From Trace Semantics for Imperative Programs to Regular and Context-Free Programs Second Bachelor Seminar Talk

> Clara Schneidewind Advisor: Prof. Dr. Gert Smolka



July 17th, 2015

# Content

### Introduction

- Overview
- Previous Work
- Motivation

### 2 Context-Free and Regular Programs

- Tail-Recursive Programs
- Regularizer
- Linearizer



### Overview

- Initial motivation: A verified compiler from Imp to LImp
- Extension: Translating programs with I/O
- New semantics for verification: Trace semantics
- Lifting of Imp and LImp programs in a more general setting:



# **Previous Work**

- Michael J. Fischer and Richard E. Landner *Propositional Dynamic Logic of Regular Programs* Journal of Computer and System Sciences, 1979
- Dexter Kozen and Frederick Smith Kleene Algebra with Tests: Completeness and Decidability Springer, 1996
- Joost Winter, Marcello M. Bonsangue, and Jan Rutten Context-Free Languages, Coalgebraically Springer, 2011

#### Karl R. Abrahamson

Succinct Representation of Regular Sets Using Gotos and Boolean Variables Journal of Computer and System Sciences, 1987

Paul Morris, Ronald A. Gray and Robert E. Filman GOTO Removal Based On Regular Expressions Journal of Software Maintenance Research and Practice, 2000

### Imp

Short review: Imp

Example

(if 
$$x < 0$$
 then  $x ::= -x$  else SKIP);  $r ::= x$ 

$$c, d ::= a \mid c; d \mid \text{ if } b \text{ then } c \text{ else } d \mid \text{ while } b \text{ do } c$$

### Example

$$s := (if b_{pos} then a_{inv} else a_{skip}); a_{res}$$

$$[x \mapsto -1], s \longrightarrow [x \mapsto -1], a_{inv}; a_{res} \longrightarrow [x \mapsto 1], a_{res}$$

# Stack Semantics

#### Example

$$s := (if b_{pos} then a_{inv} else a_{skip}); a_{res}$$

$$\begin{array}{ll} [x\mapsto -1] & \qquad [(\text{if } b_{pos} \text{ then } a_{inv} \text{ else } a_{skip}) ; a_{res}], \\ \longrightarrow [x\mapsto -1] & \qquad [\text{if } b_{pos} \text{ then } a_{inv} \text{ else } a_{skip}, a_{res}] \\ \longrightarrow [x\mapsto -1] & \qquad [a_{inv}, a_{res}] \\ \longrightarrow [x\mapsto 1] & \qquad [a_{res}] \\ \longrightarrow [x\mapsto 1, r\mapsto 1] & \qquad [] \end{array}$$

- Decomposition of sequences on the stack
- Empty stack as indicator for termination

## **Observable Actions**

Example		
	s :=	IN x; <b>if</b> $(b_{pos})$ <b>then</b> $a_{inv}$ <b>else</b> $a_{skip}$ ; OUT x if

$$[], [s] \rightarrow [], [\mathsf{IN} x, \mathsf{ if}] \xrightarrow{? \cdot 1} \cdots \rightarrow [x \mapsto 1], [\mathsf{OUT} x] \xrightarrow{! 1} [x \mapsto 1], []$$

Observable actions require to track traces in addition to final state

Resulting traces: {..., -2.2, -1.1, 0.0, 1.1, ...}

# Non-Termination

Reactive system:

Example			
	w :=	while $b_{\neg 0}$ do	IN x; if $(b_{pos})$ then $a_{inv}$ else $a_{skip}$ ; OUT x

$$[x \mapsto 42], [w] \to [x \mapsto 42], [IN x, w] \xrightarrow{-1} \dots \xrightarrow{1} \dots \xrightarrow{5} \dots \xrightarrow{5} \dots$$

