

Rotation of Sequences: Algorithms and Proofs

Carlo A. Furia
ETH Zurich, Switzerland
<http://bugcounting.net>

20 June 2014
Revised 27 November 2014, 5 February 2015

Abstract

Sequence rotation consists of a circular shift of the sequence's elements by a given number of positions. We present the four classic algorithms to rotate a sequence; the loop invariants underlying their correctness; detailed correctness proofs; and fully annotated versions for the verifiers Boogie, Dafny, and ESC/Java2. The presentation illustrates in detail both how the algorithms work and what it takes to carry out mechanized proofs of their correctness.

Contents

1	Introduction	4
2	Modular arithmetic and sequences	4
3	Rotation: the problem	6
4	Rotation: the algorithms	6
4.1	Rotation by copy	7
4.1.1	Rotation by copy: computational complexity	7
4.1.2	Rotation by copy: correctness	9
4.2	Rotation by reversal	9
4.2.1	Rotation by reversal: computational complexity	10
4.2.2	Rotation by reversal: correctness	11
4.3	Rotation by swapping	12
4.3.1	Rotation by swapping: computational complexity	14
4.3.2	Rotation by swapping: correctness	16
4.4	Rotation by modular visit	19
4.4.1	Rotation by modular visit: complexity	21
4.4.2	Rotation by modular visit: correctness	22
5	Rotation: mechanized proofs in Boogie	25
5.1	Sequences and rotated sequences	26
5.2	Rotation by copy: mechanized proofs as on paper	27
5.3	Rotation by reversal: mechanized lemmas	28
5.3.1	Axioms and lemmas about reversal	28
5.3.2	Mechanized proofs of reversal and rotation by reversal	30
5.4	Rotation by swapping: organizing code for proofs	32
5.4.1	Mechanized proof of swapping sections	32
5.4.2	Lemmas about swapping	34
5.4.3	Mechanized proof of rotation by swapping: recursive version	38
5.4.4	Mechanized proof of rotation by swapping: iterative version	39
5.5	Rotation by modular visit: ghost code and framing	39
5.5.1	Axioms about cycles	43
5.5.2	Outer loop	44
5.5.3	Inner loop	47
5.5.4	Proof conclusion	48
6	Rotation: mechanized proofs in Dafny	50
6.1	Sequences and rotated sequences	51
6.2	Rotation by copy: simplified function definitions	52
6.3	Rotation by reversal: inductive sequence definitions and splits	54
6.3.1	Reversal: definition and lemmas	54
6.3.2	Mechanized proofs of reversal and rotation by reversal	54
6.4	Rotation by swapping: sliced sequences	55
6.4.1	Mechanized proof of swapping sections	56
6.4.2	Lemmas about swapping	57
6.4.3	Mechanized proof of rotation by swapping: recursive version	57
6.4.4	Mechanized proof of rotation by swapping: iterative version	59

6.5	Rotation by modular visit: abstraction in ghost code	60
6.5.1	Ghost functions and fundamental properties	60
6.5.2	Lemmas about cycles	66
6.5.3	Outer loop	66
6.5.4	Inner loop	66
6.5.5	Outer loop: closing	69
7	Rotation: mechanized proofs in ESC/Java2	70
7.1	Specifying rotation in JML	70
7.2	Rotation by copy	73
7.3	Rotation by reversal	73
7.3.1	Reversal: definition and lemmas	74
7.3.2	Mechanized proofs of reversal and rotation by reversal	74
7.4	Rotation by swapping	74
7.4.1	Mechanized proof of swapping sections	74
7.4.2	Lemmas about swapping	74
7.4.3	Mechanized proof of rotation by swapping: recursive version	79
7.4.4	Mechanized proof of rotation by swapping: iterative version	81
7.5	Rotation by modular visit	84
8	Discussion	88

1 Introduction

Rotating a sequence, typically represented by an array, is the problem of shifting all its elements in one direction by a fixed number of positions while cyclically wrapping over the sequence's bounds. Rotations have various practical applications in programming; a classic example is in editors, to arrange the lines of text stored as sequences of characters.

There is an interesting choice of algorithms to rotate a sequence, exploring different trade offs between performance, code complexity, and resource usage. The algorithms themselves have been part of computer science folklore knowledge for a long time [2, Sec. 2.3]; they are an excellent subject to discuss algorithm design and analysis [3].

Proving correctness of these algorithms is a challenging task too, even more so if we aim for (automated) mechanized proofs. The only document formally discussing how to establish the correctness of the rotation algorithms is a technical report by Gries and Mills [8]. They sketch the loop invariants underlying the correctness arguments; the level of detail of their presentation is, however, clearly insufficient to perform complete mechanized proofs, which require to exhaustively deal with issues such as framing and intermediate properties and assertions.

This paper presents each rotation algorithm for rotation first informally, then with detailed loop invariants and lemmas, and finally with all the gory low-level details necessary to carry out automated proofs using the Boogie prover [14], the Dafny verifier [11], and the ESC/Java2 verifier [4] for Java code annotated with JML. This presentation can serve as a useful guide to carry out similar correctness proofs of the same algorithms using other automated tools, as well as a tutorial introduction to some idioms (lemma procedures, framing, ghost code, and so on) frequently used in automated verification of full functional correctness.

The code presented in the paper is available online (under directory `rotation`):

<https://bitbucket.org/caf/verified/>

2 Modular arithmetic and sequences

A precise definition of the notion of rotation relies on some mathematical concepts that we introduce in this section.

Modular arithmetic. Modular arithmetic makes extensive usage of the ‘mod’ binary operation, which is normally defined [7, Sec. 3.4] in terms of integer division and floor as

$$x \bmod y = x - y \lfloor x/y \rfloor, \quad \text{for } y \neq 0. \quad (1)$$

This definition is not, however, always the best choice to specify and reason about programs. First, programming languages may implement definitions of ‘mod’ that differ in the sign of the result; for example, `x % y` has the same sign as `x` in Java but as `y` in Python. Second, (1) relies on two other operations, whereas it would be more convenient to have a direct definition only in terms of basic operators that are universally available.

These considerations justify the introduction of the binary operation ‘wrap’ with recursive definition

$$x \text{ wrap } y = \begin{cases} x & 0 \leq x < y, \\ (x - y) \text{ wrap } y & 0 < y \leq x. \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

We only need to define ‘wrap’ for nonnegative arguments, although we could easily generalize (2) to handle negative arguments too.

When it is defined, it is easy to see that $x \text{ wrap } y$ is the same as $x \bmod y$. Specifically, we will make use of the property that

$$0 \leq (x \text{ wrap } y) < y, \quad \text{for } x \geq 0 \text{ and } y > 0, \quad (3)$$

which can be proved by induction on x (base case: $x < y$).

Sequences. Sequences are finite ordered collections of elements, which we denote by sans-serif letters such as S . The *length* of a sequence S is denoted by $|S|$. An *element* of S is denoted by S_k (also: $S[k]$), with $0 \leq k < |S|$ denoting the position (or index) of the element in the sequence starting from 0:

$$S = S_0 S_1 \cdots S_{|S|-1}.$$

For sequences S and T of equal length, $S = T$ denotes that the two sequences consist of the same elements in the same order. The empty sequence ϵ is such that $|\epsilon| = 0$.

The *concatenation* $S \circ T$ of sequences S and T is the sequence of length $|S| + |T|$ obtained by juxtaposing S and T . We define $S \circ T$ element-wisely as

$$(S \circ T)_k = \begin{cases} S_k & 0 \leq k < |S|, \\ T_{k-|S|} & |S| \leq k < |S| + |T|, \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

for $0 \leq k < |S| + |T|$. For example, the concatenation of AB and $CDEF$ is $ABCDEF$.

The *reverse* S^{-1} of a sequence S is the sequence defined by $|S^{-1}| = |S| = N$ and

$$S_k^{-1} = S_{N-1-k}, \quad \text{for } 0 \leq k < N. \quad (5)$$

For example, the reverse of sequence $ABCDEF$ is sequence $FEDCBA$.

Permutations and cycles. Rotations—introduced in the next section—are a special kind of *permutations*, that is bijections of a set onto itself; henceforth, $\{0, 1, \dots, N-1\}$ is the set in question, which we denote $\langle N \rangle$.

A *cycle* $(a_0 a_1 \cdots a_m)$, for a_0, a_1, \dots, a_m distinct values in $\langle N \rangle$, is the permutation $\lambda : \langle N \rangle \rightarrow \langle N \rangle$ such that:

$$\lambda(a_k) = \begin{cases} a_{k+1} & 0 \leq k < m, \\ a_0 & k = m, \\ a_k & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

In other words, a cycle $(a_0 a_1 \cdots a_m)$ is a permutation that sends a_0 into a_1 , a_1 into a_2 , and so on until a_m , which it sends back to a_0 , while leaving all other elements in $\langle N \rangle \setminus \{a_0, \dots, a_m\}$ unchanged. Two cycles $(a_0 \cdots a_m)$ and $(b_0 \cdots b_n)$ are disjoint if the intersection of the sets $\{a_0, \dots, a_m\}$ and $\{b_0, \dots, b_n\}$ is empty. A fundamental result of the theory of permutations [18, Th. 1.6] is that every permutation is uniquely expressible as the composition of disjoint cycles (the order of composition does not matter).

3 Rotation: the problem

The rotation $\rho^r S$ of sequence S by r (also called “ r -rotation”, “ r -circular shift”, or “ r -cyclic shift”) is the sequence obtained by shifting all elements in S by r positions while wrapping over the sequence’s bounds. We assume that positive values of r denote shifts to the left; hence the definition

$$\rho^r S = \begin{cases} \underbrace{S_r S_{r+1} \cdots S_{|S|-1}}_{|S|-r \text{ elements}} \underbrace{S_0 S_1 \cdots S_{r-1}}_{r \text{ elements}} & 0 \leq r < |S|, \\ \underbrace{S_{|S|+r} S_{|S|+r+1} \cdots S_{|S|-1}}_{-r \text{ elements}} \underbrace{S_0 S_1 \cdots S_{|S|+r-1}}_{|S|-(-r) \text{ elements}} & -|S| < r \leq 0. \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

For simplicity, we ignore the case of rotations by more than $|S|$ in absolute value (although it is clear they correspond to applications of definition (6)). Notice that ρ^0 is the identity mapping. Figure 1 demonstrates the definition on the running example: rotating the 6-element sequence ABCDEF by 2 yields sequence CDEFAB.




Figure 1: The rotation of sequence ABCDEF of length 6 by 2 (or, equivalently, by $-(6 - 2) = -4$) yields sequence CDEFAB. Different colors highlight elements of the two subsequences that are swapped.

We can derive from (6) an equivalent element-wise representation of $\rho^r S$ as the sequence such that $|\rho^r S| = |S| = N$ and, for $0 \leq k < N$,

$$(\rho^r S)_k = \begin{cases} S_{(k+r) \text{ wrap } N} & 0 \leq r < N, \\ S_{(k+N+r) \text{ wrap } N} & -N < r \leq 0. \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

The duality between left rotation and r on one side, and right rotation and $N + r$ on the other side suggests the inverse mapping of (7)

$$S_k = \begin{cases} (\rho^r S)_{(k+N-r) \text{ wrap } N} & 0 \leq r < N, \\ (\rho^r S)_{(k-r) \text{ wrap } N} & -N < r \leq 0. \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

4 Rotation: the algorithms

There are four main algorithms that compute the rotation of a sequence. We present them in increasing level of complexity, where “complexity” simultaneously refers to complexity of implementation and to complexity of understanding, reasoning about, and proving the correctness of the algorithms—but not *computational* complexity.

We present the algorithms in pseudo-code. Sequences are represented by arrays of a generic type G , indexed from 0. That is, we identify an array a with the sequence $a[0] a[1] \dots a[a.\text{count} - 1]$ of its elements, where $a.\text{count}$ denotes the length of a . An array *slice* $a[\text{low}..\text{high}]$ denotes the sequence $a[\text{low}] \dots a[\text{high} - 1]$ if

$0 \leq \text{low} \leq \text{high} \leq \text{a.count}$, and the empty sequence in all other cases. Correspondingly, equality between slices of equal length corresponds to element-wise equality of their sequences of elements; this notational convention makes it possible to elide explicit quantification without ambiguity:

$$x[a..b) = y[a..b) \iff \forall i : a \leq i < b \implies x[i] = y[i].$$

Each algorithm operates on an array a of length N (an alias of a.count), and on an integer r ; it modifies a in place so that it is rotated by r when the algorithm terminates. For simplicity, we assume $0 < r < N$ as precondition. This is without loss of generality as the *right* rotation of a sequence S by some r such that $|S| > r > 0$ coincides with its left rotation by $|S| - r$, and rotation by 0 is the identity. We also assume that a 's size does not change, so that N denotes a.count at any point during the computation.

Using this notation, Figure 2 shows the input/output **specification** of the rotation algorithms, where **old** a denotes the content of a upon calling `rotate`.

```

1 rotate (a: ARRAY[G]; r: INTEGER)
2   require 0 < r < N
3   ensure a = ρr(old a)

```

Figure 2: Rotate array a by r to the left: specification.

4.1 Rotation by copy

A straightforward application of the definition of rotation, the first algorithm (shown in Figure 3) uses a second array b as scratch space. With two pointers s (source) and d (destination), it copies each element $a[s]$ from a into b at its position in $\rho^r a$. Matching the mapping in (8), initially s is 0 and d is $N - r$; each loop iteration increments both, and resets d to 0 when it reaches N (the first non-valid position in a).¹ When the loop terminates, b contains $\rho^r a$, and its content is copied back into a .

Figure 4 demonstrates some steps of the algorithm `rotate_copy` on an example. The top left figure represents the state upon first entering the loop, followed by the state after one (top right) and two (bottom right) iterations; the bottom right figure is the state upon exiting the loop.

4.1.1 Rotation by copy: computational complexity

Algorithm `rotate_copy` takes $\Theta(N)$ time and $\Theta(N)$ space.² For large values of N , the space complexity may be prohibitive. We can save some space by noticing that we only need scratch space for $d = \min(r, N - r)$ elements, while we can swap the other $N - d$ elements in place. For example, assuming $r \leq N - r$ as in the running example, rotation of a by r reduces to:

```

b[0..r) := a[0..r)    // copy a[0..r) into b
a[0..N - r) := a[r, N) // copy a[r..N) to the left by r in place
a[N - r..N) := b[0..r) // copy b back into a[N - r..N)

```

¹Alternatively, it could initialize s to r and d to 0 and decrement indexes following (7).

²In the complexity analyses, N and r denote generic values of input length N and rotation r .

```

4 rotate_copy (a: ARRAY[G]; r: INTEGER)
5   require  $0 < r < N$ 
6   ensure  $a = \rho^r(\text{old } a)$ 
7   local b: ARRAY[G]; s, d: INTEGER
8   do
9     b := [N] // initialize to size N
10    s := 0; d := N - r
11    while s < N do
12      invariant  $0 \leq s \leq N$ 
13        d = (s + N - r) wrap N
14         $\forall i: 0 \leq i < s \implies a[i] = b[(i + N - r) \text{ wrap } N]$ 
15        b[d] := a[s]
16        s, d := s + 1, d + 1
17        // wrap over a's bounds
18        if d = N then d := 0 end
19    end
20    // copy b's content back into a
21    a.copy (b)
22  end

```

Figure 3: Rotate array a by r to the left through copy, using b as scratch space.




Figure 4: Rotating sequence ABCDEF by 2 through copy.

This takes time $\Theta(N + d)$ and space $\Theta(d)$, with $d \leq N/2$. If we use native memory copy methods (such as Java's `System.arraycopy`) this is quite fast in practice but only if enough memory is available. This is the case of the benchmarks reported in Table 1, which ran on a server with a lot of physical RAM: the implementation of `reverse_copy` using native memory copy methods is consistently the fastest (or very close to the fastest).

The algorithms presented in the following sections improve over the space requirements of the “rotation by copy” algorithm by trading time for space.

ALGORITHM	TIME	SPACE	JAVA IMPLEMENTATION ON:			
			3 k	10 k	100 k	1000 k
copy	$\Theta(N)$	$\Theta(N)$	78 ms	540 ms	47 s	4324 s
copy (native)	$\Theta(N + d)$	$\Theta(d)$	43 ms	188 ms	12 s	1159 s
reverse	$\Theta(N)$	$\Theta(1)$	44 ms	323 ms	17 s	2354 s
swap (iterative)	$\Theta(N)$	$\Theta(1)$	42 ms	221 ms	12 s	1138 s
modulo	$\Theta(N)$	$\Theta(1)$	48 ms	333 ms	37 s	5307 s

Table 1: Time and space complexity of the various algorithms for rotating an array of size N by r (with $d = \min(r, N - r) \leq N/2$). The right-hand columns show the times spent by Java 1.7 implementations of the algorithms over arrays of sizes from 3 thousand to 1000 thousand elements (for each N , an algorithm runs once for every $0 \leq r < N$). The experiments ran on an Intel Xeon 2.13 GHz server with 10 GB of physical RAM.

4.1.2 Rotation by copy: correctness

A correctness proof for `rotate_copy` relies on a suitable “essential” loop invariant [6] that characterizes the state of `b` as reflecting definition (8). For the essential invariant to be well-defined, we first need a bounding invariant that constrains the variability of index `s` to be within `a`’s bounds:

$$0 \leq s \leq N. \quad (9)$$

Since $d - s = N - r$ initially, and both `s` and `d` are incremented in every iteration (while wrapping over `N`), a corresponding bounding loop invariant about `d` is

$$d = (s + N - r) \text{ wrap } N, \quad (10)$$

whose inductiveness directly follows from the definition (2) of ‘wrap’ by case discussion.

The relation between `d` and `s` also suggests the essential invariant that relates the content of `b` to that of `a`:

$$\forall i : 0 \leq i < s \implies a[i] = b[(i + N - r) \text{ wrap } N]. \quad (11)$$

Its inductiveness is a consequence of the other invariant (9) and of the assignment `b[d] := a[s]` performed in the loop.

Upon exiting the loop, `s` equals `N`; hence, (11) asserts that

$$\forall i : 0 \leq i < N \implies a[i] = b[(i + N - r) \text{ wrap } N];$$

that is, `b` is $\rho^r a$ according to (8), which establishes the postcondition after copying `b`’s content into `a`.

