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General Objectives

Ultimate Goal

Verify that software is free of bugs

Famous software failures:
http://www.cs.tau.ac.il/~nachumd/horror.html

This lecture

Computer-assisted approaches for verifying that a software conforms to a specification
Some general approaches to Verification

Static analysis, Algorithmic Verification
- \textit{model checking} (automata-based models)
- \textit{abstract interpretation} (domain-specific model, e.g. numerical)

Deductive verification
- formal models using expressive logics
- verification = computer-assisted mathematical proof
Some general approaches to Verification

**Refinement**
- Formal models
- Code derived from model, correct by construction
A long time before success

Computer-assisted verification is an old idea

- **Turing**, 1948
- **Floyd-Hoare logic**, 1969

Success in practice: only from the mid-1990s

- Importance of the *increase of performance of computers*

A first success story:

- **Paris metro line 14**, using *Atelier B* (1998, refinement approach)
Other Famous Success Stories

- **Flight control software of A380**: Astree verifies absence of run-time errors (2005, abstract interpretation)
  
  http://www.astree.ens.fr/

- **Microsoft’s hypervisor**: using Microsoft’s VCC and the Z3 automated prover (2008, deductive verification)
  
  
  More recently: verification of PikeOS

- **Certified C compiler**, developed using the Coq proof assistant (2009, correct-by-construction code generated by a proof assistant)
  
  http://compcert.inria.fr/

- **L4.verified micro-kernel**, using tools on top of Isabelle/HOL proof assistant (2010, Haskell prototype, C code, proof assistant)
  
Other Success Stories at Industry

- Frama-C
  - EDF: abstract interpretation
  - Airbus: deductive verification
- Spark/Ada: Verification of Ada programs
  
https://www.adacore.com/industries

Remark
The two above use Why3 internally
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Proposition logic in a nutshell

▶ Syntax:

\[ \varphi ::= \bot \mid \top \mid A, B \quad \text{(atoms)} \]
\[ \mid \varphi \land \varphi \mid \varphi \lor \varphi \mid \neg \varphi \]
\[ \mid \varphi \rightarrow \varphi \mid \varphi \leftrightarrow \varphi \]

▶ Semantics, models: truth tables

\( \phi \) is satisfiable if it has a model
\( \phi \) is valid if true in all models
(equivalently \( \neg \phi \) is not satisfiable)

SAT is \textit{decidable} \( \leadsto \) SAT solvers

Demo with Why3

\$ \texttt{why3 ide propositional.mlw} \$

Notice that Why3 indeed queries solvers for satisfiability of \( \neg \phi \)
Focus on the “Tools” menu of Why3
First-order logic in a nutshell

▶ Syntax:

\[ \phi ::= \ldots \]

| \( P(t, \ldots, t) \) (predicates) |
| \( \forall x. \phi \) | \( \exists x. \phi \) |

\[ t ::= x \] variables

| \( f(t, \ldots, t) \) (function symbols) |

▶ Semantics: models must interpret variables. C

▶ Satisfiability *undecidable*, but still *semi-decidable*: there exists complete systems of deduction rules (sequent calculus, natural deduction, superposition calculus)

▶ Examples of solvers: E, Spass, Vampire

   Implement *refutationally complete* procedure:
   if they answer ’unsat’ then formula is unsatisfiable

Demo with Why3

`first-order.mlw`

Notice that Why3 logic is *typed*, and application is curryied
Logic Theories

- **Theory** = set of formulas (called *theorems*) closed by logical consequence
- **Axiomatic Theory** = set of formulas generated by axioms (or axiom schemas)
- **Consistent Theory**
  - for no $P, \neg P$ are both theorems
  - equivalently: 'false' is not a theorem
  - equivalently: the theory has models
- **Consistent Axiomatization**
  - 'false' is not derivable
Theory of Equality

\[ \forall x. \, x = x \]
\[ \forall x, y. \, x = y \to y = x \]
\[ \forall x, y, z. \, x = y \land y = z \to x = z \]

(congruence) for all function symbols \( f \) of arity \( k \):

\[ \forall x_1, y_1 \ldots, x_k, y_k. \, x_1 = y_1 \land \cdots \land x_k = y_k \to f(x_1, \ldots, x_k) = f(y_1, \ldots, y_k) \]

and for all predicates \( p \) of arity \( k \):

\[ \forall x_1, y_1 \ldots, x_k, y_k. \, x_1 = y_1 \land \cdots \land x_k = y_k \to p(x_1, \ldots, x_k) \to p(y_1, \ldots, y_k) \]
Theory of Equality, Continued

\[ \forall x. \ x = x \]

\[ \forall x, \ y. \ x = y \rightarrow y = x \]

\[ \forall x, \ y, \ z. \ x = y \land y = z \rightarrow x = z \]

(congruence) ... 

