

Sample Midterm Questions (CS 477 Spring 2013)

1. Give truth tables for each subformula of the following formulae:

(a) $\varphi_1 : A \Rightarrow A \wedge (A \vee B)$

A	B	$A \vee B$	$A \wedge (A \vee B)$	φ_1
T	T	T	T	T
T	F	T	T	T
F	T	T	F	T
F	F	F	F	T

(b) $\varphi_2 : ((A \vee C) \wedge (B \vee C)) \Rightarrow ((A \wedge B) \vee C)$

A	B	C	$A \vee C$	$B \vee C$	$(A \vee C) \wedge (B \vee C)$	$A \wedge B$	$(A \wedge B) \vee C$	φ_2
T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T
T	T	F	T	T	T	T	T	T
T	F	T	T	T	T	F	T	T
T	F	F	T	F	F	F	F	T
F	T	T	T	T	T	F	T	T
F	T	F	F	T	F	F	F	T
F	F	T	T	T	T	F	T	T
F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	T

(c) $\varphi_3 : (A \Rightarrow B) \Rightarrow ((B \Rightarrow C) \Rightarrow (A \Rightarrow C))$

A	B	C	$A \Rightarrow B$	$B \Rightarrow C$	$A \Rightarrow C$	$(B \Rightarrow C) \Rightarrow (A \Rightarrow C)$	φ_3
T	T	T	T	T	T	T	T
T	T	F	T	F	F	T	T
T	F	T	F	T	T	T	T
T	F	F	F	T	F	F	T
F	T	T	T	T	T	T	T
F	T	F	F	F	T	T	T
F	F	T	T	T	T	T	T
F	F	F	F	T	T	T	T

2. Give Natural Deduction proof trees for each of the above propositions.

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{\overline{\{A\} \vdash A} \text{ HYP}}{\{A\} \vdash A} \text{ HYP} \quad \frac{\overline{\{A\} \vdash A} \text{ HYP} \quad \overline{\{A\} \vdash A} \text{ HYP}}{\{A\} \vdash A \vee B} \text{ OR}_L \text{ I}}{\{A\} \vdash A \wedge (A \vee B)} \text{ AND I}}{\{\} \vdash A \Rightarrow A \wedge (A \vee B)} \text{ IMP I}$$

Let $\Gamma_1 = \{(A \vee C) \wedge (B \vee C), A \vee C\}$ and $\Gamma_2 = \Gamma_1 \cup \{A, B \vee C\}$ in

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{\overline{\{(A \vee C) \wedge (B \vee C)\} \vdash (A \vee C) \wedge (B \vee C)} \text{ HYP}}{\{(A \vee C) \wedge (B \vee C)\} \vdash (A \vee C) \wedge (B \vee C)} \text{ HYP} \quad \frac{\overline{\Gamma_1 \vdash A \vee C} \text{ HYP} \quad P_1 \quad \frac{\overline{\Gamma_1 \cup \{C\} \vdash C} \text{ HYP}}{\Gamma_1 \cup \{C\} \vdash (A \wedge B) \vee C} \text{ OR}_{RR} \text{ I}}{\Gamma_1 \vdash (A \wedge B) \vee C} \text{ OR}_E}}{\{(A \vee C) \wedge (B \vee C)\} \vdash (A \wedge B) \vee C} \text{ AND}_L \text{ E}}{\{\} \vdash ((A \vee C) \wedge (B \vee C)) \Rightarrow ((A \wedge B) \vee C)} \text{ IMP I}$$

where $P_1 =$

$$\frac{\frac{\overline{\Gamma_1 \cup \{A\} \vdash (A \vee C) \wedge (B \vee C)} \text{ HYP} \quad \frac{\overline{\Gamma_2 \vdash B \vee C} \text{ HYP} \quad \frac{\frac{\overline{\Gamma_2 \cup \{B\} \vdash A} \text{ HYP} \quad \overline{\Gamma_2 \cup \{B\} \vdash B} \text{ HYP}}{\Gamma_2 \cup \{B\} \vdash (A \wedge B)} \text{ AND I}}{\Gamma_2 \cup \{B\} \vdash (A \wedge B) \vee C} \text{ OR}_L \text{ I}}{\Gamma_2 \vdash (A \wedge B) \vee C} \text{ OR}_E}}{\Gamma_1 \cup \{A\} \vdash (A \wedge B) \vee C} \text{ AND}_R \text{ E}}$$

