Problem set 0

Theodore S. Norvell 6892

September 21, 2017

Q0 Take the "binary search challenge".

Solve the following problem in the language of your choice (e.g. Java, C, or pseudo-code). Don't test your code. Email me your solution.

Input: An array (possibly empty) a of numbers (let's say integers) and a number x. The array is sorted from smallest to largest.

Output: If x occurs in a, any index at which it occurs. If x does not occur in the array, -1.

Your solution should run in time roughly proportional to the log of the length of the array. A strategy to accomplish this goal is to try to eliminate roughly half of the remaining places in the array in each iteration of a loop. For Java you may wish to use this method signature

static int search(int x, int[] a)

for C/C++, you may wish to use this function signature

Q1 (a) Substitutions. For each of the following expressions, underline the bound occurrences in the following

$$\sum_{i \in \{j,\dots k\}} f(i) \tag{0}$$

$$\{i \in \{j, ..k\} \mid P(i)\}$$
(1)

$$\left(\forall i \in \{j, ..k\} \cdot i < m^2\right) \tag{2}$$

(b) Perform the following substitutions.

$$\left(\sum_{i \in \{j,\dots k\}} f(i)\right) [j:j+1] \tag{3}$$

$$\{i \in \{j, ..k\} \mid P(i)\} [i: i+1]$$
(4)

$$\left(\forall i \in \{j, ..k\} \cdot i < m^2\right) [m:i] \tag{5}$$

Q2. For each of the following proof outlines, write down all conditions that must be universally true —according to our rules— in order to show the proof-outline to be correct

- (a) $\{P\}$ $k := k + 1 \{ \forall i \in \{0, ...k\} \cdot a(i) < b(i) \}$
- (b) $\{0 \le x < n\} \ x := x + 1 \ \{1 \le x \le n\}$

(c)

$$\{ 0 \le i < a. \operatorname{length} \land \neg (\exists k \in \{0, ..i\} \cdot a(k) = x) \}$$

$$f := (a(i) = x)$$

$$\{ 0 \le i < a. \operatorname{length} \land f = (\exists k \in \{0, ..i + 1\} \cdot a(k) = x) \}$$

$$i := i + 1$$

$$\{ 0 \le i \le a. \operatorname{length} \land f = (\exists k \in \{0, ..i\} \cdot a(k) = x) \}$$

Q3. (a) The gcd function enjoys the following properties.

$$\forall x, y \in \mathbb{N} \cdot x < y \Rightarrow \gcd(x, y) = \gcd(x, y - x) \tag{6}$$

$$\forall x, y \in \mathbb{N} \cdot \gcd(x, y) = \gcd(y, x) \tag{7}$$

$$\forall x \in \mathbb{N} \cdot x > 0 \Rightarrow \gcd(x, x) = x \tag{8}$$

Fill in the blanks with assertions that make the outline below correct and verifiable using the rules presented in class. Try to make each assertion as weak as you can.⁰ Try to state all assertions as simply as you can. You may assume that a and b hold natural numbers (i.e. nonnegative integers).



(b) List all formulae that need to be shown universally true in order to show the proof outline is correct. (Hint: There should be 4.) Check that they are universally true.

(c) Building on part (a), find a loop invariant I that makes the following outline correct:

$$\begin{array}{l} \{a = A > 0 \land b = B > 0\} \\ \text{skip} \\ \{I: & \} \\ \text{while } a \neq b \text{ do} \\ \{P: & \} \\ \text{if } b < a \text{ then} \\ \{Q: & \} \\ a := a - b \\ \text{else} \\ \{R: & \} \\ b := b - a \\ \text{end if} \\ \text{end while} \\ \{a = \gcd(A, B)\} \end{array}$$

⁰A condition X is called equivalent to a condition Y if X = Y is universally true. For example $a \le b$ is equivalent to $a = b \lor b > a$. A condition Y is called weaker than a condition X iff $X \Rightarrow Y$ is universally true and they are not equivalent. For example $a \le b$ is weaker than a < b.

(d) List all formulae that need to be shown universally true, aside from those you listed in part (b). (Hint: There should be 3.) Check that they are universally true; if they are not, you may need to go back to part (a) and use a stronger P.

Q4. (a) We will say that a proof outline with missing internal assertions is correct if there is some way to fill in the missing assertions that makes the outline correct. Prove the following derived rule:

If $P \Rightarrow R[y:f][x:e]$ is universally true, then $\{P\} \ x := e \ y := f \ \{R\}$ is correct.

(b) More generally:

If $P \Rightarrow R[x_{n-1}:e_{n-1}]\cdots[x_1:e_1][x_0:e_0]$ is universally true, then

$$\{P\} x_0 := e_0 x_0 := e_0 \cdots x_{n-1} := e_{n-1} \{R\}$$
 is correct.

Apply this rule to determine whether the following proof outline is correct.

$$\{x = X \land y = Y\} \ x := x + y \ y := x - y \ x := x - y \ \{x = Y \land y = X\}$$

Q5. Were you ever taught to find square roots by hand? In this outline, all variables hold natural numbers. The $\lfloor \rfloor$ function gives the largest integer not larger than its argument. Write down all conditions that must be universally true —according to our rules— in order for the proof-outline below to be correct. You may want to first add additional assertions. Check each of these conditions to see whether they are universally true.

$$\begin{split} &\{p = X \land p < 100^i\} \\ &x := 0 \\ &a := 0 \\ &\{I : a = \lfloor \sqrt{x} \rfloor \land p < 100^i \land X = x \times 100^i + p\} \\ &\text{while } i \neq 0 \text{ do} \\ &\{I \land i \neq 0\} \\ &i := i - 1 \\ &x := 100x + p \text{ div } 100^i \\ &p := p \mod 100^i \\ &y := x - 100a^2 \\ &d := \max \{b \in \{0, ..10\} \mid b(20a + b) \leq y\} \\ &a := 10a + d \\ &\text{end while} \\ &\{a = \left\lfloor \sqrt{X} \right\rfloor \end{split}$$

By the way, the algorithm works just as well in bases 2, 4, 8, etc. and so is suitable for a fast hardware implementation. (For the base-2 case, consider 20 as meaning 10 + 10 and so 100.) The binary case is particularly nice as the line

$$d := \max \{ b \in \{0, ..10\} \mid b(20a + b) \le y \}$$

can be written as

d :=if $100a + 1 \le y$ then 1 else 0 end if

Q6. Here are some techniques for showing implications are universally true. In each case the conclusion is that

$$P \Rightarrow Q$$

is universally true. Show that each technique works.

(a) It is sufficient to show that Q is universally true.

(b) Unsatisfiable precondition. It is sufficient to show that P is unsatisfiable¹

(c) Subsetting the precondition: If P is of the form $P_0 \wedge P_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge P_n$ it is sufficient to show that

$$P' \Rightarrow Q$$

is universally true, where P' is the conjunction of some subset of the conjuncts of P. For example it is sufficient to show

 $P_0 \Rightarrow Q$

is universally true.

(d) By parts: If Q is of the form $Q = Q_0 \wedge Q_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge Q_n$ it is sufficient to show that

 $P \Rightarrow Q_i$

is universally true for each i.

 $^{^1 \}rm Which$ is equivalent to saying $\neg P$ is universally true.