

Incremental Retrospective Assertion Checking

10 August 2023

19th KeY Symposium

-Bergen, Norway-

Lukas Grätz

Software Engineering Group Departement of Computer Science Technical University of Darmstadt, Germany



Introduction



The Problem



- Legacy software system (in use since years)
- Computes or decides
- White box, we have the sources!



The Problem



- Legacy software system (in use since years)
- Computes or decides
- White box, we have the sources!

But: Is every result or decision *correct*?



The Problem



- Legacy software system (in use since years)
- Computes or decides
- White box, we have the sources!

But: Is every result or decision correct? (right or intended or expected or in according)

(right or intended or expected or in accordance with the law or ...)





Sending invitations for breast cancer screenings

- Ticket booking for railway trips
- Your application

....



Alert Reference: CEM/CMO/2018/002 Date of issue: 02 May 2018

NHS Breast Screening Programme Incident

Actions

- GPs should note the announcement by the Secretary of State for Health on Wednesday 2 May and read the attached letters
- Action by recipients: NHS England Regional offices
- Practice staff should be ready to signpost affected women to available helplines and written materials highlighted through this alert.

Action category: Important information for immediate action

Title: NHS Breast Screening Programme Incident. National screening offer to women aged 70-79 years on 01/04/2018 who have missed a final screen

Broadcast content: Following an investigation started in January 2018, Public Health Engtand (PHE) and NHE Senjard (NHES) dentified that in some instances women were not being invited for their final breast screen between their 68° and 71° birthday. Data have been anayleed back to 2009 and an estimated 260,000 women on a OP register in England, now aged 70–79 years, will receive a letter. Those aged up to 72 will be sent a catch up screenting invitation. Women aged 72 and above will be offered the opportunity for a screen. Routine breast screening will be unaffected and most women in these age groups will still have received their final screen.

An announcement was made by the Secretary of State for Health on Wednesday 2 May and the Medical Director of PHE has written directly to screening services to inform them of the issue. NHSE have also informed services. The problems, which relate to IT issues and variation in local invitation specification systems, are now resolved.

As part of this Petient Notification. Exercise all of the affected women registered with a CP will receive a letter with clear advice and signposting. Although a helpline has been estat on 8000 169 2522 women may still attend primary care for advice and support. Some reguest further clinical review of their case, particularly if cancer has been detected. See the attached letter to professionals for further details of the incident, the advice to the see the statched letter to professionals for further details of the incident. The advice to the set here is the state of the set here is the state of the st





Software

- Sending invitations for breast cancer screenings
- Ticket booking for railway trips
- Your application

....

Search \$	Hert Ticket & reservation	Payment Check	k & book Confirmation
Darmstadt Hbf Q 1 1 passenger 27 and o 1 BahnCard 50, 2nd o Show details	München Hbf () Dep: 09:31 ver, 2nd class lass		
ice for all travelle	rs*		
Outward journey Super Sparpreis Train-specific travel Cancellation excluded No City-Ticket	Outswari journey Spazprets Train-specific travel Cancillation before 1st day of validity subject to a fee in exchange for voucher City-Ticket included	Outward journey Flexprefs Outward training on day of training Cancellation before first day of validity free. City-Ticket included	Ostward journey Flexprets Plus © Unrestricted choice of trains © Free cancellation until end of validity © Valid 1 day before and 2 days after the days of travel © City-Ticket included © Including seat
> Conditions	> Conditions	> Conditions	> Conditions
 	⊖ 36,65 €	⊖ 47,90 €	⊖ 🐨 55,65 €

н.



- Sending invitations for breast cancer screenings
- Ticket booking for railway trips
- Your application





- Sending invitations for breast cancer screenings
- Ticket booking for railway trips
- Your application

...



Semantic Bugs (Logic Bugs) TECHNISCHE UNIVERSITÄT DARMSTADT specified behavior intended, observed expected





Definition

A semantic bug violates:

- observed behavior = specified behavior
- observed behavior = expected behavior





Definition

A semantic bug violates:

- observed behavior = specified behavior
- observed behavior = expected behavior
- we need *specification* or *domain expert* judgment!





Definition

A semantic bug violates:

- observed behavior = specified behavior
- observed behavior = expected behavior

we need *specification* or *domain expert* judgment!







Definition

- A semantic bug violates:
 - observed behavior = specified behavior
 - observed behavior = expected behavior
- we need *specification* or *domain expert* judgment!

