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I. INTRODUCTION

A convenient form for expressing many facts about a program is a set of invariant assertions (invariants, for short) which detail relationships between the different variables manipulated by the program. Invariant assertions play an important role in many aspects of programming, including: proving correctness and termination, proving incorrectness, guiding debugging, analyzing efficiency and aiding in optimization.

Program annotation is the process of discovering these invariants. We are given an Algol-like program along with an output specification stating the desired relationship among the program variables upon termination, and an input specification defining the set of inputs on which the program is intended to operate. It is, however, not known whether or not the program is correct and satisfies those specifications. Our task is to generate the invariant assertions describing the workings of the program as is, independent of its correctness or incorrectness.

In the following sections, we present a unified approach to program annotation, using annotation rules — in the style of Hoare[1969] — to derive invariants, Section II presents an overview of our approach. It is followed by two detailed examples: the first (Section III) illustrates the basic technique on a single-loop program; the second (Section IV) applies the techniques to a program with nested loops and arrays. A catalog of annotation rules is included in the Appendix.

We have implemented the strategies described in this paper in QLISP (Wiib er [1976]), which resides in an INTERLISP environment (Teiteiman [1974]). The two examples presented here are among those that have run successfully on our experimental system. Three earlier annotation systems are:

○ the system described in Eispas [1974], based mainly upon the solution of difference equations;
○ VISTA (German [1974], German and Wegbreit [1975]), based upon the top-down heuristics of Wegbreit [1974]; and

Our system, as described here, attempts to incorporate and expand upon those systems.
II. OVERVIEW

In this section, we first define some terminology and then, in an attempt to impart the flavor of the general approach, present samples of each type of annotation rule.

1. Notation and Terminology

Given a program with its specifications, our goal is to document the program automatically with invariants. If the program is correct with respect to the specifications, we would like the invariants to provide sufficient information to prove its correctness; if the program is incorrect, we would like information helpful in determining what is wrong with it. Three types of invariants will play a role in our discussion:

- **Global invariants** are relations that hold at all places (i.e., labels) and at all times during the execution of some program segment. We shall write
  \[
  \{ \alpha \} \text{ in } P
  \]
to indicate that the relation \( \alpha \) is a global invariant in the program segment \( P \).

- **Local invariants** are associated with specific points in the program, and hold for the current values of the variables whenever control passes through the corresponding point. Thus,
  \[
  \{ \alpha \} \text{ at } L
  \]
means that the relation \( \alpha \) holds each time control is at label \( L \).

- **Candidates** for invariants, also associated with specific points, are relations that are believed to be local invariants, but which have not yet been verified. Using question marks to emphasize that these relations are just candidates, we write
  \[
  \{ ? \alpha ? \} \text{ at } L
  \]

Consider the following simple program, meant to compute the quotient \( q \) and remainder \( r \) of the integer input values \( c \) and \( d \):
\[ P_o: \text{begin comment integer division} \]
\[ B_o: \{ \ c \in N, \ d \in N^+ \} \]
\[ q := 0 \]
\[ r := c \]
\[ \text{loop } L_o: \{ \ldots \} \]
\[ \text{until } r < d \]
\[ q := q + l \]
\[ r := r - d \]
\[ \text{repeat} \]
\[ E_o:\{ ? \ q \in N, \ q \leq c/d, \ c/d < q + l, \ r = c - q \cdot d ? \} \]
\[ \text{end}, \]

where \( N \) is the set of natural numbers, and \( N^+ \) is the set of positive integers. We use the loop-until-repeat construct, to indicate that the two loop-body assignments, \( q := q + l \) and \( r := r - d \), are repeated until the exit test \( r < d \) is true for the first time. This program will be used only to illustrate various aspects of program annotation; examples of full annotation are given in Sections II and IV.

The invariant
\[ \{ \ c \in N, \ d \in N^+ \} \]
attached to the begin label \( B_o \), is the input specification of the program defining the class of "legal" inputs. It indicates that whenever computation starts at \( B_o \), the variable \( c \) is a natural number and \( d \) is a positive integer. The input specification is assumed to hold, regardless of whether the program is correct or not. Since it is a local invariant at \( B_o \), we refer to it as
\[ \{ \ c \in N, \ d \in N^+ \} \text{ at } B_o. \]

The candidate
\[ \{ ? \ q \in N, \ q \leq c/d, \ c/d < q + l, \ r = c - q \cdot d ? \} \]
attached to the end label \( E_o \), is the output specification of the program, It states that the desired outcome of the program is that \( q \) be the largest integer that is not larger than
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$c/d$ and $r$ be the remainder. Since one cannot assume that the programmer has not erred, initially all programmer-supplied assertions — including the program's output specification — are only candidates for invariants.

In order to verify that a candidate is indeed a local invariant, we must show that whenever control reaches the corresponding point, the candidate holds. Suppose that we are given a candidate for a loop invariant

\[ \{ ? \ r = c-q\cdot d \} \quad \text{at} \quad L_0. \]

To prove that it is an invariant, one must show that the relation holds at $L_0$ when the loop is first entered, and that once it holds at $L_0$, it remains true each subsequent time control returns to $L_0$. If we succeed, then we would write

\[ \{ r = c-q\cdot d \} \quad \text{at} \quad L_0. \]

Furthermore, if $r = c-q\cdot d$ holds whenever control is at $L_0$, then it will also hold whenever control leaves the loop and reaches $E_0$. In other words, $r = c-q\cdot d$ would also be an invariant at $E_0$, and may be removed from the list of candidates at $E_0$. In that case, we would write

\[ \{ ? \ q \in \mathbb{N} \cdot q \leq c/d, \ c/d < q+1 ? \} \quad \text{and} \quad \{ r = c-q\cdot d \} \quad \text{at} \quad E_0. \]

Global invariants often express the range of variables. For example, since the variable $q$ is first initialized to zero and is subsequently incremented by ones, it is obvious that the value of $q$ is always a natural number. Thus we have the global invariant

\[ \{ q \in \mathbb{N} \} \quad \text{in} \quad P_0 \]

which relates to the program as a whole, and states that $q \in \mathbb{N}$ throughout execution of the program segment $P_0$.

In this paper, we describe various annotation techniques. These techniques are expressed as rules: the antecedents of each rule are usually annotated program segments, containing invariants or candidate invariants, and the consequent is either an invariant or a candidate. We list about forty such rules in the Appendix; they are numbered $<1>, <2>$, etc. This list is representative of the kinds of rules that may be used for annotation; it is not, however, meant to be a complete list. Not only are these
rules useful for automatic annotation, but they may also help clarify the relationships between program text and invariants for the human programmer.

We differentiate between three types of rules: assignment rules, control rules and heuristic rules.

- Assignment rules yield global invariants based only upon the assignment statements of the program.
- Control rules yield local invariants based upon the control structure of the program.
- Heuristic rules have candidates as their consequents. These candidates, though promising, are not guaranteed to be invariants.

The assignment and control rules are algorithmic in the sense that they derive relations in such a manner as to guarantee that they are invariants. The heuristics are rules of plausible inference, reflecting common programming practice.

2. Assignment Rules

Many of the algorithmic rules depend only upon the assignment statements of the program and not upon its control structure. In other words, whether the assignments appear within an iterative or recursive loop or on some branch of a conditional statement is irrelevant. Since the location and order in which the assignments are executed does not affect the validity of the rules, these rules yield global invariants.

The various assignment rules relate to particular operators occurring in the assignment statements of the program. Some of the rules for addition, for example, are: an addition rule, which gives the range of a variable which is updated by adding (or subtracting) a constant; a set-addition rule for the case where the variable is added to another variable whose range is already known; and an addition-relation rule which relates two variables that are always incremented by similar expressions. Corresponding rules apply to other operators.

Dealing with sets, we find the following notation convenient: The set of elements $f(s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_m)$ such that $s_1 \in S_1, s_2 \in S_2, \ldots, s_m \in S_m$ — where $f$ is any expression and $m \geq 0$ — is denoted by $f(S_1, S_2, \ldots, S_m)$. For example, since $N$ denotes the set of natural numbers, the set $f(N, N) = a_n + N \cdot a_i^N$ contains all elements $a_n + m \cdot a_i^n$ such that $m$ and $n$ are natural numbers.
Using this notation, we have the addition rule $1$

$$
\begin{array}{l}
x := a, \mid x+a_1 \mid x+a_2 \mid \ldots \text{ in } P \\
\{ x \in a_0+a_1^*N+a_2^*N+\ldots \} \text{ in } P,
\end{array}
$$

where $P$ is a program segment and the expressions $a_i$ are of constant value within $P$. The antecedent

$$
x := a, \mid x+a \mid x+a \mid \ldots \text{ in } P
$$

indicates that the only assignments to the variable $x$ in $P$ are $x := a$, $x := x+a$, $x := x+a_2$, etc. The consequent

$$
\{ x \in a_0+a_1^*N+a_2^*N+\ldots \} \text{ in } P
$$

is a global invariant indicating that $x$ belongs to the set $a_0+a_1^*N+a_2^*N+\ldots$ throughout execution of $P$—but only from the point when $x$ first receives a defined value in $P$.

[After any execution of $x := a_0$, clearly $x \in a_0+a_1^*N+a_2^*N+\ldots$ with $x = a_0+a_1^*0+a_2^*0+\ldots$, and if $x = a_0+a_1^*m+a_2^*n+\ldots$ for some $m$, $n$, $\ldots$ before executing $x := x+a_1$, then $x = a_0+a_1^*(m+1)+a_2^*n+\ldots$ after executing the assignment. Thus, $m$ represents the number of executions of $x := x+a_1$, since $x := a_0$ was executed last, and $n$ is the number of executions of $x := x+a_2$, etc.] From such an invariant, more specific properties may be derived. For example a bound on $x$ may be derived using methods of interval arithmetic (see, e.g., Gibb [1961]). Note that no restrictions are placed on the order in which the assignments to $x$ are executed, except that prior to the first execution of $x := a_0$, the invariant may not hold.