- General first-order deduction bad in such a case \(\sim\rightarrow\) dedicated methods
  - paramodulation
  - congruence closure (for quantifier-free fragment)
- SMT solvers (Alt-Ergo, CVC4, Z3) implement dedicated (semi-)decision procedures

Demo with Why3

equality.mlw
Theory of a given model

= formulas true in this model

- Central example: theory of linear integer arithmetic, i.e. formulas using $+$ and $\leq$
  - First-order theory is known to be decidable (Presburger)
  - SMT solvers typically implement a procedure for the existential fragment

- Also: theory of (non-linear) real arithmetic is decidable (Tarski)
Non-linear Integer Arithmetic

(a.k.a. Peano Arithmetic)

First-Order Integer Arithmetic

All valid first-order formulas on integers with $+$, $\times$ and $\leq$

- This theory is not even semi-decidable
- SMT solvers implement incomplete satisfiability checks: if solver answers 'unsat' then it is unsatisfiable

Demo with Why3

arith.mlw
Digression about Non-linear Integer Arithmetic

**Representation Theorem (Gödel)**

Every recursive function $f$ is representable by a predicate $\phi_f$ such that

$$\phi_f(x_1, \ldots, x_k, y)$$

is true if and only if

$$y = f(x_1, \ldots, x_k)$$

**First incompleteness Theorem (Gödel)**

That theory is not recursively axiomatizable
Summary of prover limitations

- Superposition solvers (E, Spass, )
  - do not support well theories except equality
  - do quite well with quantifiers
- SMT solvers (Alt-Ergo, CVC4, Z3)
  - several theories are built-in
  - weaker with quantifiers
- None support reasoning by induction
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IMP language

A very basic imperative programming language

- only global variables
- only integer values for expressions
- basic statements:
  - assignment \( x \leftarrow e \)
  - sequence \( s_1; s_2 \)
  - conditionals \( \text{if } e \text{ then } s_1 \text{ else } s_2 \)
  - loops \( \text{while } e \text{ do } s \)
  - no-op \( \text{skip} \)
Formal Contracts

General form of a program:

Contract

- **precondition**: expresses what is assumed before running the program
- **post-condition**: expresses what is supposed to hold when program exits

Demo with Why3

contracts.mlw
Hoare triples

- **Hoare triple**: notation \( \{ P \} s \{ Q \} \)
- **P**: formula called the *precondition*
- **Q**: formula called the *postcondition*

**Intended meaning**

\( \{ P \} s \{ Q \} \) is true if and only if:
when the program \( s \) is executed in any state satisfying \( P \), then
(if execution terminates) its resulting state satisfies \( Q \)

This is a *Partial Correctness*: we say nothing if \( s \) does not terminate
Examples

Examples of valid triples for partial correctness:

- $\{x = 1\} x \leftarrow x + 2 \{x = 3\}$
- $\{x = y\} x \leftarrow x + y \{x = 2 \times y\}$
- $\{\exists v. x = 4 \times v\} x \leftarrow x + 42 \{\exists w. x = 2 \times w\}$
- $\{true\} \text{while } 1 \text{ do } \text{skip} \{false\}$
Running Example

Three global variables \( n \), \( \text{count} \), and \( \text{sum} \)

\[
\text{count} \leftarrow 0; \; \text{sum} \leftarrow 1;
\]

while \( \text{sum} \leq n \) do

\[
\text{count} \leftarrow \text{count} + 1; \; \text{sum} \leftarrow \text{sum} + 2 \times \text{count} + 1
\]

What does this program compute? (assuming input is \( n \) and output is \( \text{count} \))

Informal specification:

▶ at the end of execution of this program, \( \text{count} \) contains the square root of \( n \), rounded downward
▶ e.g. for \( n=42 \), the final value of \( \text{count} \) is 6.