Crashes, deadlocks, memory errors etc. are not semantic bugs

- Other approaches & tools for bug finding
- No specification needed
- No domain expert needed



Existing bug finding approaches



- Design by contract
- Post-hoc static verification
- Regression test cases
- Code review
- (Trace) debugging



- Design by contract less specification effort
- Post-hoc static verification less specification effort
- Regression test cases
- Code review
- (Trace) debugging





- Design by contract less specification effort
- Post-hoc static verification less specification effort
- Regression test cases better coverage
- Code review
- (Trace) debugging



TECHNISCHE UNIVERSITÄT DARMSTADT



- Design by contract less specification effort
- Post-hoc static verification less specification effort
- Regression test cases better coverage
- Code review more systematic
- (Trace) debugging





- Design by contract less specification effort
- Post-hoc static verification less specification effort
- Regression test cases better coverage
- Code review more systematic
- (Trace) debugging better visualization/navigation



TECHNISCHE



- Design by contract less specification effort
- Post-hoc static verification less specification effort
- Regression test cases
- Code review more systematic
- (Trace) debugging better visualization/navigation











Software to validate

With source code





Software to validate

With source code

Program runs R

- $R = \{r_1, r_2, \dots, r_N\}$
- Large collection $N \gg 0$
- Real recorded data





Software to validate

With source code

Domain expert

- Understands source code
- Knows expected behavior in domain
- Can validate & justify

Program runs R

- $R = \{r_1, r_2, \dots, r_N\}$
- Large collection N >>> 0
- Real recorded data





Software to validate	Domain expert	
With source code	 Understands source code Knows expected behavior in domain Can validate & justify 	
Program runs <i>R</i>	Validation assistant	
 $R = \{r_1, r_2, \dots, r_N\}$ Large collection $N \gg 0$ Real recorded data 	 IDE Assists expert with: Debugging visualization/navigation Specification instrumentation 	



Incremental Specification

Lukas Grätz, Reiner Hähnle, Richard Bubel Finding Semantic Bugs Fast FASE 2022

https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-99429-7_8



August 10, 2023 | Retrospective Assertion Checking | Lukas Grätz | 12

Cinema Example



```
private double calcDscdPrice(Movie movie, int age) {
    //@ assert dscdReg: getDiscount(age) == 0 assuming <regular>;
    return movie.getPrice() * (1 - getDiscount(age)/100.0);
}
public void nextTicket(Scanner input) {
    int age = input("Enter age: ");
    //@ assume regular: 16 <= age && age < 65;
    int movieNumber = input("Select movie (1/2): ");
    Movie movie = movies[movieNumber];
    double dscdPrice = calcDscdPrice(movie, age);
    printf("Your price: %.2f €\n", dscdPrice);
}</pre>
```





```
int max(int a[]) {
    int m = a[0];
    for (int k=0; k < a.length; k++) {
        if ( m < a[k]) {
            m = a[k++];
        }
    }
    return m;
}</pre>
```



Checking—Buggy max Example

100 random runs from input arrays



{ 61 66 86 }	{60 10}	<i>{</i> 63 16 74 23 <i>}</i>	{80 60}	{24}
{53, 37}.	{25. 96. 54. 0}.	{34}.	{40, 49, 95, 8}.	{85}.
{84, 95, 53}.	{89, 30, 39, 27}.	{30, 10, 46, 16}.	{32, 12, 34}.	{15, 44, 17, 24}.
{70},	{ 5, 7, 17 },	{40, 73, 63},	{11, 30},	{92, 37, 47},
{11, 26, 6},	{94, 19},	{80, 58, 67},	{87, 53, 59},	{ 6 },
{15, 41, 2, 65},	{66, 89, 77},	{47, 53, 83, 71},	<i>{</i> 62 <i>,</i> 76 <i>},</i>	{44, 31},
{83, 33} ,	<i>{</i> 57, <i>0</i> , 53, 68 <i>}</i> ,	{80, 8} ,	{0} ,	{96, 20, 51 },
{79, 89},	{87, 18, 93, 76},	{47, 36},	{93, 54, 46, 23},	{56},
{85, 28} ,	{49} ,	{30, 50, 1, 44},	{15, 75},	{ 4, 27, 88, 21},
{43, 60, 59, 61},	{96, 60 },	{23},	{35, 50, 32, 37},	{30},
{59, 73, 7},	{21, 92, 1},	{35},	{50, 61, 99, 43} ,	{63, 69 },
{35, 85, 2, 79},	{34, 89, 46},	{35, 77, 92},	{99} ,	{57, 34, 29, 52},
{26},	{10, 68},	{67, 16} ,	{91, 51, 77},	{38, 76, 90},
{85, 59, 68},	{34, 41, 91},	{85, 90, 80, 15},	{22, 65, 63},	{96} ,
{38},	{25, 68, 41, 27},	{ 4, 76, 70},	{95, 82, 0 },	{86},
{35, 38, 36, 55},	{35, 47, 75, 66},	{48, 4, 33},	{63} ,	{34, 30, 10, 27},
{ 4, 78},	{27, 54, 47, 69},	{81, 28, 92},	{ 5, 58},	{21, 22},
{32, 71, 22},	{91, 84},	{71, 1, 56, 27},	{ 8, 3},	{57, 27, 66, 60},
{25, 23, 34},	{10, 50, 82, 22},	{76, 94, 27, 15},	<i>{</i> 66 <i>, 80},</i>	{85, 73, 39 },
{47, 92, 64},	{81, 73, 26, 15},	{56, 56, 69, 91},	{87, 36, 87, 45},	{47, 32, 12}



