

# CSE 331

## **Array Loop Heuristics**

**Kevin Zatloukal** 

func sum([]) := 0sum(A + [y]) := sum(A) + y for any  $y : \mathbb{Z}$  and  $A : Array_{\mathbb{Z}}$ 

Loop implementation: •

```
let j: number = 0;
let s: number = 0;
{{ Inv: s = sum(A[0 .. j - 1]) and j \le A.length }}
while (j !== A.length) {
  s = s + A[j];
  j = j + 1;
}
\{\{s = sum(A)\}\}
return s;
```

#### **Recall: Linear Search of an Array**

| <b>func</b> contains([], x) | := F              |               |
|-----------------------------|-------------------|---------------|
| contains(A <b>#</b> [y], x) | := T              | if $x = y$    |
| contains(A <b>#</b> [y], x) | := contains(A, x) | if $x \neq y$ |

#### • Loop implementation:

```
let j: number = 0;
{{ Inv: contains(A[0..j-1], x) = F }}
while (j != A.length) {
    if (A[j] === x)
        {{ contains(A, x) = T }}
        return true;
        j = j + 1;
    }
{{ contains(A, x) = F }}
return false;
```

Saw two more examples last lecture

 $\{\{ Inv: s = sum(A[0 .. j - 1]) and j \le A.length \} \}$  sum of array  $\{\{ Post: s = sum(A[0 .. n - 1]) \} \}$ 

{{ Inv:  $contains(A[0 .. j - 1], x) = F }} search an array$  ${{ Post: <math>contains(A[0 .. n - 1], x) = F }}$ 

- in both cases, Post is a special case of Inv (where j = n)
- in other words, Inv is a weakening of Post
- Heuristic for loop invariants: weaken the postcondition
  - assertion that allows postcondition as a special case
  - must also allow states that are easy to prepare

### **Heuristic for Loop Invariants**

- Loop Invariant allows both start and stop states
  - describing more states = weakening



- usually are many ways to weaken it...

- Suppose we require A to be sorted:
  - precondition includes

 $A[j-1] \le A[j]$  for any  $1 \le j < n$  (where n := A.length)

- Want to find the index k where  $\mbox{``x"}$  is / would be put

postcondition written as

A[j] < x for any  $0 \le j \le k - 1$  and  $x \le A[j]$  for any  $k \le j < n$ 

 $\begin{array}{l} - \mbox{ is where } x \mbox{ must be if it is present} \\ \mbox{ everything from } A[0] \mbox{ to } A[k-1] \mbox{ is smaller than } x \\ \mbox{ everything after } A[k] \mbox{ is even bigger than } A[k] \end{array}$ 



- End with complete knowledge of A[j] vs x
  - how can we describe partial knowledge?



```
// @returns true if A[j] = x for some 0 <= j < n
// false if A[j] != x for any 0 <= j < n</pre>
```

• Loop implementation:

```
let k: number = 0;
{{ Inv: A[j] < x for any 0 ≤ j < k }}
while (k !== A.length && A[k] <= x) {
    if (A[k] === x) {
        return true;
    } else {
        k = k + 1;
    }
}
return false;</pre>
```

```
let k: number = 0;
{{k=0}}
{{Inv: A[j] < x for any 0 ≤ j < k }}
while (k !== A.length && A[k] <= x) {
    if (A[k] === x) {
        return true;
        } else {
            k = k + 1;
        }
        Ket values of j satisfy 0 ≤ j < 0?
    }
    return false;
    None. Nothing is claimed.</pre>
```

Statement is (vacuously) true when  $\mathbf{k} = \mathbf{0}$ 

With "for any" facts, we need to think about exactly what facts are being claimed.

```
let k: number = 0;
{{ Inv: A[j] < x for any 0 ≤ j < k }}
while (k !== A.length && A[k] <= x) {
    if (A[k] === x) {
        return true;
    } else {
        k = k + 1;
    }
}
{{ A[j] < x for any 0 ≤ j < k and (k = n or A[k] > x) }}
{{ A[j] ≠ x for any 0 ≤ j < n }}
return false;</pre>
```

Top assertion has an "or", so we argue by cases.

```
while (k !== A.length && A[k] <= x) {
    if (A[k] === x) {
        return true;
    } else {
        k = k + 1;
    }
    }
    {{A[j] < x for any 0 ≤ j < k and (k = n or A[k] > x) }}
    {{A[j] ≠ x for any 0 ≤ j < n }}
    return false;</pre>
```

**Case** k = n (= A.length):

**Know that** A[j] < x for any  $0 \le j < n$  (since k = n)

**This means**  $A[j] \neq x$  for any  $0 \le j < n$  (since A[j] < x implies  $A[j] \neq x$ )

```
while (k !== A.length \&\& A[k] <= x) 
               if (A[k] === x) {
                 return true;
               } else {
                 k = k + 1;
               }
           {{ A[j] < x \text{ for any } 0 \le j < k \text{ and } (k = n \text{ or } A[k] > x) }}
           \{\{A[j] \neq x \text{ for any } 0 \le j < n\}\}
           return false;
Case x < A[k]:
         Know that A[j] < x for any 0 \le j < k and x < A[k]
```