In our simple program $P_6$, the assignments to the variable $q$ are

$$
q := 0 \quad q := q+1.
$$

So we can apply the addition rule, letting $a_0 = 0$ and $a_1 = 1$, and obtain the global invariant

$$
\{ q \in 0+1^*N \} \text{ in } P_6.
$$

The assignments to $r$ in $P_6$ are
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\[ r := c \quad r := r - d \]

Applying the same rule to them, letting \( a_0 = c \) and \( a_i = r - d \), yields the invariant

\[ \{ r \in c - d \cdot N \} \text{ in } P_0. \]

Given that \( d \) is positive, we may conclude that \( r \leq c \).

The set-addition rule is a more general form of the above addition rule, applicable to nondeterministic assignments of the form \( x := \text{f}(S) \), where an arbitrary element of \( \text{f}(S) \) is assigned to \( x \). Note that an assignment \( x := \text{f}(r) \), where it is only known that \( s \in S \), may be viewed as the nondeterministic assignment \( x := \text{f}(S) \). The set-addition rule is

\[ x := S_0 \mid x + S_1 \mid x + S_2 \mid \ldots \quad \text{in } P \]

\[ \{ x \in S_0 + S_1 + S_2 + \ldots \} \quad \text{in } P, \]

where \( \Sigma S \) denotes the set of sums \( s_1 + s_2 + \ldots + s_m \) for (not necessarily distinct) addends \( s_i \) in \( S \). If \( m = 0 \), the sum is 0; if \( S \) contains the single element \( s \), then \( \Sigma S = s \cdot N \).

(This rule applies analogously to any associative and commutative operator "\( \cdot \)."

These assignment rules for global invariants are related to the weak interpretation method of Sintzoff [1972] (see also Wegbreit [1976] and Harrison [1977]) which has been implemented by Scheriis [1974].

In our program \( P_0 \), the assignments to \( r \) were

\[ r := c \quad r := r - d. \]

Since we are given that \( c \in N \) and \( d \in N^+ \), we may view these as the nondeterministic assignments

\[ r := N \quad r := r - N^+, \]

and by applying the set-addition rule, we obtain the global invariant \( r \in N - \Sigma N^+ \). This simplifies to

\[ \{ r \in I \} \text{ in } P_0, \]

where \( I \) is the set of all integers.
To relate different variables appearing in a program, we have an *addition-relation* rule <11>:

\[
(x, y) := (a_x, b_y) \mid (x+a_i\cdot u, y+b_i\cdot u) \mid (x+a_i\cdot u, y+b_i\cdot u) \mid \ldots \text{ in } P
\]

\[
\{ a_i \cdot (y-b_y) = b_i \cdot (x-a_x) \} \text{ in } P ,
\]

where \( u, v, \ldots \), are arbitrary (not necessarily constant) expressions. The invariant begins to hold when the multiple assignment \((x, y) := (a_x, 6)_i\) has been executed for the first time. [The invariant \( a_i \cdot (y-b_y) = b_i \cdot (x-a_x) \) clearly holds when \( x = a_x \) and \( y = 6,\). Assuming it holds before executing \((x, y) := (x+a_i\cdot u, y+b_i\cdot u)\), then after executing the assignment, both sides of the equality are increased by \( a_i \cdot u, b_i \cdot u \), and the invariant still holds.] The multiple assignments in the antecedent of the rule, e.g., \((x, y) := (x+a_i\cdot u, y+b_i\cdot u)\), may represent the cumulative effect of individual assignments lying on a path between two labels, with the understanding that whenever \( x := x+a_i\cdot u \) is executed, so is \( y := y+b_i\cdot u \) for the same value of the expression \( u \). In that case, the invariant will not, in general, hold between the individual assignments.

In our example, the assignments in the initialization path give us

\[
(q, r) := (0, c) ,
\]

and for the loop-body path we have

\[
(q, r) := (q+1, r-d) .
\]

By a simple application of the addition-relation rule with \( a_x = 0, 6 = c, a_0 = u = v = 1, \) and \( 6, = -d, \), we derive the invariant \( l \cdot (r-c) = -d \cdot (q-0) \), which simplifies to

\[
\{ r = c-q \cdot d \} \text{ in } P .
\]

We note that this addition-relation rule (as well as several other relation rules in the Appendix) may be derived from the following general relation-rule schema:

\[
(x, y) := (a_x, b_y) \mid (x \cdot (u \cdot a_x), y \cdot (u \cdot b_y)) \mid (x \cdot (v \cdot a_x), y \cdot (v \cdot b_y)) \mid \ldots \text{ in } P
\]

\[
\{ (a_x \cdot b_y) \cdot (y \cdot a_x) = (x \cdot b_y) \cdot (b_y \cdot a_x) \} \text{ in } P ,
\]
where the operator \( \oplus \) is commutative and associative, operator \( \otimes \) satisfies 
\[
(a \otimes b) \otimes c = (a \otimes c) \otimes b,
\]
and 
\[
(a \otimes b) \otimes c = (a \otimes (b \otimes c)).
\]
(These relation rules are related to the approach in Captain [1976].)

Before turning to the control rules, we mention an additional useful technique: the augmentation of a program with counters. For example, by initializing a counter to zero upon entering a loop and incrementing it by one with each iteration, the value of the counter will indicate the number of times that the loop has been executed. Then relations between the program variables and the counter can be found. (The variable \( q \) serves as a loop counter in the example program \( P \).) By deriving upper/lower bounds on the counter upon loop exit, the termination of the loop may be proved and time complexity analyzed. Loop counters may also be used to discover relations between variables by solving first-order difference equations (see, e.g., Elspas [1974] and Katz and Manna [1976]).

3. Control Rules

Unlike the previous rules which completely ignore the control structure of the program, there are also control rules that derive important invariants from the program structure. (They are related to the verification rules of Hoare [1969].) For example, the forward loop-exit rule \( \langle 31 \rangle \),

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{loop } P' \\
\{ \alpha \} \\
\text{until } t \\
L': \\
P'' \\
\text{repeat} \\
L'': \\
\{ \alpha, \neg t \} \text{ at } L' \\
\{ \alpha, t \} \text{ at } L''
\end{align*}
\]

reflects the fact that if a loop is exited and control is at \( L'' \), then the exit test \( t \) must have just held, while if the loop is continued at \( L' \), the exit test was false. Furthermore, any relation \( \alpha \) that held just prior to the test, also holds immediately after. The forward loop-body rule \( \langle 29 \rangle \),
{ α } 
loop L:
    p 
    { β } 
repeat
{ α ∨ β } at L ,

states that for control to be at the head of a loop, at L , either the loop has just been entered, or the loop body has been executed and the loop is being repeated. Therefore the disjunction α ∨ β of an invariant α known to hold just before the loop with an invariant β known to hold at the end of the loop body, must hold at L .

Applying the first rule to the loop In the integer-division program P_0 , yields the invariant r<d at E_0 , and r≥d at the head of the loop body:

q := 0
r := c
loop L:
    until r < d 
    { r ≥ d } 
    q := q + l
    r := r - d
repeat
E_0 ; { r < d } .

To propagate invariants, such as r≥d , past assignment statements, we have a forward assignment rule <21>,

{ α(x , y) } 
x := f(x , y) 
L:

{ α( f⁻¹(x ,y) ,y) } at L ,

where f⁻ is the inverse of the function f in the first argument, i.e., EF (f(x , , y) , y) = x ,
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In our example, since the first loop-body assignment \( q := q + l \) does not affect any variable appearing in the Invariant \( r \geq d \), the invariant is pushed forward unchanged. To propagate \( r \geq d \) past the second assignment, \( r := r - d \), we replace \( r \) by the inverse of \( r - d \), that is \( r + d \), yielding \( r + d \geq d \), or

\[
\{ r \geq 0 \}
\]

at the end of the loop body.

The assignment axiom \(<18>\),

\[
x := a  \\
\{ x = a \}
\]

(the expression \( a \) may not contain \( x \)), gives us the invariant

\[
\{ r = c \}
\]

prior to entering the loop. Thus, by the forward loop-body rule \(<29>\), we get the loop invariant

\[
\{ r = c \lor r \geq 0 \} \text{ at } L_0 .
\]

Since, by the input specification \( 0 \leq c \), the first disjunct is subsumed by the second, i.e., if the first disjunct is true, then the second must also hold, and the Invariant simplifies to

\[
\{ r \geq 0 \} \text{ at } L_0 .
\]

To generate invariants from conditional statements, we have a forward test rule \(<25>\):

\[
\begin{align*}
\{ \alpha \} \\
\text{if } t \text{ then } & L' ; P' \\
& \text{else } L'' ; P'' \\
\text{fi} \\
\{ a, t \} \text{ at } L' \\
\{ a, \neg t \} \text{ at } L'' .
\end{align*}
\]

That is, for the then branch to be taken \( t \) must be true, while for the else branch to be taken \( t \) must be false. And anything that held before the test, holds after.
To illustrate the control rules, consider the following single-loop, single-conditional, program schema:

\[ P^*: \text{begin} \]
\[ z := c \]
\[ \text{loop} \quad L^*: \{ \ldots \} \]
\[ \text{until} \quad t(z) \]
\[ z := f(z) \]
\[ \text{if} \ s(z) \text{ then } 2 := g(z) \text{ else } 2 := h(z) \text{ fi repeat} \]
\[ \text{end} . \]

We shall assume that the inverse functions \( f^-, g^-, h^- \) are available whenever required by the rules.