See file \text{imp_isqrt.mlw}
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Three global variables \( n \), \texttt{count} , and \texttt{sum}

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{count} &\leftarrow 0; \text{sum} \leftarrow 1; \\
\textbf{while} \ &\text{sum} \leq n \ \textbf{do} \\
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Running Example

Three global variables $n$, count, and sum

count <- 0; sum <- 1;
while sum <= n do
  count <- count + 1; sum <- sum + 2 * count + 1

What does this program compute?
(assuming input is $n$ and output is count)

Informal specification:

- at the end of execution of this program, count contains the square root of $n$, rounded downward
- e.g. for $n=42$, the final value of count is 6.

See file imp_isqrt.mlw
Hoare logic as an Axiomatic Semantics

Original Hoare logic [\(\sim 1970\)]

Axiomatic Semantics of programs

Set of *inference rules* producing triples

\[
\begin{align*}
\{P\}\text{skip}\{P\} \\
\{P[x \leftarrow e]\}x \leftarrow e\{P\} \\
\{P\}s_1\{Q\} \quad \{Q\}s_2\{R\} \\
\{P\}s_1; s_2\{R\}
\end{align*}
\]

▶ Notation \(P[x \leftarrow e]\) : replace all occurrences of program variable \(x\) by \(e\) in \(P\).
Hoare Logic, continued

Frame rule:

\[
\frac{\{ P \} s \{ Q \}}{\{ P \land R \} s \{ Q \land R \}}
\]

with \( R \) a formula where no variables assigned in \( s \) occur

Consequence rule:

\[
\frac{\{ P' \} s \{ Q' \} \quad \models P \to P' \quad \models Q' \to Q}{\{ P \} s \{ Q \}}
\]

Example: proof of

\[
\{ x = 1 \} x \leftarrow x + 2 \{ x = 3 \}
\]
Proof of the example

\[
\begin{align*}
\{x + 2 = 3\} & x \leftarrow x + 2 \{x = 3\} & \models x = 1 \rightarrow x + 2 = 3 \\
\{x = 1\} & x \leftarrow x + 2 \{x = 3\} & \models x = 3 \rightarrow x = 3
\end{align*}
\]
Hoare Logic, continued

Rules for if and while:

\[
\begin{align*}
\{P \land e\} s_1 \{Q\} & \quad \{P \land \neg e\} s_2 \{Q\} \\
\{P\} & \text{if } e \text{ then } s_1 \text{ else } s_2 \{Q\} \\
\{I \land e\} s \{I\} & \\
\{I\} & \text{while } e \text{ do } s \{I \land \neg e\}
\end{align*}
\]

I is called a \textit{loop invariant}
Informal justification of the while rule

\[
\begin{align*}
\{l \land e\} & \mathbf{s}\{l\} \\
\{l\} & \text{while } e \text{ do } \mathbf{s}\{l \land \neg e\}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
I & \quad \text{invariant initially valid} \\
I \land e & \quad \text{condition assumed true} \\
s & \quad \text{execution of loop body} \\
I & \quad \text{invariant re-established} \\
I \land e & \quad \text{condition assumed true} \\
s & \quad \text{execution of loop body} \\
I & \quad \text{invariant re-established} \\
\vdots & \quad \text{any number of iterations} \\
I & \quad \text{invariant re-established} \\
I \land \neg e & \quad \text{loop exits when condition false}
\end{align*}
\]
Example: isqrt(42)

Exercise: prove of the triple

\{ n \geq 0 \} ISQRT \{ count^2 \leq n \land n < (count + 1)^2 \}
Example: isqrt(42)

Exercise: prove of the triple

\[ \{ n \geq 0 \} \ ISQRT \ \{ count^2 \leq n \land n < (count + 1)^2 \} \]

Could we do that by hand?
Example: isqrt(42)

Exercise: prove of the triple

\[ \{ n \geq 0 \} \text{ISQRT} \{ \text{count}^2 \leq n \land n < (\text{count} + 1)^2 \} \]

Could we do that by hand?

Back to demo: file imp_isqrt.mlw
Example: $\text{isqrt}(42)$

Exercise: prove of the triple

\[
\{ n \geq 0 \} \ ISQRT \ \{ \text{count}^2 \leq n \land n < (\text{count} + 1)^2 \}
\]

Could we do that by hand?