Precondition (sorted) says  $A[k] \le A[k+1] \le ...$ Know that A[j] < x for any  $0 \le j < k$  and A[j] > x for any  $k \le j < n$ This means  $A[j] \ne x$  for any  $0 \le j < n$ 

```
while (k !== A.length && A[k] <= x) {
    if (A[k] === x) {
        return true;
    } else {
        k = k + 1;
    }
    {
        {{(A[j] < x for any 0 ≤ j < k and (k = n or A[k] > x)}}
    {{(A[j] ≠ x for any 0 ≤ j < n}}
    return false;</pre>
```

Since one of the cases k=n and x < A[k] must hold, we have shown that

```
A[j] \neq x for any 0 \le j < n
```

holds in general.

```
let k: number = 0;
{{ Inv: A[j] < x for any 0 ≤ j < k }}
while (k !== A.length && A[k] <= x) {
    {{ {[j] < x for any 0 ≤ j < k and k ≠ n and A[k] ≤ x }}
    if (A[k] === x) {
        return true;
    } else {
            k = k + 1;
        }
        {{ {[A[j] < x for any 0 ≤ j < k }}
    }
    return false;</pre>
```

```
Yes! It holds for j = k
```

```
{{ Inv: A[j] < x for any 0 \le j < k }}
while (k !== A.length && A[k] \leq x) {
   \{\{A[j] < x \text{ for any } 0 \le j < k \text{ and } k \ne n \text{ and } A[k] \le x \}\}
   if (A[k] === x) {
      return true;
   } else {
       \{ \{ A[j] < x \text{ for any } 0 \le j < k \text{ and } k \ne n \text{ and } A[k] \le x \text{ and } A[k] \ne x \} \} 
      \{\{A[j] < x \text{ for any } 0 \le j < k+1\}\}
 k = k + 1;
{{ A[j] < x for any 0 ≤ j < k }}
                                                Step 1: What facts need proof?
                                                       Only A[k] < x
   \{\{ A[j] < x \text{ for any } 0 \le j < k \} \}
                                                 Already know A[j] < x for j = 0 ... k-1
return false;
```

```
Step 2: A[k] < x follows from A[k] \le x and A[k] \ne x
```

### **Loops Invariants with Arrays**

- Loop invariants often have lots of facts
  - recursion has fewer
- Much of the work is just keeping track of them
  - "dynamic programs" (421) are often like this
  - common to need to write these down

more likely to see line-by-line reasoning on hard problems



Implications btw "for any" facts are proven in two steps:

- **1.** Figure out what facts are <u>not</u> already known
- 2. Prove just those "new" facts

Another Example:

{{  $A[j] < x \text{ for any } 0 < j < k }$ } versus {{  $A[j] < x \text{ for any } 0 \le j < k }$ } - only need to prove A[0] < x • Loop invariant is often a weakening of postcondition

 $\{\{ \text{Inv: } s = sum(A[0 ... j - 1]) \text{ and } j \le A. \text{length } \} \}$  sum of array  $\{\{ \text{Post: } s = sum(A[0 ... n - 1]) \} \}$ 

 $\{\{ Inv: contains(A[0 .. j - 1], x) = F \} \}$  search an array  $\{\{ Post: contains(A[0 .. n - 1], x) = F \} \}$ 

 $\{ \{ \text{Inv: } A[j] < x \text{ for any } 0 \le j < k \} \}$  search a  $\{ \{ \text{Post: } A[j] \ne x \text{ for any } 0 \le j < n \} \}$  sorted array

#### **Loop Invariants**

- Algorithm Idea includes
  - how you will get form start to stop state
  - what partial progress looks like
- Algorithm Idea formalized in
  - invariant
  - progress step (e.g., j = j + 1)



In 331, expect you to (eventually) be able to

- **1.** Write invariant that is a simple weakening of postcondition
  - problems of lower complexity
- 2. Write the code, given the invariant
  - problems of moderate complexity
- 3. Check correctness, given code with invariant
  - problems of higher complexity
  - (not possible without invariant)

- In 331, expect you to (eventually) be able to
  - **1.** Write invariant that is a simple weakening of postcondition
    - problems of lower complexity
    - typical examples:

 $\{\{ \text{Inv: } s = sum(A[0 .. j - 1]) \text{ and } j \le A.length \} \}$  sum of array  $\{\{ \text{Post: } s = sum(A[0 .. n - 1]) \} \}$ 

 $\{\{ Inv: contains(A[0 .. j - 1], x) = F \} \}$  search an array  $\{\{ Post: contains(A[0 .. n - 1], x) = F \} \}$ 

### From Invariant to Code (Problem Type 2)

- Algorithm Idea formalized in
  - invariant
  - progress step (e.g., j = j + 1)