The assignment axiom \( <18> \), when applied to the initial assignment \( z := c \), yields the invariant

\[ \{ z = c \} \]

before the loop. The forward loop-exit rule \( <31> \) generates the invariant \(-t(z)\) at the head of the loop body, immediately after the until clause, and then the forward assignment rule \( <21> \) gives \(-t(f^-(z))\) preceding the conditional. So far we have the loop body

\[ \text{until} \quad t(x) \]
\[ 2 := f(z) \]
\[ ( -t(f^-(z)) ) \]
\[ \text{if} \ s(2) \text{ then } 2 := g(2) \text{ else } 2 := h(z) \text{ fi} . \]

The forward test rule \( <25> \) propagates that invariant forward and adds \( s(2) \) at the head of the then clause of the conditional, and \(-s(z)\) at the head of the else clause:

\[ \text{if} \ s(z) \text{ then } \{ -t(f^-(z)) \land s(z) \} ; z := g(z) \]
\[ \text{else e l s e } \{ -t(f^-(z)) \land \neg s(z) \} ; z := h(z) \]
\[ \text{fi} . \]

By pushing \(-t(f^-(z))\) and \( s(z) \) through the then -branch assignment \( z := g(z) \), and \(-t(f^-(z))\) and \(-s(z)\) through the else -branch assignment \( z := h(x) \), we get
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\[
\text{if } s(z) \text{ then } z := g(r); \{ \neg t(f^{-1}(g^{-1}(z))) \land s(g^{-1}(z)) \}
\]
\[
\text{else } z := h(z); \{ \neg t(f^{-1}(h^{-1}(z))) \land s(h^{-1}(z)) \}
\]
\[
\text{fi}.
\]

After a conditional statement, we know that one of the two branches must have been taken. This is expressed by the forward branch rule\(^{(27)}\)

\[
\text{if} \quad t \quad \text{then } P'; \{ \alpha \}
\]
\[
\text{else} \quad P''; \{ \beta \}
\]
\[
\text{fi}
\]

\[
\{ \alpha \lor \beta \} \text{ at } L.
\]

Thus, by disjoining the invariants from the two different paths, one gets

\[
\{ \neg t(f^{-1}(g^{-1}(z))) \land s(g^{-1}(z)) \lor \neg t(f^{-1}(h^{-1}(z))) \land s(h^{-1}(z)) \}
\]

after the conditional, at the end of the loop body.

The forward loop-body rule\(^{(29)}\) expressed the fact that if control is at the head of a loop, either the loop-initialization invariant or the loop-body invariant must hold. Applying this rule to our schema

\[
\{ z = c \}
\]

\[
\text{loop } \quad L^*; \{ \ldots \}
\]
\[
\text{until } t(z)
\]
\[
z := f(z)
\]
\[
\text{if } s(z) \text{ then } 2 := g(z) \text{ else } 2 := h(z) \quad \text{fi}
\]
\[
\{ \neg t(f^{-1}(g^{-1}(z))) \land s(g^{-1}(z)) \lor \neg t(f^{-1}(h^{-1}(z))) \land s(h^{-1}(z)) \}
\]
\[
\text{repeat ,}
\]

we derive the loop invariant

\[
\{ z = c \lor \neg t(f^{-1}(g^{-1}(z))) \land s(g^{-1}(z)) \lor \neg t(f^{-1}(h^{-1}(z))) \land s(h^{-1}(z)) \} \text{ at } L^*.
\]
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This loop invariant embodies two facts about the control structure of this schema:

1. **exit lemma:** Whenever control is at $L^*$, either the loop has just been entered, or the loop-exit test was false the last time around the loop. That is,

$$\{ z = c \lor \neg t(f(g^{-1}(z))) \lor \neg t(f(h^{-1}(z))) \} \text{ at } L^*.$$  

The first disjunct is the result of the initialization path; the second states that the exit test was false for the value of $z$ when $L^*$ was last visited, assuming control came via the *then* path of the conditional; the third disjunct says the same for the case when control came via the *else* path.

2. **test lemma:** Whenever control is at $L^*$, either the loop has just been entered, or the conditional test was true the last time around and the *then* path was taken, or the test was false and the *else* path was taken. That is,

$$\{ z = c \lor s(g^{-1}(z)) \lor s(h^{-1}(z)) \} \text{ at } L^*.$$  

The following **forall rule** is valuable for programs with universally-quantified output specification. Given a loop invariant $a(x)$ at $L$, containing the Integer variable (or expression) $x$ and no other variables, check if $x$ is monotonically increasing by one. If it is, then we have as a loop invariant at $L$, that $a$ still holds for all intermediate values lying between the initial and current values. That is

$$\{ x = a \}$$

loop $L$: $\{ a(x) \}$

$\{ x = x_L + 1 \}$

repeat

$$\{ (\forall l \in L)(a \leq 1 \supset x(a(l)) \}$ at $L$,  

where $a$ is an integer expression with a constant value in $P$ and $x_L$ is the value of $x$ when last at $L$. (This rule is similar to the universal-quantification technique for arrays in Katz and Manna [1973].) The rule may be broadened to apply when $x$ is increasing by an amount-other than $1$, or for a decreasing $x$. Note that any loop counter will satisfy the conditions on $x$.

As a simple example, consider the loop
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\[ i :: 0 \]
\[ \text{loop } L: \]
\[ \quad \text{until } t(i) \]
\[ \quad i ::= i + 1 \]
\[ \quad \text{repeat} \]
\[ \text{E: .} \]

We clearly have \( i = 0 \) upon entering the loop, and \( i = i + 1 \) at the end of the loop body. By the exit lemma, we have

\[ \{ i = 0 \lor \neg t(i-1) \} \text{ at } L, \]

and generalization of this invariant yields \( (\forall l)(0 \leq l \leq i)(l = 0 \lor \neg t(l-1)) \) at \( L \). Simplifying, we get

\[ \{ (\forall l)(0 \leq l < i) \neg t(l) \} \text{ at } L. \]

This invariant may be pushed forward to \( E \), where we also have the invariant \( t(i) \). Together they imply

\[ \{ i = \min t(l) \} \text{ at } E. \]

4, Heuristic Rules

In contrast with the above rules which are algorithmic in the sense that they derive relations that are guaranteed to be invariants, there is another class of rules, heuristic rules, that can only suggest candidates for invariants. These candidates must be verified. [Since we have not implemented a theorem prover, our system suggests candidates, but does not verify them.]

As an example, consider the following disjunction heuristic (36)

\[
\text{- if } t \text{ then } P'; \{ \alpha \}
\]
\[ \quad \text{else } P'' ; \{ \beta \} \]
\[ \text{fi} \]
\[ \text{L: } \]
\[ \{ t, \alpha, \beta \} \text{ at } L. \]
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Since we know that \( a \) holds if the then path \( P' \) is taken, while \( b \) holds if the else path \( P'' \) is taken, clearly their disjunction \( a \lor b \) holds at \( L \) in either case (that was expressed in the forward branch rule (27)). However, since in constructing a program, a conditional statement is often used to achieve the same relation in alternative cases, it is plausible that \( a \) (or, by the same token, \( b \)) may hold true for both the then and else paths.

Wegbreit [1974] and Katz and Manna [1976] have suggested a more general form of this heuristic (39):

\[
\{ a \lor b \} \text{ at } L
\]

However, as they remark, this heuristic should not be applied indiscriminantly to any disjunctive invariant. We would not, for example, want to replace all occurrences of an invariant \( x \geq 0 \) with the candidates \( x > 0 \) and \( x = 0 \). Special cases, such as the above disjunction heuristic, are needed to indicate where the strategy is relatively likely to be profitable.

As mentioned earlier, the output specification and user-supplied assertions are the initial set of candidates. Candidates are propagated over assignment and conditional statements using the same control rules as for invariants, and the top-down heuristic (38),

\[
\{ \gamma \} \text{ loop } P' \\
L' : \\
\text{ until } t \\
P'' \\
\text{ repeat } \\
L'' : \{ ? \gamma ? \} \\
\{ ? \gamma ? \} \text{ at } L',
\]

may be used to push a candidate backwards into a loop. Though \( \gamma \) would be a sufficiently strong loop invariant at \( L' \) to establish \( \gamma \) at \( L'' \) upon loop exit, the heuristic suggests a stronger candidate, \( \gamma \) itself, at \( L' \). Since a necessary condition for \( \gamma \) to be an invariant is that it hold upon entrance to the loop, the antecedent of the rule requires the invariant \( \gamma \) before the loop. If some \( \beta \), rather than \( \gamma \), is known at that point, then for the heuristic to be applied, \( \beta \) must imply \( \gamma \).
Returning to our integer-division example, the top-down heuristic suggests that of the candidates

\[
\{ ? \ q \in \mathbb{N}, \ q \leq \text{c/d} , \text{c/d} \leq q+1 , r = c-q \cdot d ? \} \quad \text{at } E_o ,
\]

those which hold upon entering the loop — when \( q=0 \) and \( r=c \) — are also candidates at \( L_o \). They are

\[
\{ ? \ q \in \mathbb{N} , \ q \leq \text{c/d} , r = c-q \cdot d ? \} \quad \text{at } L_o .
\]

The third candidate at \( E_o , \text{c/d} < q+1 \), does not necessarily hold for \( q=0 \).

Each candidate must be checked for invariance: it must hold for the loop-initialization path and must be maintained true around the loop. Of the three candidates at \( L_o \), the first, \( q \in \mathbb{N} , \text{and last, } r = c-q \cdot d \), have already been shown to be global invariants. To prove that the second, \( q \leq \text{c/d} \), is a loop invariant at \( L_o \), we first try to show that it is true when the loop is entered, \( \text{i.e., that} \)

\[
0 \leq \text{c/d} .
\]

The truth of this condition follows from the input specifications. Then we try to show that if \( q \leq \text{c/d} \) is true at \( L_o \), and assuming that the loop is not exited, then it holds when control returns to \( L_o \), \( \text{i.e.,} \)

\[
q \leq \text{c/d} \quad \text{A} \quad r \geq d \implies q+1 \leq \text{c/d} .
\]

This condition, however, does not hold. Nevertheless, we can show that \( q \leq \text{c/d} \) is an invariant by using other invariants: We have seen why \( r \geq 0 \) and \( r = c-q \cdot d \) are loop invariants at \( L_o \). Since substituting \( c-q \cdot d \) for \( r \) in \( r \geq 0 \) yields \( c-q \cdot d \geq 0 \), it follows that \( q \leq \text{c/d} \) is also an invariant at \( L_o \). Thus, while an attempt to directly verify the candidate \( q \leq \text{c/d} \) failed, once we have established that \( r \geq 0 \) and \( r = c-q \cdot d \) are invariants, we can also show that \( q \leq \text{c/d} \) is an invariant.