Back to demo: file $\text{imp_isqrt.mlw}$

**Warning**
Finding an adequate loop invariant is a major difficulty
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- Operational Semantics
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Beyond Axiomatic Semantics

- Operational Semantics
- Semantic Validity of Hoare Triples
- Hoare logic as correct deduction rules
Operational semantics

[Plotkin 1981, structural operational semantics (SOS)]

- we use a standard *small-step semantics*
- *program state*: describes content of global variables at a given time. It is a finite map $\Sigma$ associating to each variable $x$ its current value denoted $\Sigma(x)$.
- Value of an expression $e$ in some state $\Sigma$:
  - denoted $[e]_{\Sigma}$
  - always defined, by the following recursive equations:

  $$
  [n]_{\Sigma} = n \\
  [x]_{\Sigma} = \Sigma(x) \\
  [e_1 \text{ op } e_2]_{\Sigma} = [e_1]_{\Sigma} [\text{ op }] [e_2]_{\Sigma}
  $$

- $[\text{ op }]$ natural semantic of operator $\text{ op }$ on integers (with relational operators returning 0 for false and $\neq 0$ for true).
Semantics of statements

Semantics of statements: defined by judgment

\[ \Sigma, s \leadsto \Sigma', s' \]

meaning: in state \( \Sigma \), executing one step of statement \( s \) leads to the state \( \Sigma' \) and the remaining statement to execute is \( s' \). The semantics is defined by the following rules.

\[
\Sigma, x \leftarrow e \leadsto \Sigma\{x \leftarrow \llbracket e \rrbracket_{\Sigma}\}, \text{skip}
\]

\[
\Sigma, s_1 \leadsto \Sigma', s'_1 \\
\Sigma, (s_1; s_2) \leadsto \Sigma', (s'_1; s_2)
\]

\[
\Sigma, (\text{skip}; s) \leadsto \Sigma, s
\]
Semantics of statements, continued

\[
\frac{[e]_\Sigma \neq 0}{\Sigma, \text{if } e \text{ then } s_1 \text{ else } s_2 \rightsquigarrow \Sigma, s_1}
\]

\[
\frac{[e]_\Sigma = 0}{\Sigma, \text{if } e \text{ then } s_1 \text{ else } s_2 \rightsquigarrow \Sigma, s_2}
\]

\[
\frac{[e]_\Sigma \neq 0}{\Sigma, \text{while } e \text{ do } s \rightsquigarrow \Sigma, (s; \text{while } e \text{ do } s)}
\]

\[
\frac{[e]_\Sigma = 0}{\Sigma, \text{while } e \text{ do } s \rightsquigarrow \Sigma, \text{skip}}
\]
Execution of programs

▶ ~⇒: a binary relation over pairs (state, statement)
▶ transitive closure: ~⇒+
▶ reflexive-transitive closure: ~⇒*

In other words:

Σ, s ~⇒* Σ’, s’

means that statement s, in state Σ, reaches state Σ’ with remaining statement s’ after executing some finite number of steps.

Running example:

\{n = 42, count = ?, sum = ?\}, ISQRT ~⇒*  
\{n = 42, count = 6, sum = 49\}, skip
Execution and termination

- any statement except `skip` can execute in any state
- the statement `skip` alone represents the final step of execution of a program
- there is no possible *runtime error*.

**Definition**

Execution of statement $s$ in state $\Sigma$ *terminates* if there is a state $\Sigma'$ such that $\Sigma, s \leadsto^* \Sigma'$, `skip`

- since there are no possible runtime errors, $s$ does not terminate means that $s$ *diverges* (i.e. executes infinitely).
Semantics of formulas

\( [p]_\Sigma \):  
- semantics of formula \( p \) in program state \( \Sigma \)  
- is a logic formula where no program variables appear anymore  
- defined recursively as follows.

\[
\begin{align*}
[e]_\Sigma &= [e]_\Sigma \neq 0 \\
[p_1 \land p_2]_\Sigma &= [p_1]_\Sigma \land [p_2]_\Sigma \\
&\vdots
\end{align*}
\]

where semantics of expressions is augmented with

\[
\begin{align*}
[v]_\Sigma &= v \\
[x]_\Sigma &= \Sigma(x)
\end{align*}
\]

Notations:

- \( \Sigma \models p \): the formula \( [p]_\Sigma \) is valid
- \( \models p \): formula \( [p]_\Sigma \) holds in all states \( \Sigma \).
Semantics of formulas