Finally, let $\Gamma_1 = \{A \Rightarrow B, B \Rightarrow C\}$ in

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{\overline{\Gamma_1 \cup \{A\} \vdash A \Rightarrow B} \text{ HYP} \quad \overline{\Gamma_1 \cup \{A\} \vdash A} \text{ HYP}}{\Gamma_1 \cup \{A\} \vdash A} \text{ HYP} \quad \frac{\overline{\Gamma_1 \cup \{A, B\} \vdash B \Rightarrow C} \text{ HYP} \quad \overline{\Gamma_1 \cup \{A, B\} \vdash B} \text{ HYP}}{\Gamma_1 \cup \{A, B\} \vdash C} \text{ HYP}}{\Gamma_1 \cup \{A\} \vdash C} \text{ IMP E}}{\Gamma_1 \vdash A \Rightarrow C} \text{ IMP I}}{\{A \Rightarrow B\} \vdash (B \Rightarrow C) \Rightarrow (A \Rightarrow C)} \text{ IMP I}}{\{\} \vdash (A \Rightarrow B) \Rightarrow ((B \Rightarrow C) \Rightarrow (A \Rightarrow C))} \text{ IMP I}$$

3. Consider the signature $\mathcal{G} = (V = \{x, y, z\}, F = \emptyset, af = \emptyset, R = \{<\}, ar = \{< \mapsto 2\})$, and the structure $S = \{\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{D} = \mathbb{N}, \mathcal{F}, \phi, \mathcal{R}, \rho\}$ where $\rho(<)$ is normal less-than comparison. Given the formula $\forall y. y < x \Rightarrow (\forall z. \neg(z < y))$:

(a) give an assignment that satisfies the formula, and explain why it does.

Any assignment that assigns 1 to x will do, since the only $y < 1$ is 0, and there is no $z < 0$ in \mathbb{N} . Any assignment that assigns 0 to x will also work, since there is no $y < 0$, making the implication vacuously true.

(b) give an assignment that falsifies the formula, and explain why it does.

Any assignment that assigns a number greater than 1 to x will do, since we can then choose $y < x$ such that $y > 0$, and then choose 0 for z to falsify the formula.

4. Give a Natural Deduction proof for the formula $(\exists x. \forall y. r(x, y)) \Rightarrow (\forall y. \exists x. r(x, y))$

	$\frac{\{\exists x. \forall y. r(x, y), \forall y. r(x, y)\} \vdash \forall y. r(x, y)}{\text{HYP}}$	$\frac{\{\exists x. \forall y. r(x, y), \forall y. r(x, y), r(x, y)\} \vdash r(x, y)}{\text{HYP}}$	
	$\{\exists x. \forall y. r(x, y), \forall y. r(x, y)\} \vdash r(x, y)$		ALL E
	$\{\exists x. \forall y. r(x, y), \forall y. r(x, y)\} \vdash \exists x. r(x, y)$		EX I
$\{\exists x. \forall y. r(x, y)\} \vdash \exists x. \forall y. r(x, y)$	$\{\exists x. \forall y. r(x, y), \forall y. r(x, y)\} \vdash \forall y. \exists x. r(x, y)$		ALL I
	$\{\exists x. \forall y. r(x, y)\} \vdash \forall y. \exists x. r(x, y)$		EX E
	$\{\} \vdash (\exists x. \forall y. r(x, y)) \Rightarrow (\forall y. \exists x. r(x, y))$		IMP I

5. Prove the following Hoare triple:

$$\{n \geq 1\} f := 1; i := n; \text{ while } i > 1 \text{ do } (f := f * i; i := i - 1) \{f = n!\}$$

By Precondition Strengthening, it suffices to show that

$$\{n \geq 1 \wedge 1 = n!/n!\} f := 1; i := n; \text{ while } i > 1 \text{ do } (f := f * i; i := i - 1) \{f = n!\}$$

The reason for this rather strange precondition will become clear when we reach the **while** loop. Using the Sequencing rule and the Assignment Rule, we can show that

$$\{n \geq 1 \wedge 1 = n!/n!\} f := 1 \{n \geq 1 \wedge f = n!/n!\}$$

and

$$\{n \geq 1 \wedge f = n!/n!\} i := n \{i \geq 1 \wedge f = n!/i!\}$$

leaving us with the remaining triple

$$\{i \geq 1 \wedge f = n!/i!\} \text{ while } i > 1 \text{ do } (f := f * i; i := i - 1) \{f = n!\}$$