Indeed, in general there may be Insufficient Information to prove that a candidate is invariant when it is first suggested, and only when other invariants are subsequently discovered does it become possible to verify the candidate. Therefore, every candidate should be retained until all invariants and candidates have been generated. Unproved candidates are also used by the heuristics to generate additional candidates. For example, the top-down heuristic uses the as yet unproved candidate \( \gamma \) at \( L'' \) to generate the candidate loop-invariant \( \gamma \) at \( L' \).
Note that a candidate invariant must sometimes be replaced by a stronger candidate in order to prove invariance. This is analogous to other forms of proof by induction, where it is often necessary to strengthen the desired theorem for a proof to carry through. The reason is that by strengthening the theorem to be proved, we are at the same time strengthening the hypothesis that is used in the inductive step. We could not, for example, directly prove that the relation \((r \geq d) \lor (r = c - q \cdot d)\) is a loop invariant (that is the necessary condition for \(r = c - q \cdot d\) to hold after the loop), since this candidate is not preserved by the loop, i.e.,

\[
[r \geq d \lor r = c - q \cdot d] \Rightarrow [r - d \geq d \lor r - d = c - (q + l) \cdot d]
\]

does not hold. On the other hand, we can prove that the stronger relation \(r = c - q \cdot d\) is an invariant, since we have a stronger hypothesis on the left-hand side of the implication; that is,

\[
r = c - q \cdot d \land r \geq d \Rightarrow r - d = c - (q + l) \cdot d
\]

does hold. Clearly, once we establish that \(r = c - q \cdot d\) is an invariant, it follows that \((r \geq d) \lor (r = c - q \cdot d)\) also is.

Various specific methods of strengthening candidates have been discussed in the literature (Wegbreit [1974], Katz and Manna [1976], Moriconi [1974] and others); they are closely related to methods of "top-down" structured programming. Related techniques are used by Greif and Waldinger [1974] and Suzuki and Ishihata [1977]. Also the candidates that Misra [1976] and Morris and Wegbreit [1977] derive, using the subgoal-induction method of verification, fall into this class.

In each of the following two sections, we shall demonstrate how a nontrivial program can be annotated using the rules in the Appendix. These examples are deliberately taken from previously published papers on program annotation in order to demonstrate the power of our approach.
III. EXAMPLE: Real-Division Program

Consider the following program $P$, purporting to approximate the quotient $c/d$ of two real numbers $c$ and $d$, where $0 \leq c < d$. Upon termination, the variable $q$ should be no greater than the exact quotient, and the difference between $q$ and the quotient must be less than a given positive tolerance $e$. In other words, the input specification is

$$0 \leq c < d \quad \text{A} \quad 0 < e$$

and the output specification is

$$q \leq c/d \quad \text{A} \quad cl/d < q+e.$$  

The program is

$$P: \begin{align*}
\text{begin} & \text{ comment real division} \\
B, : & \{ \ 0 \leq c < d, 0 < e \} \\
q := & 0 \quad qq := 0 \quad r := l \quad rr := d \\
\text{loop} & \ L; \ ( \ldots \ ) \\
& \text{ until } r \leq e \\
& \quad \quad \text{ if } qq + rr \leq c \ \text{ then } q := q + r; \quad q := qq + rr; \quad f1 \\
& \quad \quad \quad \ r := r/2; \quad rr := rr/2 \\
& \text{ repeat} \\
E, : & \{ ? \quad q \leq c/d, \ cl/d < q+e \} \\
\text{end}
\end{align*}$$

and our goal is to find loop invariants at $L$, in order to verify the output candidates at $E$. In our presentation of the annotation of this program, we first apply the assignment rules and then the control rules combined with a heuristic rule.

1. Assignment Rules

As a first step we attempt to derive simple Invariants by ignoring the control structure of the program, and considering only the assignment statements. This will yield global invariants that hold throughout execution.
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We first look for range invariant by considering all assignments to \( r \) and \( a \) variables. For example, since the assignments to \( r \) are

\[
\begin{align*}
    r := 1 & & r := r/2 ,
\end{align*}
\]

we can apply the multiplication rule \( \text{rule} <2> \)

\[
\begin{align*}
    x := a_0 \mid x \cdot a_1 & \quad \text{in } P \\
    \{ x \in a_0 \cdot a_1^N \} & \quad \text{in } P .
\end{align*}
\]

Taking \( r \) for \( x \), 1 for \( a \), and \( r/2 \) for \( a \), we derive the global invariant

\[
\{ r \in r/2^N \} \quad \text{in } P_1 .
\]

in other words, \( r = r/2^n \) for some natural number \( n \). From this it is possible to derive lower and upper bounds on \( r \), i.e., \( 0 < r \leq 1 \).

Similarly, applying the multiplication rule to the assignments' to \( rr \)

\[
\begin{align*}
    rr := d & & rr := rr/2 ,
\end{align*}
\]

yields

\[
\{ rr \in d/2^N \} \quad \text{in } P .
\]

Since we are given that \( d > 0 \), it follows that \( 0 < rr \leq d \).

The assignments to \( q \) are

\[
\begin{align*}
    q := 0 & & q := q+r .
\end{align*}
\]

Since we know \( 1 \) \( r \in r/2^N \), these assignments may be interpreted as the nondeterministic assignments

\[
\begin{align*}
    q := 0 & & q := q+l/2^N .
\end{align*}
\]

Using the set-addition rule \( \text{rule} <5> \)

\[
\begin{align*}
    x \in S_0 \mid x \cdot S_1 & \quad \text{in } P \\
    \{ x \in S_0 + S_1 \} & \quad \text{in } P ,
\end{align*}
\]
we conclude
\[ \{ q \in \Sigma/2^N \} \text{ in } P, \] (3)

This invariant states that \( q \) is a finite sum of elements of the form \( l/2^n \), where \( n \) is some natural number. Since for any two such elements, one is a multiple of the other, it follows that the sum is of the form \( m/2^n \), where \( m, n \in N \).

From (2) \( rr \in d/2^N \) and the assignments
\[ qq := 0 \quad qq := qq + rr, \]
we get by the same set-addition rule
\[ \{ qq \in d \cdot \Sigma/2^N \} \text{ in } P, \] (4)

The above four invariants give the range of each of the four program variables. Now we take up relations between pairs of variables by considering their respective assignments. Consider, first, the variables \( r \) and \( rr \). Their assignments are
\[ (r, rr) := (l, d) \quad (r, rr) := (r/2, rr/2). \]

Each time one is halved, so is the other; therefore, the proportion between the initial values of \( r \) and \( rr \) is maintained throughout loop execution. This is an instance of the multiplication-relation rule (12)
\[ (x, y) := (a_0, b_0) \quad (x \cdot u^{a_1}, y \cdot u^{b_1}) \quad \text{in } P \]
\[ \{ x^{b_1} \cdot b \cdot a_i = a_0 \cdot b \cdot y^{a_1} \} \quad \text{in } P, \]
yielding \( r^{l_1} \cdot d^{l_1} = r^{l_1} \cdot rr^{l_1} \) which simplifies to
\[ \{ rr = d \cdot r \} \text{ in } P, \] (5)

The assignments to \( q \) and \( qq \) are
\[ (q, qq) := (0, 0) \quad (q, qq) := (q + r, qq + rr). \]

Using (5) \( rr = d \cdot r \) to substitute for \( rr \) in the assignment \( qq := qq + rr \), we have
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\[(q, qq) := (0, 0) \quad (q, qq) := (q+r, qq+d*r)\]

which is an instance of the addition-relation rule\langle 11\rangle

\[
(x, y) := (a_o, b_o) \mid (x+a_i*u, y+b_i*u) \quad \text{in } P
\]

\[
\{ a_i \cdot (y-b_i) = b_i \cdot (x-a_i) \} \quad \text{in } P.
\]

Thus we have the global invariant \(I \cdot (qq - O) = d \cdot (q - 0)\), i.e.,

\[
\{ qq = d \cdot q \} \quad \text{in } P.
\]

(6)

In all, we have established the following global invariants:

\[
\{ r \in \Sigma \mid 2^N, \quad r \in d \cdot \Sigma \mid 2^N, \quad q \in \Sigma \mid 2^N, \quad q \in d \cdot \Sigma \mid 2^N, \quad rr = d \cdot r, \quad qq = d \cdot q \} \quad \text{in } P.
\]

2. Control and Heuristic Rules

So far we have derived global invariants from the assignment statements, ignoring the control structure of the program. We turn now to local invariants extracted from the program structure.

By applying the assignment axiom \langle 18\rangle

\[
x := a
\]

\[
\{ x = a \}
\]

to the four assignments at the beginning of the program, we get the local invariant

\[
\{ (q, qq, r, rr) = (0, 0, 1, d) \}
\]

just prior to the loop. The loop axiom \langle 20\rangle,
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\begin{verbatim}
loop \( P' \)
  until \( t \)
  \{ \( \neg t \) \}
  \( P'' \)
repeat
\end{verbatim}

yields \( r > e \) at the head of the loop body. Thus far, we have the annotated program segment

\begin{verbatim}
\{ (q, qq, r, rr) = (0, 0, 1, d) \}
loop \( L_i \) \( ( \ldots ) \) until \( r \leq e \)
  \{ \( r > e \) \}
  if \( qq + rr \leq c \) then \( q := q + r \); \( qq := qq + rr \) fi
  \( r := r/2 \); \( rr := rr/2 \)
repeat.
\end{verbatim}

The conditional statement of the loop,

\begin{verbatim}
if \( qq + rr \leq c \) then \( q := q + r \); \( qq := qq + rr \) fi
\end{verbatim}

may be considered as having an empty else branch, i.e.,

\begin{verbatim}
if \( qq + rr \leq c \) then \( q := q + r \); \( qq := qq + rr \) else fi.
\end{verbatim}

So we apply the forward test rule <25>.

\begin{verbatim}
\{ a \}
if \( t \) then \( L' ; P' \)
  else \( L'' ; P'' \)
fi
\{ a, \( t \) \} at \( L' \)
\{ a, \( \neg t \) \} at \( L'' \),
\end{verbatim}

obtaining, thereby,
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if \(qq + rr \leq c\) then 
\[
\{ r > e, qq + rr \leq c \}; q := q + r; qq := qq + rr
\]
else 
\[
\{ r > e, c < qq + rr \}
\]
fi .