Other presentation of the semantics: $\llbracket p \rrbracket_\Sigma$:

- inline semantic of first-order formula
- $\llbracket e \rrbracket_\Sigma,\nu$ with $\nu$ mapping of logic variables to integers.
- defined recursively as follows.

\[
\llbracket p_1 \land p_2 \rrbracket_\Sigma,\nu = \begin{cases} 
\top & \text{if } \llbracket p_1 \rrbracket_\Sigma,\nu = \top \text{ and } \llbracket p_2 \rrbracket_\Sigma,\nu = \top \\
\bot & \text{if for all } \nu. \llbracket e \rrbracket_\Sigma,\nu[x\leftarrow \nu] = \top 
\end{cases}
\]

where semantics of expressions is augmented with

\[
\llbracket v \rrbracket_\Sigma,\nu = \nu(v), \\
\llbracket x \rrbracket_\Sigma,\nu = \Sigma(x)
\]
Soundness

**Definition (Partial correctness)**

Hoare triple \( \{P\} s \{Q\} \) is said **valid** if:

for any states \( \Sigma, \Sigma' \), if

- \( \Sigma, s \leadsto^* \Sigma', \text{skip} \) and
- \( \Sigma \models P \)

then \( \Sigma' \models Q \)

**Theorem (Soundness of Hoare logic)**

*The set of rules is correct: any derivable triple is valid.*

This is *proved by induction on the derivation tree* of the considered triple.

For each rule: assuming that the triples in premises are valid, we show that the triple in conclusion is valid too.
Digression: Completeness of Hoare Logic

Two major difficulties for proving a program

- guess the appropriate intermediate formulas (for sequence, for the loop invariant)
- prove the logical premises of consequence rule
Digression: Completeness of Hoare Logic

Two major difficulties for proving a program

▶ *guess the appropriate intermediate formulas* (for sequence, for the loop invariant)
▶ *prove the logical premises of consequence rule*

Theoretical question: completeness. Are all valid triples derivable from the rules?

**Theorem (Relative Completeness of Hoare logic)**

*The set of rules of Hoare logic is relatively complete: if the logic language is expressive enough, then any valid triple* \( \{P\} s \{Q\} \*can be derived using the rules.*
Digression: Completeness of Hoare Logic

Two major difficulties for proving a program

- _guess the appropriate intermediate formulas_ (for sequence, for the loop invariant)
- _prove the logical premises of consequence rule_

Theoretical question: completeness. Are all valid triples derivable from the rules?

**Theorem (Relative Completeness of Hoare logic)**

_The set of rules of Hoare logic is relatively complete: if the logic language is expressive enough, then any valid triple \( \{P\} s \{Q\} \) can be derived using the rules._

_[Cook, 1978]_ “Expressive enough”: representability of any recursive function

Yet, this does not provide an effective recipe to discover suitable loop invariants (see also the theory of abstract interpretation _[Cousot, 1990]_).
Annotated Programs

Goal
Add automation to the Hoare logic approach

We augment IMP with *explicit loop invariants*

\[ \text{while } e \text{ invariant } l \text{ do } s \]
Weakest liberal precondition

[Dijkstra 1975]

Function $\text{WLP}(s, Q)$:

- $s$ is a statement
- $Q$ is a formula
- returns a formula

It should return the \textit{minimal precondition} $P$ that validates the triple $\{P\}s\{Q\}$
Definition of $WLP(s, Q)$

Recursive definition:

$$
WLP(skip, Q) = Q
$$

$$
WLP(x \leftarrow e, Q) = Q[x \leftarrow e]
$$

$$
WLP(s_1; s_2, Q) = WLP(s_1, WLP(s_2, Q))
$$

$$
WLP(if e then s_1 else s_2, Q) = (e \rightarrow WLP(s_1, Q)) \land (\neg e \rightarrow WLP(s_2, Q))
$$
Definition of $WLP(s, Q)$, continued

$$WLP(\text{while } e \text{ invariant } l \text{ do } s, Q) =$$

$$l \land$$

$$\forall v_1, \ldots, v_k.$$  

$$(((e \land l) \rightarrow WLP(s, l)) \land ((\neg e \land l) \rightarrow Q))$$  

[$w_i \leftarrow v_i$]  

