

ADT Exercise Solution

Prove balance always returns non-negative value

Base case: $\text{balance}(\text{new_account}(o)) \geq 0$

Step case: Assume $\text{balance}(e) \geq 0$ where e is of n nested levels

Prove that $\text{balance}(e') \geq 0$ where expression e' is of $n+1$ nested levels

Prove:

Base case: $\text{balance}(\text{new_account}(o)) \geq 0$ axiom 1

Step case:

e' can be of either form: $\text{deposit}(e, v)$ or $\text{withdraw}(e, v)$

Case 1: e' is $\text{deposit}(e, v)$

$\text{balance}(\text{deposit}(e, v)) = \text{balance}(e) + v$

$\text{balance}(e) \geq 0$

$v \geq 0$

$\text{balance}(e) + v \geq 0$

axiom3

induction hypothesis

precondition of deposit

Case 2: e' is $\text{withdraw}(e, v)$

$\text{balance}(e') = \text{balance}(\text{withdraw}(e, v))$

$\text{balance}(e) \geq 0$

$v \geq 0$ and $\text{balance}(e) \geq v$

$\text{balance}(e) - v \geq 0$

axiom 4

induction hypothesis

precondition of withdraw

QED

How to find out missing specification?

Using existing axioms, can we decide the value of:

owner (deposit (a, v))

owner (withdraw (a, v))

So we add the following:

owner (deposit (a, v)) = owner (a) (axiom 5)

owner (withdraw (a, v)) = owner (a) (axiom 6)

Prove sufficient completeness

We need to show that we can:

- S1 Determine correctness of well-formed expression e .
- S2 Decide the value of e , if e is correct query.

Prove sufficient completeness by structural induction

Base case: `new_account` is correct

`balance (new_account (o))` is correct and value is 0

`owner (new_account (o))` is correct and value is o

Step case: assume expression `e` with `n` nested level is correct, prove that we can decide whether `e'` with `n+1` nested level:

- `balance (e')` is correct
- `owner(e')` is correct
- `deposit (e', v)` is correct
- `withdraw (e', v)` is correct

And in the first two cases when `e'` is correct and, show we can decide its value.

Prove sufficient completeness – Base case

Base case: to prove

- `new_account` is correct

Proof:

Because `new_account` has no precondition, so it is correct.

Prove sufficient completeness – Base case

Base case: to prove

- `balance (new_account (o))` is correct and value is 0

Proof:

`balance (new_account (o))` is correct because `new_account(o)` is correct and `balance` has no precondition.

Value of `balance(new_account(o))` is 0 axiom1

Prove sufficient completeness – Base case

Base case: to prove

- $\text{owner}(\text{new_account}(o))$ is correct and value is o

Prove:

$\text{owner}(\text{new_account}(o))$ is correct because $\text{new_account}(o)$ is correct and owner has no precondition.

Value of $\text{owner}(\text{new_account}(o))$ is o axiom2

Note that o itself can contain function of `BANK_ACCOUNT`

$o = \text{owner}(\text{deposit}(\text{new_account}(\text{"John"}), 100))$

Another structural induction needed here

Prove sufficient completeness – Step case

Assume expression e with n nested levels is correct and if the outermost function is query, value can be decided.

Prove that correctness of $\text{balance}(e')$ can be decided, and show its value, where e' is with $n+1$ nested levels.

Proof:

e' can be of either form: $\text{deposit}(e, v)$ or $\text{withdraw}(e, v)$

Case 1: e' is $\text{deposit}(e, v)$

$\text{balance}(e')$ is $\text{balance}(\text{deposit}(e, v))$, it is correct iff $v \geq 0$.

When e' is correct, its value is:

$$\text{balance}(\text{deposit}(e, v)) = \text{balance}(e) + v \quad \text{axiom3}$$

Case 2: e' is $\text{withdraw}(e, v)$

$\text{balance}(e')$ is $\text{balance}(\text{withdraw}(e, v))$,

it is correct iff $v \geq 0$ and $\text{balance}(e) \geq v$.

When e' is correct, its value is:

$$\text{balance}(\text{withdraw}(e, v)) = \text{balance}(e) - v \quad \text{axiom 4}$$

Prove sufficient completeness – Step case

Assume expression e with n nested levels is correct and if expression, value can be decided.

Prove that correctness of $\text{owner}(e')$ can be decided, and show its value, where e' is with $n+1$ nested levels.

Prove:

e' can be of either form: $\text{deposit}(e, v)$ or $\text{withdraw}(e, v)$

Case 1: e' is $\text{deposit}(e, v)$

$\text{owner}(e')$ is $\text{owner}(\text{deposit}(e, v))$, it is correct when e is correct and $v \geq 0$.

When e' is correct, its value is:

$$\text{owner}(\text{deposit}(e, v)) = \text{owner}(e) \quad \text{axiom5}$$

Case 2: e' is $\text{withdraw}(e, v)$

$\text{owner}(e')$ is $\text{owner}(\text{withdraw}(e, v))$,

it is correct when e is correct and $v \geq 0$ and $\text{balance}(e) \geq v$.

When e' is correct, its value is:

$$\text{owner}(\text{withdraw}(e, v)) = \text{owner}(e) \quad \text{axiom 6}$$

Prove sufficient completeness – Step case

Assume expression e with n nested levels is correct

Prove that correctness of e' with $n+1$ nested level can be decided, where e' is $\text{deposit}(e, v)$

Prove:

$\text{deposit}(e, v)$ is correct iff e is correct and $v \geq 0$

Prove sufficient completeness – Step case

Assume expression e with n nested levels is correct

Prove that correctness of e' with $n+1$ nested level can be decided, where e' is $\text{withdraw}(e, v)$

Prove:

$\text{withdraw}(e, v)$ is correct iff e is correct and $v \geq 0$ and $\text{balance}(e) \geq v$

QED

Transfer money: ADT PAIR

TYPES

PAIR [G, H]

FUNCTIONS

$\text{new_pair}: G \times H \rightarrow \text{PAIR } [G, H]$

$\text{first}: \text{PAIR } [G, H] \rightarrow G$

$\text{second}: \text{PAIR } [G, H] \rightarrow H$

AXIOMS

$\text{first} (\text{new_pair} (x, y)) = x$

$\text{second} (\text{new_pair} (x, y)) = y$

Transfer money

FUNCTIONS

transfer: ACCOUNT \times ACCOUNT \times INTEGER \rightarrow PAIR
[ACCOUNT, ACCOUNT]

PRECONDITIONS (with $v \in$ INTEGER, $a, b \in$ ACCOUNT)

transfer (a, b, v) require balance (a) $\geq v$ and $v \geq 0$

AXIOMS

transfer (a, b, v) = new_pair (withdraw (a, v), deposit (b, v))