4.2 Rotation by reversal

The rotation by reversal algorithm conjugates simplicity and efficiency in a way that makes it a very effective solution in practice. In fact, it has been used in numerous text editors to reshuffle lines of text; Bentley reports usage as early as 1971—according to Ken Thompson, it was folklore even then [2, Sec. 2.3].

To rotate $a[0..N)$ to the left by r , the algorithm performs three in-place reversals. The first two reversals are partial, in that they reverse the slices $a[0..r)$ and $a[r..N)$. The last reversal targets the whole $a[0..N)$. Figure 6 shows the resulting straightforward implementation, which calls a routine `reverse` to reverse a in place.

The algorithm works thanks to a fundamental property of reversal with respect to concatenation (which we prove in Section 4.2.2 below): the reversal $(X \circ Y)^{-1}$ of the concatenation of two sequences X and Y is the concatenation $Y^{-1} \circ X^{-1}$ of Y 's reversal and X 's reversal. Then, consider a sequence S of length N as the concatenation $X \circ Y$, where $|X| = r$ and $|Y| = N - r$. As demonstrated in Figure 5 on the running example, where $N = 6$ and $r = 2$, the rotation by reversal algorithm applies the following transformations to S :

$$S = X \circ Y \xrightarrow{\text{reverse } X} X^{-1} \circ Y \xrightarrow{\text{reverse } Y} X^{-1} \circ Y^{-1} \xrightarrow{\text{reverse all}} Y \circ X = \rho^r S,$$

where the fundamental property justifies the last reversal of the whole $X^{-1} \circ Y^{-1}$.




Figure 5: Rotating sequence ABCDEF by 2 through three reversals.

Completing the picture, Figure 7 provides an implementation of `reverse` that works by switching elements at opposite ends of $a[\text{low}..\text{high})$ while working its way inward: each iteration of the main loop swaps $a[p]$ and $a[q]$ on line 48, and then increments p and decrements q (initialized to `low` and `high - 1`) on line 49.

```

26 rotate_reverse (a: ARRAY[G]; r: INTEGER)
27   require 0 < r < N
28   ensure a = \rho^r(old a)
29   do
30     reverse (a, 0, r)
31     reverse (a, r, N)
32     reverse (a, 0, N)
33   end

```

Figure 6: Rotate array a by r to the left through three reversals.

4.2.1 Rotation by reversal: computational complexity

Since `rotate_reverse` just calls `reverse` three times, the asymptotic complexities of the two algorithms are the same. The implementation of `reverse` shown in Figure 7 has space complexity $\Theta(1)$ (since it only needs one variable to swap) and time complexity $\Theta(\text{high} - \text{low})$. Hence, `rotate_reverse` has time complexity $\Theta(N)$ and space

```

34 reverse (a: ARRAY[G]; low, high: INTEGER)
35   require  $0 \leq \text{low} \leq \text{high} \leq N$ 
36   ensure  $a[\text{low}..\text{high}] = (\text{old } a[\text{low}..\text{high}])^{-1}$ 
37   local p, q: INTEGER
38   do
39     p, q := low, high - 1
40     while  $p < q + 1$ 
41       invariant
42          $\text{low} \leq p \leq q + 2 \leq \text{high} + 1$ 
43          $q = \text{high} + \text{low} - 1 - p$ 
44          $\forall i: \text{low} \leq i < p \implies (\text{old } a)[i] = a[\text{high} + \text{low} - 1 - i]$ 
45          $\forall i: q < i < \text{high} \implies (\text{old } a)[i] = a[\text{high} + \text{low} - 1 - i]$ 
46     do
47       // swap a[p] and a[q]
48       a[p], a[q] := a[q], a[p]
49       p, q := p + 1, q - 1
50     end
51   end

```

Figure 7: In-place reversal of $a[\text{low}..\text{high}]$ by swapping elements at opposite ends.

complexity $\Theta(1)$. In terms of swaps of array elements, reverse performs $r/2 + (N - r)/2 + N/2 = N$ of them. Table 1 shows that rotation by reversal also scales gracefully in practice and, while it is not the fastest overall, it normally is in the ballpark of the fastest.

Another appealing feature of rotation by reversal is its flexibility with respect to the data structure it operates on. As long as we can implement in-place reversal in constant space and linear time on the structure, `rotate_reverse` will still work with the same complexity. In particular, we can have linear-time in-place reversal on linked lists; rotation by reversal works there as well as it works on arrays.

4.2.2 Rotation by reversal: correctness

We sketched a correctness argument for `rotate_reverse` in Section 4.2; now we provide a complete proof, beginning with loop invariants sufficient to verify reverse.

Reversal: correctness. A basic bounding invariant requires the indexes p and q to be valid positions within $a[\text{low}..\text{high}]$:

$$\text{low} \leq p \leq q + 2 \leq \text{high} + 1. \quad (12)$$

The loop exits when $p = q + 1$ if $\text{high} - \text{low}$ is an even number; and when $p = q + 2$ if $\text{high} - \text{low}$ is an odd number. This reveals that there is a bit of redundancy in reverse: when $\text{high} - \text{low}$ is odd, $p = q = \lfloor (\text{high} - \text{low})/2 \rfloor + 1$ at the beginning of the last loop iteration, which consequently swaps $a[\text{low}..\text{high}]$'s central element with itself. To avoid this unnecessary swap, relax the loop staying condition (line 40) to $p < q$. Here, however, we prefer the slightly redundant formulation because it makes for simpler loop invariants and correctness arguments, as we do not have to separately discuss what happens to the central element.

Another bounding invariant relates q to p :

$$q = \text{high} + \text{low} - 1 - p, \quad (13)$$

which implies, together with (12), that q is also within bounds in the loop.

The essential loop invariant is two-fold, as it has to relate elements in the upper half $a[q..high)$ to the corresponding elements in the lower half of **old** a that have been swapped; and vice versa for the lower half $a[low..p)$ with respect to the upper half of **old** a :

$$\begin{aligned} \forall i : \text{low} \leq i < p &\implies (\mathbf{old} \ a)[i] = a[\text{high} + \text{low} - 1 - i], \\ \forall i : q < i < \text{high} &\implies (\mathbf{old} \ a)[i] = a[\text{high} + \text{low} - 1 - i]. \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

Initiation and consecution are trivial to prove for the bounding invariants, based on how p and q are initialized (line 39) and modified by every loop iteration (line 49). The bounding invariants are also the basis to prove inductiveness of the essential invariant: each iteration swaps the elements at positions p and q , thus preserving (14) thanks to (13). Finally, one can check that (14) implies *reverse*'s postcondition when the loop exits with $p \geq q + 1$.

Rotation by reversal: correctness. We prove the lemma relating reversal and concatenation that underpins the correctness of `rotate_reverse`.

Lemma 1 (Reverse of concatenation). $(S \circ T)^{-1} = (T^{-1}) \circ (S^{-1})$, for any two sequences S and T .

Proof. Let $0 \leq k < |S| + |T|$ be a generic position in $(S \circ T)^{-1}$. By (5), $(S \circ T)_k^{-1}$ equals $(S \circ T)_{k'}$, where $k' = |S| + |T| - 1 - k$. We discuss two cases. First case: (a) $0 \leq k < |T|$, and hence $|S| \leq k' < |S| + |T|$. Thus $(S \circ T)_{k'}$ equals $T_{k'-|S|}$ by (4) and $k' - |S| = |T| - 1 - k$; hence $T_{k'-|S|}$ is the element at position k in T^{-1} according to (5). Otherwise, second case: (b) $|T| \leq k < |S| + |T|$, and hence $0 \leq k' < |S|$. Thus $(S \circ T)_{k'}$ equals $S_{k'}$ by (4); hence $S_{k'}$ is the element at position $k - |T|$ in S^{-1} according to (5). (a) and (b) show that $(S \circ T)^{-1}$ follows the definition of $(T^{-1}) \circ (S^{-1})$. \square

Let $0 \leq x < r$ be an index in the lower half of $a[0..N)$. The first reversal of `rotate_reverse` maps x to $r - 1 - x$ according to (5); the second reversal leaves it unchanged; the third reversal maps it to $N - 1 - (r - 1 - x) = x + N - r$ still according to (5) and to Lemma 1. Following (8), the latter is the position in **old** a 's rotation of the element originally at x (note that $0 \leq x < r$ implies $x + N - r < N$). The dual argument, for $r \leq y < N$, establishes that the element originally at y ends up in the position in **old** a 's rotation. Since such generic x and y span the whole interval $[0..N)$, `rotate_reverse`'s postcondition holds.

4.3 Rotation by swapping

The rotation by swapping algorithm applies a divide-and-conquer strategy to improve over the space requirements of the rotation by copy algorithm (Section 4.1).

The algorithm builds upon two key observations. First, as it is apparent from definition (6) of rotation, rotating $a[0..N)$ to the left by r can be seen as swapping the adjacent array slices $a[0..r)$ and $a[r..N)$ —which have different length in general. Second, swapping two non-overlapping array slices of *equal* length can be done in

place in linear time, as shown in Figure 8: we simply maintain two index variables x and z pointing to the corresponding elements in each section, and swap the corresponding element elements in each iteration.

```

52 // swap a[low..low + d] and a[high - d..high)
53 swap_sections (a: ARRAY[G]; low, high: INTEGER; d: INTEGER)
54 // non overlapping slices
55 require  $0 \leq \text{low} \leq \text{low} + d \leq \text{high} - d \leq \text{high} \leq N$ 
56 ensure a[low..low + d) = old a[high - d..high)
57       a[low + d..high - d) = old a[low + d..high - d)
58       a[high - d..high) = old a[low..low + d)
59 // pointers to left (x) and right (z) slices
60 local x, z: INTEGER
61 do
62   x, z := low, high - d
63   until x = low + d
64   invariant
65      $\text{low} \leq x \leq \text{low} + d \wedge \text{high} - d \leq z \leq \text{high}$ 
66      $x - \text{low} = z - (\text{high} - d)$ 
67     a[low..x) = (old a)[high - d..z)
68     a[x..high - d) = (old a)[x..high - d)
69     a[high - d..z) = (old a)[low..x)
70     a[z..high) = (old a)[z..high)
71 do
72   // swap a[x] and a[z]
73   a[x], a[z] := a[z], a[x]
74   x, z := x + 1, z + 1
75 end
76 end

```

Figure 8: In-place swap of $a[\text{low}.. \text{low} + d)$ and $a[\text{low}.. \text{low} + d)$.

The divide-and-conquer strategy implemented by the rotation by swapping algorithm calls `swap_sections` to compute part of the rotation, and then repeats on the smaller unrotated section until completion. To illustrate, consider the running example in Figure 9, where the goal is to swap the subsequence denoted by X with the rest. Since the size $r = 2$ of X is less than $N - r = 4$, we can select another subsequence of size r (denoted by Z in Figure 9), at the other end of the whole sequence, such that it does not overlap X . After swapping X and Z by calling `swap_sections`, X acquires its final position in the rotation of the whole sequence. Then, we recursively apply the algorithm to the subsequence $Z \circ Y$, which we rotate also by r . In this case, the two subsequences Z and Y have equal length; hence swapping them concludes the overall rotation.

It is natural to generalize this approach using a recursive formulation. As Figure 10 shows, we rely on a helper procedure `rotate_swap_helper` that swaps the slices $a[\text{low}..p)$ and $a[p.. \text{high})$. If the two slices have equal length (case on line 91), then calling `swap_sections` with $d = p - \text{low} = \text{high} - p$ does the job. Otherwise, suppose the first slice is smaller (case on line 95, such as in the running example of Figure 9, where $p = r = 2$); that is, $p - \text{low} < \text{high} - p$. Then, swap $a[\text{low}..p)$ with $a[\text{high} - (p - \text{low}).. \text{high})$; as a result, the latter slice is in place, and we




Figure 9: Rotating sequence ABCDEF by 2 through swapping sections.

repeat on $a[\text{low}..\text{high} - (\text{p} - \text{low})]$. Conversely, if $\text{p} - \text{low} > \text{high} - \text{p}$ (case on line 100, such as in the other example of Figure 11, where $\text{p} = \text{r} = 4$), swap $a[\text{low}..\text{low} + (\text{high} - \text{p})]$ with $a[\text{high} - \text{p}..\text{high}]$; as a result, the former slice is in place, and we repeat on $a[\text{low} + (\text{high} - \text{p})..\text{high}]$.

In the remainder, we refer to the two recursive cases as the “left is smaller” case, for $\text{p} - \text{low} < \text{high} - \text{p}$, and the “right is smaller” case, for $\text{p} - \text{low} > \text{high} - \text{p}$. As we justify rigorously in Section 4.3.2, the correctness of the algorithm relies on two dual properties of rotation with respect to concatenation, one for each recursive case. In both cases, we represent $a[\text{low}..\text{high})$ as the concatenation $X \circ Y \circ Z$ of three sequences. In the *left is smaller* case, $|X| = |Z| = \text{p} - \text{low}$, and the property that $\rho^{|X|}(X \circ Y \circ Z) = \rho^{|Z|}(Z \circ Y) \circ X$ justifies the recursive call. In the *right is smaller* case, $|X| = |Z| = \text{high} - \text{p}$ (hence $|X| + |Y| = \text{p} - \text{low}$), and the property that $\rho^{|X|+|Y|}(X \circ Y \circ Z) = Z \circ \rho^{|Y|}(Y \circ X)$ justifies the recursive call.

4.3.1 Rotation by swapping: computational complexity

Here is a back-of-the-envelope complexity analysis of `rotate_swap` via its helper function. Overall, `rotate_swap_helper` makes some n recursive calls to `swap_sections`; let d_k denote the value of argument d in the k th call, for $1 \leq k \leq n$ (for example, $d_1 = \min(\text{r}, \text{N} - \text{r})$). Every such call to `swap_sections` takes time $\Theta(d)$ and reduces the problem size by d . Since recursion terminates when the yet-to-be-rotated array slice becomes empty, it must be $d_1 + \dots + d_n = N$. The overall time complexity is then $\Theta(d_1) + \dots + \Theta(d_n) = \Theta(N)$.

Gries and Mills [8, Sec. 5] provide a more rigorous analysis of the complexity of `rotate_swap` in terms of number of swaps between array elements. First, note the elegant property that `rotate_swap_helper` reduces to Euclid’s algorithm for greatest common divisor by successive subtractions [6, Sec. 1.3] if we omit the calls to `swap_sections`: it computes $\text{gcd}(\text{r}, \text{N} - \text{r})$. Hence, the last call to `swap_sections` takes place when $\text{p} - \text{low} = \text{high} - \text{p} = \text{gcd}(\text{r}, \text{N} - \text{r})$; it places the remaining $2 \cdot \text{gcd}(\text{r}, \text{N} - \text{r})$ elements in their final rotated position through exactly $\text{gcd}(\text{r}, \text{N} - \text{r})$ swaps. The previous calls to `swap_sections` perform another $\text{N} - 2 \cdot \text{gcd}(\text{r}, \text{N} - \text{r})$ swaps: each swap places one element in its final rotated position. Overall `rotate_swap` performs $\text{N} - \text{gcd}(\text{r}, \text{N} - \text{r})$ swaps.

The space complexity is $\Theta(N)$ due to recursion: the worst case is $\text{r} = 1$, when the maximum recursion depth is N . However, it is straightforward to produce an equivalent iterative version of `rotate_swap`, as shown in Figure 12. The condition $\neg(\text{low} < \text{p} < \text{high})$ that terminates recursion becomes the exit condition for a loop

```

77 rotate_swap (a: ARRAY[G]; r: INTEGER)
78   require  $\theta < r < N$ 
79   ensure  $a = \rho^r(\text{old } a)$ 
80   do rotate_swap_helper (a,  $\theta$ , r, N) end
81
82
83 // Rotate a[low..high) at p by swapping a[low..p) and a[p..high)
84 rotate_swap_helper (a: ARRAY[G]; low, p, high: INTEGER)
85   require  $\theta \leq \text{low} \leq p < \text{high} \leq N$ 
86   ensure
87      $a[\text{low}..\text{high}) = \rho^{(p-\text{low})}(\text{old } a)[\text{low}..\text{high})$ 
88      $a[0..\text{low}) = (\text{old } a)[0..\text{low}) \wedge a[\text{high}..N) = (\text{old } a)[\text{high}..N)$ 
89   do
90     if  $\text{low} < p < \text{high}$  then
91       if  $p - \text{low} = \text{high} - p$  then
92         // swap a[low..p) and a[p..high)
93         swap_sections (a, low, high, p - low)
94         // now the whole a[low..high) is in place
95       elseif  $p - \text{low} < \text{high} - p$  then
96         // swap a[low..p) and a[high - (p - low)..high)
97         swap_sections (a, low, high, p - low)
98         // now a[high - (p - low)..high) is in place
99         rotate_swap_helper (a, low, p, high - (p - low))
100      elseif  $p - \text{low} > \text{high} - p$  then
101        // swap a[low..low + (high - p)) and a[p..high)
102        swap_sections (a, low, high, high - p)
103        // now a[low..low + (high - p)) is in place
104        rotate_swap_helper (a, low + (high - p), p, high)
105      end
106    end
107  end

```

Figure 10: Rotate array a by r to the left by swapping sections of equal length: recursive algorithm.




Figure 11: Rotating sequence LMNOPQ by 4 through swapping sections.

(line 114 in Figure 12) that calls `swap_sections` and moves `low` or `high` closer to each other accordingly. The iterative version clearly has space complexity $\Theta(1)$. Practical

implementations will use iteration even if enough memory is available, since limits on recursion stack size would become a bottleneck. As Table 1 shows, such iterative version is quite fast in practice, often nearly as fast as rotation by copy using native methods, but with only constant memory usage.

4.3.2 Rotation by swapping: correctness

We first quickly illustrate the invariants for a correctness proof of `swap_sections`. Then, we discuss the key steps of a correctness proof for `rotate_swap` in its recursive and iterative versions.