August 10, 2023 | Retrospective Assertion Checking | Lukas Grätz | 15

Checking—Buggy max Example

100 random runs from input arrays



{61, 66, 86},	{60, 10},	<i>{</i> 63 <i>,</i> 16 <i>,</i> 74 <i>,</i> 23 <i>},</i>	{80, 60},	{24},
$\{53, 37\}, \{84, 95, 53\}$	{25, 96, 54, 0},	{34}, {30 10 46 16}	{40, 49, 95, 8}, {32, 12, 34}	$\{85\},\$
{70}.	$\{5, 7, 17\}.$	$\{40, 73, 63\}.$	$\{11, 30\}.$	$\{92, 37, 47\}.$
{11, 26, 6},	{94, 19},	{80, 58, 67},	{87, 53, 59},	{ <mark>6</mark> },
{15, 41, 2, 65},	{66, 89, 77},	{47, 53, 83, 71},	{62, 76},	{44, 31},
{83, 33},	{57, 0, 53, 68},	{80, 8},	{ 0 },	{96, 20, 51},
$\{79, 89\}, \langle Assistant $	{87, 18, 93, 76},	{47, 36},	{93, 54, 46, 23},	{ 56 },
{85, 28},	{49} ,	{30, 50, 1, 44},	{15, 75},	{ 4, 27, 88, 21},
{43, 60, 59, 61},	{96, 60},	{23},	{35, 50, 32, 37},	{30},
{59, 73, 7},	{21, 92, 1},	(35),	{50, 61, 99, 43},	{63, 69},
{35, 85, 2, 79},	{34, 89, 46},	{35, 77, 92},	{99}} ,	{57, 34, 29, 52},
{26},	{10, 68},	{67, 16},	{91, 51, 77},	{38, 76, 90}
{85, 59, 68},	{34, 41, 91},	{85, 90, 80, 15},	{22, 65, 63},	{96} ,
{38},	{25, 68, 41, 27},	{ 4, 76, 70},	{95, 82, 0},	{86} ,
{35, 38, 36, 55},	{35, 47, 75, 66},	{48, 4, 33},	{63} ,	{34, 30, 10, 27},
{ 4, 78},	{27, 54, 47, 69},	{81, 28, 92},	{ 5, 58},	{21, 22},
{32, 71, 22},	{91, 84},	{71, 1, 56, 27},	{ 8, 3},	{57, 27, 66, 60},
{25, 23, 34}	{10, 50, 82, 22},	{76, 94, 27, 15},	{66, 80}.	{85, 73, 39}
{47, 92, 64},	{81, 73, 26, 15},	{56, 56, 69, 91},	{87, 36, 87, 45},	{47, 32, 12}



August 10, 2023 | Retrospective Assertion Checking | Lukas Grätz | 15

Validation Step (1)







Validation Step (1)





Assistant: Is this run valid?



August 10, 2023 | Retrospective Assertion Checking | Lukas Grätz | 16

Validation Step (1)





Assistant: Is this run valid? Expert: ...adds max1res...



Validation Step (1)



```
int max(int a[]) {
    int m = a[0];
    for (int k=0; k < a.length; k++) {
        if ( m < a[k]) {
            m = a[k++];
        }
    }
    //@ assert max1res: m==a[1] assuming;
    return m;
    // m = 89
</pre>
```

Assistant: Is this run valid?

Expert: ...adds max1res...

Expert: Because a[1] is the result (max1res).

Validation Step (2)



```
int max(int a[]) {
    int m = a[0];
    for (int k=0; k < a.length; k++) {
        if ( m < a[k]) {
            m = a[k++];
        }
}
Assistant //@ assert max1res: m==a[1] assuming;
    return m;
    }
}</pre>
```



Validation Step (2)



```
int max(int a[]) {
    int m = a[0];
    for (int k=0; k < a.length; k++) {
        if ( m < a[k]) {
            m = a[k++];
        }
}
Assistant //@ assert max1res: m==a[1] assuming;
    return m;
        // m = 89
}</pre>
```

Assistant: Why is it valid for this run to satisfy max1res?



August 10, 2023 | Retrospective Assertion Checking | Lukas Grätz | 18

Validation Step (2)



```
int max(int a[]) {
        Assistant // a = {79, 89}
        //@ max1of2: a.length==2 && a[0]<=a[1];
        int m = a[0];
        for (int k=0; k < a.length; k++) {
            if ( m < a[k]) {
                m = a[k++];
            }
        }
        Assistant //@ assert max1res: m==a[1] assuming <max1of2>;
        return m;
        // m = 89
        }
```

Assistant: Why is it valid for *this run* to satisfy max1res? Expert: Because max1of2.