From invariant to code:

- 1. Write code before loop to make Inv hold initially
- 2. Write code inside loop to make Inv hold again
- 3. Choose exit so that "Inv and not cond" implies postcondition

Ρ

Ι

Q

#### Max of an Array (Problem Type 2)

- Calculate a number "m" that is the max in array  $\boldsymbol{A}$
- Use the following invariant:
  - m is the maximum of A[0 ... k-1], i.e.,

| $A[j] \le m \text{ for any } 0 \le j < k$ | m <b>is bigger than</b> A[0],, A[k-1] |
|---|---------------------------------------|
| $A[j] = m \text{ for some } 0 \le j < k$  | m <b>is one of</b> A[0],, A[k-1]      |

- Invariant references "m" and " $k\sp{"}$ 
  - these will be variables in the code

```
{{ Pre: n = A.length > 0 }}
let k: number = ...
let m: number = ...
    What's an easy way to make this hold?
    m = A[0] and k = 1

{{ Inv: A[j] ≤ m for any 0 ≤ j < k and A[j] = m for some 0 ≤ j < k }}
while (______) {
    ...
}
{{ Post: A[j] ≤ m for any 0 ≤ j < n and A[j] = m for some 0 ≤ j < n }}
return m;</pre>
```

return m;

return m;

```
{{ Pre: n = A.length > 0 }}
let k: number = 1;
let m: number = A[0];
{{ Inv: A[j] ≤ m for any 0 ≤ j < k and A[j] = m for some 0 ≤ j < k }}
while (k !== n) {
    ...
        k = k + 1;
    }
{{ Post: A[j] ≤ m for any 0 ≤ j < n and A[j] = m for some 0 ≤ j < n }}</pre>
```

{{ **Post**:  $A[j] \le m$  for any  $0 \le j < n$  and A[j] = m for some  $0 \le j < n$  }} return m;

```
{{ Pre: n = A.length > 0 }}
let k: number = 1;
let m: number = A[0];

{{ Inv: A[j] ≤ m for any 0 ≤ j < k and A[j] = m for some 0 ≤ j < k }}
while (k !== n) {
    {{ {{ [[j] ≤ m for any 0 ≤ j < k and A[j] = m for some 0 ≤ j < k }}
    ...
    {{ [[A[j] ≤ m for any 0 ≤ j < k+1 and A[j] = m for some 0 ≤ j < k+1 }}
    k = k + 1;
    {{ [[A[j] ≤ m for any 0 ≤ j < k and A[j] = m for some 0 ≤ j < k }}
}</pre>
```

{{ Post:  $A[j] \le m$  for any  $0 \le j < n$  and A[j] = m for some  $0 \le j < n$  }} return m;

#### Max of an Array (Problem Type 2)

 $\{\{A[j] \le m \text{ for any } 0 \le j < k \text{ and } A[j] = m \text{ for some } 0 \le j < k \}\}$ 

 $\{\{A[j] \le m \text{ for any } 0 \le j < k+1 \text{ and } A[j] = m \text{ for some } 0 \le j < k+1 \}\}$ 

Step 1: What facts are new in the bottom assertion?

Just  $A[k] \le m$ 

•••

Note that second part is weakened from A[j] = m for some  $0 \le j < k$ to A[j] = m for some  $0 \le j < k+1$ 

Now, we can have A[k] = m, when we couldn't before.

What code do we write to ensure  $A[k] \le m$ ?

```
while (k != n) {
    {{ (A[j] ≤ m for any 0 ≤ j < k and A[j] = m for some 0 ≤ j < k }}
    if (A[k] > m)
        m = A[k];
    {{ (A[j] ≤ m for any 0 ≤ j < k+1 and A[j] = m for some 0 ≤ j < k+1 }}
    k = k + 1;
}</pre>
```

Step 1: What facts are new in the bottom assertion?

Just  $A[k] \le m$ 

Else branch happens if  $A[k] \le m$ 

Then branch makes that true by setting m = A[k]Still have A[j] = m for some j, namely, j = k

```
{{ Pre: n = A.length > 0 }}
let k: number = 0;
let m: number = A[0];

{{ Inv: A[j] ≤ m for any 0 ≤ j < k and A[j] = m for some 0 ≤ j < k }}
while (k != n) {
    if (A[k] > m)
        m = A[k];
    k = k + 1;
    }
```

{{ Post:  $A[j] \le m$  for any  $0 \le j < n$  and A[j] = m for some  $0 \le j < n$  }} return m;

In 331, expect you to (eventually) be able to

- **1.** Write invariant that is a simple weakening of postcondition
  - problems of lower complexity
- 2. Write the code, given the invariant
  - problems of moderate complexity
- 3. Check correctness, given code with invariant
  - problems of higher complexity
  - (not possible without invariant)

#### Searching a Sorted Array (Take Two)



• End with complete knowledge of A[j] vs x

– how can we describe partial knowledge?