Swap sections: correctness. Variables x and z span the intervals $[\text{low}.. \text{low} + d)$ and $[\text{high} - d.. \text{high})$; hence the bounding invariant

$$\begin{aligned} \text{low} &\leq x \leq \text{low} + d, \\ \text{high} - d &\leq z \leq \text{high}. \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

At the beginning of every loop iteration, they point to the pair of elements that are about to be swapped; hence the other bounding invariant

$$x - \text{low} = z - (\text{high} - d). \quad (16)$$

Based on the bounding invariants (15) and (16), we characterize the content of a during `swap_sections`'s execution as partitioned into six sections:

	0	low	x	high - d	z	high	N
a:	untouched	region X: swapped with (Z)	unchanged	region Z: swapped with (X)	unchanged	untouched	

Thus, we have the essential invariants:

$$\begin{aligned} a[\text{low}..x) &= (\mathbf{old} \ a)[\text{high} - d..z), \\ a[x.. \text{high} - d) &= (\mathbf{old} \ a)[x.. \text{high} - d), \\ a[\text{high} - d..z) &= (\mathbf{old} \ a)[\text{low}..x), \\ a[z.. \text{high}) &= (\mathbf{old} \ a)[z.. \text{high}). \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

It is not difficult to prove initiation and consecution of (17). In particular, swapping the elements $a[x]$ and $a[z]$ on line 73 in Figure 8 maintains invariance of the swapped slices $a[\text{low}..x)$ and $a[\text{high} - d..z)$.

Rotation by swapping: correctness of recursive version. As mentioned in the overview, the proof makes usage of a fundamental lemma, which we now prove.

Lemma 2 (Rotation and swap). *For any three sequences X, Y, Z , with $|X| = |Z| = d$ and $|X| + |Y| + |Z| = N$:*

$$\rho^d(X \circ Y \circ Z) = \rho^d(Z \circ Y) \circ X, \quad (18a)$$

$$\rho^{N-d}(X \circ Y \circ Z) = Z \circ \rho^{N-2d}(Y \circ X). \quad (18b)$$

Proof. We prove (18a); the proof of (18b) can be constructed by similar means. Let $0 \leq k < N$ be a generic position in $X \circ Y \circ Z$; the goal is showing that the mapping $k \mapsto_1 k_1$ determined by the left-hand side transformation $\rho^d(X \circ Y \circ Z)$ and the mapping $k \mapsto_2 k_2$ determined by the right-hand side transformation $\rho^d(Z \circ Y) \circ X$ are such that $k_1 = k_2$. We discuss two cases: (a) $0 \leq k < d$ and (b) $d \leq k < N$.

In case (a), $k + N - d < N$; hence k_1 is $k + N - d$ according to (8). Also in case (a), k denotes a position of X ; hence, mapping \mapsto_2 shifts k by $|Z| + |Y|$ to the right; that is, $k_2 = k + (N - 2d) + d = k_1$, which concludes case (a).

In case (b), $N \leq k + N - d < 2N$; hence k_1 is $(k + N - d) - N = k - d$ according to (8) (and the definition (2) of ‘wrap’). To determine the value of k_2 , we describe \mapsto_2 as the application of $\mapsto_{2.1}$ followed by $\mapsto_{2.2}$: $\mapsto_{2.1}$ accounts for the swapping of Z and X in $X \circ Y \circ Z$, and $\mapsto_{2.2}$ accounts for the rotation $\rho^d(Z \circ Y)$. Accordingly, we further split case (b) into: (b.1) $d \leq k < N - d$ and (b.2) $N - d \leq k < N$. In case (b.1), k denotes a position within Y in sequence $X \circ Y \circ Z$. Hence, mapping $\mapsto_{2.1}$ leaves k unchanged (since $|Z| = |X|$), and then $\mapsto_{2.2}$ maps it to $(k + |Z \circ Y| - d)$ wrap $|Z \circ Y| = k - d$ according to (8) (since $|Z \circ Y| = N - d$ and $N - d \leq k + (N - d) - d < 2(N - d)$ in this case). In case (b.2), k denotes a position within Z in sequence $X \circ Y \circ Z$. Hence, mapping $\mapsto_{2.1}$ shifts k by $(N - d)$ to the left (i.e., $k \mapsto_{2.1} k - (N - d)$), and then $\mapsto_{2.2}$ maps it to $(k - (N - d)) + (N - 2d) = k - d$ according to (6) (since $|Y| = N - 2d$). This concludes the proof that $k_1 = k_2$ in all cases. \square

The proof of `rotate_swap_helper` now discusses the three main cases, for the three conditional branches on lines 91, 95, and 100 in Figure 10. In the first case, $p - \text{low} = \text{high} - p$, note that the postcondition of `swap_sections` called on $a[\text{low}..\text{high})$ with $d = p - \text{low}$ satisfies definition (4) of rotation for $r = p - \text{low}$ and $N = \text{high} - \text{low}$. In the *left is smaller* case, $p - \text{low} < \text{high} - p$, after the call to `swap_sections` the content of $a[\text{low}..\text{high})$ is the concatenation

$$\underbrace{(\text{old } a)[\text{high} - (p - \text{low})..\text{high})}_Z \circ \underbrace{(\text{old } a)[p..\text{high} - (p - \text{low})]}_Y \circ \underbrace{(\text{old } a)[\text{low}..p]}_X .$$

Using the names assigned to each slice, the call to `swap_sections` turns sequence $X \circ Y \circ Z$ into $Z \circ Y \circ X$; the following recursive call rotates $Z \circ Y$ by $r = p - \text{low}$. According to (18a), for $X = X$, $Y = Y$, $Z = Z$, and $d = r$, this achieves a rotation of the original sequence $(\text{old } a)[\text{low}..\text{high}) = X \circ Y \circ Z$ by the same r , which establishes `rotate_swap_helper`’s postcondition. The *right is smaller* case is symmetric and crucially relies on (18b) for $d = \text{high} - p$ and $N = \text{high} - \text{low}$.

Rotation by swapping: correctness of iterative version. As usual, we start by identifying the straightforward bounding invariants. Variables `low` and `high` mark a shrinking slice of `a` as they get closer to `p`, hence the obvious invariant

$$0 \leq \text{low} \leq p \leq \text{high} \leq N. \quad (19)$$

As we prove inductiveness of this invariant based on how `low` and `high` are updated in every iteration, we notice that when the loop exits both $p = \text{low}$ and $p = \text{high}$ hold. We record this fact with another bounding invariant

$$\text{low} = p \iff p = \text{high}, \quad (20)$$

which lets us establish that the interval $[\text{low}..\text{high})$ is empty when the loop exits.


The bounding invariants suggest an essential invariant that predicates about three slices of `a`:

```

108 rotate_swap_iterative(a: ARRAY[G]; r: INTEGER)
109   require 0 < r < N
110   ensure a = ρr(old a)
111   local low, high, p: INTEGER
112   do
113     low, p, high := 0, r, N
114     while low < p < high
115       invariant
116         0 ≤ low ≤ p ≤ high ≤ N
117         low = p ⇔ p = high
118         // rotated on the left
119         ∀i: 0 ≤ i < low ⇒ a[i] = ρr(old a)[i]
120         // to be rotated
121         p - low < high - low ⇒ ∀i: low ≤ i < high ⇒
122           ρp-low(a[low..high])[i - low] = ρr(old a)[i]
123         // rotated on the right
124         ∀i: high ≤ i < N ⇒ a[i] = ρr(old a)[i]
125     do
126       if p - low = high - p then
127         // swap a[low..p] and a[p..high]
128         swap_sections (a, low, high, p - low)
129         // now the whole a[low..high] is in place
130         low, high := low + (p - low), high - (high - p)
131       elseif p - low < high - p then
132         // swap a[low..p] and a[high - (p - low)..high]
133         swap_sections (a, low, high, p - low)
134         // now a[high - (p - low)..high] is in place
135         high := high - (p - low)
136       elseif p - low > high - p then
137         // swap a[low..low + (high - p)] and a[p..high]
138         swap_sections (a, low, high, high - p)
139         // now a[low..low + (high - p)] is in place
140         low := low + (high - p)
141       end
142     end
143   end

```

Figure 12: Rotate array a by r to the left by swapping sections of equal length: iterative algorithm.



The leftmost and rightmost slices are initially empty and invariably in place as the loop iterates:

$$\begin{aligned}
 a[0..low] &= \rho^r(\text{old } a)[0..low], \\
 a[high..N] &= \rho^r(\text{old } a)[high..N].
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{21}$$

The mid slice has to be rotated; precisely, slices $a[\text{low}..p)$ and $a[p..high)$ have to be swapped relative to each other:

$$p - \text{low} < \text{high} - \text{low} \implies \left(\begin{array}{l} \forall i: \text{low} \leq i \leq \text{high} \implies \\ \rho^{p-\text{low}}(a[\text{low}..\text{high}])[i - \text{low}] = \rho^r(\text{old } a)[i] \end{array} \right). \quad (22)$$

Invariant (22) is required only to make the other essential invariant inductive, not to establish the postcondition which follows from (21) alone upon exiting the loop. Notice the index shift in the left-hand side of the equality in (22): the first element (index 0) of the rotation of sequence $a[\text{low}..high)$ by $p - \text{low}$ corresponds to the element at position low in the rotation of the whole a by $r = p$.

Without the antecedent $p - \text{low} < \text{high} - \text{low}$, (22) would not be inductive in the case $p - \text{low} = \text{high} - \text{low}$: in this case, $r = p - \text{low} = \text{high} - \text{low} = 0 = N$ after updating low and high , but (6) is undefined if $r = N$. Then, proving inductiveness of the essential invariants in the “left is smaller” and “right is smaller” cases crucially relies on Lemma 2, following the same overall argument as the proof of the recursive version `rotate_swap`. Consider the *right is smaller* case: $p - \text{low} > \text{high} - p$. The call to `swap_sections` in the corresponding branch of `rotate_swap_iterative`’s loop (line 138 in Figure 12) swaps $X = (\text{old } a)[\text{low}..\text{low} + (\text{high} - p)]$ with $Z = (\text{old } a)[p..high)$, while leaving $Y = (\text{old } a)[\text{low} + (\text{high} - p)..p)$ untouched. Thus, $a[\text{low}..high)$ consists of $Z \circ Y \circ X$ after the swap. For $N = \text{high} - \text{low}$, $d = \text{high} - p$, $X = X$, $Y = Y$, and $Z = Z$, (18b) shows that Z is in place, whereas $a[\text{low} + (\text{high} - p)..high)$ must be rotated by $N - 2d = 2p - \text{high} - \text{low}$. After incrementing low by $\text{high} - p$ (on line 140 in Figure 12), this corresponds to a rotation by $p - \text{low}$ of $a[\text{low}..high)$, thus establishing that (22) is inductive in this case.

4.4 Rotation by modular visit

The rotation by modular visit algorithm has the property that it directly moves elements into their final position. To understand how it works, we see ρ^r as a permutation of the set $\langle N \rangle$ —that is as the mapping $k \mapsto (k + (N - r)) \text{ wrap } N$ defined in (8). (Remind that we only deal with left rotations: $0 \leq r < N$.)

Cycle decomposition of rotations. As recalled in Section 2, ρ^r has a unique decomposition in disjoint cycles. The first cycle starts from the element at index 0, goes through the elements at indexes

$$0 \rightarrow (0 + (N - r)) \text{ wrap } N \rightarrow (0 + 2(N - r)) \text{ wrap } N \rightarrow \dots$$

until it reaches index 0 again. Similarly, the second cycle goes through

$$1 \rightarrow (1 + (N - r)) \text{ wrap } N \rightarrow (1 + 2(N - r)) \text{ wrap } N \rightarrow \dots$$

until it reaches 1 again. And a generic cycle that starts from s is

$$s \rightarrow (s + (N - r)) \text{ wrap } N \rightarrow (s + 2(N - r)) \text{ wrap } N \rightarrow \dots \quad (23)$$

until s .

The number of elements in each cycle is the smallest positive integer t such that $s + (t(N - r)) \text{ wrap } N = s$, which we equivalently express as the modular equation

$$t(N - r) \equiv 0 \pmod{N}. \quad (24)$$

The Linear Congruence Theorem [19, Th. 1.6.14]³ says that (24) has solutions for $t \in \{kN/\text{gcd}(N, N - r) \mid k \in \mathbb{Z}\}$. The smallest positive integer in this set is obviously $N/\text{gcd}(N, N - r)$, which is then the length of each cycle.

```

144 rotate_modulo (a: ARRAY[G]; r: INTEGER)
145   require 0 < r < N
146   ensure a = ρr(old a)
147   local start, moved, v: INTEGER; displaced: G
148   do
149     start := 0
150     moved := 0
151     while moved ≠ N
152       invariant
153         0 ≤ moved ≤ N
154         0 ≤ start ≤ gcd(N, N - r)
155         moved = start · τ(N, N - r)
156         ∀i, s, p: 0 ≤ i < τ(N, N - r) ∧ 0 ≤ s < start ∧ p = πNN-r(s, i)
157           ⇒ a[p] = ρr(old a)[p]
158       do
159         displaced := a[start]
160         v := start
161         repeat
162           v := v + N - r
163           // wrap over a's bounds
164           if v ≥ N then v := v - N end
165           // swap a[v] and displaced
166           a[v], displaced := displaced, a[v]
167           moved := moved + 1
168         invariant
169           0 < moved - start · τ(N, N - r) ≤ τ(N, N - r)
170           v = πNN-r(start, moved - start · τ(N, N - r))
171           displaced = (old a)[v]
172           ∀i, s, p: 0 ≤ i < τ(N, N - r) ∧ 0 ≤ s < start ∧ p = πNN-r(s, i)
173             ⇒ a[p] = ρr(old a)[p]
174           ∀j, q: 0 < j ≤ moved - start · τ(N, N - r)
175             ∧ q = πNN-r(start, j) ⇒ a[q] = ρr(old a)[q]
176         until v = start end
177       start := start + 1
178     end
179   end

```

Figure 13: Rotate array a by r to the left through modular visit.

Rotation by visiting cycles. We finally have all elements to describe the rotation by modular visit algorithm, presented in Figure 13 and demonstrated on the running example in Figure 14. The basic idea is to go through elements in the order given by the decomposition, one cycle at a time until all elements are moved. During the

³Also: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Linear_congruence_theorem.

visit, the element originally at position 0 moves to position $(0 + (N - r)) \text{ wrap } N$; the element originally at $(0 + (N - r)) \text{ wrap } N$ moves to $(0 + 2(N - r)) \text{ wrap } N$, and so on for all elements in the cycle. Thanks to the unique decomposition property of permutations, this procedure eventually reaches all elements in the sequence; when they are all moved, the whole sequence has been rotated in place.

In the implementation of Figure 13, the outermost loop (line 151) performs a series of cyclic visits starting with the element at index `start`—which is 0 initially (line 149). Variable `moved` is a counter that records the number of number of elements that are in place; correspondingly, the outermost loop exits when `moved = N` and the rotation is complete.

The inner loop (line 161) actually performs the visits of the cycles; precisely, each iteration of the outer loop executes the inner loop to completion for the current value of `start`, which visits all elements in the cycle beginning at `start` as follows. With every iteration of the inner loop, a local variable `v` takes on the values in the cycle beginning at `start`: `start`, `start + N - r`, and so on, where each new value of `v` (line 162) is wrapped over when it overflows `N` (line 164). After updating `v`, the inner loop exchanges `a[v]` with the element at the *previous* position in the cycle (line 166), which is stored in variable `displaced` (initially equal to `a[start]` and successively updated after updating `v`). It then continues with the next iteration. In the running example, the first iteration of the inner loop begins with `displaced = a[0] = A` (top left in Figure 14); which it writes to position $0 + N - r = 4$ (its position in the rotation by `r`) while saving `(old a)[4]` into `displaced` for the next iteration (mid right in Figure 14).

Earlier in this section, we established that each cycle has $N/\text{gcd}(N, N - r)$ elements. Hence, the inner loop iterates this many times before reaching the exit condition `v = start` (line 176). In the running example, $N = 6$, $r = 2$, and $\text{gcd}(6, 4) = 2$, and in fact the inner loop has put $6/2 = 3$ elements in place when it reaches `start` again (bottom right in Figure 14). The outer loop correspondingly performs exactly $N/(N/\text{gcd}(N, N - r)) = \text{gcd}(N, N - r)$ iterations, which is when the last cycle in the decomposition is visited (mid left in Figure 14, where the outer loop iterates twice).

According to Gries and Mills [8], the “jumping around” pattern of the cyclic visits suggested the name “dolphin algorithm” by which it is sometimes referred to—like a dolphin that leaps out of water and plunges back into it someplace forth.

4.4.1 Rotation by modular visit: complexity

The illustration of the algorithm suggests the complexity of rotation by modular visit. Clearly, only a finite amount of scratch memory is needed; hence the space complexity is $\Theta(1)$. The outer loop iterates $\text{gcd}(N - r, N)$ times, each of which sees the inner loop iterate $N/\text{gcd}(N - r, N)$; hence the time complexity is $\Theta(N)$.

This corresponds to N array writes (one per element put in place). Gries and Mills [8] present a variant of the algorithm that puts the elements in place in each cycle backwards, using $N + \text{gcd}(N - r, N)$ array *accesses*: one for each element plus $\text{gcd}(N - r, N)$ to temporarily save the array value put in place last and overwritten first (i.e., `a[start]`). If we count swapping a pair of array elements as three array accesses (using a temporary variable for the swap), this variant of the modular visit algorithm performs the fewest number of array writes among the rotation algorithms. Even in the form of Figure 13, rotation by modular visit has the property that it swaps elements directly into their final position (using `displaced` as pivot).

Nevertheless, Table 1 suggests that the algorithm does not scale well in practice.




Figure 14: Rotating sequence A B C D E F by 2 through modular visit.

While we have not thoroughly investigated the reasons for this lackluster practical performance, it might have to do with (lack of) locality in access: the “jumping around” of modular visits accesses non-adjacent elements which may generate many cache misses when a large array cannot be stored in the fastest level of the memory hierarchy.⁴

4.4.2 Rotation by modular visit: correctness

A proof that it works is remarkably difficult. . .

— Richard Bornat about rotation by modular visit [3]

We introduce the loop invariants necessary to prove correctness; we then discuss how to prove their inductiveness.

Loop invariants. The formal analysis starts with the outer loop: each iteration visits (and puts in place) all elements whose index is in the cycle that begins at `start`. The bounding invariants

$$0 \leq \text{moved} \leq N, \tag{25}$$

$$0 \leq \text{start} \leq \text{gcd}(N, N - r), \tag{26}$$

are then easy to justify (but not so easy to prove!). (25) follows from the number of moved elements being initially zero; and the outer loop exiting when all N elements have been moved. (26) captures the fact that the outer loop executes exactly

⁴It is somewhat surprising that method `rotate` of `java.util.Collections` in OpenJDK 6 uses rotation by modular visit (with an implementation very similar to the one used for the experiments reported in Table 1) not only for small collections but also whenever a collection supports constant-time random access—as in arrayed lists.