100 random runs from input arrays



{61, 66, 86}, {53, 37}.	{60, 10}, {25, 96, 54, 0}.	{63, 16, 74, 23}, {34}.	{80, 60}, {40, 49, 95, 8}.	{24}, {85}.
{84, 95, 53},	{89, 30, 39, 27},	{30, 10, 46, 16},	{32, 12, 34},	{15, 44, 17, 24},
{70},	{ 5, 7, 17 },	{40, 73, 63},	{11, 30},	{92, 37, 47},
{11, 26, 6},	{94, 19},	{80, 58, 67},	{87, 53, 59},	{ 6 },
{15, 41, 2, 65},	{66, 89, 77} ,	{47, 53, 83, 71},	$\{62, 76\},\$	{44, 31},
{83, 33},	{57, 0, 53, 68} ,	{80, 8} ,	{0} ,	{96, 20, 51 },
{79, 89}, Assistant	{87, 18, 93, 76},	{47, 36},	{93, 54, 46, 23},	{ 56 } ,
{85, 28}, \	{49} ,	{30, 50, 1, 44},	<u>{15, 75}</u> ,	{ 4, 27, 88, 21},
{43, 60, 59, 61},	{96, 60},	{23},	{35, 50, 32, 37},	{30},
{59, 73, 7},	{21, 92, 1},	{35},	{50, 61, 99, 43},	$\{63, 69\},\$
{35, 85, 2, 79},	{34, 89, 46},	{35, 77, 92},	{99} ,	{57, 34, 29, 52},
{26},	$\{10, 68\},\$	{67, 16} ,	{91, 51, 77 },	{38, 76, 90},
{85, 59, 68},	{34, 41, 91},	{85, 90, 80, 15},	{22, 65, 63},	{96} ,
{38},	{25, 68, 41, 27},	{ 4, 76, 70},	{95, 82, 0 } ,	{86} ,
<i>{</i> 35, 38, 36, 55 <i>}</i> ,	{35, 47, 75, 66},	{48, 4, 33},	{ 63 },	{34, 30, 10, 27},
{ 4, 78},	{27, 54, 47, 69},	{81, 28, 92},	<u>{ 5, 58}</u> ,	$\{21, 22\},\$
{32, 71, 22},	{91, 84},	{71, 1, 56, 27},	<u>{ 8, 3}</u> ,	{57, 27, 66, 60} ,
{25, 23, 34},	{10, 50, 82, 22},	{76, 94, 27, 15},	<u>{66, 80}</u> ,	{85, 73, 39 },
{47, 92, 64},	{81, 73, 26, 15},	{56, 56, 69, 91},	{87, 36, 87, 45},	{47, 32, 12}



August 10, 2023 | Retrospective Assertion Checking | Lukas Grätz | 20

100 random runs from input arrays



<i>{</i> 61, 66, 86 <i>}</i> , <i>{</i> 60, 10 <i>}</i> ,	{63, 16,	74, 23}, {80,	60}, {24	},
<i>{</i> 53 <i>,</i> 37 <i>}, <i>{</i>25<i>,</i> 96<i>,</i> 5</i>	4, 0}, {34},	{40,	49,95,8}, {85	},
{84, 95, 53}, {89, 30, 3	9, 27}, {30, 10,	46, 16}, {32,	12, 34}, {15	, 44, 17, 24},
{70}, {5, 7, 1	7}, {40, 73,	63}, {11,	30}, {92	, 37, 47},
{11, 26, 6}, {94, 19},	{80, 58,	67}. {87.	53, 59}, { 6	}.
{15, 41, 2, 65}, {66, 89, 7	7}. {47.53.	83, 71}. {62.	76}. {44	. 31}.
{83, 33}, {57, 0, 5	3. 68}. {80. 8}.	$\{0\}$	{96	. 20. 51}.
{79, 89}, {87, 18, 9	$3, 76\}, \{47, 36\}$	{93	54, 46, 23}, {56	}.
{85, 28}, {49},	{30, 50,	1, 44}, {15,	75}. { 4	. 27. 88. 21}.
{43 60 59 61} {96 60}	{23}	{35	50 32 37} (30	}
$\{59, 73, 7\}, \{21, 92, \dots\}$	1 , $\{35\}$,	{50.	61, 99, 43}. (63	. 69}.
$\{35, 85, 2, 79\}$ $\{34, 89, 4\}$	6} {35 77	92} {99}	{57	34 29 52
$\{26\}$ $\{26\}$ $\{10, 68\}$	67 16V	<i>J</i> 2), (<i>J</i> 2), <i>J</i> 01	51 77\ /38	76 99
1207, $(10, 00),$	1\ /85 00	90 15\ <u>122</u>	65 621 /06	, 70, 90 <u>,</u>
$\{00, 09, 00\}, \{04, 41, 9\}$	1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0,	(0, 10), (22, 70)		<i>f</i> ,
{38},	1, 2/}, {4, /6,	70}, {95,	82, 0}, {86	},
{35, 38, 36, 55}, Assistant 47, 7	5, 66}, {48, 4,	33}, {63},	{34	, 30, 10, 27},
{ 4, 78}, { 27, 54, 4	7, 69}, {81, 28,	92}, { 5,	58}, {21	, 22},
$\{32, 71, 22\}, \{91, 84\},\$	{71, 1,	56, 27}, { 8,	3), {57	, 27, 66, 60},
{25, 23, 34}. {10, 50, 8	2. 22}. {76. 94.	27.15}. {66	80}. {85	73 39}
{47, 92, 64}, {81, 73, 2	6, 15}, {56, 56,	69, 91}, {87,	36, 87, 45}, {47	, 32, 12}