Using the forward assignment rule \(21\),

\[
\{ \alpha(u, y) \}
\]
\[
x := u
\]

\[
L:
\]

\[
\{ \alpha(x, y) \} \text{ at } L ,
\]

where \(x\) does not appear in \(\alpha(l, y)\), the assignments of the then branch transform the invariant \(qq + rr \leq c\) into \(QQ \leq c\) and leave \(r > e\) unchanged. We obtain

if \(qq + rr \leq c\) then 
\[
q := q + r; qq := qq + rr; \{ r > e, qq \leq c \}
\]
else 
\[
\{ r > e, c < qq + rr \}
\]
fi .

We may now apply the forward branch rule \(27\)

\[
\text{if } t \text{ then } P' ; \{ a \}
\]
\[
\text{else } P'' ; \{ b \}
\]

\[
L:
\]

\[
\{ a \lor b \} \text{ at } L .
\]

This rule disjoins the two possible outcomes of the conditional, and we obtain the invariant

\[
\{ (r > e \land qq \leq c) \lor (r > e \land c < qq + rr) \}.
\]

The invariant simplifies to just

\[
\{ r > e \}
\]

since \(r > e\) appears in both disjuncts while \(qq \leq c \lor c < qq + rr\) is a tautology (if the first disjunct is false, then \(qq > c\), and since \(rr\) is positive, \(qq + rr > c\) is implied).

However, the disjunction heuristic
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\[
\begin{align*}
\text{if} & \quad t \quad \text{then} \quad P'; \{ a \} \\
\text{else} & \quad P''; \{ \beta \} \\
\text{fi}
\end{align*}
\]

suggests that each of the two Invariants, \( qq \leq c \) and \( c < qq + rr \), may itself be an Invariant. So we have

\[
\{ \quad r > e \quad \} \quad \text{and} \quad \{ \quad qq \leq c \quad , \quad c < qq + rr \quad ? \}
\]

following the conditional and preceding the assignments

\[
\begin{align*}
r & := r/2; \quad rr := rr/2. 
\end{align*}
\]

By further application of the \textit{forward assignment rule} to the one invariant and the two candidates, we get

\[
\{ \quad 2 \cdot r > e \quad \} \quad \text{and} \quad \{ \quad qq \leq c \quad , \quad c < qq + 2 \cdot rr \quad ? \}
\]
at the end of the loop. So far we have the annotated loop:

\[
\{(q, qq, r, rr) = (0, 0, 1, d)\} \\
\text{loop} \quad L; \{ \quad \ldots \quad \} \quad \text{until} \quad r \leq e \\
\quad \text{if} \quad qq + rr \leq c \quad \text{then} \quad q := q + r; \quad qq := qq + rr \quad \text{fi} \\
\quad r := r/2; \quad rr := rr/2 \\
\quad \{ \quad 2 \cdot r > e \quad \} \quad \{ \quad qq \leq c \quad , \quad c < qq + 2 \cdot rr \quad ? \}
\]

Finally, by applying the \textit{forward loop-body rule\(\langle 29 \rangle\)},
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\[
\{ \alpha \} \\
\text{loop } L: \\
\text{P} \\
\{ \beta \} \\
\text{repeat} \\
\{ \alpha \lor \beta \} \text{ at } L,
\]
to the invariant at the end of the loop body, we derive the loop invariant

\[
( (q, qq, r, rr) = (0, 0, 1, d) \lor 2r > e ) \text{ at } L,
\]
In order to simplify the presentation slightly, we shall use instead the weaker

\[
\{ r = 1 \lor 2r > e \} \text{ at } L. \tag{7}
\]

By a similar application of the forward loop-body rule to the two candidates at the end of the loop body, we get the candidates

\[
\{ ? (q, qq, r, rr) = (0, 0, 1, d) \lor qq \leq c ? \} \text{ at } L,
\]
and

\[
\{ ? (q, qq, r, rr) = (0, 0, 1, d) \lor c < qq + 2*rr ? \} \text{ at } L.
\]

Both candidates may be simplified, since their first disjunct is subsumed by their second, leaving

\[
\{ ? qq \leq c, \ c < qq + 2*rr ? \} \text{ at } L,
\]
These two candidates can indeed be proved to be invariants: The first candidate, \(qq \leq c\), derived from the initialization and then paths, is unaffected by the else path which leaves the value of \(qq\) unchanged. Similarly, the other candidate, \(c < qq + 2*rr\), derived from the initialization and else paths, is maintained true by the then path. So we have the loop invariants

\[
\{ qq \leq c, \ c < qq + 2*rr \} \text{ at } L. \tag{8}
\]

Since there are no assignments between the loop and the end of the program, all the
loop invariants may be pushed forward unchanged, and hold upon termination, With the loop exit test \( r \leq e \), the output invariants include

\[
\{ \, \begin{array}{l} \text{rr} = d \cdot r \, , \, \text{qq} = d \cdot q \, , \, (r = l \lor 2 \cdot r > e) \\
\quad \text{qq} \leq c \, , \, c < \text{qq} + 2 \cdot \text{rr} \, , \, 7 \leq e \end{array} \} \quad \text{at} \ E_1. \tag{9}
\]

Note that we did not make any use of the candidates

\[
\{ \, q \leq c/d \, , \, c/d < q + e \, ? \} \quad \text{at} \ E_1,
\]

suggested by the output specification, au no new invariants would be derived.

Though these invariants do imply \( q \leq c/d \) as specified, they do not imply \( c/d < q + e \). In fact our program as given is incorrect. For a discussion of how these invariants may be used to guide the debugging of the program, see Dershowitz and Manna [1977].

3. Loop Counter

By introducing an imaginary loop counter \( n \) — initialized to 0 upon entering the loop and incremented by 1 with each iteration — we may derive relationships between the program variables and the number of iterations.

The extended program (annotated with some of the invariants we have already found) is:

\[
P_1: \begin{array}{l}
\text{begin} \quad \text{comment \ real division} \\
B: : \{ \, 0 \leq c < d \, , \, 0 < e \} \\
q := 0; \text{qq} := 0; r := 1; \text{rr} := d \\
n := 0 \\
\text{loop} \quad L: : \{ \, \text{rr} = d \cdot r \, , \, \text{qq} = d \cdot q \, , \, (r = l \lor 2 \cdot r > e) \, , \, \text{qq} \leq c \, , \, c < \text{qq} + 2 \cdot \text{rr} \} \\
\text{until} \ r \leq e \\
\text{if} \ \text{qq} + \text{rr} \leq c \ \text{then} \ q := q + r; \ q := q + \text{rr} \ \text{fi} \\
7 := r/2; \ 77 := \text{rr}/2 \\
n := n + 1 \\
\text{repeat} \\
E: : \{ \, \text{rr} = d \cdot r \, , \, \text{qq} = d \cdot q \, , \, (r = l \lor 2 \cdot r > e) \, , \, \text{qq} \leq c \, , \, c < \text{qq} + 2 \cdot \text{rr} \, , \, 7 \leq e \} \\
\text{end} .
\end{array}
\]
Inference Rules for Program Annotation

Obviously,

\[
\{ \ n \in N \ \} \ \ \text{in} \ P, .
\]

For the variables \( r \) and \( n \), we have the assignments

\[
(r, n) := (1, 0) \quad (r, n) := (r/2, n + 1)
\]

and we can apply the linear-relation rule \( \langle 14 \rangle \)

\[
\frac{(x, y) := (a, b)}{(a_1 x + a_2 y + b_1) \ \text{in} \ P}
\]

\[
\{ [x = (a_1 - l) + a_2 y + b_1 = \{ x = (a_1 - l) + a_2 y + b_1 ) \} \ \text{in} \ P.
\]

With this rule we get the global invariant

\[
\{ [r = (l/2 - l) + 0] \cdot (l/2)^0 = \{ l = (l/2 - l) + 0] \cdot (l/2)^0 \} \ \text{in} \ P.
\]

which simplifies to yield

\[
\{ r = l/2^n \} \ \text{in} \ P, .
\]

Applying the same rule to

\[
(r, n) := (d, 0) \quad (rr, n) := (rr/2, n + 1)
\]

we deduce

\[
\{ rr = d/2^n \} \ \text{in} \ P, .
\]

With these loop-counter invariants, the total number of loop iterations as a function of the input values may be determined. Using \( \langle 11 \rangle \), we can substitute \( l/2^n \) for \( r \) in the output invariant \( (r = \{ n = 2^r > \epsilon \} \), and get

\[
l/2^n \leq \epsilon \ \text{A} (l/2^n = 1 \lor 2l/2^n > \epsilon).
\]

Taking the logarithm (\( \epsilon \) is positive), we have the lower bound

\[-\log_\epsilon \epsilon \leq n\]

and upper bound

\[
n = 0 \lor n < -\log_\epsilon \epsilon + 1
\]

on the number of loop iterations \( n \). Note that by finding an upper bound on the number of
iterations, we have actually proved that the loop terminates.