By Postcondition Weakening, it is sufficient to show that

$$\{i \geq 1 \wedge f = n!/i!\} \text{ while } i > 1 \text{ do } (f := f * i; i := i - 1) \{i \geq 1 \wedge f = n!/i! \wedge i \leq 1\}$$

since $i \geq 1 \wedge i \leq 1$ implies that $i = 1$, and $n!/1! = n!$. Now we can use the While rule: by showing that

$$\{i \geq 1 \wedge f = n!/i! \wedge i > 1\} f := f * i; i := i - 1 \{i \geq 1 \wedge f = n!/i!\}$$

we will have verified the original triple. $i > 1$ implies that $i - 1 \geq 1$, and $f = n!/i!$ implies that $f * i = n!/(i - 1)!$, so by Precondition Strengthening, this is equivalent to showing that

$$\{i - 1 \geq 1 \wedge f * i = n!/(i - 1)!\} f := f * i; i := i - 1 \{i \geq 1 \wedge f = n!/i!\}$$

Now, by the Assignment rule we show that

$$\{i - 1 \geq 1 \wedge f * i = n!/(i - 1)!\} f := f * i \{i - 1 \geq 1 \wedge f = n!/(i - 1)!\}$$

and

$$\{i - 1 \geq 1 \wedge f = n!/(i - 1)!\} i := i - 1 \{i \geq 1 \wedge f = n!/i!\}$$

and use the Sequencing Rules to combine these two steps, completing the proof.

6. Give a Floyd-Hoare rule for the command **repeat** C **until** B , which repeatedly executes C until B is true. Note that B is checked *after* each execution of C , so that C is always executed at least once.

The simplest correct rule is:

$$\frac{\{P\}C\{Q\} \quad \{Q \wedge \neg B\}C\{Q\}}{\{P\}\mathbf{repeat} C \mathbf{until} B\{Q \wedge B\}}$$

More complicated solutions are possible; the rules are correct as long as they reflect the fact that **repeat** C **until** $B = C$; **while** $\neg B$ **do** C .

7. Calculate weakest preconditions and verification conditions for the following Hoare triples:

- (a) $\{n \geq 1\} f := 1; i := n; \mathbf{while} i > 1 \mathbf{do} (f := f * i; i := i - 1) \{f = n!\}$

First, we have to annotate the loop with its loop invariant, $P = (i \geq 1 \wedge f = n!/i!)$. Now: $wp(\mathbf{while} i > 1 \mathbf{inv} P \mathbf{do} (f := f * i; i := i - 1)) \{f = n!\} = P$, $wp(i := n; \mathbf{while} i > 1 \mathbf{inv} P \mathbf{do} (f := f * i; i := i - 1)) \{f = n!\} = wp(i := n) P = P[i \Rightarrow n]$, and the weakest precondition for the entire program is $P[i \Rightarrow n, f \Rightarrow 1] = (n \geq 1 \wedge 1 = n!/n!)$ (which you might recognize from the proof above).

For verification conditions, since the conditions generated by a sequence of assignment statements is **true**, the conditions for the entire program are equal to $vcg(\mathbf{while} i > 1 \mathbf{inv} P \mathbf{do} (f := f * i; i := i - 1)) \{f = n!\} = ((P \wedge i > 1) \Rightarrow wp C P) \wedge (vcg C P) \wedge ((P \wedge i \leq 1) \Rightarrow (f = n!))$, where C is the loop body. $wp C P$ is $P[f \Rightarrow f * i][i \Rightarrow i - 1]$, and $vcg C P$ is **true**, so the above is equivalent to $((P \wedge i > 1) \Rightarrow P[f \Rightarrow f * i][i \Rightarrow i - 1]) \wedge ((P \wedge i \leq 1) \Rightarrow (f = n!))$.

- (b) $\{a > 0 \wedge b > 0\}$

$m := a; n := b;$

while $n \neq m$ **do** (**if** $m < n$ **then** $n := n - m$ **else** $m := m - n$)

$\{a \bmod m = 0 \wedge b \bmod m = 0\}$

A likely loop invariant for this program's loop is $P = (\text{GCD}(a, b) = \text{GCD}(n, m))$. With this invariant, the weakest precondition for the program is $P[n \Rightarrow b][m \Rightarrow a] = (\text{GCD}(a, b) = \text{GCD}(a, b))$, which is trivial as long as $a > 0$ and $b > 0$.

As before, the assignment statements contribute no verification conditions, and the vcg of the program is $((P \wedge m \neq n) \Rightarrow (wp C P)) \wedge ((P \wedge m = n) \Rightarrow (a \bmod m = 0 \wedge b \bmod m = 0))$, where C is the loop body. Now $wp C P = (m < n \wedge (P[n \Rightarrow n - m])) \vee (m \geq n \wedge (P[m \Rightarrow m - n]))$, giving a final verification condition of $((P \wedge m \neq n) \Rightarrow ((m < n \wedge (P[n \Rightarrow n - m])) \vee (m \geq n \wedge (P[m \Rightarrow m - n])))) \wedge ((P \wedge m = n) \Rightarrow (a \bmod m = 0 \wedge b \bmod m = 0))$.