August 10, 2023 | Retrospective Assertion Checking | Lukas Grätz | 20

Validation Step (3)



```
int max(int a[]) {
                                                    Assistant // a = \{35, 38, 36, 55\}
        //@ max1of2: a.length==2 && a[0]<=a[1];</pre>
        int m = a[0];
        for (int k=0; k < a.length; k++) {
           if ( m < a[k]) {
               m = a[k++]:
        //@ assert max1res: m==a[1] assuming <max1of2>;
        return m;
                                                              //m = 55
ssistant
```



Validation Step (3)



```
Assistant // a = \{35, 38, 36, 55\}
      int max(int a[]) {
        //@ max1of2: a.length==2 && a[0]<=a[1];</pre>
        int m = a[0];
        for (int k=0; k < a.length; k++) {
           if ( m < a[k]) {
               m = a[k++]:
        //@ assert max1res: m==a[1] assuming <max1of2>;
        return m;
                                                              //m = 55
ssistant
```

Assistant: Is this run valid?



Validation Step (3)



```
Assistant // a = \{35, 38, 36, 55\}
      int max(int a[]) {
        //@ max1of2: a.length==2 && a[0]<=a[1]:</pre>
        int m = a[0];
        for (int k=0; k < a.length; k++) {
           if ( m < a[k]) {
              m = a[k++]:
        //@ assert max1res: m==a[1] assuming <max1of2>;
        //@ assert max3res: m==a[3] assuming;
                                                              //m = 55
        return m;
ssistant
```

Assistant: Is this run valid?

Expert: Because a[3] is the result (max3res).



Validation Step (4)



```
Assistant // a = \{35, 38, 36, 55\}
      int max(int a[]) {
        //@ max1of2: a.length==2 && a[0]<=a[1];</pre>
        int m = a[0];
        for (int k=0; k < a.length; k++) {
           if ( m < a[k]) {
              m = a[k++]:
        //@ assert max1res: m==a[1] assuming <max1of2>;
Assistant //@ assert max3res: m==a[3] assuming;
        return m;
                                                             //m = 55
```



Validation Step (4)



```
Assistant // a = \{35, 38, 36, 55\}
      int max(int a[]) {
        //@ max1of2: a.length==2 && a[0]<=a[1]:</pre>
        int m = a[0]:
        for (int k=0; k < a.length; k++) {
           if ( m < a[k]) {
              m = a[k++]:
        //@ assert max1res: m==a[1] assuming <max1of2>;
Assistant //@ assert max3res: m==a[3] assuming;
        return m;
                                                              //m = 55
```

Assistant: Why is it valid for this run to satisfy max3res?



Validation Step (4)



```
Assistant // a = \{35, 38, 36, 55\}
      int max(int a[]) {
        //@ max1of2: a.length==2 && a[0]<=a[1]:</pre>
        //@ max3of4: a.length==4 && a[0]<=a[3] && a[1]<=a[3] && a[2]<=a[3];
        int m = a[0]:
        for (int k=0; k < a.length; k++) {
           if ( m < a[k]) {
              m = a[k++]:
        //@ assert max1res: m==a[1] assuming <max1of2>;
Assistant //@ assert max3res: m==a[3] assuming <max3of4>;
        return m:
                                                             //m = 55
```

Assistant: Why is it valid for *this run* to satisfy max3res? Expert: Because max3of4.