- Infinite traces should be observed
  - $\Rightarrow$  Partial traces / Prefixes
- Resulting traces:  $\{\epsilon, \dots, -1, -1.1, -1.1.5, -1.1.5.5, \dots\}$
- End marker for terminating traces:

$$\Rightarrow -1.1.5.5.0.0.\# \in \mathsf{TS}_P(w, [x \mapsto 42])$$

## Abstraction from States

- Recording all actions instead of only effects allows to reconstruct
  - final states
  - effects
- Tests are modelled as partial identities on states





# Regular Programs (RP)

Connection with regular expressions

$$s,t ::= \emptyset \mid \epsilon \mid a \mid s;t \mid s+t \mid s^*$$

Imp programs as regular programs:

if *b* then *s* else 
$$t \rightsquigarrow b$$
;  $s + \overline{b}$ ;  $t$   
while *b* do  $s \rightsquigarrow (b; s)^*$ ;  $\overline{b}$ 

Example

$$(b_{\neg 0}; a_{in}; (b_{pos}; a_{inv} + \overline{b_{pos}}; a_{skip}); a_{out})^*; \overline{b_{\neg 0}}$$

Trace Semantics for RE (with stacks)



- Abort-rule for partial traces
- Marker-rule for terminal traces
- Two rules for \*
  - Rule to finish
  - Rule to iterate

$$\begin{array}{l} \xi \text{ executable on } \sigma := \ \xi = a_0.a_1.\ldots a_n \\ & \wedge \exists \sigma_0, \sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_{n+1}, \forall i \leq n, \texttt{exec}(\sigma_i, a_i, \sigma_{i+1}) \land \sigma_0 = \sigma \end{array}$$

# Linear Imp

#### $s, t ::= a; s \mid \text{ if } b \text{ then } s \text{ else } t \mid \text{ fix } X.s \mid X$

LImp no subset of regular programs

#### Example

fix X. IN x; if 
$$x < 0$$
 then OUT z  
else fix Y. IN y; if  $y < 0$  then  $z := x + z$ ; X  
else  $x := y * x$ ; Y



Regular and Context-Free Programs

# Context-Free Programs (CFP)

$$s,t ::= \epsilon \mid a \mid s;t \mid s+t \mid fix X.s \mid X$$

$$\frac{\xi/s_{\mathsf{fix}X.s}^X:T}{\xi/(\mathsf{fix}X.s)::T}$$

Not only regular languages:

Example

$$s := fix x. \epsilon + a; x; b$$

$$\forall n \in \mathbb{N}. a^n b^n \#/s$$

# Can express Context-Free Grammars

### Example



# Tail-Recursive Programs (TRP)

tail-recursive s := All bound variables in s occur in end position

regular s := Every fix in s is of the form fix X.  $\epsilon + t$ ; X or fix X. X

linear s := Every sequence in s is of the form a; s

- Regular programs (RP) are tail-recursive (especially Imp)
- Linear programs (LP) are tail-recursive (especially LImp)



# From Tail-Recursive Programs to Regular Programs

Tail-recursive programs can be translated in regular programs



Intuition: Every fix can be split up in a part that will iterate and one which will finish

## Regularizer - Example



# Normalizing expressions

- Goal: Equations which allow to transform TRP stepwise to RP
- Searched: Adequate equivalence  $\approx$  which allows the following transformations:

For fix X. s split up the function body s in a disjunction of the form

 $s \approx s' + (t; x)$ 

where x is not in the free variables of s' and t contains no free variables With

$$t^* = \operatorname{fix} X. \epsilon + t; X$$

We show:

fix 
$$X. s \approx t^*$$
;  $s'$ 

# Program Equivalence

$$s \approx t := \forall \xi. \, \xi/[s] \leftrightarrow \xi/[t]$$

Problem:  $\approx$  not congruent for fix

Example				
	a; $x \approx$ a; y	but	fix <i>x. a</i> ; <i>x</i> ≉ fix <i>x. a</i> ; <i>y</i>	

Possible solutions:

• Redefining equivalence with environment  $\alpha: \mathcal{V} \to \mathsf{cfp}$ :

$$s \equiv t := \forall \alpha \xi. \quad \xi / s, \alpha \leftrightarrow \xi / t, \alpha$$

