CSE 331 Software Design & Implementation

Autumn 2025 Section 8 – Arrays

Administrivia

- HW8 released tonight Due @ 6pm Friday
- There WILL be section next Tuesday before the break!
- Quiz on Monday Dec 1st is moved to Wednesday
 Dec 3rd





Array Notation: Indexing

- Arrays are treated like Lists mathematically
 - They are an alternative way to represent Lists in code
- To get the jth element, use at(j, L), abbreviated "L[j]" at : (List, ℕ) → ℤ
 at(nil, n) := undefined
 at(x :: L, 0) := x
 at(x :: L, n+1) := at(L, n)
 - Must ensure that 0 <= j < n

More Array Notation

- Prefix: All elements from the start to j:
 - A[...j]
- Suffix: All elements starting at j to the end:
 - A[j…]
- Sublist: All elements in the array from i to j:
 - A[i...j]

Other useful facts:

- A[len(A)...] = nil
- A[...-1] = nil
- A[...j-1] + A[j] = A[...j]
- -A[...j-1] + A[i...] = A
- A[...len(A)-1] = A

For Any Facts

- Necessary facts about arbitrary parts of an array
- Ex: To show an array is sorted in asc formally:
 - A[j] < A[j+1] for any $0 \le j \le len(A) 2$

```
// @requires A[i] < A[i+1] for any 0 <= i < len(A)-1
// @returns false if A[i] /= y for any 0 <= i < len(A)
// true otherwise
public boolean bsearch(int[] A, int y) { ... }</pre>
```

Array Mutation

- Array mutation can change "for any" facts!
- Ex:

```
\{\{A[j] < A[j+1] \text{ for any } 0 \le j \le 9 \}\}

A[0] = 100;

\{\{(A[j] < A[j+1] \text{ for any } 1 \le j \le 9) \text{ and } A[0] = 100 \}\}
```

- Old facts about A[0] could be invalidated!
 - Need to update the range of "for any" facts

Mutating Arrays (add/remove)

Can add to the end of an array

```
{{A}}

A.push(100);

{{A_0 and A = A_0 # [100]}}

{{A}}

A.push(100);

{{A}}
```

Can remove from the end of an array

```
{{A}}

A.remove(A.size()-1);

{{A_0 and

A = A_0[..len(A_0) - 2]}}

{{A[..len(A) - 2]}}

A.remove(A.size()-1);

{{A}}
```

The function replace : (List, y, z) \rightarrow List is defined by

```
\begin{split} \operatorname{replace}(\operatorname{nil},y,z) &:= \operatorname{nil} \\ \operatorname{replace}(x :: L,y,z) &:= z :: \operatorname{replace}(L,y,z) \quad \text{if } x = y \\ \operatorname{replace}(x :: L,y,z) &:= x :: \operatorname{replace}(L,y,z) \quad \text{if } x \neq y \end{split}
```

In this problem, we will prove that replace works the same way at the end of the list that it does at the front of the list, i.e.:

$$\operatorname{replace}(L + [x], y, z) = \operatorname{replace}(L, y, z) + [z] \quad \text{if } x = y$$

$$\operatorname{replace}(L + [x], y, z) = \operatorname{replace}(L, y, z) + [x] \quad \text{if } x \neq y$$

a) Explain, in your own words, why the following statement, if proven, would imply the one above:

$$\mathsf{replace}(L + [x], y, z) = \mathsf{replace}(L, y, z) + \mathsf{replace}([x], y, z)$$

If x = y, then replace([x], y, z) = [z] by the definition of replace, and if $x \neq y$, then replace([x], y, z) = [x] by the definition of replace.

claim from a: replace(L + [x], y, z) = replace(L, y, z) + replace([x], y, z)

b) Explain, in your own words, why the following claim, if proven, would imply the one from part (a):

$$replace(L + R, y, z) = replace(L, y, z) + replace(R, y, z)$$

Setting R = [x] gives the claim from part (a).

c) Prove the claim from part (b) by induction on \underline{L} .

$$\mathsf{replace}(L +\!\!\!/ R, y, z) = \mathsf{replace}(L, y, z) +\!\!\!\!/ \mathsf{replace}(R, y, z)$$

Define P(L) to be the claim $\operatorname{replace}(L + R, y, z) = \operatorname{replace}(L, y, z) + \operatorname{replace}(R, y, z)$. We will prove that this holds for all values of L by induction.

Base Case. We can see that P(nil) holds as follows:

```
\begin{split} \mathsf{replace}(\mathsf{nil} + R, y, z) &= \mathsf{replace}(R, y, z) \\ &= \mathsf{nil} + \mathsf{replace}(R, y, z) \\ &= \mathsf{replace}(\mathsf{nil}, y, z) + \mathsf{replace}(R, y, z) \quad \mathsf{def of replace} \end{split}
```

Inductive Hypothesis. Suppose that P(L) holds for some arbitrary L.