August 10, 2023 | Retrospective Assertion Checking | Lukas Grätz | 24

100 random runs from input arrays



{61, 66, 86},	{60, 10}, (25, 26, 54, 2)	{63, 16, 74, 23},	{80, 60}, (40, 40, 05, 9)	{24},
{53, 37}, {84, 95, 53},	{25, 96, 54, 6}, {89, 30, 39, 27},	{34}, {30, 10, 46, 16},	{40, 49, 95, 8}, {32, 12, 34},	{85}, {15, 44, 17, 24},
{70}, {11 26 6}	{ 5, 7, 17}, {94 19}	{40, 73, 63}, {80, 58, 67}	$\frac{\{11, 30\}}{\{87, 53, 59\}}$	{92, 37, 47}, { 6}
$\{15, 41, 2, 65\},\$	{66, 89, 77},	{47, 53, 83, 71},	$\{62, 76\},\$	{44, 31},
{83, 33}, {79, 89}.	$\frac{\{57, 0, 53, 68\}}{\{87, 18, 93, 76\}}$	{80, 8}, {47, 36}.	{0}, {93, 54, 46, 23}.	{96, 20, 51}, {56}.
{85, 28},	{49}, {00, 00, 00, 00, 00, 00, 00, 00, 00, 00,	{30, 50, 1, 44},	$\{15, 75\},$	{ 4, 27, 88, 21},
$\{\frac{43}{59}, \frac{60}{73}, \frac{59}{7}, \frac{61}{7}\},\$	{96, 60}, {21, 92, 1},	{23}, {35},	{35, 50, 32, 37}, {50, 61, 99, 43},	{30}, {63, 69},
{35, 85, 2, 79},	{34, 89, 46}, {10, 68}	{35, 77, 92}, {67, 16}	{99}, {91 51 77}	$\{57, 34, 29, 52\},$
{85, 59, 68},	$\{34, 41, 91\},\$	{85, 90, 80, 15},	{22, 65, 63},	{96}, /0, 90 <i>}</i> ,
{38}, {35 38 36 55}	{25 68, 41, 27}, sistant 47 75 66}	{ 4, 76, 70}, { 48	{95, 82, 0}, {63}	{86}, {34 30 10 27}
(33, 33, 33, 33, 33, 33, 33, 33, 33, 33,	$\{27, 54, 47, 69\},\$	{81, 28, 92},	$\{5, 58\},\$	$\{21, 22\},\$
{32, 71, 22}, {25, 23, 34}.	{91, 84}, {10, 50, 82, 22}.	{71, 1, 56, 27}, {76, 94, 27, 15}.	{ 8, 3}, {66, 80}.	{57, 27, 66, 60}, {85, 73, 39}.
{47, 92, 64},	{81, 73, 26, 15},	{56, 56, 69, 91}	{87, 36, 87, 45},	{47, 32, 12}



August 10, 2023 | Retrospective Assertion Checking | Lukas Grätz | 25

Validation Step (4)



```
int max(int a[]) {
                                                              // a = {56, 56, 69, 91}
        //@ max1of2: a.length==2 && a[0]<=a[1];</pre>
        //@ max3of4: a.length==4 && a[0]<=a[3] && a[1]<=a[3] && a[2]<=a[3];</pre>
        int m = a[0]:
        for (int k=0; k < a.length; k++) {</pre>
            if ( m < a[k]) {
               m = a[k++]:
        //@ assert max1res: m==a[1] assuming <max1of2>:
Assistant //@ assert max3res: m==a[3] assuming <max3of4>;
                                                              //m = 69
        return m:
```

Assistant: Why is it valid for *this run* to satisfy max3res?

Expert: Because max3of4.



Validation Step (4)





Assistant: Why is it valid for this run to satisfy max3res?

Expert: Because max3of4.



General Description



Validation Step

- 1. Tool chooses existing assertion *a*, run *r*
- 2. Expert judges *a* correct for *r*
 - Otherwise: Bug found!
- 3. Expert adds assertion references $<L_1, \ldots, L_n >$ to assuming of *a*
- 3a Expert also adds all referenced assertions
- 4. Verification tools check a with new assumptions



(WIP) Program Run Debugging & Visualization in the IDE

(Student Software Project)



Status Quo



Conservative Debugging in IDEs

- Set breakpoint
- Debug 'Program'

Visualization:

- 1. Current line
- 2. Current variable values



Better



Visualization of the whole program run

- 1. Control Flow Path
- 2. All variable values



Better



Visualization of the whole program run

- 1. Control Flow Path
- 2. All variable values

Ire Simple idea, isn't it?



1. Control Flow Path





- Control flow of whole program run
 - Arrow: Code line executed
 - Pointed: Conditioned code skipped
 - Zickzack: Loop multiple times
 - Circle arrow: Function call
- Link: Jump (call/return)



1. Control Flow Path





- Control flow of whole program run
 - Arrow: Code line executed
 - Pointed: Conditioned code skipped
 - Zickzack: Loop multiple times
 - Circle arrow: Function call
- Link: Jump (call/return)



Record, Replay, Validate





Omniscient recording/debugging (gdb)

✗ High Overhead





- Omniscient recording/debugging (gdb)
 - ✗ High Overhead
- Manual interface instrumentation (liblog, R2)





- Omniscient recording/debugging (gdb)
 - X High Overhead
- Manual interface instrumentation (liblog, R2)



Figure 2: Four cuts in a call graph for record and replay. The function f3 interacts with the environment.





