## **Loops and invariants**

#### CSE 331 University of Washington

**Michael Ernst** 

# **Reasoning about loops**

A loop represents an unknown number of paths Case analysis is problematic Recursion presents the same problem as loops

Cannot enumerate all paths

This is what makes testing and reasoning hard Things to prove about a loop:

- 1. It computes the correct value
- 2. It terminates (no infinite loop)

# Reasoning about loops: values and termination

```
// assert x ≥ 0 & y = 0
while (x != y) {
    y = y + 1;
}
// assert x = y
```

Does "x=y" hold after this loop?

Does this loop terminate?

```
1) Pre-assertion guarantees that x \ge y
```

2) Every time through loop

```
x \ge y holds at the test – and if body is entered, x > y
```

y is incremented by 1

x is unchanged

Therefore, y is closer to x (but  $x \ge y$  still holds)

- 3) Since there are only a finite number of integers between x and y, y will eventually equal x
- 4) Execution exits the loop as soon as x = y (but  $x \ge y$  still holds)

# **Understanding loops by induction**

We just made an inductive argument

Inducting over the *number of iterations* 

Computation induction

Show that conjecture holds if zero iterations

Show that it holds after *n*+1 iterations

(assuming that it holds after *n* iterations)

Two things to prove

- Some property is preserved (known as "partial correctness"), if the code terminates
   Loop invariant is preserved by each iteration, if the iteration completes
- 2. The loop completes (known as "termination") The "decrementing function" is reduced by each iteration and cannot be reduced forever

# How to choose a loop invariant, LI

```
{P}
while (b) S;
{Q}
```

Find an invariant, LI, such that

- 1.  $P \Rightarrow LI$  // true initially
- 2. { LI & b } S { LI } // true if the loop executes once
- 3. (LI &  $\neg$ b)  $\Rightarrow$  Q // establishes the postcondition

Finding the invariant is the key to reasoning about loops

- Fact: For any loop and pre/post conditions it satisfies, there exists a loop invariant sufficient to prove them (Equivalently: inductive assertions is a "complete method of
  - proof")
- (We will not yet prove loop termination; it is sufficient to know that if loop terminates, Q will hold.)

#### Loop invariant for the example

```
// assert x ≥ 0 & y = 0
while (x != y) {
    y = y + 1;
}
// assert x = y
```

```
A suitable invariant:

LI = x \ge y
```

```
1. x \ge 0 & y = 0 \Rightarrow L// true initially2. {Ll & x \ne y } y = y+1; {Ll } // true if the loop executes once3. (Ll & \neg(x \ne y)) \Rightarrow x = y // establishes the postcondition
```

## Termination

#### via reduction to natural numbers

Total correctness = partial correctness + termination We have not established that the loop terminates Suppose that the loop always reduces some variable's value. Does the loop terminate if the variable is a

- Natural number?
- Integer?
- Non-negative real number?
- Boolean?
- ArrayList?

The loop terminates if:

- each variable value maps to a natural number, and
- the number decreases on each iteration

# **Well-ordered sets**

We don't *have* to use the natural numbers

- The loop terminates if the variable values are, or can be mapped to, (a subset of) a wellordered set
  - Ordered set
  - Every non-empty subset has a least element
- The natural numbers are the best choice

# **Decrementing function**

#### Decrementing function D(X)

Maps state (program variables) to a natural number

#### Consider: while (b) S;

We seek D(X), where X is the state, such that

- 1. An execution of the loop reduces the function's value:
  {1. & b } S { D(X ) < D(X ) }</p>
  - { LI & b } S {  $D(X_{post}) < D(X_{pre})$  }
- 2. If the function's value is minimal, the loop terminates:
  (LI & D(X) = 0) ⇒ ¬b

## **Proving termination**

```
// assert x ≥ 0 & y = 0
// Loop invariant: x ≥ y
// Loop decrements: (x-y)
while (x != y) {
    y = y + 1;
}
// assert x = y
```

Is this a good decrementing function?

Does the loop reduce the decrementing function's value?
 // assert (y ≠ x); let d<sub>pre</sub> = (x-y)
 y = y + 1;
 // assert (x<sub>post</sub> - y<sub>post</sub>) < d<sub>pre</sub>
 If the function has minimum value, does the loop exit?

```
(x \ge y \And x - y = 0) \Longrightarrow (x = y)
```

# **Choosing loop invariants**

For non-looping code, the wp (weakest precondition) function enables proofs

For loops, you have to guess:

The loop invariant

The decrementing function

Then, use reasoning techniques to prove the goal property If the proof doesn't work:

Maybe you chose a bad invariant or decrementing function Choose another and try again

Maybe the loop is incorrect

Fix the code

Automatically choosing loop invariants is a research topic

# When to use code proofs for loops

Most of your loops need no proofs

for (String name : friends) { ... }

When you are unsure about a loop,

write loop invariants and decrementing functions

If a loop is not working:

Add invariant and decrementing function if missing

Write code to check them

Understand why the code doesn't work

Reason to ensure that no similar bugs remain

#### **Example: Factorial**

{ n≥0 ∧ t=n } r=1; n≥0 ∧ t=n ∧ r=1 while  $(n \neq 0)$  {  $r=t!/n! \land t \ge n \ge 0$ r=r\*n; r=t!/(n-1)! ∧ t≥n>0 n=n-1; $r=t!/n! \land t \ge n \ge 0$ } { r=t! }

#### **Example: Quotient and remainder**

#### **Example: Greatest common divisor**

```
\{x1 > 0 \land x2 > 0\}
y1:=x1;
y2:=x2;
while (y1≠y2) do
  if y_1>y_2
     then y1 := y1-y2
     else y2 := y2-y1
\{ y1 = gcd(x1,x2) \}
                   Recall: if y1,y2 are both positive integers, then:
                     If y1>y2 then gcd(y1,y2)=gcd(y1-y2,y2)
                     If y2>y1 then gcd(y1,y2)=gcd(y1,y2-y1)
                   • If y1-y2 then gcd(y1,y2)=y1=y2
```

# Invariants help you write code as well as prove it correct

Dutch National Flag problem: Given an array containing balls of three colors, arrange them with like colors together and in the right order



- Precondition:
- Postcondition:
- Loop invariant:



