



COMP4161: Advanced Topics in Software Verification



Gerwin Klein, June Andronick, Ramana Kumar, Miki Tanaka
S2/2017

data61.csiro.au



Content



- Intro & motivation, getting started [1]

- Foundations & Principles
 - Lambda Calculus, natural deduction [1,2]
 - Higher Order Logic [3^a]
 - Term rewriting [4]

- Proof & Specification Techniques
 - Inductively defined sets, rule induction [5]
 - Datatypes, recursion, induction [6, 7]
 - Hoare logic, proofs about programs, C verification [8^b,9]
 - (mid-semester break)
 - Writing Automated Proof Methods [10]
 - Isar, codegen, typeclasses, locales [11^c,12]

^aa1 due; ^ba2 due; ^ca3 due

Last Time



- Equations and Term Rewriting
- Confluence and Termination of reduction systems
- Term Rewriting in Isabelle

Applying a Rewrite Rule



- $l \rightarrow r$ **applicable** to term $t[s]$
if there is substitution σ such that $\sigma l = s$
- **Result:** $t[\sigma r]$
- **Equationally:** $t[s] = t[\sigma r]$

Example:

Rule: $0 + n \rightarrow n$

Term: $a + (0 + (b + c))$

Substitution: $\sigma = \{n \mapsto b + c\}$

Result: $a + (b + c)$

Conditional Term Rewriting



Rewrite rules can be conditional:

$$[[P_1 \dots P_n]] \implies l = r$$

is **applicable** to term $t[s]$ with σ if

- $\sigma l = s$ and
- $\sigma P_1, \dots, \sigma P_n$ are provable by rewriting.

Rewriting with Assumptions



Last time: Isabelle uses assumptions in rewriting.

Can lead to non-termination.

Example:

lemma " $f\ x = g\ x \wedge g\ x = f\ x \implies f\ x = 2$ "

simp

(simp (no_asm))

(simp (no_asm_use))

(simp (no_asm_simp))

use and simplify assumptions

ignore assumptions

simplify, but do **not use** assumptions

use, but do **not simplify** assumptions

Preprocessing



Preprocessing (recursive) for maximal simplification power:

$$\begin{aligned}\neg A &\mapsto A = \textit{False} \\ A \longrightarrow B &\mapsto A \implies B \\ A \wedge B &\mapsto A, B \\ \forall x. A \ x &\mapsto A \ ?x \\ A &\mapsto A = \textit{True}\end{aligned}$$

Example:

$$(p \longrightarrow q \wedge \neg r) \wedge s$$

\mapsto

$$p \implies q = \textit{True} \quad p \implies r = \textit{False} \quad s = \textit{True}$$

A background pattern of white hexagons on a dark teal background, arranged in a staggered grid.

DATA
61



Demo

Case splitting with simp



$$P \text{ (if } A \text{ then } s \text{ else } t) \\ = \\ (A \longrightarrow P s) \wedge (\neg A \longrightarrow P t)$$

Automatic

$$P \text{ (case } e \text{ of } 0 \Rightarrow a \mid \text{Suc } n \Rightarrow b) \\ = \\ (e = 0 \longrightarrow P a) \wedge (\forall n. e = \text{Suc } n \longrightarrow P b)$$

Manually: apply (simp split: nat.split)

Similar for any data type **t**: **t.split**

Congruence Rules



congruence rules are about using context

Example: in $P \longrightarrow Q$ we could use P to simplify terms in Q

For \implies hardwired (assumptions used in rewriting)

For other operators expressed with conditional rewriting.