Inductive Step. We must show that P(w::L) holds for any w so we will continue by cases:

```
Suppose that w=y. Then, we can see that  \begin{aligned} &\operatorname{replace}((w::L) + R, y, z) \\ &= z :: \operatorname{replace}(L + R, y, z) & \operatorname{def of replace (since } w = y) \\ &= z :: (\operatorname{replace}(L, y, z) + \operatorname{replace}(R, y, z)) & \operatorname{Ind. Hyp.} \\ &= (z :: \operatorname{replace}(L, y, z)) + \operatorname{replace}(R, y, z) \\ &= \operatorname{replace}(w :: L, y, z) + \operatorname{replace}(R, y, z) & \operatorname{def of replace (since } w = y) \end{aligned}
```

Inductive Step. We must show that P(w::L) holds for any w so we will continue by cases:

Now, suppose that $w \neq y$. Then, we can see that

```
\begin{split} \operatorname{replace}((w::L) & \# R, y, z) \\ & = w :: \operatorname{replace}(L + R, y, z) & \operatorname{def of replace (since } w \neq y) \\ & = w :: (\operatorname{replace}(L, y, z) + \operatorname{replace}(R, y, z)) & \operatorname{Ind. Hyp.} \\ & = (w :: \operatorname{replace}(L, y, z)) + \operatorname{replace}(R, y, z) & \operatorname{def of replace (since } w \neq y) \\ & = \operatorname{replace}(w :: L, y, z) + \operatorname{replace}(R, y, z) & \operatorname{def of replace (since } w \neq y) \end{split}
```

Since these two cases are exhaustive, we have proven P(w::L) holds in general.

Conclusion. P(L) holds for all L by induction.

```
/**
     * Writes over each copy of y in A with the value z.
     * @param A .. y .. z ..
    * @modifies A
     * Qeffects A = replace(A_0, y, z)
     */
   public void replace(int[] A, int y, int z) { .. }
a)
      int i = _____
      // Inv: A[...i] = A_0[...i] and A[i+1...] = replace(A_0[i+1...], y, z)
      while (_____) {
      }
```

```
/**
   * Writes over each copy of y in A with the value z.
   * @param A .. y .. z ..
   * @modifies A
   * Qeffects A = replace(A_0, y, z)
   */
  public void replace(int[] A, int y, int z) { .. }
int i = A.length - 1;
// Inv: A[..i] = A_0[..i] and A[i+1..] = replace(A_0[i+1..], y, z)
while (i \ge 0) {
     if (A[i] == y)
         A[i] = z;
    i = i - 1;
```

b)

}

```
/**
 * Writes over each copy of y in A with the value z.
 * @param A .. y .. z ..
 * @modifies A
 * Qeffects A = replace(A_0, y, z)
 */
public void replace(int[] A, int y, int z) { .. }
   int i = _____
   // Inv: A[.. i-1] = replace(A_0[.. i-1], y, z) and A[i ..] = A_0[i ..]
   while (_____) {
```

```
/**
    * Writes over each copy of y in A with the value z.
    * @param A .. y .. z ..
    * @modifies A
    * Qeffects A = replace(A_0, y, z)
    */
   public void replace(int[] A, int y, int z) { .. }
int i = 0;
// Inv: A[.. i-1] = replace(A_0[.. i-1], y, z) and A[i ..] = A_0[i ..]
while (i < A.length) {
        if (A[i] == y)
            A[i] = z;
        i = i + 1;
```

Recall the function remove : (List, y) \rightarrow List defined as follows:

```
\begin{aligned} \mathsf{remove}(\mathsf{nil},y) &:= \mathsf{nil} \\ \mathsf{remove}(x :: L,y) &:= \mathsf{remove}(L,y) & \text{if } x = y \\ \mathsf{remove}(x :: L,y) &:= x :: \mathsf{remove}(L,y) & \text{if } x \neq y \end{aligned}
```

It is possible to prove, as the same manner as we did in Task 1, that the following holds:

```
\mathsf{remove}(L + [x], y) = \mathsf{remove}(L, y) \qquad \text{if } x = y \mathsf{remove}(L + [x], y) = \mathsf{remove}(L, y) + [x] \quad \mathsf{if } x \neq y
```

You can use these facts below without proof. Refer to them as "Lemma 2".