$\gcd(N, N - r)$ times—as each cycle visits $N / \gcd(N, N - r)$ elements. Since the quantity $N / \gcd(N, N - r)$ will feature often in the invariants and proof of the algorithm, we give it an abbreviation:

$$\tau(N, N - r) = \frac{N}{\gcd(N, N - r)}. \quad (27)$$

The first usage of this definition is to express an exact relation between `moved` and `start`. As we repeatedly discussed, every cycle consists of exactly $\tau(N, N - r)$ elements, and `start` is incremented on line 177 after every cycle is completed; hence the invariant

$$\text{moved} = \text{start} \cdot \tau(N, N - r). \quad (28)$$

The outer loop's essential loop invariant precisely characterizes the elements put in place by each iteration of the loop. Given an initial value \bar{s} of `start`, such an iteration visits all elements whose indexes are in the cycle of $\tau(N, N - r)$ elements defined by (23) for $s = \bar{s}$. Using the abbreviation

$$\pi_N^M(s, k) = (s + kM) \text{ wrap } N \quad (29)$$

to denote the k th index in the cycle of step M modulo N that starts at s , the essential loop invariant is

$$\forall i, s, p: \left(\begin{array}{l} 0 \leq i < \tau(N, N - r) \\ \wedge \quad 0 \leq s < \text{start} \\ \wedge \quad p = \pi_N^{N-r}(s, i) \end{array} \right) \implies a[p] = \rho^r(\text{old } a)[p]. \quad (30)$$

That is, all elements of all cycles originating in values of `start` less than the current one have been put in place.

Moving on to the inner loop,⁵ variable `v` takes on all the values in the currently visited cycle (beginning at `start` on line 160). Since all cycles previously visited have the same length $\tau(N, N - r)$, we can express the value of `v` as a function of `start` and `moved`:

$$v = \pi_N^{N-r}(\text{start}, \text{moved} - \text{start} \cdot \tau(N, N - r)). \quad (31)$$

Expression $\text{moved} - \text{start} \cdot \tau(N, N - r)$ is 1 initially (that is, after the first unconditionally executed loop iteration); it is $\tau(N, N - r)$ when the inner loop exits with $v = \text{start}$. Hence the bounding loop invariant

$$0 < \text{moved} - \text{start} \cdot \tau(N, N - r) \leq \tau(N, N - r). \quad (32)$$

Given the current value of `v`, `displaced` is simply the value in `a` initially at index `v`:

$$\text{displaced} = (\text{old } a)[v]. \quad (33)$$

The outer loop's essential invariant (30) is also maintained by the inner loop: (30) only involves elements whose indexes are in a cycle starting at some $s < \text{start}$, but these cycles are disjoint from the currently visited cycle (which begins at `start`). To describe partial progress made by the inner loop in visiting the current cycle, we introduce another essential invariant:

$$\forall j, q: \left(\begin{array}{l} 0 < j \leq \text{moved} - \text{start} \cdot \tau(N, N - r) \\ \wedge \quad q = \pi_N^{N-r}(\text{start}, j) \end{array} \right) \implies a[q] = \rho^r(\text{old } a)[q]. \quad (34)$$

⁵Notice it is a `repeat...until` loop, and hence initiation for its invariants means that they have to hold after one iteration.

Quantified variable j determines the position in the current cycle; correspondingly, j 's range of quantification excludes 0, since $a[\pi_N^{N-r}(\text{start}, 0)]$ is set last, and includes $\text{moved} - \text{start} \cdot \tau(N, N - r)$, corresponding to the element set in the latest loop iteration.

Proving initiation. Initiation is trivial for the outer loop invariants, so let's focus on initiation for the inner loop invariants. The outer loop's (28) still holds at the beginning of the inner loop body, since neither `start` nor `moved` has changed. Thus, incrementing `moved` at the end of the inner loop body makes $\text{moved} - \text{start} \cdot \tau(N, N - r) = 1$, which proves initiation of (32). Since $\pi_N^{N-r}(\text{start}, 1)$ is $(\text{start} + N - r) \bmod N$, (31) also holds initially. For similar reasons, `displaced` stores the value originally at index v that has just been assigned to; hence (33) initially.

We already discussed that the outer loop essential invariant's validity is not affected by the inner loop's work; hence (30) satisfies initiation and consecution with respect to the inner loop. Finally, initiation for (34) amounts to proving that the value assigned to $a[\pi_N^{N-r}(\text{start}, 1)]$ in the first execution of line 166 is the one of $\rho^r(\text{old } a)$; this can be done by matching the definitions of π_N^{N-r} and of rotation (8).

Proving consecution. The outer loop's bounding invariant (26) is unaffected by the inner loop, which does not modify `start`. Its inductiveness follows from the bound (25) on `moved` and on the connection (28) between the latter and `start`.

For the consecution proofs of the remaining outer loop invariant, we rely on the inner loop invariants. When the inner loop terminates, $v = \text{start}$; through (31), it follows that $\text{moved} - \text{start} \cdot \tau(N, N - r) = \tau(N, N - r)$; hence (28) is restored after incrementing `start` by one on line 177.

We now move to proving inductiveness of the inner loop invariants. Since the inner loop exits when $v = \text{start}$, (31) implies that the increment of `moved` does not overflow $\tau(N, N - r)$ relative to the initial value at the current outer loop iteration; hence (32) is maintained. Conversely, (31) is maintained because the inner loop body implements the definition of π_N^{N-r} with respect to the current `moved` that is incremented by one. Along the same lines one can prove that (33) is inductive.

Disjointness of the cycles visited by the inner loop ensures that (30) is also maintained. Proving consecution of (34) is more involved. Thanks to the inductive hypothesis, we only have to establish progress for $q = v$. The inner loop, on line 166, assigns to $a[v]$ the value that was assigned to `displaced` in the *previous* loop iteration; from (33), noting that `moved` has just been incremented, this is the element in `old a` whose index is given by the previous value in the cycle, that is the previous value of v . This is in fact $\rho^r(\text{old } a)[v]$ because of how π_N^{N-r} is defined.

Final correctness. The final step in the correctness proof of `rotate_modulo` is establishing the postcondition from the outer loop invariants. When the outer loop terminates, $\text{moved} = N$; (28) implies that $\text{start} = \gcd(N, N - r)$. Therefore, proving the postcondition boils down to the following lemma.

Lemma 3. *Given r and N satisfying the precondition of `rotate_modulo`: for every $0 \leq k < N$, there exist $0 \leq i < \tau(N, N - r)$ and $0 \leq s < \gcd(N, N - r)$ such that $\pi_N^{N-r}(s, i) = k$.*

Proof. The lemma ultimately follows from the property of decomposition in cycles of permutations (Section 2).

Since k is listed in some cycle (23), the three variables k, s, i satisfy $s + i(N - r) \equiv k \pmod{N}$, which indicates that $s = k \pmod{N - r}$. It follows, from standard properties of modular arithmetic [19, Sec. 1.6.2], that $N - r$ divides $k - s$. Hence, we can rewrite the expression that relates k, s , and i —where now only i is unknown—as

$$i \cdot \frac{N - r}{g} \equiv \frac{k - s}{g} \pmod{\frac{N}{g}}, \quad (35)$$

for $g = \gcd(N, N - r)$. (35) has exactly one solution: use the extended Euclidean algorithm to find x and y such that $x(N - r)/g + yN/g = \gcd((N - r)/g, N/g) = 1$ satisfies Bézout’s identity. Then, $i = x(k - s)/g$ is the unique solution. \square

5 Rotation: mechanized proofs in Boogie

Notwithstanding our efforts to be as rigorous as possible in the correctness arguments of Section 4, there still is substantial ground to cover before we can have mechanized proofs. Part of the remaining gap is due to the unforgiving level of precision that is required by mechanical proof tools; another part is more specific to the nature of a specific tool we may choose, such as its level of automation and limitations. In this section, we provide a detailed account of what is necessary to turn the proof ideas of Section 4 into successful verification using Boogie [14].⁶

Boogie is an *auto-active* tool, providing a level of automation intermediate between completely automatic (such as in static analyzers) and interactive (such as in proof assistants). In practice, users interact with the tool offline by providing *annotations* (such as assertions and lemmas) that guide proof attempts.

Boogie is mainly used as an intermediate language for verification; hence we will have to provide annotations at a relatively low level of detail. This will turn out to be instructive and will showcase several fundamental categories of annotations and annotation styles that are present, in one form or another, in practically every auto-active tool—and possibly in other kinds of tools as well.

The four rotation algorithms make for a gradual introduction to these features of automated verification, as each of them requires new specific annotation techniques:

Rotation by copy is simple enough that it only requires basic definitions; we can replicate the proof essentially as done on paper.

Rotation by reversal requires intermediate assertions to guide the prover and explicit *lemmas* proved separately and applied where appropriate in the main correctness proof.

Rotation by swapping requires lemmas with non-trivial proofs and modularization tailored to the proof outline; it also requires a little usage of *triggers* to curb instantiation patterns of the underlying automatic theorem prover.

Rotation by modular visit requires clever axiomatization, as well as non-trivial *ghost code* added to the implementation specifically to represent additional information about program state required to justify the correctness proof; a *framing* specification is of the essence.

⁶The presentation assumes basic familiarity with the Boogie language and tool.

```

180 // Sequence of a[low..high)
181 function seq(a: [int]int, low: int, high: int) returns([int]int);
182 axiom (∀ a: [int]int, low: int, high: int, i: int •
183     0 ≤ i ∧ i < high - low ⇒ seq(a, low, high)[i] = a[low + i]);
184
185 // Definition (2): i wrap N
186 function wrap(i: int, N: int) returns(int);
187 axiom (∀ i, N: int • 0 ≤ i ∧ i < N ⇒ wrap(i, N) = i);
188 axiom (∀ i, N: int •
189     0 < N ∧ N ≤ i ⇒ wrap(i, N) = wrap(i - N, N));
190
191 // Left-rotated sequence of a[low..high) by r
192 function rot(a: [int]int, low: int, high: int, r: int)
193     returns([int]int);
194 axiom (∀ a: [int]int, low: int, high: int, i, r: int •
195     0 ≤ r ∧ r < high - low ∧ 0 ≤ i ∧ i < r ⇒
196     rot(a, low, high, r)[i + high - low - r] = seq(a, low, high)[i]);
197 axiom (∀ a: [int]int, low: int, high: int, i, r: int •
198     0 ≤ r ∧ r < high - low ∧ r ≤ i ∧ i < high - low ⇒
199     rot(a, low, high, r)[i - r] = seq(a, low, high)[i]);

```

Figure 15: Boogie declarations and axiomatic definitions of array slice sequence `seq`, `wrap`, and rotated sequence `rot`.

In each case, the features used (such as ghost code or framing annotations) are not necessarily the only way to carry out a proof of that algorithm using Boogie. However, they support a natural approach, and one that is often idiomatic to using auto-active tools of the same family.

5.1 Sequences and rotated sequences

Before delving into the details of the algorithms, Figure 15 introduces some basic definitions that we will use in all the Boogie annotations and proofs. As arrays, we use Boogie *maps* from integers to integers (type `[int]int`). While we could use a generic type as codomain, sticking to plain integers generally works better as it has better support with the underlying SMT solver (in other words, it requires fewer explicit axioms).

First, it is convenient to have an explicit representation of array slices as *sequences*. Since we still using maps to represent sequences, this amounts to a scaling of indexes, so that the lower index of the sequence corresponding to `a[low..high)` is zero. Thus, function `seq` takes a map `a`, a lower index `low`, and an upper index `high` and returns another map whose content over indexes `[0..high - low)` coincides with `a[low..high)`.

The two axioms defining `wrap` replicate definition (2) verbatim. And the definition of rotated sequence follows (6): precisely, function `rot` takes a slice `a[low..high)` and a rotation coefficient `r` and returns a sequence (that is, a zero-based map) representing the left rotation of `a[low..high)` by `r`. Since we only consider nonnegative values of `r`, the axiomatic definition of `rot` consists of two axioms, in the same order as definition (6): the first one describes the head of $(\text{high} - \text{low}) - r$ elements; and the second one describes the tail of `r` elements of the rotated sequence.

Using functions `seq` and `rot`, Figure 15 shows the generic signature and input/output specification of a Boogie procedure that performs rotation. Since input arguments are read only in Boogie, `rotate` returns another map `b` whose content represents the input slice `a[0..N]` after processing. The rest is as in Figure 2, but we have to make explicit, in the postcondition, the quantification over range that was implicit in the notation $a = \rho^r(\text{old } a)$.

```

200 procedure rotate(a: [int]int, N: int, r: int) returns(b: [int]int)
201   requires 0 < r ∧ r < N;
202   ensures (∀ i: int •
203     0 ≤ i ∧ i < N ⇒ seq(b, 0, N)[i] = rot(a, 0, N, r)[i]);

```

Figure 16: Rotate array `a` by `r` to the left: signature and specification in Boogie.

5.2 Rotation by copy: mechanized proofs as on paper

Rotation by copy retains most of its simplicity in Boogie. As Figure 17 shows, the same implementation and loop invariants of Figure 3 work in Boogie.

The proof outline presented in Section 4.1.2 mentioned that the essential loop invariant implies the postcondition thanks to the equivalent definition of rotation (8). In a similar way, Boogie has to prove that the representation of `rot` in terms of `wrap`, used in the loop invariant, and the axiomatic definition of `rot` in Figure 15, used in the

```

204 // Rotate a[0..N] to the left by r by copying
205 procedure rotate_copy(a: [int]int, N: int, r: int)
206   returns(b: [int]int)
207   requires 0 < r ∧ r < N;
208   ensures (∀ i: int •
209     0 ≤ i ∧ i < N ⇒ seq(b, 0, N)[i] = rot(a, 0, N, r)[i]);
210 {
211   var s, d: int;
212   s, d := 0, N - r;
213   while (s < N)
214     invariant 0 ≤ s ∧ s ≤ N;
215     invariant d = wrap(s + N - r, N);
216     invariant (∀ i: int • 0 ≤ i ∧ i < s ⇒
217       seq(a, 0, N)[i] = seq(b, 0, N)[wrap(i + N - r, N)]);
218   {
219     b[d] := a[s];
220     s := s + 1;
221     d := d + 1;
222     if (d = N) { d := 0; }
223   }
224   assert (∀ i: int • 0 ≤ i ∧ i < N ⇒
225     rot(a, 0, N, r)[i] = seq(a, 0, N)[wrap(i + r, N)]);
226 }

```

Figure 17: Verified Boogie annotated implementation of the rotation by copy algorithm of Figure 3.

postcondition, are equivalent. To this end, we introduce an assert expressing (7), on line 224 in Figure 17.

Since (7) is (8)'s inverse, it is the former that translates from a representation based on the latter into one conforming to `rot`'s axioms. Namely, after proving the **assert** from `rot`'s definition, Boogie's reasoning follows this chain of equalities, for a generic index $0 \leq k < N$:

```

    rot(a, 0, N, r)[k]
  = seq(a, 0, N)[k+r]    (assert on line 224 in Figure 17)
  = seq(b, 0, N)[wrap((k+r) + N - r, N)]
                        (invariant on line 216 in Figure 17)
  = seq(b, 0, N)[wrap(k+N, N)]    (arithmetic)
  = seq(b, 0, N)[k]    (axiom on line 188 in Figure 15)
  QED                      (postcondition ensures).

```

5.3 Rotation by reversal: mechanized lemmas

Rotation by reversal requires expressing Lemma 1 in Boogie, which is crucial to prove that the three reversals achieve a rotation of the original sequence. In order to be able to do that, we first axiomatize reversal along the same lines as done for rotation.

5.3.1 Axioms and lemmas about reversal

Figure 18 shows an axiomatization based on (5): `rev(a, low, high)` is the sequence obtained by reversal of `a[low..high]`. We also introduce a function `rp(i, low, high)` that represents the mapping used in the essential loop invariant of `reverse`. This is merely a convenience, since we could equivalently use the expanded expression `high + low - 1 - i` wherever `rp(i, low, high)` occurs. However, this choice may have an impact in practice because Boogie introduces different triggers for integer expressions than for uninterpreted function applications. For lack of space, we won't discuss every single alternative in detail; trying out some of them is a useful exercise, also to realize the sensitivity of Boogie's encoding to changes in annotation style.