**Combining** both bounds gives (assuming \( n \neq 0 \))

\[-\log_e I \leq n < -\log_e I + 1 ,\]

or, since \( n \) is an integer (10), it is equal to the one integer lying between its lower and upper bound

\[n = \lceil -\log_e I \rceil = \lfloor \log_e I \rfloor .\]

Thus we have the output invariant

\[
\{ n = 0 \lor n = -\lceil \log_e I \rceil \} \text{ at } E_i .
\] (13)

Since \( n \) is the number of times the loop was executed before termination, we have derived the desired expression for the time complexity of the loop.
IV. EXAMPLE: Selection-Sort Program

The previous example contained only one loop and dealt with simple variables. As a more challenging example, we annotate an array-manipulation program containing nested loops. The program is intended to sort the array \(A[0:n]\) of \(n+1\) elements \(A[0], A[1], \ldots, A[n]\) in ascending sequence. The output specification can therefore be expressed as

\[(\forall l)(0 \leq l < n)(A[l] \leq A[l+1]) \land \text{perm}(A[0:n], A_{0:n})\]

where \(\text{perm}(A[0:n], A_{0:n})\) indicates that \(A[0:n]\) is a permutation of the array \(A_{0:n}\), and \(A_{0}\) is the value of the array \(A\) when the program is first entered. The program is:

\begin{verbatim}
begin \texttt{comment selection sort}
B_1: \{ n \in \mathbb{N} \}
i := 0
loop \texttt{L_1: \{ \ldots \}}
    until i \geq n
P_1: \texttt{begin}
    j := i+1; m := A[i]; k := i
    loop \texttt{L_2: \{ \ldots \}}
        until j > n
        if A[j] < m then m := A[j]; k := j fi
        j := j+1
    repeat
    A[k] := A[i]; A[i] := m; i := i+1
end
repeat
E_1: \{ \exists \forall l \geq 0 (0 \leq l < n)(A[l] \leq A[l+1]) \land \text{perm}(A[0:n], A_{0:n}) \}
end .
\end{verbatim}

1. Assignment Rules

We first try to determine the range of the program variables. The variables in the
program $P_i$ are $i$, $j$, $k$, $m$, and $A$; the inner loop (the program segment $P_i$) sets the variables $j$, $k$ and $m$, and leaves $i$ and $A$ unchanged.

The assignments to $i$ are

\[ i := 0 \quad i := i + 1 \]

which by the addition rule $<1>^\ast$

\[ x := a_0 \quad x + a_1 \quad \text{in } P \]

\[ \{ x \in a_0 + a_1 \cdot N \} \quad \text{in } P \]

give the global invariant

\[ \{ i \in N \} \quad \text{in } P_i .\]  

(1)

Since the program $P_i$ contains the labels $L_i$, $L_i$, and $E_i$, this relation holds at all three points.

The assignments to $j$ are

\[ j := i + l \quad j := j + l \]

Since we know $i \in N$, we may substitute $N$ for $i$ to obtain the nondeterministic assignments

\[ j \in N + l \quad j \in j + l \],

and by the jet-addition rule $<5>$ we get $j \in N + j + \sum l$, which simplifies to

\[ \{ j \in N, \quad l \leq j \} \quad \text{in } P_i .\]  

(2)

(Recall that these global invariants only hold after $j := i + l$ is executed for the first time.) Since within $P_i$ the value of $i$ is unchanged, it may be regarded as a constant. We can therefore apply the addition rule to the assignments to $j$, $j := i + l$ and $j := j + l$, obtaining

\[ \{ j \in i + l + N \} \quad \text{in } P_i , \]

and consequently

\[ \{ i < j \} \quad \text{in } P_i .\]  

(3)
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The assignments to $k$ are

$$k := i \quad k := j.$$ 

Using (1) and (2) to substitute $N$ for $i$ and $j$, we have

$$k \in N \quad k \in N$$

and from the simple set-union rule (4)

$$\begin{align*}
  x \in S_0 & \mid S_1 \quad \text{in } P \\
  \{x \in S_0 \cup S_1\} & \quad \text{in } P
\end{align*}$$

it follows that

$$\{k \in N\} \quad \text{in } P,$$

in $P$, as we have seen, $i$ is constant and $j \in i + i + N$; so we substitute $i + i + N$ for $j$ in the assignments to $k$ to obtain

$$k := i \quad k := i + i + N.$$ 

By the same set-union rule, we have that $k$ belongs to the union of $i$ and $i + i + N$. Therefore $k \in i + N$, and

$$\{i \leq k\} \quad \text{in } P,$$

Finally, for $m$ we have the assignments

$$m := A[i] \quad m := A[j].$$

Using (1) $i \in N$ and (2) $j \in N$ to substitute $N$ for $i$ and $j$, we get

$$m \in A[N] \quad m \in A[N].$$

Thus, by the set-union rule, we obtain

$$\{m \in A[N]\} \quad \text{in } P,$$

In the following subsections, we shall apply the control rules and heuristics first to the inner loop and then to the outer loop.
2. Control Rules - Inner Loop

At any point in a program, the disjunction of what is known from the paths leading to that point is an invariant. So we can obtain loop invariants at label $L$, by considering the three paths leading to $L$: the initialization path from $L$ to $L$, the loop-body path from $L$ to $L$ via the then branch of the conditional, and the loop-body path via the else branch of the conditional.

From the initialization path, we have upon entering the inner loop

$$i < n \land j = i + 1 \land m = A[i] \land k = i. \tag{7}$$

The conjunct $i < n$ derives from the negation of the outer-loop exit test (using the loop axiom <20>); the other three conjuncts are obtained from the three assignments along the initialization path (by the assignment axiom <18>).

At the head of the inner-loop body, we have the invariant

$$j \leq n \land i = i_L \land A = A_L \land j = j_L \land k = k_L \land m = m_L,$$

where $x_L$, for some variable $x$ and label $L$, denotes the value of $x$ when control was last at $L$. The first conjunct is the negation of the exit test and the other conjuncts, which are generated at $L$, using the value axiom <33>,

$$\{ x = x_L \} \text{ at } L,$$

have been pushed passed the exit test unchanged (this is an application of the forward loop-exit rule <31> to the inner loop). After executing the assignments in the then branch of the conditional, we know

$$j \leq n \land m = A[j] \land k = j \land i = i_L \land A = A_L \land j = j_L.$$

The second and third conjuncts derive from the assignments (by <18>); all the other conjuncts have been propagated forward (by the forward test rule <25> and forward assignment rule <21>).

After the (empty) else branch of the conditional, we have
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\[ j \leq n \quad A \quad m \leq A[j] \quad A \quad i = i_{L_3} \quad A \quad A = A_{L_3} \quad A \quad j = j_{L_3} \quad A \quad k = k_{L_3} \quad A \quad m = m_{L_3} \]

The second conjunct is the negation the conditional test (by the conditional axiom \(<19>\)). Since we must have traversed either the then or else branch, we know that after the conditional

\[
( j \leq n \quad A \quad m = A[j] \quad A \quad k = j \quad A \quad i = i_{L_3} \quad A \quad A = A_{L_3} \quad A \quad j = j_{L_3} )
\]

\[
V \quad ( j \leq n \quad A \quad m \leq A[j] \quad A \quad i = i_{L_3} \quad A \quad A = A_{L_3} \quad A \quad j = j_{L_3} \quad A \quad k = k_{L_3} \quad A \quad m = m_{L_3} )
\]

(this is the forward branch rule \(<27>\)). Thus, at the end of the loop body, after incrementing j by 1, we have (by \(<21>\))

\[
( j-1 \leq n \quad A \quad m = A[j-1] \quad A \quad k = j - 1 \quad A \quad i = i_{L_3} \quad A \quad A = A_{L_3} \quad A \quad j-1 = j_{L_3} )
\]

\[
V \quad ( j-1 \leq n \quad A \quad m \leq A[j-1] \quad A \quad i = i_{L_3} \quad A \quad A = A_{L_3} \quad A \quad j-1 = j_{L_3} \quad A \quad k = k_{L_3} \quad A \quad m = m_{L_3} )
\]

Furthermore, if a relation \(a\) holds upon entering a loop, and we know that the loop body either does not change the values of the variables in \(a\), or reaches \(a\) for the new values of the variables, then \(a\) is a loop invariant. This is the protected-invariant rule \(<34>\)

\[
\{a(x)\}
\text{loop } L:
\text{P}
\{a(x) \lor x = x_L\}
\text{repeat}
\{a(x)\} \text{ at } L.
\]

By substituting \(k\) for \(j-1\) in the first disjunct of (8), we may derive \(k \leq n\) and \(m = A[k]\). Thus, at the end of the loop body we know \((k \leq n \quad A \quad m = A[k])\) \(V\)

\[
( A = A_{L_3} \quad A \quad k = k_{L_3} \quad A \quad m = m_{L_3} )
\]

This invariant is of the form \(a(x) \lor x = x_L\), taking \(a(x)\) to be \(k \leq n \land m = A[k]\) and \(x\) to be the variables \(A, k\) and \(m\). The first disjunct indicates that the then path achieves \(a(x)\); the second disjunct states that the else path leaves \(A, k\) and \(m\) unchanged. From invariant (7) preceding the loop, we can derive that initially \(k \leq n\) and \(m = A[k]\). So we have
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\{ k \leq n, m = A[k] \} \text{ at } L, \text{ .} \quad (9)

Similarly, by (8) we have \( k = l \) \( L \), for both loop-body paths, and by (7) we have \( i < n \) upon entering the loop. Taking \( a(f) \) to be \( k < n \), we get
\{ i < n \} \text{ at } L, \text{ .} \quad (10)

Disjoining invariant (7) of the initialization path and (8) from the loop-body path, we get the following inner-loop invariant (by the forward loop-body rule):\text{ (11)}
\begin{align*}
\{ (i < n \text{ } A \text{ } j = i + 1 \text{ } A \text{ } m = A[i] \text{ } \wedge \text{ } k = i ) \\
V ( j - 1 \leq n \text{ } A \text{ } m = A[j-1] \text{ } A \text{ } k = j - 1 ) \\
V ( j - 1 \leq n \text{ } A \text{ } m \leq A[j-1] ) \}
\text{ at } L, \text{ .}
\end{align*}
(The conjuncts referring to the previous value of a variable at \( L \), have been removed.)

