

Strongest Postcondition

Andreas Podelski

November 28, 2011

correctness proof via forward derivation

- ▶ given a Hoare triple $\{\phi\} C \{\psi\}$,

correctness proof via forward derivation

- ▶ given a Hoare triple $\{\phi\} C \{\psi\}$,
- ▶ construct a *forwards* derivation

correctness proof via forward derivation

- ▶ given a Hoare triple $\{\phi\} C \{\psi\}$,
- ▶ construct a *forwards* derivation
- ▶ derivation = sequence of Hoare triples,
each Hoare triple is an axiom (skip, update)
or it is inferred by one of the inference rules (seq, cond, while)

correctness proof via forward derivation

- ▶ given a Hoare triple $\{\phi\} C \{\psi\}$,
- ▶ construct a *forwards* derivation
- ▶ derivation = sequence of Hoare triples,
each Hoare triple is an axiom (skip, update)
or it is inferred by one of the inference rules (seq, cond, while)
- ▶ Hoare triples with ψ and *strongest postcondition*
for larger and larger program fragments

correctness proof via forward derivation

- ▶ given a Hoare triple $\{\phi\} C \{\psi\}$,
- ▶ construct a *forwards* derivation
- ▶ derivation = sequence of Hoare triples,
each Hoare triple is an axiom (skip, update)
or it is inferred by one of the inference rules (seq, cond, while)
- ▶ Hoare triples with ψ and *strongest postcondition*
for larger and larger program fragments
- ▶ verification condition:
strongest postcondition of ϕ under C entails ψ
(+ special treatment of while)

strongest postcondition $\text{post}(C, \psi)$

▶ $\text{post}(\mathbf{skip}, \phi) =$

strongest postcondition $\text{post}(C, \psi)$

- ▶ $\text{post}(\mathbf{skip}, \phi) = \phi$
- ▶ $\text{post}(x := e, \phi) =$

strongest postcondition $\text{post}(C, \psi)$

- ▶ $\text{post}(\mathbf{skip}, \phi) = \phi$
- ▶ $\text{post}(x := e, \phi) = ?$
- ▶ $\text{post}(C_1 ; C_2, \phi) =$

strongest postcondition $\text{post}(C, \psi)$

- ▶ $\text{post}(\mathbf{skip}, \phi) = \phi$
- ▶ $\text{post}(x := e, \phi) = ?$
- ▶ $\text{post}(C_1 ; C_2, \phi) = \text{post}(C_2, \text{post}(C_1, \phi))$
- ▶ $\text{post}(\mathbf{if } b \mathbf{ then } C_1 \mathbf{ else } C_2, \phi) =$

strongest postcondition $\text{post}(C, \psi)$

- ▶ $\text{post}(\mathbf{skip}, \phi) = \phi$
- ▶ $\text{post}(x := e, \phi) = ?$
- ▶ $\text{post}(C_1 ; C_2, \phi) = \text{post}(C_2, \text{post}(C_1, \phi))$
- ▶ $\text{post}(\mathbf{if } b \mathbf{ then } C_1 \mathbf{ else } C_2, \phi) = \text{post}(b \wedge \phi) \wedge (\neg b \wedge \phi)$
- ▶ $\text{post}(\mathbf{while } b \mathbf{ do } \{\theta\} C_0, \phi) =$

strongest postcondition $\text{post}(C, \psi)$

- ▶ $\text{post}(\mathbf{skip}, \phi) = \phi$
- ▶ $\text{post}(x := e, \phi) = ?$
- ▶ $\text{post}(C_1 ; C_2, \phi) = \text{post}(C_2, \text{post}(C_1, \phi))$
- ▶ $\text{post}(\mathbf{if } b \mathbf{ then } C_1 \mathbf{ else } C_2, \phi) = \text{post}(b \wedge \phi) \wedge (\neg b \wedge \phi)$
- ▶ $\text{post}(\mathbf{while } b \mathbf{ do } \{\theta\} C_0, \phi) = \theta \wedge \neg b$
- ▶ next:
static analysis constructs candidate for θ via forward analysis
“reachability analysis”