- Omniscient recording/debugging (gdb)
 - X High Overhead
- Manual interface instrumentation (liblog, R2)
- OS interface (RR debugger)
 - Low Overhead
 - ? Stability, Security
 - × Portability



Control Flow Recording







Control Flow Recording





Recorded trace (simplified):0 110 0



Control Flow Recording





Recorded trace (simplified):0 110 0



Retrospective Assertion Checking



	Approach	Replay	Assertion Checking
1	Record all inputs	Concrete re-execution	Run-time assertion checking
2	Deterministic replay	Using a <i>debugger</i> (<i>RR</i> debugger)	Interactive in debugger
3	Control flow recording	Symbolic execution	Check symbolic path condition + negated assertion



Retrospective Assertion Checking



	Approach	Replay	Assertion Checking
1	Record all inputs	Concrete re-execution	Run-time assertion checking
2	Deterministic replay	Using a <i>debugger</i> (<i>RR</i> debugger)	Interactive in debugger
3	Control flow recording	Symbolic execution	Check symbolic path condition + negated assertion

- Approaches old, except for assertion checking
- ✓ We implemented approach 3



(WIP) A Theory of Sound Dependent Assertions



Problem



- Dependent assertions (our 2022 paper)
- Semantics unclear





- Dependent assertions (our 2022 paper)
- Semantics unclear
- Solution: Use a meta logic
- Different syntax



Box & Diamond



Assertion in line 2 valid for all iterations of block in line 1

```
1 while (...) {
2 assert expr ;
3 }
```

Assertion in line 2 valid for at least one iteration of block in line 1

```
1 while (...) {
2 assert expr ;
3 }
```



Box & Diamond



Assertion in line 2 valid for all iterations of block in line 1

```
1 while (...) {
2 assert expr with [1]2;
3 }
```

Assertion in line 2 valid for at least one iteration of block in line 1

```
1 while (...) {
2     assert expr with <1>2;
3 }
```



Meta-Logic Pattern—"Postcondition" I



```
1 int bar () {

2 assert pre with ...;

3

4

5 CODE;

6

7

8 assert post with [1](2 \rightarrow 7);

9 return 42;

10 }
```



Meta-Logic Pattern—"Postcondition" II



```
1 int bar () {

2 assert pre with ...;

3

4 if (...) {

5 assert post with [1](2 \rightarrow \langle 4 \rangle 5);

6 return 17;

7 }

8

9 return 42;

10 }
```



Meta-Logic Pattern—"Loop-Invariant" I



```
1 int bar () {

2 assert pre with ...;

3

4 for (...) {

5 CODE;

6 assert linv with [1](2 \rightarrow [3]5);

7 }

8

9 return 42;

10 }
```


Meta-Logic Pattern—"Postcondition" III



```
1 int bar () {

2

3

4 for (...) {

5 CODE;

6 assert ... with ...;

7 }

8 assert post with [1]( [3]5 \rightarrow 7);

9 return 42;

10 }
```



Meta-Logic Pattern—"Precondition"



```
int bar () {
 1
         assert pre with [11](12 \rightarrow [12][1] 2)
 2
 3
4
5
6
7
8
9
         CODE;
         return 42;
10
11
12
    caller () {
13
         assert ...:
         bar ();
14
15
    }
```





- Can use standard calculus of modal logic
- Propositional logic + axiom K + rule of necessity





- Can use standard calculus of modal logic
- Propositional logic + axiom K + rule of necessity
- Conjecture: Our meta problems in are O(n)





- Can use standard calculus of modal logic
- Propositional logic + axiom K + rule of necessity
- Conjecture: Our meta problems in are O(n)
- Some derived rules

[x] A ,	$[x](\ {oldsymbol A} o {oldsymbol B}$)	\implies	[x]B	(apply post)
[y] A ,	$[x](\ [y] A o B$)	\implies	[x]B	(apply post-rec)
[y][x] A ,	$[x](\ {oldsymbol A} o {oldsymbol B}$)	\implies	[y][x]B	(apply pre)





- Can use standard calculus of modal logic
- Propositional logic + axiom K + rule of necessity
 - Conjecture: Our meta problems in are O(n)
- Some derived rules

[x] A ,	$[x](\ {oldsymbol A} o {oldsymbol B} \)$	\implies	[x]B	(apply post)
[y] A ,	$[x](\ [y]A o B\)$	\implies	[x]B	(apply post-rec)
[y][x] A ,	$[x](\ {oldsymbol A} o {oldsymbol B}$)	\implies	[y][x]B	(apply pre)