Lemmas as procedures. In Boogie, lemmas are encoded as **procedures** without returned values: preconditions express the lemma's hypotheses; postconditions express the lemma's statement; and the procedure body outlines steps in the lemma's proof. For example, this is a lemma procedure expressing the conclusion of a classic syllogism:

```

procedure syllogism(p: P) requires greek(p) ensures mortal(p)
{ assert human(p); /* p is human, and hence mortal */ }

```

Since lemmas are procedures in Boogie, asserting a lemma is done by calling the corresponding procedure. For example, we can ask Boogie to derive the fact that Socrates is mortal by the instruction **call** `syllogism(socrates)`, which checks that `greek(socrates)` and derives that `mortal(socrates)`. To instantiate a lemma for a generic value of some of its arguments, there is the **call forall** instruction: **call forall** `syllogism(*)` makes the fact that every Greek is mortal available at the call site.

```

234 // Reversed sequence of a[low..high)
235 function rev(a: [int]int, low: int, high: int) returns([int]int);
236 axiom (∀ a: [int]int, low: int, high: int, i: int •
237   0 ≤ i ∧ i < high - low ⇒
238   rev(a, low, high)[i] = seq(a, low, high)[high - low - 1 - i]);
239
240 // The position i maps to in a reversal of [low..high)
241 function rp(i: int, low: int, high: int) returns(int);
242 axiom (∀ i, low, high: int • rp(i, low, high) = high + low - 1 - i);

```

Figure 18: Boogie declarations and axiomatic definitions of reversed sequence `rev` and inverse index mapping `rp` in a reversal.

```

243 // Representation (7) is equivalent to rot's definition
244 procedure lemma_rot(a: [int]int, low, high: int, r: int, p: int)
245   requires low ≤ high;
246   requires 0 ≤ r ∧ r < high - low;
247   requires 0 ≤ p ∧ p < high - low;
248   ensures rot(a, low, high, r)[p] =
249     seq(a, low, high)[wrap(p + r, high - low)];
250 { }
251
252 // Lemma 1 (reverse of concatenation)
253 procedure lemma_rev_cat(t: [int]int, tl: int, th: int,
254   s: [int]int, sl: int, sh: int,
255   c: [int]int, p: int)
256   requires tl ≤ th ∧ sl ≤ sh;
257   requires 0 ≤ p ∧ p < sh - sl + th - tl;
258   requires (∀ i: int • 0 ≤ i ∧ i < th - tl ⇒
259     seq(c, 0, th - tl)[i] = rev(t, tl, th)[i]);
260   requires (∀ i: int • 0 ≤ i ∧ i < sh - sl ⇒
261     seq(c, th - tl, sh - sl + th - tl)[i] = rev(s, sl, sh)[i]);
262   ensures 0 ≤ p ∧ p < sh - sl ⇒
263     rev(c, th - tl, th - tl + sh - sl)[p] = seq(s, sl, sh)[p];
264   ensures 0 ≤ p ∧ p < th - tl ⇒
265     rev(c, 0, th - tl)[p] = seq(t, tl, th)[p];
266   ensures 0 ≤ p ∧ p < sh - sl ⇒
267     rev(c, 0, th - tl + sh - sl)[p] = seq(s, sl, sh)[p];
268   ensures 0 ≤ p ∧ p < th - tl ⇒
269     rev(c, 0, th - tl + sh - sl)[p + sh - sl] = seq(t, tl, th)[p];
270 { }

```

Figure 19: Two Boogie lemma procedures about rotation and reversal. Procedure `lemma_rot` establishes that (7) is equivalent to `rot`'s axiomatic definition. Procedure `lemma_rev_cat` represents, for a generic index $0 \leq p < |S| + |T|$, Lemma 1 with $S = s[sl..sh)$, $T = t[tl..th)$, and $c[0..|S| + |T|) = T^{-1} \circ S^{-1}$.

Two lemmas about rotation and reversal in Boogie. The first lemma we present is the Boogie version of (7) as an alternative definition of `rot`. We already used this fact in the proof of `rotate_copy`, where we introduced it as an ad hoc `assert`; now, we proceed systematically and formalize it as procedure `lemma_rot`.

The second lemma is the fundamental Lemma 1. Procedure `lemma_rev_cat` formalizes it in a form that is readily usable with maps: it asserts that, given slices $s[s_l..s_h]$, $t[t_l..t_h]$, and $c[0..s_h - s_l + t_h - t_l]$ such that c 's slice equals the concatenation of $t[t_l..t_h]$'s reversal and $s[s_l..s_h]$'s reversal, reversing the whole c 's slice gives the concatenation of $s[s_l..s_h]$ and $t[t_l..t_h]$. Precisely, only the last two `ensures`, lines 266 and 268 in Figure 19, express the lemma's conclusion. By contrast, using the more readily understandable slice notation, the first two `ensures` express that

$$\begin{aligned} c[ah - al..ah - al + bh - bl]^{-1} &= b[bl..bh], \\ c[0..ah - al]^{-1} &= a[al..ah], \end{aligned}$$

which is part of the information used in proving the lemma. If we wanted to directly reflect the lemma's structure on paper, we would move the formulas on lines 262 and 264 in Figure 19 as `asserts` inside `lemma_rev_cat`'s body. This is another alternative that we do not explore in full. It turns out, however, that having those formulas as `ensures` rather than `assert` makes for an overall faster verification—probably because the extra `ensures` are useful facts where the lemma is employed: not having to derive them again from other available facts at the call site is advantageous.

Short of this, both lemma procedures have empty bodies: Boogie can round up the facts required to prove them without additional guidance.

5.3.2 Mechanized proofs of reversal and rotation by reversal

We now have all the ingredients to present the implementation and proof of the main algorithms.

Proof of in-place reversal. Figure 20 shows Boogie procedure `reverse`,⁷ which renders the pseudo-code implementation of Figure 7 using the same convention on input and output used for `rotate` in Figure 16.

Boogie can convert between the representation of b 's content with respect to a 's given by the loop invariants and the one used in the definition of `rev`, and hence in `reverse`'s postcondition. When the loop terminates, the essential invariant characterizes the program state in a way that can be expressed as follows, for $0 \leq k < \text{high} - \text{low}$:

$$\text{seq}(a, \text{low}, \text{high})[k] = \text{seq}(b, \text{low}, \text{high})[\text{high} - \text{low} - 1 - k]. \quad (36)$$

Hence, Boogie verifies the following chain of equalities:

⁷Boogie's performance in this example is affected by the names given to local variables s and d , as well as the temporary local t . For instance, using p and q as in the original pseudo-code listing triggers a time out. We could not investigate this bizarre (and somewhat distressing) issue in depth, but it probably has to do with how the SMT solver's instantiation rewrite order depends on Boogie's translation of variable names in the encoding of verification conditions.

```

273 procedure reverse(a: [int]int, low, high: int) returns(b: [int]int)
274   ensures (∀ i: int • 0 ≤ i ∧ i < high - low ⇒
275     seq(b, low, high)[i] = rev(a, low, high)[i]);
276   ensures (∀ i: int • i < low ⇒ b[i] = a[i]);
277   ensures (∀ i: int • high ≤ i ⇒ b[i] = a[i]);
278 {
279   var s, d, t: int; // Variable t is temporary for swapping
280   b := a;
281   if (low ≥ high) { return; }
282   s, d := low, high - 1;
283   assert d = rp(s, low, high);
284   while (s < d + 1)
285     invariant low ≤ s ∧ s ≤ d + 2 ∧ d + 1 ≤ high;
286     invariant d = rp(s, low, high);
287     invariant
288       (∀ i: int • low ≤ i ∧ i < s ⇒ a[i] = b[rp(i, low, high)]);
289     invariant
290       (∀ i: int • d < i ∧ i < high ⇒ a[i] = b[rp(i, low, high)]);
291     invariant (∀ i: int • s ≤ i ∧ i ≤ d ⇒ b[i] = a[i]);
292     invariant (∀ i: int • i < low ⇒ b[i] = a[i]);
293     invariant (∀ i: int • high ≤ i ⇒ b[i] = a[i]);
294     { // swap b[s] and b[d]
295       t := b[d]; b[d] := b[s]; b[s] := t;
296       s, d := s + 1, d - 1;
297     }
298 }

```

Figure 20: Verified Boogie annotated implementation of the in-place reversal algorithm of Figure 7.

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{rev}(a, \text{low}, \text{high})[k] \\
= & \text{seq}(a, \text{low}, \text{high})[\text{high} - \text{low} - 1 - k] \\
& \quad \text{(definition of rev: axiom on line 236)} \\
= & \text{seq}(b, \text{low}, \text{high})[\text{high} - \text{low} - 1 - (\text{high} - \text{low} - 1 - k)] \\
& \quad \text{(equation 36)} \\
= & \text{seq}(b, \text{low}, \text{high})[k] \\
& \quad \text{(arithmetic)} \\
& \text{QED} \quad \text{(postcondition ensures)}.
\end{aligned}$$

The code in Figures 20 and 7 is structurally very similar. The only major—yet unsurprising—difference is that Boogie procedure `reverse` includes information (in the postcondition and, correspondingly, in the loop invariants) about what is *not* changed by the body: `b` is the same as `a` for indexes smaller than `low` and greater than or equal to `high`. This is a simple form of *framing* necessary because Boogie’s reasoning is modular: the effects of calls to `reverse` within any of its callers are limited to what is explicit in `reverse`’s specification irrespective of its implementation; anything that is not explicitly defined in `reverse`’s postcondition may have changed.

Another, minor, difference between the Boogie code in Figures 20 and the pseudocode in Figure 7 is that the former’s `reverse` has no precondition, and simply returns the input `a` when `[low..high)` is an empty range of indexes. In fact, the conditional `return` statement on line 281 is actually not needed, since the following loop exits

```

306 // Rotate a[0..N) to the left by r by reversal
307 procedure rotate_reverse(a: [int]int, N: int, r: int)
308     returns(b: [int]int)
309     requires 0 < r ∧ r < N;
310     ensures (∀ i: int •
311         0 ≤ i ∧ i < N ⇒ seq(b, 0, N)[i] = rot(a, 0, N, r)[i]);
312 {
313     b := a;
314     call b := reverse(b, 0, r);
315     call b := reverse(b, r, N);
316     call forall lemma_rev_cat(a, 0, r, a, r, N, b, *);
317     call b := reverse(b, 0, N);
318     call forall lemma_rot(a, 0, N, r, *);
319 }

```

Figure 21: Verified Boogie annotated implementation of the rotation by reversal algorithm of Figure 6.

immediately when $\text{low} \geq \text{high}$ (but note that the invariant $s \leq d + 2$ may fail initially if $s \geq d + 1$). Boogie needs a little nudge to understand how it handles this case separately: providing a conditional **return** is one way to do it with code; ways to do it with annotations are inserting a precondition **requires** $\text{low} \leq \text{high}$, or making the failing invariant conditional, so that it holds vacuously when $\text{low} \geq \text{high}$.

Proof of rotation by reversal. As we can see in Figure 21, the Boogie annotated implementation of the rotation by reversal algorithm closely follows its presentation in Section 4.2.2. After reversing in-place $b[0..r)$ and then $b[r..N)$, `lemma_rev_cat` ensures that reversing $b[0..N)$ again yields a rotation of $a[0..N)$ by r . The last call to reverse performs this final reversal; and `lemma_rot` helps convert between the index representation in `lemma_rev_cat`'s postcondition and the one used in the definition of `rot`. Even if `wrap` is directly used in neither, it is applicable to “invert” the former for $\text{sh} - \text{sl} = N - r$. This reasoning is similar to the argument at the end of Section 5.2 that should have become familiar by now.

5.4 Rotation by swapping: organizing code for proofs

Mechanizing the rotation by swapping algorithm requires more complex usage of lemma procedures; and a careful organization of the imperative code to help guide the proof search so that it terminates in reasonable time. The first step is, however, straightforward: verifying the auxiliary routine `swap_sections`—which we discuss next.

5.4.1 Mechanized proof of swapping sections

Procedure `swap_sections` in Figure 22 directly translates the pseudo-code in Figure 8. There are only a few, unsurprising differences:

- The Boogie procedure uses an output map since input arguments are read only; maps have infinite domains, and hence there is no need to require that $0 \leq \text{low}$ and $\text{high} \leq N$.


```

320 procedure swap_sections(a: [int]int, low, high: int, d: int)
321     returns(b: [int]int)
322     requires low ≤ low + d ∧ low + d ≤ high - d ∧ high - d ≤ high;
323     ensures (∀ i: int • 0 ≤ i ∧ i < d ⇒
324         seq(b, low, high)[i] = seq(a, low, high)[i + (high - low - d)]);
325     ensures (∀ i: int • d ≤ i ∧ i < high - low - d ⇒
326         seq(b, low, high)[i] = seq(a, low, high)[i]);
327     ensures (∀ i: int • high - low - d ≤ i ∧ i < high - low ⇒
328         seq(b, low, high)[i] = seq(a, low, high)[i - (high - low - d)]);
329     ensures (∀ i: int • i < low ⇒ b[i] = a[i]);
330     ensures (∀ i: int • high ≤ i ⇒ b[i] = a[i]);
331 {
332     var x, z: int;
333     var tmp: int; // Temporary variable for swap
334     b := a;
335     x, z := low, high - d;
336     while (x < low + d)
337     invariant low ≤ x ∧ x ≤ low + d;
338     invariant high - d ≤ z ∧ z ≤ high;
339     invariant x - low = z - (high - d);
340     invariant (∀ i: int • 0 ≤ i ∧ i < x - low ⇒
341         seq(b, low, high)[i] = seq(a, low, high)[i + (high - low - d)]);
342     invariant (∀ i: int • x - low ≤ i ∧ i < high - low - d ⇒
343         seq(b, low, high)[i] = seq(a, low, high)[i]);
344     invariant (∀ i: int • high - low - d ≤ i ∧ i < z - low ⇒
345         seq(b, low, high)[i] = seq(a, low, high)[i - (high - low - d)]);
346     invariant (∀ i: int • i < low ⇒ b[i] = a[i]);
347     invariant (∀ i: int • z ≤ i ⇒ b[i] = a[i]);
348     { // swap b[x] and b[z]
349         tmp := b[z]; b[z] := b[x]; b[x] := tmp;
350         x, z := x + 1, z + 1;
351     }
352 }

```

Figure 22: Verified Boogie annotated implementation of the in-place slice swapping algorithm of Figure 8.

- The postcondition (and correspondingly the loop invariants) has two additional clauses about framing on lines 329 and 330: the output b is the same as the input a for indexes outside the range $[low..high)$.
- A **while** loop in Boogie renders the semantics of the **until...do** loop in pseudocode.

The correctness proof goes through without additional annotations. In fact, unlike the case of reverse, Boogie’s translation seems much more robust with respect to inessential changes such as variable names or equivalent orderings of declarations.

```

353 procedure lemma_left_smaller(a: [int]int, al, ah: int,
354                               c: [int]int, cl, ch: int,
355                               b: [int]int, bl, bh: int, d: int)
356   requires al < ah;
357   requires ah - al = bh - bl  $\wedge$  ah - al = ch - cl;
358   requires 0 < d  $\wedge$  d < ah - al - d;
359   requires ( $\forall$  i: int  $\bullet$  ah - (d + al)  $\leq$  i  $\wedge$  i < ah - al  $\implies$ 
360     rot(a, al, ah, d)[i] = seq(b, bl, bh)[i]);
361   requires ( $\forall$  i: int  $\bullet$  0  $\leq$  i  $\wedge$  i < ah - (d + al)  $\implies$ 
362     rot(c, cl, ch - d, d)[i] = seq(b, bl, bh - d)[i]);
363   requires ( $\forall$  i: int  $\bullet$  0  $\leq$  i  $\wedge$  i < d  $\implies$ 
364     seq(c, cl, ch)[i] = seq(a, al, ah)[i + (ah - d - al)]);
365   requires ( $\forall$  i: int  $\bullet$  d  $\leq$  i  $\wedge$  i < ah - (d + al)  $\implies$ 
366     seq(c, cl, ch)[i] = seq(a, al, ah)[i]);
367   ensures ( $\forall$  i: int  $\bullet$  0  $\leq$  i  $\wedge$  i < ah - al  $\implies$ 
368     rot(a, al, ah, d)[i] = seq(b, bl, bh)[i]);
369 {
370   assert ( $\forall$  i: int  $\bullet$  0  $\leq$  i  $\wedge$  i < ah - (d + al)  $\implies$ 
371     rot(c, cl, ch - d, d)[i] = seq(b, bl, bh)[i]);
372   assert ( $\forall$  i: int  $\bullet$  0  $\leq$  i  $\wedge$  i < ch - cl - d - d  $\implies$ 
373     rot(c, cl, ch - d, d)[i] = seq(c, cl, ch - d)[i + d]);
374   assert ( $\forall$  i: int  $\bullet$  0  $\leq$  i  $\wedge$  i < ch - cl - d - d  $\implies$ 
375     rot(c, cl, ch - d, d)[i] = seq(c, cl, ch)[i + d]);
376   assert ( $\forall$  i: int  $\bullet$  ch - cl - d - d  $\leq$  i  $\wedge$  i < ch - cl - d  $\implies$ 
377     rot(c, cl, ch - d, d)[i] =
378     seq(c, cl, ch - d)[i - (ch - cl - d - d)]);
379   assert ( $\forall$  i: int  $\bullet$  ch - cl - d - d  $\leq$  i  $\wedge$  i < ch - cl - d  $\implies$ 
380     rot(c, cl, ch - d, d)[i] =
381     seq(c, cl, ch)[i - (ch - cl - d - d)]);
382   assert ( $\forall$  i: int  $\bullet$  0  $\leq$  i  $\wedge$  i < ah - (d + al)  $\implies$ 
383     rot(a, al, ah, d)[i] = seq(b, bl, bh)[i]);
384   assert ( $\forall$  i: int  $\bullet$  ah - (d + al)  $\leq$  i  $\wedge$  i < ah - al  $\implies$ 
385     rot(a, al, ah, d)[i] = seq(b, bl, bh)[i]);
386 }

```

Figure 23: Lemma 2 for case *left is smaller* (18a) as a Boogie lemma procedure, with $d = d$, $N = ah - al = bh - bl = ch - cl$, $a[al..ah] = X \circ Y \circ Z$, $c[cl..ch - d] = Z \circ Y$, and $b[bl..bh] = \rho^d(c[cl..ch - d]) \circ X$.

5.4.2 Lemmas about swapping

The most elaborate component for a Boogie proof of rotation by swapping is a translation of Lemma 2, which is used to justify the recursive calls in the main algorithm. We provide two distinct lemma procedures with symmetric structures, one for each of the *left is smaller* case (18a) and *right is smaller* case (18b).

Lemma for *left is smaller* case. Figure 23 shows the Boogie translation of Lemma 2 in case (18a). Recall how the lemma justifies the main algorithm, demonstrated in Figure 9: to compute $\rho^d(X \circ Y \circ Z)$, first swap equal-length sequences X and Z , and then recur on $Z \circ Y$.

Procedure `lemma_left_smaller` traces these two macro steps through an additional input map c . Then, $a[a_l..a_h]$ represents the input consisting of $X \circ Y \circ Z$, with d the length of both leftmost X and rightmost Z segments, as in the top-left picture of Figure 9. Slice $c[c_l..c_h - d]$ represents $Z \circ Y$: the initial part of the processed array after swapping X and Z , as in the top-right picture of Figure 9. Slice $b[b_l..b_h]$ represents the final output after recursively rotating $c[c_l..c_h - d]$ by d , as in the bottom-right picture of Figure 9. The preconditions of `lemma_left_smaller` encode these assumptions: line 359 describes the right-most slice $b[b_h - d..b_h]$ as X , which is in place in the rotation of $a[a_l..a_h]$; line 361 describes the other slice $b[b_l..b_h - d]$ as $\rho^d(c[c_l..c_h - d])$; lines 363 and 363 respectively describe $c[c_l..c_l + d]$ as Z and $c[c_l + d..c_h - d]$ as Y . The postcondition on line 367 concludes that the $b[b_l..b_h]$ described in the precondition is indeed the rotation of $a[a_l..a_h]$ by d .