• Axiomatic characterization with a depth counter:

 $s \equiv_n t := s \approx t$  and only calls to variables > n may differ

### Linearizer

Linear context-free programs (LP) as a generalization of LImp:

Llmp  $s, t ::= a; s \mid \text{ if } b \text{ then } s \text{ else } t \mid \text{ fix } X.s \mid X$ 

$$P \qquad s,t ::= \epsilon \mid a; s \mid s+t \mid fix X.s \mid X$$

Translation from TRP to LP:

$$\begin{split} \mathcal{L}(\_,\_) &: \mathsf{trp} \to \mathsf{lp} \to \mathsf{lp} \\ \mathcal{L}(\epsilon, u) &= \epsilon \\ \mathcal{L}(x, u) &= x \\ \mathcal{L}(a, u) &= a; u \\ \mathcal{L}(s; t, u) &= \mathcal{L}(s, \mathcal{L}(t, u)) \\ \mathcal{L}(s + t, u) &= \mathcal{L}(s, u) + \mathcal{L}(t, u) \\ \mathcal{L}(\mathsf{fix} x. s, u) &= \mathsf{fix} X. \, \mathcal{L}(s, u) \quad \mathsf{non-capturing} \end{split}$$

## Correctness Proof

Verification with respect to  $\approx$ 

$$s \approx t := \forall \xi. \, \xi/[s] \leftrightarrow \xi/[t]$$

Strong substitution lemma needed which allows to substitute under fix:

$$s \operatorname{trp} 
ightarrow \mathcal{L}(s_t^{ imes}, u) = \mathcal{L}(s, u)_{\mathcal{L}(t, u)}^{ imes}$$

Proof by induction on *s* trp Correctness Lemma:

$$(\forall s \in T, \operatorname{trp} s) \rightarrow \frac{\xi_1}{T} \rightarrow \frac{\xi_2}{[u]} \rightarrow \frac{\xi_3}{T'} \rightarrow \frac{\xi_1 \cdot \xi_2 \cdot \xi_3}{(\mathcal{L}(T, u))::T'}$$

$$\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{T}, u) :=$$
foldr ( $\lambda(s,$ cont).  $\mathcal{L}(s,$ cont))  $u \mathcal{T}$ 

# Program Equivalence

Verification of translation with program equivalence

$$s \equiv t := \forall \alpha \xi. \quad \xi / s, \alpha \leftrightarrow \xi / t, \alpha$$

Characteristic equations to push sequences inwards:

$$\epsilon; u \equiv u$$

$$(s; t); u \equiv s; (t; u)$$

$$(s + t); u \equiv s; u + t; u$$

$$(fix X. s + (t; X)); u \equiv fix X. (s; u) + (t; X)$$
if X is not in the free variables of s u and t

# Linearizer - Example

### Example

(fix x. a; (x + b)); c



Summary



# Results

Results obtained:

- Linearizer for TRP
- Correctness of the TRP-Linearizer with trace semantics
- Regularizer

Results wanted:

- Correctness of Regularizer
- Correctness of characteristic fix-equations
- Correctness results with stronger semantics (≡)
- $\bullet$  Sound equational system for  $\equiv$

# Outlook

- Correspondence of context-free programs and context-free languages (together with Jana)
- Connection between partial trace equivalence and big-step semantics
- Decidability of prefix languages for tail-recursive programs
- Equational deduction system for tail-recursive programs
- Extending context-free programs with mutual recursion



# **Tail-Recursion**

			trc x s	trc x t
$\overline{\operatorname{trc} x \epsilon}$	trc x a	trc x y	$\operatorname{trc} x (s+t)$	
$x \not\in \mathcal{F}(s)$	trc x t	trc x s	x	$\in \mathcal{F}(s)$
$\operatorname{trc} x(s;t)$		$\overline{\operatorname{trc} x \left( \operatorname{fix} y. s \right)}$	trc x s	