In this problem, we will check the correctness of the following code that implements remove. Specifically, it writes $\operatorname{remove}(A,y)$ into some prefix of the array, A[...j-1], and returns j.

```
int i = 0;
int j = 0;
\{\{ \text{Inv}: A[..j-1] = \text{remove}(A[..i-1], y) \text{ and } A[i..] = A_0[i..] \} \}
while (i != A.length) {
 if (A[i] == y) {
     \{\!\{P_2\colon
 } else {
     \{\{P_3: \underline{\hspace{1cm}}\}\}
    \{\!\{\,Q_3\colon
    A[j] = A[i];
     j = j + 1;
 i = i + 1;
\{\{ \text{Post: } A[..j-1] = \text{remove}(A, y) \} \}
return j;
```

a) Fill in P_1 using forward reasoning and then prove that P_1 implies Inv.

 P_1 should say that i=0 and j=0 (and $A=A_0$ if you want).

The second fact of Inv holds since

$$A[i..]$$
 $= A[0..]$ $= A$
 $= A$
 $= A_0$ $= A_0[0..]$ $= A_0[i..]$ $= A_0[i..]$ $= 0$

a) Fill in P_1 using forward reasoning and then prove that P_1 implies Inv.

 P_1 should say that i=0 and j=0 (and $A=A_0$ if you want).

The first fact of Inv holds since

$$A[...j-1] = A[...0-1]$$
 since $j=0$
 $= \operatorname{nil}$
 $= \operatorname{remove}(\operatorname{nil},y)$ def of remove
 $= \operatorname{remove}(A[...-1],y)$
 $= \operatorname{remove}(A[...i-1],y)$ since $i=0$

```
 \{\!\!\{\, P_4 \colon \underline{\hspace{1cm}} \}\!\!\}   \{\!\!\{\, \mathsf{Post} \colon A[..\,j-1] = \mathsf{remove}(A,y) \,\}\!\!\}   \mathsf{return} \ \mathsf{j} \ ;
```

b) Fill in P_4 using forward reasoning and then prove that P_4 implies the postcondition.

 P_4 should say $A[...j-1]=\mathsf{remove}(A[...i-1],y)$ and $A[i...]=A_0[i...]$ and $i=\mathsf{len}(A)$. This gives us the postcondition since

```
\begin{split} A[..\,j-1] &= \mathsf{remove}(A[..\,i-1],y) & \mathsf{since}\ A[..\,j-1] &= \mathsf{remove}(A[..\,i-1],y) \\ &= \mathsf{remove}(A[..\,\mathsf{len}(A)-1],y) & \mathsf{since}\ i &= \mathsf{len}(A) \\ &= \mathsf{remove}(A,y) \end{split}
```

if (A[i] == y) {
$$\{\!\!\{ P_2 \colon \underline{\hspace{1cm}} \}\!\!\}$$

$$\{\!\!\{ Q_2 \colon \underline{\hspace{1cm}} \}\!\!\}$$

c) Fill in P_2 using forward reasoning and Q_2 using backward. Then, prove that P_2 implies Q_2 .

```
P_2 should say A[...j-1] = \operatorname{remove}(A[...i-1],y), \ A[i..] = A_0[i..], \ \operatorname{and} \ A[i] = y. Q_2 should say A[...j-1] = \operatorname{remove}(A[...i],y) and A[i+1..] = A_0[i+1..].
```

The second part of Q_2 is implied by the second fact from P_2 (since A[i+1..] is a sublist of A[i..]). The first fact follows since

$$\begin{split} A[..\,j-1] &= \mathsf{remove}(A[..\,i-1],y) \\ &= \mathsf{remove}(A[..\,i-1] +\!\!\!\!+ [A[i]],y) \quad \mathsf{Lemma 2 (since } y = A[i]) \\ &= \mathsf{remove}(A[..\,i],y) \end{split}$$

```
\{\{P_3: ____ \}\}
```

d) Fill in P_3 using forward reasoning and Q_3 using backward. Then, prove that P_3 implies Q_3 .

```
P_3 should say A[..j-1] = \text{remove}(A[..i-1],y), A[i..] = A_0[i..], and A[i] \neq y. Q_3 should say A[..j-1] + [A[i]] = \text{remove}(A[..i],y) and A[i+1..] = A_0[i+1..].
```

The second part of Q_3 is implied by the second fact from P_3 (since A[i+1..] is a sublist of A[i..]). The first fact follows since

```
\begin{split} A[..\,j-1] + [A[i]] \\ &= \mathsf{remove}(A[..\,i-1],y) + [A[i]] \quad \mathsf{since} \ A[..\,j-1] = \mathsf{remove}(A[..\,i-1],y) \\ &= \mathsf{remove}(A[..\,i-1] + [A[i]],y) \quad \mathsf{Lemma} \ 2 \ (\mathsf{since} \ y \neq A[i]) \\ &= \mathsf{remove}(A[..\,i],y) \end{split}
```