(where $w_1, \ldots, w_k$ is the set of assigned variables in statement $s$ and $v_1, \ldots, v_k$ are fresh logic variables)

(invariant true initially)

(invariant preserved)

(invariant implies post)
Examples

\[ \text{WLP}(x \leftarrow x + y, x = 2y) \equiv x + y = 2y \]
Examples

\[ \text{WLP}(x \leftarrow x + y, x = 2y) \equiv x + y = 2y \]

\[ \text{WLP(while } y > 0 \text{ invariant even(y) do } y \leftarrow y - 2, \text{even(y)) } \equiv \]
Examples

\[
\text{WLP}(x < x + y, x = 2y) \equiv x + y = 2y
\]

\[
\text{WLP(while } y > 0 \text{ invariant } \text{even}(y) \text{ do } y < y - 2, \text{even}(y)) \equiv \\
\text{even}(y) \land \\
\forall v, ((v > 0 \land \text{even}(v)) \rightarrow \text{even}(v - 2)) \\
\land ((v \leq 0 \land \text{even}(v)) \rightarrow \text{even}(v))
\]
Soundness

Theorem (Soundness)
For all statement $s$ and formula $Q$, $\{\text{WLP}(s, Q)\}s\{Q\}$ is valid.

Proof by induction on the structure of statement $s$.

Consequence
For proving that a triple $\{P\}s\{Q\}$ is valid, it suffices to prove the formula $P \rightarrow \text{WLP}(s, Q)$.

This is basically the goal that Why3 produces
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Exercises
Consider the following (inefficient) program for computing the sum $a + b$.

```plaintext
x <- a; y <- b;
while y > 0 do
  x <- x + 1; y <- y - 1
```

(Why3 file to fill in: imp_sum.mlw)

- Propose a post-condition stating that the final value of $x$ is the sum of the values of $a$ and $b$
- Find an appropriate loop invariant
- Prove the program.
Exercise 2

The following program is one of the original examples of Floyd.

```plaintext
q <- 0; r <- x;
while r >= y do
    r <- r - y; q <- q + 1
```

(Why3 file to fill in: `imp_euclidean.mlw`)

- Propose a formal precondition to express that \( x \) is assumed non-negative, \( y \) is assumed positive, and a formal post-condition expressing that \( q \) and \( r \) are respectively the quotient and the remainder of the Euclidean division of \( x \) by \( y \).

- Find appropriate loop invariants and prove the correctness of the program.
Let’s assume given in the underlying logic the functions div2(x) and mod2(x) which respectively return the division of x by 2 and its remainder. The following program is supposed to compute, in variable $r$, the power $x^n$.

```plaintext
r <= 1; p <- x; e <- n;
while e > 0 do
  if mod2(e) <> 0 then r <- r * p;
  p <- p * p;
  e <- div2(e);
```

(Why3 file to fill in: `power_int.mlw`)

- Assuming that the power function exists in the logic, specify appropriate pre- and post-conditions for this program.
- Find an appropriate loop invariant, and prove the program.
Exercise 4

The Fibonacci sequence is defined recursively by \( \text{fib}(0) = 0 \), \( \text{fib}(1) = 1 \) and \( \text{fib}(n + 2) = \text{fib}(n + 1) + \text{fib}(n) \). The following program is supposed to compute \( \text{fib} \) in linear time, the result being stored in \( y \).

\[
y <- 0; \ x <- 1; \ i <- 0;
\text{while } i < n \text{ do}
\quad \text{aux} <- y; \ y <- x; \ x <- x + aux; \ i <- i + 1
\]

- Assuming \( \text{fib} \) exists in the logic, specify appropriate pre- and post-conditions.
- Prove the program.
Exercise (original Floyd rule for assignment)

1. *Prove that the triple*

\[
\{P\}x \leftarrow e\{\exists v, \ e[x \leftarrow v] = x \land P[x \leftarrow v]\}
\]

*is valid with respect to the operational semantics.*

2. *Show that the triple above can be proved using the rules of Hoare logic.*

Let us assume that we replace the standard Hoare rule for assignment by the Floyd rule

\[
\{P\}x \leftarrow e\{\exists v, \ e[x \leftarrow v] = x \land P[x \leftarrow v]\}
\]

3. *Show that the triple \(\{P[x \leftarrow e]\}x \leftarrow e\{P\}\) can be proved with the new set of rules.*
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