The procedure body consists of a series of seven **assert** that guide Boogie through the proof of the postcondition from the preconditions. As usual, there is room for variations, but this particular sequence of **assert** is fairly natural and produces a fast proof; to illustrate, this is an informal explanation of what each **assert** establishes:

Line 370 relaxes the right bound of `seq(b)` in the precondition on line 361 from $b_h - d$ to b_h , since indexes beyond $b_h - d$ are out of the quantification range.

Line 372 recalls the definition of `rot` for $c[c_l + d..c_h - d - d]$ or Y .

Line 374 relaxes the right bound of `seq(c)` in the previous **assert** from $c_h - d$ to c_h , since indexes beyond $c_h - d$ are out of the quantification range.

Line 376 recalls the definition of `rot` for $c[c_l..c_l + d]$ or Z .

Line 379 relaxes the right bound of `seq(c)` in the previous **assert** from $c_h - d$ to c_h , since indexes beyond $c_h - d$ are out of the quantification range.

Line 382 concludes that $b[b_l..b_h - d]$ is $\rho^d(a[a_l..a_h])$ between $[a_l..a_h - d]$, using the facts about c proved so far (specifically, lines 374 and 379), and the relations between b and c and between b and a in the preconditions.

Line 384 recalls that $b[b_h - d..b_h]$ coincides with $\rho^d(a[a_l..a_h])[a_h - d..a_h]$; even if this **assert** is the very same as the precondition on line 359, it is necessary to recall it explicitly in the body so that Boogie uses it to close the proof.

Once we have understood the rationale behind `lemma_left_smaller`, it is not difficult to derive the dual `lemma_right_smaller` shown in Figure 24 and corresponding to case (18b) of Lemma 2. Following the example of Figure 11 going from a (top-left picture) through c (top-right picture) to b (bottom-right picture) helps understand the lemma procedure. Compared to `lemma_left_smaller`, there now is one more **assert** due to an additional index rescaling (the second **assert** refers to $i - d$, which becomes i in the third **assert**).

The real twist is, however, the need for a *trigger* in the last **assert** on line 422:

$$\{ \text{seq}(b, b_l, b_h)[i] \}.$$

Even if the **assert** is just a repetition of the precondition on line 393, Boogie needs help to pick the relevant facts among the many instantiated terms that are available. The trigger directs the SMT solver⁸ to only instantiate the universal quantifier in the **assert**

⁸The description of the SMT solver Simplify [5] discusses how triggers work; see also [16, 1] and [14, Sec. 11.2].

```

387 procedure lemma_right_smaller(a: [int]int, al, ah: int,
388                               c: [int]int, cl, ch: int,
389                               b: [int]int, bl, bh: int, d: int)
390   requires al < ah;
391   requires ah - al = bh - bl  $\wedge$  ah - al = ch - cl;
392   requires 0 < d  $\wedge$  d < ah - al - d;
393   requires ( $\forall$  i: int • 0  $\leq$  i  $\wedge$  i < d  $\implies$ 
394     rot(a, al, ah, ah - al - d)[i] = seq(b, bl, bh)[i]);
395   requires ( $\forall$  i: int • 0  $\leq$  i  $\wedge$  i < ah - (d + al)  $\implies$ 
396     rot(c, cl + d, ch, ah - al - d - d)[i] = seq(b, bl + d, bh)[i]);
397   requires ( $\forall$  i: int • ah - (d + al)  $\leq$  i  $\wedge$  i < ah - al  $\implies$ 
398     seq(c, cl, ch)[i] = seq(a, al, ah)[i - (ah - d - al)]);
399   requires ( $\forall$  i: int • d  $\leq$  i  $\wedge$  i < ah - (d + al)  $\implies$ 
400     seq(c, cl, ch)[i] = seq(a, al, ah)[i]);
401   ensures ( $\forall$  i: int • 0  $\leq$  i  $\wedge$  i < ah - al  $\implies$ 
402     rot(a, al, ah, ah - al - d)[i] = seq(b, bl, bh)[i]);
403 {
404   assert ( $\forall$  i: int • 0  $\leq$  i  $\wedge$  i < ah - (d + al)  $\implies$ 
405     rot(c, cl + d, ch, ah - al - d - d)[i] = seq(b, bl, bh)[i + d]);
406   assert ( $\forall$  i: int • d  $\leq$  i  $\wedge$  i < ch - cl - d  $\implies$ 
407     rot(c, cl + d, ch, ah - al - d - d)[i] =
408     seq(c, cl + d, ch)[i - d]);
409   assert ( $\forall$  i: int • 0  $\leq$  i  $\wedge$  i < ch - cl - d - d  $\implies$ 
410     rot(c, cl + d, ch, ah - al - d - d)[i + d] =
411     seq(c, cl + d, ch)[i]);
412   assert ( $\forall$  i: int • d  $\leq$  i  $\wedge$  i < ch - cl - d  $\implies$ 
413     rot(c, cl + d, ch, ah - al - d - d)[i] = seq(c, cl, ch)[i]);
414   assert ( $\forall$  i: int • 0  $\leq$  i  $\wedge$  i < d  $\implies$ 
415     rot(c, cl + d, ch, ah - al - d - d)[i] =
416     seq(c, cl + d, ch)[i + (ch - cl - d - d)]);
417   assert ( $\forall$  i: int • 0  $\leq$  i  $\wedge$  i < d  $\implies$ 
418     rot(c, cl + d, ch, ah - al - d - d)[i] =
419     seq(c, cl, ch)[i + (ch - cl - d)]);
420   assert ( $\forall$  i: int • d  $\leq$  i  $\wedge$  i < ah - al  $\implies$ 
421     rot(a, al, ah, ah - al - d)[i] = seq(b, bl, bh)[i]);
422   assert ( $\forall$  i: int • { seq(b, bl, bh)[i] } // trigger
423     0  $\leq$  i  $\wedge$  i < d  $\implies$ 
424     rot(a, al, ah, ah - al - d)[i] = seq(b, bl, bh)[i]);
425 }

```

Figure 24: Lemma 2 for case *right is smaller* (18b) as a Boogie lemma procedure, with $d = d$, $N = ah - al = bh - bl = ch - cl$, $a[al..ah] = X \circ Y \circ Z$, $c[cl + d..ch] = Y \circ X$, and $b[bl..bh] = Z \circ \rho^{N-2d}(c[cl + d..ch])$.

for those i 's such that $seq(b, bl, bh)[i]$ is a term in the current proof context. In this particular case, using the trigger makes a dramatic difference in terms of performance when proving the whole lemma procedure.

```

426 procedure rotate_swap(a: [int]int, N: int, r: int)
427     returns(b: [int]int)
428     requires  $0 < r \wedge r < N$ ;
429     ensures  $(\forall i: \text{int} \bullet$ 
430          $0 \leq i \wedge i < N \implies \text{seq}(b, 0, N)[i] = \text{rot}(a, 0, N, r)[i])$ ;
431 {
432     call b := rotate_swap_helper(a, r, 0, N);
433 }
434
435
436 procedure rotate_swap_helper(a: [int]int, p: int, low, high: int)
437     returns(b: [int]int)
438     requires  $\text{low} \leq p \wedge p < \text{high}$ ;
439     ensures  $(\forall i: \text{int} \bullet 0 \leq i \wedge i < \text{high} - \text{low} \implies$ 
440          $\text{rot}(a, \text{low}, \text{high}, p - \text{low})[i] = \text{seq}(b, \text{low}, \text{high})[i])$ ;
441     ensures  $(\forall i: \text{int} \bullet i < \text{low} \implies b[i] = a[i])$ ;
442     ensures  $(\forall i: \text{int} \bullet \text{high} \leq i \implies b[i] = a[i])$ ;
443 {
444     var c: [int]int; // ghost: value of b before recursive call
445     if (p = low) { b := a; return; }
446     if (p - low  $\leq$  high - p) {
447         // swap a[low..p] and a[high - (p - low)..high)
448         call b := swap_sections(a, low, high, p - low);
449         if (p - low = high - p) {
450             // now the whole b[low..high) is in place
451             return;
452         } else {
453             // now b[high - (p - low)..high) is in place
454             c := b; // ghost
455             call b := rotate_swap_helper(b, p, low, high - (p - low));
456             call lemma_left_smaller(a, low, high, c, low, high,
457                 b, low, high, p - low);
458         }
459     } else {
460         assert p - low > high - p;
461         assert  $0 \leq \text{high} - p \wedge \text{high} - p \leq \text{high} - \text{low}$ ;
462         // swap a[low..low + (high - p)] and a[p..high)
463         call b := swap_sections(a, low, high, high - p);
464         // now b[low..low + (high - p)] is in place
465         c := b; // ghost
466         call b := rotate_swap_helper(b, p, low + (high - p), high);
467         call lemma_right_smaller(a, low, high, c, low, high,
468             b, low, high, high - p);
469     }
470 }

```

Figure 25: Verified Boogie annotated implementation of the rotation by swapping recursive algorithm of Figure 10.

5.4.3 Mechanized proof of rotation by swapping: recursive version

Presenting annotated versions of `rotate_swap` and `rotate_swap_helper`, Figure 25 is the Boogie counterpart to Figure 10.

With respect to the pseudo-code version of Figure 10, `rotate_swap_helper` in Boogie has some structural differences that are worth discussing. The most pronounced one is a different conditional structures. The pseudo-code algorithm clearly distinguishes between three cases (equal length of slices to be swapped, left is smaller, right is smaller), and each case has a call to `swap_sections` followed, in the last two cases, by a recursive call to the helper; the trivial base case `low = p` is handled by an enclosing **if**. By contrast, the Boogie procedure handles the trivial base case initially introducing abrupt termination (i.e., a **return**). Then, the call to `swap_sections` on line 448 applies to two cases: “equal length” and “left is smaller”. This structure helps reduce repetitions in reasoning along different conditional branches, and in fact it makes for quicker verification. Having one fewer call to `swap_sections` with respect to the pseudo-code version avoids checking `swap_sections`’s precondition twice with the same arguments in different contexts; and the **return** in the “equal length” case drives a direct proof of the helper’s postcondition from `swap_sections`’s postcondition and the few other facts available at that location, instead of having to consider many other inapplicable facts in a conditional reasoning at the unique exit point of the structured pseudo-code version. Of course, other solutions are possible in Boogie with some trial and error, but it should be clear that the two versions are semantically equivalent. To help unravel the branching structure with more clarity, we have two **assert** in the “right is smaller” branch; they also are crucial for performance.

The usage of a *ghost* variable `c` is another novelty of Figure 25 compared to the previous Boogie examples. It is no coincidence that the name `c` is also used for one argument of the lemma procedures presented in Section 5.4.2. In `rotate_swap_helper`, `c` keeps track of the value of `b` after the first macro-step (call to `swap_sections`) and before the second one (recursive call to the helper). Thanks to `c`, we conclude the proof of each recursive case by calling the corresponding lemma procedure, which relates the input `a` to the final output `b` through `c` to establish `rotate_swap_helper`’s postcondition. As discussed in the upcoming Section 5.5, the rotation by modular visit algorithm contemplates a much richer usage of ghost code, but the idea is already clear here: ghost code keeps track of program state beyond what is explicit in the non-ghost program variables (that is, variables used in the actual computation), capturing information that is readily useful for proofs.

A final aspect of modularization leveraged in the proof of rotation by swapping is not apparent in the presentation on paper. We split the proof of the procedures in separate files. Each file contains only one procedure with implementation (for example, `rotate_swap_helper`) together with only the signature and specification of other procedures called in the single implementation (for example, `lemma_left_smaller`, `lemma_right_smaller`, and `swap_sections`). We invoke Boogie separately on each file. Even if Boogie works modularly, there clearly is interference between different proofs originating in the same file; having only one procedure to prove per invocation significantly reduces the possible problems—ultimately causing slower proofs or time-outs due to unfruitful proof search heuristics being applied. The bottom line is that how code and annotations are structured can make a significant difference when mechanizing verification of algorithms.

5.4.4 Mechanized proof of rotation by swapping: iterative version

A careful organization of code and annotations is also central to the proof of the *iterative* version of rotation by swapping. A formalization of Lemma 2 is still at the core of the correctness argument; but we now proceed using a different approach than in the recursive version: since lemmas and imperative code are both encoded as **procedures** in Boogie, we combine them in the same procedure.

To this end, we introduce three variants of `swap_sections`, one for each of the by-now familiar cases: “equal length” sections, “left is smaller”, and “right is smaller”. We name the three variants accordingly: `swap_equal`, `swap_left`, and `swap_right`. The operational part of the variants is identical, and simply consists of a suitable call to `swap_sections` of Figure 22. What is different is their *specification*: besides describing output in terms of input, it also relates the output to the original reversal problem as per Lemma 2. Take for example `swap_left` in Figure 26, which swaps $c[l..p]$ and $c[h - (p - l)..h]$ under the assumption $p - l < h - p$. Its input arguments also include the original input $a[low..high]$ to be rotated. Its precondition assumes that $c[low..l]$ and $c[h..high]$ correspond to already rotated slices of $a[low..high]$. Its postcondition guarantees that output $b[low..l]$ and $b[h - (p - l)..high]$ will consist of rotated slices of $a[low..high]$, thus ensuring progress; and that rotating $b[l..h - (p - l)]$ by $p - l$ will complete the rotation of $a[low..high]$. Of course, the names a , b , and c correspond to the three macro-step also underlying the recursive version and the running example in Figure 9. Similar comments apply to the augmented specification of `swap_equal` and `swap_right` shown in Figure 27.

The advantage of this approach is that we can reason about special properties of swapping separately in each case. The call to `swap_sections` in the bodies of `swap_left`, `swap_right`, and `swap_equal` is followed by a sequence of **assert** that proves the special properties of the swapping declared in the augmented postconditions. For brevity, we omit the proofs; suffice it to say that `swap_equal` has a simple proof, whereas `swap_left` and `swap_right`’s proofs are quite involved and require elaborate assertions and careful usage of triggers.

With this organization, Boogie can prove `rotate_swap_iterative` in Figure 28 with the same invariants as the pseudo code in Figure 12 without additional annotations (the only exception being the straightforward framing invariants to keep track of the unchanged parts of the map domain before θ and after N). While we could have used nested **ifs** to replicate the three-case structure in the loop body of Figure 12, we demonstrate another construct, nondeterministic **goto**, which emphasizes the three-way case split. Embedding the proof of Lemma 2 in separate procedures makes for a simple and efficient high-level proof that reflects the argument on paper.

5.5 Rotation by modular visit: ghost code and framing

Underlying the proof of the rotation by modular visit algorithm discussed informally in Section 4.4.2 were properties of modular arithmetic and cyclic decompositions of permutations. Mechanizing the proofs of those properties all the way down to fundamental arithmetic would be exceedingly complicated and out of the scope of the present discussion; instead, we capture the fundamental mathematical properties as axioms whose correctness is intuitively clear, and build the main correctness proof atop them.

This approach has the additional advantage that it lets us focus on other aspects central to mechanizing the proof of rotation by modular visit, and in particular on keeping track of implicit information in the program state by means of *ghost code*.

```

471 procedure swap_left(a: [int]int, c: [int]int, low, high: int,
472                    l, h: int, p: int) returns(b: [int]int)
473   requires low ≤ l ∧ l < p ∧ p < h ∧ h ≤ high;
474   requires p - l < h - p;           // left is smaller
475   requires (∀ i: int • 0 ≤ i ∧ i < l - low ⇒
476     rot(a, low, high, p - low)[i] = seq(c, low, high)[i]);
477   requires (∀ i: int • l - low ≤ i ∧ i < h - low ⇒
478     rot(a, low, high, p - low)[i] =
479     rot(c, l, h, p - l)[i - (l - low)]);
480   requires (∀ i: int • h - low ≤ i ∧ i < high - low ⇒
481     rot(a, low, high, p - low)[i] = seq(c, low, high)[i]);
482   requires (∀ i: int • i < low ⇒ c[i] = a[i]);
483   requires (∀ i: int • high ≤ i ⇒ c[i] = a[i]);
484   ensures (∀ i: int • 0 ≤ i ∧ i < l - low ⇒
485     rot(a, low, high, p - low)[i] = seq(b, low, high)[i]);
486   ensures (∀ i: int • l - low ≤ i ∧ i < h - low - (p - l) ⇒
487     rot(a, low, high, p - low)[i] =
488     rot(b, l, h - (p - l), p - l)[i - (l - low)]);
489   ensures (∀ i: int • h - low - (p - l) ≤ i ∧ i < high - low ⇒
490     rot(a, low, high, p - low)[i] = seq(b, low, high)[i]);
491   ensures (∀ i: int • i < low ⇒ b[i] = a[i]);
492   ensures (∀ i: int • high ≤ i ⇒ b[i] = a[i]);
493 {
494   call b := swap_sections(c, l, h, p - l);
495   // Asserts to prove post from pre and swap_sections's post
496   // ...
497 }

