Weakest Precondition Calculus

COMP2600 — Formal Methods for Software Engineering

Rajeev Goré

Australian National University Semester 2, 2016 (Most lecture slides due to Ranald Clouston)

Weakest Preconditions for Conditionals (Rule 3a/4)

 $wp(\text{if } b \text{ then } S_1 \text{ else } S_2, Q) \equiv (b \Rightarrow wp(S_1, Q)) \land (\neg b \Rightarrow wp(S_2, Q))$

Proof:

By cases on condition b,

• *b* is *true*: $RHS \equiv (True \Rightarrow wp(S_1, Q)) \land (False \Rightarrow wp(S_2, Q))$ *wp* for the conditional is the weakest precondition for S_1 guaranteeing postcondition Q - that is, LHS is $wp(S_1, Q)$.

The right hand side reduces to the same thing if we replace b with True.

• *b* is *false*:

Similarly, both left hand and right hand sides reduce to $wp(S_2, Q)$

Conditional Example:

 $wp(\text{if } b \text{ then } S_1 \text{ else } S_2, Q) \equiv (b \Rightarrow wp(S_1, Q)) \land (\neg b \Rightarrow wp(S_2, Q))$

wp(if x>2 then y:=1 else y:=-1, (y>0)) $\equiv ((x>2) \Rightarrow wp(y:=1, (y>0)) \land (\neg(x>2) \Rightarrow wp(y:=-1, (y>0)))$ $\equiv ((x>2) \Rightarrow (1>0)) \land (\neg(x>2) \Rightarrow (-1>0))$ $\equiv ((x>2) \Rightarrow True) \land ((x \le 2) \Rightarrow False)$ $\equiv x > 2$

(If you are unhappy with the last step, draw a truth table.)

Alternative Rule for Conditionals (Rule 3b/4)

The conditional rule tends to produce complicated logical expressions which we then have to simplify.

It is often easier to deal with disjunctions and conjunctions than implications, so the following *equivalent* rule for conditionals is usually more convenient.

 $wp(\text{if } b \text{ then } S_1 \text{ else } S_2, Q) \equiv (b \wedge wp(S_1, Q)) \vee (\neg b \wedge wp(S_2, Q))$

Conditional Example Again:

 $wp(\text{if } b \text{ then } S_1 \text{ else } S_2, Q) \equiv (b \wedge wp(S_1, Q)) \vee (\neg b \wedge wp(S_2, Q))$

$$wp(if x>2 then y:=1 else y:=-1, (y>0))$$

$$\equiv ((x>2) \land wp(y:=1, (y>0)) \lor (\neg(x>2) \land wp(y:=-1, (y>0)))$$

$$\equiv ((x>2) \land (1>0)) \lor (\neg(x>2) \land (-1>0))$$

$$\equiv ((x>2) \land True) \lor (\neg(x>2) \land False)$$

$$\equiv (x>2) \lor False$$

$$\equiv x>2$$

(Again, any step you are unhappy with can be confirmed via truth table.)

Why The Rules are Equivalent

All that has changed is the form of the proposition. Rather than

$$(b \! \Rightarrow \! p) \land (\neg b \! \Rightarrow \! q)$$

we have

 $(b \wedge p) \vee (\neg b \wedge q)$: $(b \Rightarrow p) \wedge (\neg b \Rightarrow q)$ $(b \wedge p) \quad \lor$ $(\neg b \land q)$ b p qТ Т Т Т т Т Т т F Т Т F т т Т т т F

 I
 I
 I
 I
 I
 I

 T
 F
 T
 F
 F
 T

 T
 F
 F
 F
 T
 I

 F
 T
 T
 T
 T
 I

 F
 T
 F
 F
 F
 I

 F
 T
 F
 F
 F
 I

 F
 F
 T
 T
 T
 I

 F
 F
 F
 T
 T
 T

 F
 F
 F
 T
 F
 F

 F
 F
 F
 T
 F
 F

 F
 F
 F
 T
 F
 F

 F F F F F F F **T** Т F F F F T Т F F F

Conditionals Without 'Else'

It is sometimes convenient to have conditionals without else, i.e.

if b then S

recalling that this is just a compact way of writing

if b then S else x := x

We can derive wp rules for this case:

 $wp(\text{if } b \text{ then } S, Q) \equiv (b \Rightarrow wp(S_1, Q)) \land (\neg b \Rightarrow Q)$ $\equiv (b \land wp(S_1, Q)) \lor (\neg b \land Q)$