Now we extract the "common denominator" of the disjuncts in (11) arising from the different paths. The relation \( j - 1 \leq n \) appears in the second two disjuncts and is implied by the two conjuncts \( i < n \) and \( j = i + 1 \) of the first disjunct, so we get the invariant
\{ j - 1 \leq n \} \text{ at } L, \text{ .} \quad (12)

in the first disjunct of (11) we have \( j = i + 1 \text{ } A \text{ } m = A[i] \), in the second we have \( m = A[j-1] \), while in the third we have \( m \leq A[j-1] \), thus for all paths
\{ m \leq A[j-1] \} \text{ at } L, \text{ .} \quad (13)

3. Generalization Heuristic - Inner Loop

The following generalization heuristic is particularly valuable for loops involving arrays:
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\[
\{ x = a \} \quad \text{loop } L: \{ a(x, y) \} \quad \text{repeat} \quad \{ x = x_{L+1} \} \quad \text{at } L.
\]

This heuristic is similar to the \textit{forall} rule \( \text{35} \), but only suggests a candidate, since the variable \( y \) may change value in \( P \). In our case, reconsider the inner-loop invariant \( \text{13} \):

\[ a(j, m) : m \leq A[j-1] \text{ at } L, \]

initially \( j = i+1 \), and at the end of the loop body \( j = j_{L+1} \), so, as an invariant candidate, we try

\[
\{ ? (\forall l)(a \leq l \leq x)a(l, y) ? \} \text{ at } L,
\]

which we shall abbreviate as \( m \leq A[ij-j] \). Checking the candidate for the \textit{then} and \textit{else} paths, determines that it is in fact an invariant, and we have for the inner loop

\[
\{ m \leq A[ij-1] \} \text{ at } L. \quad (14)
\]

- So far we have derived the \textit{following} inner-loop invariant \( \text{8} \)

\[
\{ k \leq n, m = A[k], i < n, j-1 \leq n, m \leq A[ij-1] \} \text{ at } L,
\]

We turn now to consider the outer loop.

4. Control Rules - Outer Loop

Using the \textit{forward loop-exit} rule \( \text{31} \), the invariants at \( L \), may be propagated past the exit test \( j > n \), obtaining

\[
\{ k \leq n, m = A[k], i < n, j-1 \leq n, m \leq A[ij-1] \}
\]

just prior to the assignments

\[ A[k] := A[i]; A[i] := m; i := i+1. \]
Propagating these invariants past the assignments, we get the following invariants at the end of the outer-loop body:

\[
\{ k \leq n, \ i \leq n, \ m \leq A[ij-l], m = A[i-1], j-1 = n \}. \tag{15}
\]

The invariant \( k \leq n \) is propagated unchanged. The invariant \( i < n \) becomes \( i-l < n \) after executing \( i := i+l \) (by the forward assignment rule \(<21>\)), which is equivalent to \( i \leq n \) (since both \( i \) and \( n \) are integers). The invariant \( m \leq A[ij-l] \) still holds after assigning to \( A[k] \), since it also held for \( A[i] \); after the assignment to \( A[i] \), it becomes \( m \leq A[i+l;j-l] \) (by the forward array-assignment rule \(<23>\)); after incrementing \( i \), it becomes \( m \leq A[i;j-l] \). The assignment \( A[i] := m \) generates the invariant \( m = A[i] \) (by the assignment axiom \(<18>\)), which becomes \( m = A[i-1] \) after incrementing \( i \). Finally, the invariants \( j-l < n \) and \( j > n \) simplify to \( j-l = n \) (since \( 2 \)).

Clearly upon entering the outer loop (by \(<18>\))

\[ i = 0 \]
Thus, by the forward loop-body rule \(<29>\), we have the outer-loop invariant

\[
\{ i = 0 \ \text{\( V \)} \ (k \leq n \ A \ i \leq n \ A \ m \leq A[ij-l] \ A \ m = A[i-1] \ A \ j-1 = n) \} \text{ at } L_z
\]

with the following two corollaries:

\[
\{ i = 0 \ V \ A[i-1] \leq A[i;n] \} \text{ at } L_z \tag{16}
\]

(the second disjunct follows from \( m \leq A[ij-l] \), \( m = A[i-1] \) and \( j-1 = n \)), and

\[
\{ i \leq n \} \text{ at } L_z \tag{17}
\]

(since \( i = 0 \) is subsumed by \( i \leq n \) for \( n \in N \)). If we use the forward loop-exit rule \(<31>\) to push \( i \leq n \) past the exit test \( i \geq n \) and out of the loop, we get the output invariant \( i \leq n \ A \ i \geq n \) at \( E_z \), or,

\[
\{ i = n \} \text{ at } E_z. \tag{18}
\]

5. Heuristics • Outer Loop

We use the generalization heuristic \(<37>\) to generalize (16) for the counter \( i \), where \( a(i, A) \) is \( i = 0 \ \text{\( V \)} \ A[i-1] \ A A[i;n] \). Since \( i \) is initially \( 0 \), this yields the candidate
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\((\forall l)(0 \leq l < i)(l = 0 \vee A[l-1] \leq A[l+1])\) at \(L_1\).

This is equivalent to

\((? (\forall l)(0 \leq l < i)(A[l] \leq A[l+1]))\) at \(L_1\)

and states, in effect, that the array elements \(A[0:i-1]\) are sorted and that they are all smaller than the array elements \(A[i:n]\). It can be shown that it does indeed remain invariant, so we have the outer-loop invariant

\((\forall l)(0 \leq l < i)(A[l] \leq A[l+1])\) at \(L_2\).

This may be pushed out of the loop to \(E_2\), and with \((18)\), i.e., \(i = n\) at \(E_2\), implies the first conjunct of the output specification,

\((\forall l)(0 \leq l < n)(A[l] \leq A[l+1])\).

The top-down heuristic \((38)\) suggests that the output speculation \(perm(A[0:n], A[0:n])\), which is obviously true initially, is itself a candidate at \(L_2\). Since it can be shown that the only two assignments to \(A\) have the effect of exchanging the values of \(A[k]\) and \(A[i]\), we have the invariant

\((perm(A[0:n], A[0:n]))\) at \(L_2\).

The program, annotated with some of the more important loop and output assertions, is:
To determine the time complexity of this program, we add three counters: one for the outer loop, one for the inner loop, and a third to sum the total number of inner-loop executions. Using the annotation rules, one can easily show that the outer loop is iterated \( n \) times, that the inner loop is executed \( n-i \) times for each outer-loop iteration, and that the total number of inner-loop executions is \( n \cdot (n+1)/2 \).
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APPENDIX

In this appendix we present a catalog of annotation rules. We use the following conventions:

- $P$, $P'$ and $P''$ denote program segments;
- $L$, $L'$ and $L''$ are statement labels;
- $\alpha$, $\beta$, $\gamma$ and $\delta$ denote predicates;
- $x$, $y$ and $z$ are variables;
- $a$, $a_i$ and $b_i$ are expressions which are constant in the given program segment;
- $u$ and $v$ are arbitrary expressions;
- $\mathbb{N}$ denotes the set of natural numbers and $\mathbb{I}$ the set of all integers.

1. Assignment Rules

- **Range rules**

  <1> addition rule
  \[ x := a, \ x + a_1, x + a_2, \ldots \text{ in } P \]
  \[ \{ x \in a_0 + a_1 \cdot \mathbb{N} + a_2 \cdot \mathbb{N} + \ldots \} \text{ in } P \]

  <2> multiplication rule
  \[ x := a, \ x \cdot a_1, x \cdot a_2, \ldots \text{ in } P \]
  \[ \{ x \in a_0 \cdot a_1^N \cdot a_2^N \cdot \ldots \} \text{ in } P \]

  <3> exponentiation rule
  \[ u := a, \ u^{a_1}, u^{a_2}, \ldots \text{ in } P \]
• Set assignment rules
  \( x : \in S \) refers to an assignment \( x := u \) where it is known that \( u \in S \);
  \( \Sigma S \) is the closure of the set \( S \) under \( + \);
  \( \Pi S \) is the closure of the set \( S \) under \( \cdot \);

<4> set-union rule

\[
\begin{align*}
  x & : \in S_0 \mid S_1 \mid S_2 \mid \ldots \quad \text{in P} \\
  \{ x \in S_0 \cup S_1 \cup S_2 \cup \ldots \} & \text{in P}
\end{align*}
\]

<5> set-addition rule

\[
\begin{align*}
  x & : \in S_0 \mid x + S_1 \mid x + S_2 \mid \ldots \quad \text{in P} \\
  \{ x \in S_0 + \Sigma S_1 + \Sigma S_2 + \ldots \} & \text{in P}
\end{align*}
\]

<6> set-multiplication rule

\[
\begin{align*}
  x & : \in S_0 \mid x \cdot S_1 \mid x \cdot S_2 \mid \ldots \quad \text{in P} \\
  \{ x \in S_0 \cdot \Pi S_1 \cdot \Pi S_2 \cdot \ldots \} & \text{in P}
\end{align*}
\]

<7> set-exponentiation rule

\[
\begin{align*}
  x & := S_0 \mid x^S_1 \mid x^S_2 \mid \ldots \quad \text{in P} \\
  \{ x \in S_0^{\Pi S_1 \cdot \Pi S_2 \cdot \ldots} \} & \text{in P}
\end{align*}
\]

• Counter relation rules
  \( n \) is an integer variable;
  \( n_0 \) is an integer;
  \( v(n) \) is an expression containing the one variable \( n \).