```

Figure 26: Verified Boogie annotated implementation of the in-place slice swapping algorithm Figure 8: postcondition augmented with Lemma 2 for case *left is smaller* (18a).


```

498 procedure swap_equal(a: [int]int, c: [int]int, low, high: int,
499                      l, h: int, p: int) returns(b: [int]int);
500   requires low ≤ l ∧ l < p ∧ p < h ∧ h ≤ high;
501   requires p - l = h - p; // left same size as right
502   requires (∀ i: int • 0 ≤ i ∧ i < l - low ⇒
503     rot(a, low, high, p - low)[i] = seq(c, low, high)[i]);
504   requires (∀ i: int • l - low ≤ i ∧ i < h - low ⇒
505     rot(a, low, high, p - low)[i] =
506     rot(c, l, h, p - l)[i - (l - low)]);
507   requires (∀ i: int • h - low ≤ i ∧ i < high - low ⇒
508     rot(a, low, high, p - low)[i] = seq(c, low, high)[i]);
509   requires (∀ i: int • i < low ⇒ c[i] = a[i]);
510   requires (∀ i: int • high ≤ i ⇒ c[i] = a[i]);
511   ensures (∀ i: int • 0 ≤ i ∧ i < p - low ⇒
512     rot(a, low, high, p - low)[i] = seq(b, low, high)[i]);
513   ensures (∀ i: int • p - low ≤ i ∧ i < high - low ⇒
514     rot(a, low, high, p - low)[i] = seq(b, low, high)[i]);
515   ensures (∀ i: int • i < low ⇒ b[i] = a[i]);
516   ensures (∀ i: int • high ≤ i ⇒ b[i] = a[i]);
517
518
519 procedure swap_right(a: [int]int, c: [int]int, low, high: int,
520                    l, h: int, p: int) returns(b: [int]int);
521   requires low ≤ l ∧ l < p ∧ p < h ∧ h ≤ high;
522   requires p - l > h - p; // right is smaller
523   requires (∀ i: int • 0 ≤ i ∧ i < l - low ⇒
524     rot(a, low, high, p - low)[i] = seq(c, low, high)[i]);
525   requires (∀ i: int • h - low ≤ i ∧ i < high - low ⇒
526     rot(a, low, high, p - low)[i] = seq(c, low, high)[i]);
527   requires (∀ i: int • l - low ≤ i ∧ i < h - low ⇒
528     rot(a, low, high, p - low)[i] =
529     rot(c, l, h, p - l)[i - (l - low)]);
530   requires (∀ i: int • i < low ⇒ c[i] = a[i]);
531   requires (∀ i: int • high ≤ i ⇒ c[i] = a[i]);
532   ensures (∀ i: int • 0 ≤ i ∧ i < l - low + (h - p) ⇒
533     rot(a, low, high, p - low)[i] = seq(b, low, high)[i]);
534   ensures (∀ i: int • l - low + (h - p) ≤ i ∧ i < h - low ⇒
535     rot(a, low, high, p - low)[i] =
536     rot(b, l + (h - p), h, p - (l + (h - p)))[i - (l - low + h - p
537       )]);
538   ensures (∀ i: int • h - low ≤ i ∧ i < high - low ⇒
539     rot(a, low, high, p - low)[i] = seq(b, low, high)[i]);
540   ensures (∀ i: int • i < low ⇒ b[i] = a[i]);
541   ensures (∀ i: int • high ≤ i ⇒ b[i] = a[i]);

```

Figure 27: Boogie specifications of the in-place slice swapping algorithm Figure 8. The postcondition of `swap_equal` is augmented with the property that, when $p - l = h - p$, swapping $c[l..p)$ and $c[p..h)$ in place is tantamount to rotating $c[l..h)$ by $p - l$. The postcondition of `swap_right` is augmented with Lemma 2 for case *right is smaller* (18b).

```

541 procedure rotate_swap_iterative(a: [int]int, N: int, r: int)
542     returns(b: [int]int)
543     requires  $0 < r \wedge r < N$ ;
544     ensures  $(\forall i: \text{int} \bullet$ 
545          $0 \leq i \wedge i < N \implies \text{seq}(b, 0, N)[i] = \text{rot}(a, 0, N, r)[i])$ ;
546 {
547     var low, p, high: int;
548     low, p, high := 0, r, N;
549     b := a;
550     while (low < p  $\wedge$  p < high)
551     invariant  $0 \leq \text{low} \wedge \text{low} \leq p \wedge p \leq \text{high} \wedge \text{high} \leq N$ ;
552     invariant low = p  $\iff$  p = high;
553     invariant  $(\forall i: \text{int} \bullet 0 \leq i \wedge i < \text{low} \implies$ 
554          $\text{rot}(a, 0, N, p)[i] = \text{seq}(b, 0, N)[i])$ ;
555     invariant p - low < high - low  $\implies$ 
556          $(\forall i: \text{int} \bullet \text{low} \leq i \wedge i < \text{high} \implies$ 
557              $\text{rot}(a, 0, N, p)[i] =$ 
558                  $\text{rot}(b, \text{low}, \text{high}, p - \text{low})[i - \text{low}])$ ;
559     invariant  $(\forall i: \text{int} \bullet \text{high} \leq i \wedge i < N \implies$ 
560          $\text{rot}(a, 0, N, p)[i] = \text{seq}(b, 0, N)[i])$ ;
561     invariant  $(\forall i: \text{int} \bullet i < 0 \implies b[i] = a[i])$ ;
562     invariant  $(\forall i: \text{int} \bullet N \leq i \implies b[i] = a[i])$ ;
563     {
564         goto equal_length, left_smaller, right_smaller;
565     equal_length:
566         assume p - low = high - p;
567         call b := swap_equal(a, b, 0, N, low, high, p);
568         low, high := low + (p - low), high - (high - p);
569         goto continue;
570     left_smaller:
571         assume p - low < high - p;
572         call b := swap_left(a, b, 0, N, low, high, p);
573         high := high - (p - low);
574         goto continue;
575     right_smaller:
576         assume p - low > high - p;
577         call b := swap_right(a, b, 0, N, low, high, p);
578         low := low + (high - p);
579         goto continue;
580     continue:
581     }
582 }

```

Figure 28: Verified Boogie annotated implementation of the rotation by swapping iterative algorithm of Figure 12.

We already encountered ghost code among the annotations of rotation by swapping (Section 5.4.3), but proving rotation by modular visit will require more complex usage, especially to detail *framing* of the result array b .

5.5.1 Axioms about cycles

Figure 29 shows declarations and axiomatic definitions of three fundamental quantities featuring in the proof of rotation by modular visit: $\pi_N^M(s, k)$, $\text{gcd}(N, M)$, and $\tau(N, M)$ corresponding to $\text{mp}(N, M, s, k)$, $\text{gcd}(N, M)$, and $\tau(N, M)$ in Boogie.

```

583 function mp(N: int, M: int, s: int, p: int) returns(int);
584 axiom ( $\forall$  N: int, M: int, s: int •
585    $\emptyset < M \wedge M < N \wedge \emptyset \leq s \wedge s < N \implies \text{mp}(N, M, s, \emptyset) = s$ );
586 axiom ( $\forall$  N: int, M: int, s: int, k: int •
587    $\emptyset < M \wedge M < N \wedge \emptyset \leq s \wedge s < N \wedge \emptyset < k \implies$ 
588    $\text{mp}(N, M, s, k) = \text{wrap}(\text{mp}(N, M, s, k - 1) + M, N)$ );
589
590 function gcd(N: int, M: int) returns(int);
591 axiom ( $\forall$  N, M: int •  $\emptyset < N \wedge \emptyset < M \implies$ 
592    $\emptyset < \text{gcd}(N, M) \wedge \text{gcd}(N, M) \leq N \wedge \text{gcd}(N, M) \leq M$ );
593
594 function  $\tau$ (N: int, M: int) returns(int);
595 axiom ( $\forall$  N: int, M: int •
596    $\emptyset \leq M \wedge M < N \implies \emptyset < \tau(N, M) \wedge \tau(N, M) \leq N$ );
597
598 axiom ( $\forall$  N: int, M: int •  $\emptyset < M \wedge M < N \implies$ 
599    $\text{gcd}(N, M) * \tau(N, M) = N$ );
600 axiom ( $\forall$  N: int, M: int, s: int •  $\text{mp}(N, M, s, \tau(N, M)) = s$ );
601 axiom ( $\forall$  N: int, M: int, s: int, p: int •
602    $\emptyset < p \wedge p < \tau(N, M) \implies \text{mp}(N, M, s, p) \neq s$ );
603 axiom ( $\forall$  N: int, M: int, s: int, p, q: int •
604    $\emptyset \leq p \wedge p < \tau(N, M) \wedge \emptyset \leq q \wedge q < \tau(N, M) \wedge p \neq q \implies$ 
605    $\text{mp}(N, M, s, p) \neq \text{mp}(N, M, s, q)$ );
606 axiom ( $\forall$  N: int, M: int, s, t: int, p, q: int •
607    $\emptyset \leq p \wedge p < \tau(N, M) \wedge \emptyset \leq q \wedge q < \tau(N, M) \wedge$ 
608    $\emptyset \leq s \wedge s < t \wedge t < s + \text{gcd}(N, M) \wedge t < N \implies$ 
609    $\text{mp}(N, M, s, p) \neq \text{mp}(N, M, t, q)$ );

```

Figure 29: Boogie declarations and axiomatic definitions of mp , gcd , and τ .

The first two axioms characterize $\pi_N^M(s, k)$ —which gives the k -th index in a cycle starting at s with step M wrapping over N —inductively as

$$\pi_N^M(s, k) = \begin{cases} s & k = 0, \\ (M + \pi_N^M(s, k - 1)) \text{ wrap } N & k > 0. \end{cases}$$

This definition and the one in (29) are equivalent (a fact which could be proved from a suitable axiomatization of modular arithmetic), but the inductive definition has the advantage of directly matching the program’s logic: each iteration of the inner loop moves v to the “next” value in the modular visit. In contrast, (29) is inductive only indirectly through definition (2) of ‘wrap’.

The following two axioms, lines 591 and 595 in Figure 29, define how gcd and τ are bounded by their arguments.

The remaining axioms in Figure 29 complete the characterization of π , gcd , and τ in terms of mutual properties. The axiom on line 598 is equivalent to (27); in the proof, it is necessary to conclude that the inner and outer loops combined visit all the \mathbb{N} elements of the input. The three axioms on lines 600–605 define the $\tau(\mathbb{N}, \mathbb{M})$ elements in the same cycle starting at a generic s ; in the proof, these characterize the elements visited by the inner loop (executed to completion for a given value of s). By contrast, the last axiom in Figure 29 declares disjointness between elements of the cycles a rotation can be decomposed into; in the proof, it is necessary to combine the effect of each iteration of the outer loop (in fact, the axiom covers exactly $\tau(\mathbb{N}, \mathbb{M})$ different consecutive values of s).

5.5.2 Outer loop

The Boogie version of the algorithm is a mouthful; we begin looking at the annotated outer `while` loop, whose Boogie version is shown in Figure 30 (with references to the parts presented later).

Framing using a ghost map. A fundamental difficulty we encounter trying to translate the annotated algorithm of Figure 13 into Boogie is the lack of readily available framing annotations. To prove that the essential outer loop invariant (30) is inductive, we have to establish that each new iteration works on new elements of b or, equivalently, that it does not touch the elements set by previous iterations. This non-interference property ultimately boils down to the fact that the cycle visited by each outer loop iteration is disjoint from the other cycles. To put this fact to use in the mechanized proof, we introduce ghost state that keeps track precisely of the visited locations. The axioms in Figure 29 can then be used to prove that the ghost state changes following invariants that reflect progress as in the original loop invariant (30).

Concretely, we introduce a Boolean map `set` as ghost state: `set[k]` is `true` iff the imperative code has changed the value of `b[k]` from its initial input value `a[k]` to its correct value in the rotation underway. This convention makes it possible to decouple framing (“what elements the algorithm modifies”) from functional properties (“how the algorithm modifies the elements”), which simplifies the life of the theorem prover by bringing the annotations closer in form to the axioms used to verify them, and hence also simplifies the task of checking each of them individually.

The invariant on line 635 in Figure 30 restates the essential outer loop invariant (30) in terms of `set`: if `set[i]` is `true` then `b[i]` represents the elements at position i in a rotation of a by r . This is equivalent to (30) if combined with the other invariant on line 632: `set[p]` is `true` for the same values of i, s, p as in the antecedent of (30).

The two other outer loop invariants about `set` (lines 627 and 629) provide the complementary information about what elements have *not* been modified: `set[i]` is `false` for all i ’s corresponding to values in cycles not visited yet (beginning at indexes larger than or equal to the current value of `start`); and `b[i]` is unchanged for these i ’s.

We have to appropriately update ghost variable `set` during the computation. The inner loop, which performs the actual visits, also sets `set[i]` to `true` whenever it assigns to `b[i]`. The rest of the program is only responsible for initializing `set` to all `false` values, which we do with an `assume` (line 622) rather than with imperative code that would needlessly increase the complexity of verification.

```

610 procedure rotate_modulo(a: [int]int, N: int, r: int)
611     returns(b: [int]int)
612     requires  $0 < r \wedge r < N$ ;
613     ensures  $(\forall i: \text{int} \bullet$ 
614          $0 \leq i \wedge i < N \implies \text{seq}(b, 0, N)[i] = \text{rot}(a, 0, N, r)[i])$ ;
615 {
616     var start, v, displaced: int;
617     // ghost:
618     var k: int; // index mp(N, N - r, start, k) currently visited
619     var set: [int]bool; // set[i] iff b[i] has been assigned to
620
621     b := a;
622     assume  $(\forall i: \text{int} \bullet \neg \text{set}[i])$ ; // ghost: initialize b
623
624     start := 0;
625     while (start < gcd(N, N - r))
626     invariant  $(0 \leq \text{start} \wedge \text{start} \leq \text{gcd}(N, N - r))$ ;
627     invariant  $(\forall i: \text{int} \bullet$ 
628          $0 \leq i \wedge i < N \wedge \neg \text{set}[i] \implies b[i] = a[i])$ ;
629     invariant  $(\forall i: \text{int}, s: \text{int} \bullet$ 
630          $0 \leq i \wedge i < \tau(N, N - r) \wedge \text{start} \leq s \wedge s < \text{gcd}(N, N - r)$ 
631          $\implies \neg \text{set}[\text{mp}(N, N - r, s, i)])$ ;
632     invariant  $(\forall i: \text{int}, s: \text{int} \bullet$ 
633          $0 \leq i \wedge i < \tau(N, N - r) \wedge 0 \leq s \wedge s < \text{start}$ 
634          $\implies \text{set}[\text{mp}(N, N - r, s, i)])$ ;
635     invariant  $(\forall i: \text{int} \bullet 0 \leq i \wedge i < N \wedge \text{set}[i] \implies$ 
636          $\text{seq}(b, 0, N)[i] = \text{rot}(a, 0, N, r)[i])$ ;
637     {
638         v, displaced := start, b[start];
639         k := 0; // ghost
640
641         // one unconditional iteration of the inner loop
642         k := k + 1; // ghost
643         v := v + N - r;
644         if (v  $\geq$  N) { v := v - N; }
645         b[v], displaced := displaced, b[v];
646         set[v] := true; // ghost
647
648         // Inner loop here: see Figure 31
649
650         assert k =  $\tau(N, N - r)$ ;
651         start := start + 1;
652     }
653     // Concluding assertions here: see Figure 33
654 }

```

Figure 30: Verified Boogie annotated implementation of the rotation by modular visit algorithm of Figure 13.

Simplifying program state. The remaining bounding outer loop invariants, (25), (26), and (28), constrain the values of `moved` and `start`. They are redundant since the value of `moved` between iterations of the outer loop is uniquely determined by the value `start` through (28). We simplify the program state by omitting `moved` and using (28) to rewrite properties of `moved` in terms of `start`. Then, (26) remains the only bounding invariant of the outer loop, whose staying condition changes from `moved \neq N` to `start < gcd(N, N - r)`.

In practice, we realized that this simplification was very useful, if not necessary, only late while arranging the mechanized proof. Boogie became very sensitive to adding more annotations and invariants, and it struggled to connect to the postcondition the final state characterized by the outer loop invariant. Removing the dependence on `moved` greatly helped, since it simplified the logic of the whole program down to the inner loop (which incremented `moved`). Since the imperative parts of the program are modified only minimally (just the assignments that initialize and update `moved`), and we still prove the same postcondition, we can still consider this a full-fledged mechanized correctness proof of the original algorithm in Figure 13.

```

655 call lemma_rotmp(start, a, 0, N, r, k);
656
657 while (v  $\neq$  start)
658   invariant  $0 \leq v \wedge v < N$ ;
659   invariant  $0 < k \wedge k \leq \tau(N, N - r)$ ;
660   invariant  $v = \text{mp}(N, N - r, \text{start}, k)$ ;
661   invariant  $\text{displaced} = a[\text{mp}(N, N - r, \text{start}, k)]$ ;
662   invariant  $(\forall i: \text{int} \bullet 0 \leq i \wedge i < N \wedge \neg \text{set}[i] \implies b[i] = a[i])$ ;
663   invariant  $(\forall i: \text{int} \bullet k < i \wedge i \leq \tau(N, N - r) \implies$ 
664      $\neg \text{set}[\text{mp}(N, N - r, \text{start}, i)])$ ;
665   invariant  $(\forall i: \text{int} \bullet 0 < i \wedge i \leq k \implies$ 
666      $\text{set}[\text{mp}(N, N - r, \text{start}, i)])$ ;
667   invariant  $(\forall i: \text{int}, s: \text{int} \bullet$ 
668      $0 \leq i \wedge i < \tau(N, N - r) \wedge \text{start} < s \wedge s < \text{gcd}(N, N - r) \implies$ 
669      $\neg \text{set}[\text{mp}(N, N - r, s, i)])$ ;
670   invariant  $(\forall i: \text{int}, s: \text{int} \bullet$ 
671      $0 \leq i \wedge i < \tau(N, N - r) \wedge 0 \leq s \wedge s < \text{start} \implies$ 
672      $\text{set}[\text{mp}(N, N - r, s, i)])$ ;
673   invariant  $(\forall i: \text{int} \bullet 0 \leq i \wedge i < N \wedge \text{set}[i] \implies$ 
674      $\text{seq}(b, 0, N)[i] = \text{rot}(a, 0, N, r)[i])$ ;
675   {
676     k := k + 1; // ghost
677     v := v + N - r;
678     if (v  $\geq$  N) { v := v - N; }
679     b[v], displaced := displaced, b[v];
680     set[v] := true; // ghost
681
682     call forall lemma_mp(N, N - r, start, *);
683     call lemma_rotmp(start, a, 0, N, r, k);
684   }

```

Figure 31: Inner loop of the verified Boogie annotated implementation of the rotation by modular visit algorithm of Figure 13.

5.5.3 Inner loop

The inner loop in Figure 13 is a `repeat...until`, whose body is executed at least once. Boogie only has one kind of loop (the `while` loop), and hence the inner loop body appears twice: once executed unconditionally right before the inner loop, in Figure 30), and once as body of the inner `while` loop, in Figure 31. The following discussion applies to both but focuses on the latter.

