P \vee \text{false} \equiv P$, by transforming its more structured side into its simpler side.
 - c) Prove $P \Rightarrow Q \equiv \neg P \vee \neg Q \equiv \neg P$

3. (Predicate Calculus - 10 points)

-
- a) Prove $(\forall x : R : P \equiv Q) \Rightarrow ((\forall x : R : P) \equiv (\forall x : R : Q))$
 - b) Prove $\neg(\exists x : R : P) \equiv (\forall x : R : \neg P)$
 - c) Translate the following English statements into predicate logic:
 - (i) Every positive integer is smaller than the absolute value of some negative integer. (Use $abs.i$ for the absolute value of i)
 - (ii) Real number i is the largest real solution of the equation $f.i = i + 1$
 - (iii) No integer is larger than all others.
 - d) Translate into English the meaning of :
 - (i) $(\exists x, y : x \in R \wedge y \in R : (f.x < 0 \wedge 0 < f.y) \Rightarrow (\exists z : z \in Reals : f.z = 0))$
 - (ii) $(\forall z : z \in Integers \wedge even.z : (\forall w : w \in Integers \wedge odd.w : z \neq w))$

4. (Closure) -- 30 points

 Let P and Q range over state predicates of a program $prog$. Recall that the statements of each action of $prog$ are terminating.
 Recall that in class we defined:

$$\text{closed } P \text{ iff } \{P\} \text{ prog } \{P\}$$

True or False? (Explain your answer.)

- a) closed *false*
- b) closed *true*
- c) (closed P or closed Q) implies (closed $(P \vee Q)$)
- d) (closed $\neg P$) implies (closed P)
- e) (closed $(P \vee Q)$) implies $(\forall s :: \{P\} s \{Q\})$
- f) (exists $s :: \{P\} s \{false\}$) implies (closed $\neg P$)
- g) closed $(P \vee Q)$
implies $(\forall s :: \{P\} s \{P \vee Q\})$
- h) closed P and closed Q and $(R \Rightarrow (P \wedge Q))$
implies closed R
- i) closed P and closed Q and closed R
implies closed $(P \wedge (Q \wedge R))$

5. (Leads-to) -- 24 points

Let P , Q , and R range over state predicates of a program *prog*.

True or False? (Explain your answer.)

- a) *false* leads-to $P \vee Q$
- b) (P leads-to Q) implies $((P \wedge Q)$ leads-to Q)
- c) (P leads-to Q) implies $((P \wedge R)$ leads-to Q)
- d) $((P$ leads-to $Q)$ and $(P$ leads-to $R))$ implies $(P$ leads-to $(Q \wedge R))$
- e) $(P$ leads-to $Q)$ and $((Q \vee R)$ leads-to $T)$
implies $((P \vee R)$ leads-to $T)$
- f) P leads-to Q and P leads-to R and closed R
implies $(P$ leads-to $(Q \wedge R))$

6. (Variant functions) - 20 points

For each program described below, prove, by exhibiting a variant function, that the desired progress property holds, or show that the progress property does not hold. Assume the semantics of minimal progress: At every step in the computation, if some action is enabled, then some enabled action is executed.

8. (Distributed load balancing)

Prove either that the desired liveness specification holds
by exhibiting a variant function, or show that it does not hold.

Let $x.j$ be an integer for each node j in an undirected graph.
For each pair of neighboring nodes j and k in the graph,
consider the program action:

$$(x.j - x.k) > 1 \quad \text{-->} \quad x.j, x.k := x.j - 1, x.k + 1$$

The liveness specification to be verified for this set of actions is:

$$\text{true leads-to } (\text{forall } j, k: j \text{ and } k \text{ are neighboring nodes: } |x.j - x.k| \leq 1)$$

9. (Verifying Hoare-triples)

Let m , n , and l be integers, and M and N be integer constants. Carefully prove or disprove the following Hoare-triples. (Formal proofs are not necessary, but are encouraged).

- (a) $\{m = M\}$
 $m < 0 \longrightarrow m := -m$
 $\{m = |M|\}$
- (b) $\{m > M\}$
 $m > n \longrightarrow m, n := n, m$
 $\{m \leq n\}$

Here are two new rules about Hoare-triples:

Rule of Sequential Assignment:

Let x and y be variables and E and F be expressions whose value are in the domain of x and y , respectively, and let P be a state predicate.

$$\{(P [y := F]) [x := E]\} \text{ true} \longrightarrow x := E ; y := F \quad \{P\}$$

Rule of Guards:

Let $prog$ be a program with two actions $g1 \longrightarrow st1$ and $g2 \longrightarrow st2$, and let Q and R be state predicates of $prog$.

$$\begin{aligned} Q &\Rightarrow g1 \vee g2, \\ \{Q\} g1 &\longrightarrow st1 \quad \{R\}, \\ \{Q\} g2 &\longrightarrow st2 \quad \{R\} \end{aligned}$$

implies

$$\{Q\} prog \quad \{R\}$$

Prove or disprove the following Hoare-triples:

- (c) $\{m = M \wedge n = N\}$
 $\text{true} \longrightarrow n := n + m ; m := n - m ; n := n - m$
 $\{m = N \wedge n = M\}$
- (d) $\{\text{true}\} \quad l \leq m \longrightarrow n := m \quad \parallel \quad m \leq l \longrightarrow n := l \quad \{n = \max(l, m)\}$