Example:

$$\llbracket P = P'; P' \implies Q = Q' \rrbracket \implies (P \longrightarrow Q) = (P' \longrightarrow Q')$$

Read: to simplify $P \longrightarrow Q$

- first simplify P to P'
- then simplify Q to Q' using P' as assumption
- the result is $P' \longrightarrow Q'$

More Congruence



Sometimes useful, but not used automatically (slowdown):

conj_cong: $\llbracket P = P'; P' \implies Q = Q' \rrbracket \implies (P \wedge Q) = (P' \wedge Q')$

Context for if-then-else:

if_cong: $\llbracket b = c; c \implies x = u; \neg c \implies y = v \rrbracket \implies$
 $(\text{if } b \text{ then } x \text{ else } y) = (\text{if } c \text{ then } u \text{ else } v)$

Prevent rewriting inside then-else (default):

if_weak_cong:

$b = c \implies (\text{if } b \text{ then } x \text{ else } y) = (\text{if } c \text{ then } x \text{ else } y)$

- declare own congruence rules with **[cong]** attribute
- delete with **[cong del]**
- use locally with e.g. **apply** (simp cong: <rule>)

Ordered rewriting



Problem: $x + y \longrightarrow y + x$ does not terminate

Solution: use permutative rules only if term becomes lexicographically smaller.

Example: $b + a \rightsquigarrow a + b$ but not $a + b \rightsquigarrow b + a$.

For types `nat`, `int` etc:

- lemmas **add_ac** sort any sum (+)
- lemmas **mult_ac** sort any product (*)

Example: `apply (simp add: add_ac)` yields
 $(b + c) + a \rightsquigarrow \dots \rightsquigarrow a + (b + c)$

AC Rules



Example for associative-commutative rules:

Associative: $(x \odot y) \odot z = x \odot (y \odot z)$

Commutative: $x \odot y = y \odot x$

These 2 rules alone get stuck too early (not confluent).

Example: $(z \odot x) \odot (y \odot v)$

We want: $(z \odot x) \odot (y \odot v) = v \odot (x \odot (y \odot z))$

We get: $(z \odot x) \odot (y \odot v) = v \odot (y \odot (x \odot z))$

We need: AC rule $x \odot (y \odot z) = y \odot (x \odot z)$

If these 3 rules are present for an AC operator
Isabelle will order terms correctly

A white hexagonal grid pattern is overlaid on a dark teal background, covering the top half of the slide.

DATA
61



Demo

Back to Confluence



Last time: confluence in general is undecidable.

But: confluence for terminating systems is decidable!

Problem: overlapping lhs of rules.

Definition:

Let $l_1 \rightarrow r_1$ and $l_2 \rightarrow r_2$ be two rules with disjoint variables.

They form a **critical pair** if a non-variable subterm of l_1 unifies with l_2 .

Example:

Rules: (1) $f x \rightarrow a$ (2) $g y \rightarrow b$ (3) $f (g z) \rightarrow b$

Critical pairs:

$$\begin{array}{llll} (1)+(3) & \{x \mapsto g z\} & a \xleftarrow{(1)} f (g z) & \xrightarrow{(3)} b \\ (3)+(2) & \{z \mapsto y\} & b \xleftarrow{(3)} f (g y) & \xrightarrow{(2)} f b \end{array}$$

Completion



$$(1) f x \longrightarrow a \quad (2) g y \longrightarrow b \quad (3) f (g z) \longrightarrow b$$

is not confluent

But it can be made confluent by adding rules!

How: join all critical pairs

Example:

$$(1)+(3) \quad \{x \mapsto g z\} \quad a \xleftarrow{(1)} f (g z) \xrightarrow{(3)} b$$

shows that $a = b$ (because $a \xleftarrow{*} b$), so we add $a \longrightarrow b$ as a rule

This is the main idea of the Knuth-Bendix completion algorithm.



DATA
61



Demo: Waldmeister

Orthogonal Rewriting Systems



Definitions:

A rule $l \rightarrow r$ is **left-linear** if no variable occurs twice in l .

A **rewrite system** is **left-linear** if all rules are.

A system is **orthogonal** if it is left-linear and has no critical pairs.

Orthogonal rewrite systems are confluent

Application: functional programming languages

We have learned today ...



- Conditional term rewriting
- Congruence rules
- AC rules
- More on confluence