<8> addition-counter rule

\[
\begin{align*}
  (x, n) & := (a_0, n_0) \mid (x + v(n), n + 1) \quad \text{in P} \\
  \{ x = a_0 + \Sigma_{l=n_0}^{n-1} v(l) \} & \quad \text{in P}
\end{align*}
\]

<9> multiplication-counter rule

\[
\begin{align*}
  (x, n) & := (a_0, n_0) \mid (x \cdot v(n), n + 1) \quad \text{in P} \\
  \{ x = a_0 \cdot \Pi_{l=n_0}^{n-1} v(l) \} & \quad \text{in P}
\end{align*}
\]
<10> exponentiation-counter rule

\[
(x, n) := (a, n) \mid (x^y(n), n+1) \text{ in } P
\]

\[
\{ \ x = a \prod_{i=0}^{n-1} y_i \} \text{ in } P
\]

- Basic relation rules

<11> addition-relation rule

\[
(x, y) := (a, b) \mid (x+a^u, y+b^v) \mid (x+a^u, y+b^v) \cdots \text{ in } P
\]

\[
\{ a^v (y-b) = b^v (x-a) \} \text{ in } P
\]

<12> multiplication-relation rule

\[
(x, y) := (a, b) \mid (x^u a^v, y^u b^v) \mid (x^u a^v, y^u b^v) \cdots \text{ in } P
\]

\[
\{ x^v b^v = a^v b^v y^v \} \text{ in } P
\]

<13> exponentiation-relation rule

\[
(x, y) := (a, b) \mid (x^u, y^v) \mid (x^u, y^v) \cdots \text{ in } P
\]

\[
\{ \log(x)^\log(b^a) = \log(a)^\log(b)^\log(y)^\log(a) \} \text{ in } P
\]

- Assorted relation rules

<14> linear-relation rule

\[
(x, y) := (a, b) \mid (a^x+a^y, b^x+y^y) \text{ in } P
\]

\[
\{ [x^\log((a^x+a^y)), y^\log((b^x+y^y))] \text{ in } P \quad \text{when } b = 1
\]

\[
\{ [x^\log((a^x+a^y)), [y^\log((b^x+y^y))] \text{ in } P \quad \text{otherwise}
\]

<15> quadratic rule

\[
(x, y) := (a, b) \mid (x+a^x, y+b^y) \text{ in } P
\]

\[
\{ (y-b)^2 - (x-a)^2 = (x-a)^2 (y-b)^2 \} \text{ in } P
\]
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16. Factorial rule

\[(x, y) = (a_0 \cdot a_1, b_0) \mid (x+a_1, y+x+b_1) \quad \text{in } P\]

\[a_0, a_1 \in \text{iv}\]

\[\{ y \cdot a_0! = b_0 \cdot (a_1 \cdot b_1)^{x/a_1-a_0 \cdot (x/a_0)!} \} \quad \text{in } P\]

17. Multiplication-exponentiation rule

\[(x, y) = (a_0, b_0) \mid (x \cdot a_1^u, y^b_1) \mid (x \cdot a_1^v, y^b_1) \ldots \quad \text{in } P\]

\[\{ [x/a_0]^\log(b_1) = \log(y)/\log(b_0) \cdot \log(a_1) \} \quad \text{in } P\]

2. Control Rules

- Control axioms

18. Assignment axiom

\[x := a\]

\[\{ \ x = a \ \} \]

19. Conditional axiom

\[\text{if } t \text{ then } \{ t \} ; P' \]

\[\text{else } \{ \neg t \} ; P'' \]

\[\text{fi}\]

20. Loop axiom

\[\text{loop } P' \]

\[\text{until } t\]

\[\{ \neg t \} \]

\[P''\]

\[\text{repeat}\]

\[\{ t \} \]
Assignment control rules

A is an array variable; the array function $\text{assign}(A, y, z)$ yields $A$, with $z$ replacing $A[y]$.

**<21> forward assignment rule**

\[
\begin{align*}
\{ \alpha(x, y) \} & \quad \{ ? \gamma(x, y) \} \\
x := f(x, y) & \quad x := f(x, y) \\
L : & \quad L : \\
\{ \alpha(f^-(x, y), y) \} \text{ at } L & \quad \{ ? \gamma(f^-(x, y), y) \} \text{ at } L
\end{align*}
\]

where $f^-$ is the inverse of the function $f$ in the first argument, i.e., $f^-(f(x, y), y) = x$.

\[
\begin{align*}
\{ \alpha(u, y) \} & \quad \{ ? \gamma(u, y) \} \\
x := u & \quad x := u \\
L : & \quad L : \\
\{ \alpha(x, y) \} \text{ at } L & \quad \{ ? \gamma(x, y) \} \text{ at } L
\end{align*}
\]

where $x$ does not appear in $\alpha(l, y)$ or $\gamma(l, y)$.

**<22> backward assignment rule**

\[
\begin{align*}
L : & \quad L : \\
x := u & \quad x := u \\
\{ \beta(x, y) \} & \quad \{ ? \delta(x, y) \} \\
\{ \beta(u, y) \} \text{ at } L & \quad \{ ? \delta(u, y) \} \text{ at } L
\end{align*}
\]

**<23> forward array-assignment rule**

\[
\begin{align*}
\{ \alpha(A, z) \} & \quad \{ ? \gamma(A, z) \} \\
L : & \quad L : \\
\{ \alpha(\text{assign}(A, y, f^-(A[y], z)), z) \} \text{ at } L & \quad \{ ? \gamma(\text{assign}(A, y, f(A[y], z)), z) \} \text{ at } L
\end{align*}
\]

where $f^-(f(A[y], z), z) = A[y]$.

**<24> backward array-assignment rule**

\[
\begin{align*}
L : & \quad L : \\
\{ \beta(A, z) \} & \quad \{ ? \delta(A, z) \} \\
\{ \beta(\text{assign}(A, y, v), z) \} \text{ at } L & \quad \{ ? \delta(\text{assign}(A, y, v), z) \} \text{ at } L
\end{align*}
\]
Conditional control rules

<25> forward test rule

\[
\{ \alpha \}
\]
\[
\text{if } t \text{ then } L'; P' \\
\text{else } L''; P'' \\
\text{fi}
\]
\[
\{ \alpha, t \} \text{ at } L' \\
\{ \alpha, \neg t \} \text{ at } L''
\]

<26> backward test rule

\[
L:
\]
\[
\text{if } t \text{ then } \{ \alpha \}; P' \\
\text{else } \{ \beta \}; P'' \\
\text{fi}
\]
\[
\{ \alpha \lor \beta \} \text{ at } L
\]

<27> forward branch rule

\[
\text{if } t \text{ then } P' ; \{ \alpha \} \\
\text{else } P'' ; \{ \beta \} \\
\text{fi}
\]
\[
L:
\]
\[
\{ \alpha \lor \beta \} \text{ at } L
\]

<28> backward branch rule

\[
\text{if } t \text{ then } P' ; L' \\
\text{else } P'' ; L'' \\
\text{fi}
\]
\[
\{ \beta \} \\
\{ \beta \} \text{ at } L' \text{ and } L''
\]

Loop control rules

<29> forward loop-body rule

\[
\{ \alpha \}
\]
\[
\text{loop } L:
\]
\[
P \\
\{ \beta \} \\
\text{repeat}
\]
\[
\{ \alpha \lor \beta \} \text{ at } L
\]

Loop control rules

<29> forward loop-body rule

\[
\{ \alpha \}
\]
\[
\text{loop } L:
\]
\[
P \\
\{ \beta \} \\
\text{repeat}
\]
\[
\{ \alpha \lor \beta \} \text{ at } L
\]
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<30> backward loop-body rule

\[ L': \]
\[
\text{loop } \{ \beta \} \\
\]
\[ L'': \]
\[
\text{repeat} \\
\]
\[
\{ \beta \} \text{ at } L' \text{ and } L'' \\
\]

<31> forward loop-exit rule

\[ L'': \]
\[
\text{loop } \{ \alpha \} \\
\]
\[
\text{until } t \\
\]
\[ L': \]
\[
\text{repeat} \\
\]
\[
\{ \alpha, \neg t \} \text{ at } L' \\
\]
\[
\{ \alpha, t \} \text{ at } L'' \\
\]

<32> backward loop-exit rule

\[ L'': \]
\[
\text{loop } \{ \beta \} \\
\]
\[
\text{repeat} \\
\]
\[
\{ \neg t \supset \alpha, t \supset \beta \} \text{ at } L \\
\]

- Value rules

\( x_L \) denotes the value of the variable \( x \) when control was last at label \( L \).

<33> value axiom

\[-(x = x_L) \text{ at } L\]

An invariant containing \( x_L \) may not be pushed over the label \( L \).
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34. protected-invariant rule

\[
\begin{align*}
\{ \ & a(x) \} \\
\text{loop } & L: \\
& P \\
& \{ a(x) \land x = x_L \} \\
& \text{repeat} \\
& \{ a(x) \} \text{ at } L
\end{align*}
\]

where \( x \) is the only variable in \( a \).

35. forall rule

\[
\begin{align*}
\{ & \ x = a, \ x \in I \} \\
\text{loop } & L: \{ a(x) \} \\
& P \\
& \{ x = x_L + 1 \} \\
& \text{repeat.} \\
& \{ (\forall l \in I)(a \leq l \leq x)a(l) \} \text{ at } L
\end{align*}
\]

where \( x \) is the only variable in \( a \).

3. Heuristic Rules

36. disjunction heuristic

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{if } & t \text{ then } P'; \{ a \} \\
& \text{else } P''; \{ \beta \} \\
& \text{fi} \\
& L: \\
& \{ ? \ a, \ \beta \ ? \} \text{ at } L
\end{align*}
\]

37. generalization heuristic

\[
\begin{align*}
\{ & \ x = a, \ x \in I \} \\
\text{loop } & L: \{ a(x, y) \} \\
& P \\
& \{ x = x_L + 1 \} \\
& \text{repeat} \\
& \{ ? (\forall l \in I)(a \leq l \leq x)a(l, y) \ ? \} \text{ at } L
\end{align*}
\]
\(<38>\) top-down heuristic
\[
\begin{align*}
\{ \gamma \} \\
\text{loop} \not\!
ot\!\not\!\not \text{L:} \\
\quad \text{until} \ t \\
\quad \not\!
ot\!\not\!\not \text{P''} \\
\quad \text{repeat} \\
\{? \gamma ?\} \\
\{? \gamma 3\} \text{ at L}
\end{align*}
\]

- Dangerous heuristics - To be applied with caution

\(<39>\) or heuristic (applied in conjunction with the forward branch rule)
\[
\begin{align*}
\{ a \vee \beta \} \text{ at L} \\
\{? a, \beta ?\} \text{ at L}
\end{align*}
\]

\(<40>\) strengthening heuristic (applied in conjunction with the top-down heuristic)
\[
\begin{align*}
\{ a(x) \} \text{ and } \{? \gamma(x) 3\} \text{ at L} \\
\{? (\forall x)(a(x) \supset \gamma(x)) ?\} \text{ at L}
\end{align*}
\]

\(<41>\) transitivity heuristic (applied in conjunction with the top-down heuristic)
\[
\begin{align*}
\{ uRw \} \text{ and } \{? uRw ?\} \text{ at L} \\
\{? vRw \lor v = w ?\} \text{ at L}
\end{align*}
\]

where \( R \) is a transitive relation.