Name of meta logic: modal horn logic

Insertion Sort



```
void insert(int pos, int array[len]) {
 1
         int value = array[pos];
 2
 3
        for (int j = pos-1; j > 0; j--) {
            if (array[j] < value) {</pre>
 4
5
6
7
                 break:
            array[j+1] = array[j];
            assert \forall k; \emptyset < k < j; array[k] == \old(array[k])
                with [13][14,1][3]7<sub>1</sub>;
             assert \forall k; j \leq k \leq pos; array[k+1] == \old(arrav[k])
                with [13][14, 1][3]7<sub>3</sub>:
8
9
         array[j+1] = value;
         assert \forall k: \emptyset < k < pos: arrav[k] < arrav[k+1]
            with [13]([14, 1][3](7_1 \land 7_3) \rightarrow \langle 14, 1 \rangle 9_1);
         assert \forall i: (\count k: 0 < k < len: i == arrav[k])
                     == (\count k; \theta < k < len; i == (old(array[k]))
            with [12][13]([14, 1][3](7_1 \land 7_3) \rightarrow \langle 14, 1 \rangle 9_3);
10
```



Insertion Sort



```
12 void insertionSort(int array[len]) {

13 for (int pos = 1; pos < len; pos++) {

14 insert(pos, array);

15 }

assert \forall i; (\count k; 0 \le k < len; i == array[k])

== (\count k; 0 \le k < len; i == \old(array[k]))

with [12]([13](14, 1)9_3 \rightarrow 15_1);

assert \forall k; 0 \le k < len-1; array[k] \le array[k+1]

with [12]([13](14, 1)9_1 \rightarrow 15_4);

16 }
```



Insertion Sort—Meta Logic



$$\begin{split} & [13][14,1][3]7_1 \\ & [13][14,1][3]7_3 \\ & [13]([14,1][3](7_1 \wedge 7_3) \rightarrow \langle 14,1 \rangle 9_1) \\ & [12][13]([14,1][3](7_1 \wedge 7_3) \rightarrow \langle 14,1 \rangle 9_3) \\ & [12]([13]\langle 14,1 \rangle 9_3 \rightarrow 15_1) \\ & [12]([13]\langle 14,1 \rangle 9_1 \rightarrow 15_4) \end{split}$$



August 10, 2023 | Retrospective Assertion Checking | Lukas Grätz | 49

Insertion Sort—Meta Logic



$$\begin{split} & [13][14,1][3]7_1 \\ & [13][14,1][3]7_3 \\ & [13]([14,1][3](7_1 \wedge 7_3) \rightarrow \langle 14,1 \rangle 9_1) \\ & [12][13]([14,1][3](7_1 \wedge 7_3) \rightarrow \langle 14,1 \rangle 9_3) \\ & [12]([13]\langle 14,1 \rangle 9_3 \rightarrow 15_1) \\ & [12]([13]\langle 14,1 \rangle 9_1 \rightarrow 15_4) \end{split}$$

Derivable: [12]151 and [12]154 (easy exercise!)



August 10, 2023 | Retrospective Assertion Checking | Lukas Grätz | 49

Note On Verification



- Meta logic inferences O(n)
- Verification?



Note On Verification



- Meta logic inferences O(n)
- Verification?
- Verification idea
 - 0. Automatic assignable/accessible clause generation
 - 1. Start symbolic execution somewhere
 - 2. Show that the assertion holds (once or never reached, depending on assertion)
 - 3. Do either:
 - 3.1 Unroll loop and continue from 2
 - 3.2 Continue from 1



Note On Verification



- Meta logic inferences O(n)
- Verification?
- Verification idea
 - 0. Automatic assignable/accessible clause generation
 - 1. Start symbolic execution somewhere
 - 2. Show that the assertion holds (once or never reached, depending on assertion)
 - 3. Do either:
 - 3.1 Unroll loop and continue from 2
 - 3.2 Continue from 1
- reversion Verification strategies depend on classification as pre-condition, loop-invariant, post-condition, ...



Conclusion



- Incremental specifications with assertions
- Retrospective assertion checking
- Better debugging visualization
- Modularity
- Generalization of method contracts*





- Design by contract
 less specification effort
- Post-hoc static verification
 less specification effort
- Regression test cases better coverage
- Code review more systematic
- ✓ (Trace) debugging better visualization/navigation



Backup



Careful With Normal Assert/Assume in KeY



```
/*@ requires true;
    ensures anything; */
foo () {
    //@ assume false;
}
```

```
/*@ requires true;
    ensures true; */
bar () {
    //@ assert anything;
}
```



Careful With Normal Assert/Assume in KeY



```
/*@ requires true;
    ensures anything; */
foo () {
    //@ assume false;
}
```

- Inconstent specification!
- ensures does not follow from requires alone!
- Soundness issue: caller is not required to establish any assume!

```
/*@ requires true;
    ensures true; */
bar () {
    //@ assert anything;
}
```

- KeY might not verify specification!
- But ensures follows trivial!
- Modularity issue: caller cannot use assert result!