Progress in the current cycle using a ghost variable. The major novelty in the inner loop is the introduction of a new ghost variable k . The need for k comes quite naturally from observing that the expression $\text{moved} - \text{start} \cdot \tau(N, N - r)$ appears twice in the inner loop invariants. The value of this expression enumerates the indexes of the current cycle, each visited by an iteration of the inner loop: a value of 0 corresponds to the first index, a value of 1 to the second index, and so on. Thus, we introduce a ghost variable k that keeps track of this value; this is also consistent with our choice to drop moved and represent its information by means of other variables. k is initialized to 0 in the outer loop before every execution of the inner loop; and is incremented by one in the inner loop body. The inner loop's bounding invariants (31) and (32) become the invariants on lines 659 and 660 in Figure 31 after substituting k for $\text{moved} - \text{start} \cdot \tau(N, N - r)$.

The invariant (33) defines the value of displaced as `(old a)[v]`, corresponding to just $a[v]$ in Boogie. However, this formulation does not work well with Boogie, which reasons more directly if the definition of v is replicated, giving the invariant on line 661.

We express the essential inner loop invariants—in particular (34), specific to the inner loop—in terms of `set` as we expressed the essential outer loop invariant. (34) determines two new invariants on lines 663 and 665. Both predicate about indexes in the currently visited cycle. The former invariant targets those not visited yet, for positions larger than k ; the latter targets those visited, for positions up to k . The remaining framing invariants are as in the outer loop.

Lemmas to prove inductiveness. To prove the inductiveness of the inner loop invariants, Boogie needs a little help in the form of two lemmas about properties of function `mp`, whose statements and proofs are shown in Figure 32. `lemma_mp` simply bounds $\text{mp}(N, M, s, p)$ to be nonnegative and less than N . This is a consequence of the definition of `mp` in terms of `wrap N`, but we need to nudge Boogie to use this property among the many others that could be proved. The Boogie proof is by induction, corresponding to a conditional `if` in the lemma procedure: the inductive step calls the lemma for the previous value of $p - 1$ assumed by inductive hypothesis; since the definition of $\text{mp}(N, M, s, p)$ is in terms of $\text{mp}(N, M, s, p - 1)$, this is enough to close the proof.⁹

`lemma_rotmp` asserts that two elements at consecutive indexes in a cycle (that is, two evaluations of function `mp` for successive values of its last argument), relate elements in a rotation. This is an important property that explicitly connects the indexes in the cycles to the definition of rotation. Boogie can prove it by induction: the inductive step calls `lemma_mp` whose bounds justify the application of the definition of `rot`; based on this, the SMT solver combines the axiomatic definitions of `rot` and `mp` to prove the lemma.

⁹Boogie does not check that the inductive call is sound by referring to a *smaller* instance, but it should be clear that this is the case here.

```

685 procedure lemma_mp(N: int, M: int, s: int, p: int)
686   requires  $0 < M \wedge M < N$ ;
687   requires  $0 \leq s \wedge s < N$ ;
688   requires  $p \geq 0$ ;
689   ensures  $0 \leq mp(N, M, s, p) < N$ ;
690   { // proof by induction
691     if (p = 0) { } else { call lemma_mp(N, m, s, p - 1); }
692   }
693
694 procedure lemma_rotmp(s: int, a: [int]int,
695                       low: int, high: int, r: int, k: int)
696   requires  $0 < r \wedge r < high - low \wedge 0 \leq s \wedge s < high - low$ ;
697   requires  $k > 0$ ;
698   ensures  $rot(a, low, high, r)[mp(high - low, high - low - r, s, k)]$ 
699     =  $seq(a, low, high)[mp(high - low, high - low - r, s, k - 1)]$ ;
700   { // proof by induction
701     if (k = 1) { } else {
702       // lemma_mp makes it possible to apply the definition of rot
703       call lemma_mp(high - low, high - low - r, s, k - 1);
704     }
705   }

```

Figure 32: Lemmas used to prove the inner loop of rotation by modular visit.

We close the body of the inner loop by calling `lemma_mp` followed by `lemma_rotmp`; the order matters since the former asserts a more fundamental property on which the latter builds. Note that we also need to recall `lemma_rotmp` before entering the inner loop, to prove initiation after one unconditional execution of the loop body.

There remains one simple element of specification needed to guide Boogie’s proof to success. Even if this is, once again, a consequence of the definition of `mp`, we have to express it as a new bounding loop invariant on v : $0 \leq v < N$. This guarantees that the accesses to `b[v]` are within the bounds the other invariants predicate about. In fact, recalling `lemma_mp` in the loop body helps prove this invariant, which is then used in the rest of the proof.

Variants and performance. The Boogie proof is sensitive to the order in which some invariants appear and the ghost state is updated. To achieve a bit more robustness, we could add ghost state to make for a more step-wise proof of inductiveness. For example, we could add a ghost `c` map that represents the value of `b` in the previous iteration, so that the inductiveness proof uses facts about `c` as inductive hypotheses and only has to prove the inductive step about the latest update in `b`. We do not discuss this variant in more detail and prefer the terser proof presented above.

5.5.4 Proof conclusion

At high level, the Boogie proof of the postcondition from the outer loop invariants and exit condition follows the same steps as the one illustrated in Section 4.4.2. The assertions in Figure 33 correspond to such final steps: the first two assertions recall the essential outer loop invariants upon exiting the loop; then two simple arithmetic


```

706 assert ( $\forall i: \text{int}, s: \text{int} \bullet$ 
707    $0 \leq i \wedge i < \tau(N, N - r) \wedge 0 \leq s \wedge s < \text{gcd}(N, N - r) \implies$ 
708    $\text{set}[\text{mp}(N, N - r, s, i)]$ );
709 assert ( $\forall i: \text{int} \bullet 0 \leq i \wedge i < N \wedge \text{set}[i] \implies$ 
710    $\text{seq}(b, 0, N)[i] = \text{rot}(a, 0, N, r)[i]$ );
711 assert  $0 < N - r \wedge N - r < N$ ;
712 call forall lemma_wrap_bounds(*, gcd(N, N - r));
713 assert ( $\forall i: \text{int} \bullet 0 \leq i \wedge i < N \implies$ 
714    $\text{set}[\text{mp}(N, N - r, \text{wrap}(i, \text{gcd}(N, N - r))),$ 
715      $\text{yp}(N, N - r, \text{wrap}(i, \text{gcd}(N, N - r)), i)]$ );
716 call forall lemma_yp_mp(N, N - r, *, set);
717 call lemma_extensional(N, N - r, set);
718 assert ( $\forall i: \text{int} \bullet 0 \leq i \wedge i < N \implies \text{set}[i]$ );

```

Figure 33: Concluding assertions in the verified Boogie annotated implementation of the rotation by modular visit algorithm of Figure 13.

facts about $N - r$ and wrap are recalled (the second fact in the form of a lemma procedure `wrap_bounds` corresponding to a formal statement of (3)); then an assertion and a lemma `yp_mp` capture and use the statement of Lemma 3; the concluding call to `lemma_extensional` and assertion on the last line in Figure 33 are technicalities that we discuss last.

Let us focus on the interesting part of expressing Lemma 3 in Boogie. Informally, Lemma 3 shows how to “invert” `mp` so that the indexes it enumerates can be shown to span the whole domain of the input array. The proof of Lemma 3 uses fundamental properties of modular arithmetic that we avoided axiomatizing in detail in Boogie. Instead, we extend the axiomatization at the same level of abstraction used so far in the mechanized proofs by introducing the definitions in Figure 34. Function `yp` is like an inverse of `mp`, as declared by the axioms in Figure 34—the second one in particular which declares that $\text{mp}(\dots, \text{yp}(\dots, i)) = i$. We postulate its existence, instead of proving it from simpler principles as Lemma 3 does. Then, lemma procedure `lemma_yp_mp` connects `mp` to its inverse in the context in which they are used in the proof: if $\text{set}[\text{mp}(\dots, \text{yp}(\dots, i))]$ for any i between 0 and N , then $\text{set}[i]$ as well. The concluding proof in Figure 33 recalls `lemma_yp_mp`. For speed, it asserts one of the procedure’s preconditions before calling to focus the proof context.

At this point it would seem that all facts are available to prove the postcondition. Procedure `lemma_yp_mp` concludes that $\text{set}[i]$ for all $0 \leq i < N$ and the essential outer loop invariant (repeated by an **assert**) upon exiting says that $b[0..N)$ is $a[0..N)$ ’s rotation for all i such that $\text{set}[i]$. Nonetheless, we have to shoehorn the final conclusion into lemma procedure `extensional`, followed by an **assert** that reaffirms its postcondition. Specifically, the prover refuses to match the identical quantifications over $[0..N)$ in the **call forall** of `lemma_yp_mp`’s postcondition and in:

```
assert ( $\forall i: \text{int} \bullet 0 \leq i \wedge i < N \implies \text{set}[i]$ ).
```

While Boogie can prove the same assertion if put in the body of `lemma_extensional`¹⁰, it still cannot match it to the lemma’s identical postcondition. Using triggers does not seem to help. Since this is clearly due to inessential details of quantifier instantiation in the SMT solver, we simply declare the property as a **free ensures** and use it

¹⁰The name is because the form of the property reminds one of extensionality.

```

719 // yp(N, m, s, i) = p iff mp(N, m, s, p) = i
720 function yp(N: int, m: int, s: int, i: int) returns(int);
721 axiom (∀ N: int, m: int, i: int •
722   0 < m ∧ m < N ∧ 0 ≤ i ∧ i < N ⇒
723   0 ≤ yp(N, m, wrap(i, gcd(N, m)), i) < τ(N, m));
724 axiom (∀ N: int, m: int, i: int •
725   0 < m ∧ m < N ∧ 0 ≤ i ∧ i < N ⇒
726   mp(N, m, wrap(i, gcd(N, m)), yp(N, m, wrap(i, gcd(N, m)), i)) = i);
727
728 procedure lemma_yp_mp(N: int, m: int, i: int, set: [int]bool)
729   requires 0 ≤ i ∧ i < N;
730   requires 0 < m ∧ m < N;
731   requires 0 ≤ wrap(i, gcd(N, m)) < gcd(N, m);
732   requires 0 ≤ yp(N, m, wrap(i, gcd(N, m)), i) < τ(N, m);
733   requires mp(N, m, wrap(i, gcd(N, m)),
734             yp(N, m, wrap(i, gcd(N, m)), i)) = i;
735   requires set[mp(N, m, wrap(i, gcd(N, m)),
736                yp(N, m, wrap(i, gcd(N, m)), i))];
737   ensures set[i];
738 { }
739
740 procedure lemma_extensional(N: int, m: int, set: [int]bool);
741   requires 0 < m ∧ m < N;
742   requires (∀ i: int • 0 ≤ i ∧ i < N ⇒
743     0 ≤ wrap(i, gcd(N, m)) < gcd(N, m));
744   requires (∀ i: int • 0 ≤ i ∧ i < N ⇒
745     0 ≤ yp(N, m, wrap(i, gcd(N, m)), i) < τ(N, m));
746   requires (∀ i: int • 0 ≤ i ∧ i < N ⇒
747     mp(N, m, wrap(i, gcd(N, m)), yp(N, m, wrap(i, gcd(N, m)), i)) = i);
748   requires (∀ i: int • 0 ≤ i ∧ i < N ⇒
749     set[mp(N, m, wrap(i, gcd(N, m)),
750           yp(N, m, wrap(i, gcd(N, m)), i))]);
751   free ensures (∀ i: int • 0 ≤ i ∧ i < N ⇒ set[i]);

```

Figure 34: Lemmas and additional definitions used in the conclusion of the proof of rotation by modular visit.

without guilt. Finally, note that using a **free ensures** in a lemma procedure is generally preferable to using an axiom with the same statement, because its application is on demand—where it is really needed—rather than being a fact always available—cluttering the proof anywhere else.

6 Rotation: mechanized proofs in Dafny

Like Boogie, Dafny [11, 15] is an auto-active verifier, but one providing a language and reasoning capabilities at a higher level of abstraction.¹¹ In fact, Dafny uses Boogie as back-end, and its programs can be compiled and executed. These features make it

¹¹Our experiments used Dafny v. 1.9.1.11022 and Z3 v. 4.3.2.

suitable for developing verified algorithm implementations that are straightforward to present; in applying it to the rotation algorithms we will therefore try to be as close as possible to our proofs on paper (discussed in Section 4).

Similar warnings as those raised about the Boogie solutions of Section 5 apply: the solutions we show may not be the only ways to carry out proofs of the rotation algorithms in Dafny; and the addition of new features to Dafny in the future may pave the way to better ones—for example using fewer annotations. However, our solutions are appropriate given Dafny’s current capabilities and the rotation algorithms that we’re dealing with.

6.1 Sequences and rotated sequences

Dafny’s language offers features that match the idioms we used in Sections 2 and 3 to define sequences and the rotation problem.

Dafny supports arrays with C#-like syntax; our algorithms will operate on integer arrays. Given an integer array `a`: `array<int>`, `a.Length` denotes its length; `a[.]` denotes the *sequence* of `a`’s elements (from position 0 to position `a.Length - 1`), whose length `|a[.]|` is then also `a.Length`; and `a[low..high]` denotes the *slice* (or subsequence) of length `high - low`, which we indicated as `a[low..high)` in the rest of this paper—that is, all elements from position `low` included to position `high` excluded. Dafny sequences are immutable types used in specifications, just like we used them in the definitions of Section 3. Suitable axioms in Dafny’s prelude specify their defining properties, but one doesn’t have to deal with such axioms explicitly; this raises the level of abstraction and reduces the chances that we introduce subtle unwanted inconsistencies in how we represent the fundamental entities in our specifications.

```

753 // x wrap y
754 function wrap(x: int, y: int): int
755     requires 0 ≤ x ∧ 0 < y;
756 { if x < y then x else wrap(x - y, y) }
757
758 // rot(S, r) is ρrS
759 function rot(S: seq<int>, r: int): seq<int>
760     requires 0 ≤ r < |S|;
761     ensures |S| = |rot(S, r)|;
762     ensures ∀ k •
763         0 ≤ k < |S| ⇒ rot(S, r)[k] = S[wrap(k + r, |S|)];
764     ensures ∀ k •
765         0 ≤ k < |S| ⇒ S[k] = rot(S, r)[wrap(k + |S| - r, |S|)];
766 { S[r..|S|] + S[0..r] }

```

Figure 35: Dafny definitions of wrap and rotated sequence rot.

Figure 35 lists Dafny definitions of the wrap and rot functions, which closely follow the original definitions (2) and (6). Dafny’s **functions** are *ghost*; this means that they can be used in specification but not in executable code—exactly as we use them in Section 3. The explicit definition of a function (the expression between the function’s body marked by curly braces) is available to Dafny wherever the function is used. Additionally, functions may have preconditions (restricting a function’s domain) and postconditions; the latter express derived properties of a function, which also are

available for reasoning wherever the function is used. In our case, `rot`'s postcondition clauses in Figure 35 correspond to properties (7) and (8) of the rotation function ρ .

```

767 method rotate(a: array<int>, r: int)
768   requires a  $\neq$  null;
769   requires  $0 \leq r < a.Length$ ;
770   modifies a;
771   ensures a.Length = old(a.Length);
772   ensures a[..] = rot(old(a[..]), r);

```

Figure 36: Specification of rotation routines in Dafny.

Figure 36 shows the specification of a generic rotation routine (a `method` in Dafny). Arrays are heap-allocated; hence we check that `a` is not `null`, that is, it is attached to a valid array object. We allow ourselves a bit more generality than in the other sections, and choose to deal with the (trivial) case $r = 0$ explicitly. The rotation algorithms work by modifying the input array in place; hence the frame specification `modifies a`, that is, `rotate` may modify the state of array `a`. The essential specification is given by referring to the sequence `a[..]` before (using the `old` notation) and after `rotate` executes. Note that `old(a)` has a very different semantics than `old(a[..])` in Dafny, where `a` is a reference to a heap-allocated array object: `old(a)` denotes the same reference as `a` which obviously does not change, whereas `old(a[..])` denotes the sequence of `a`'s elements in the pre-state, which changes because the body modifies `a`'s content. The postcondition clause `a.Length = old(a.Length)` is implied by the essential postcondition, but having it explicitly generally enables faster proofs since it suggests an intermediate goal to be proved before reasoning about rotation.

6.2 Rotation by copy: simplified function definitions

Rotation by copy is, as usual, straightforward, but it already exposes some critical behavior of Dafny's that we will have to deal with carefully in more complex proofs.

Figure 37 shows the Dafny verified implementation of rotation by copy, which differ from Figure 3 only by minor details, such as dealing with the case $r = 0$ and adding the framing invariant that `a`'s content is not changed by the loop.

Figure 38 displays the straightforward implementation of routine `copy`, used within `rotate_copy` to transfer the result from local array `b` back into `a`. `copy`'s body uses Dafny's *forall statement*, which performs a parallel assignment over data defined by a bounded quantification. While such *forall* statements are mainly used in specification (as we will use them in other rotation algorithms), they are executable, and hence `copy`'s implementation is complete. Inlining `copy`'s body directly where it is used in `rotate_copy` also works but significantly slows down verification.

An important detail for the annotated implementation of `rotate_copy` to verify is the definition of `wrap`. Dafny times out if we use the recursive definition of Figure 35: recursion triggers many otiose instantiations that make the search for a proof very inefficient. Instead, we simply use `if x < y then x else x - y` as `wrap`'s body, which makes verification terminate in reasonable time. The simpler definition is equivalent to the one in Figure 35 only for $x < 2*y$. You can see that this constraint is always satisfied wherever `wrap` appears in `rotate_copy`'s specification: the loop invariant $s \leq N$ implies that $s + N - r < 2*N$, because $r > 0$ in the loop. Unfortunately, Dafny cannot check this explicitly: adding a precondition `requires x < 2*y` to `wrap`'s new, non-recursive, definition also triggers a time out. It is clear, however, that `rotate_copy`

```

773 // Left-rotate a by r by copying
774 method rotate_copy(a: array<int>, r: int)
775   requires a ≠ null;
776   requires 0 ≤ r < a.Length;
777   modifies a;
778   ensures a[..] = rot(old(a[..]), r);
779 {
780   var N := a.Length;
781   var b: array<int>;
782   var s: int, d: int;
783
784   if r = 0 { return; }
785
786   b := new int[N];
787   s := 0; d := N - r;
788   while s < N
789     invariant 0 ≤ s ≤ N;
790     invariant d = wrap(s + N - r, N);
791     invariant ∀ i • 0 ≤ i < s ⇒ a[i] = b[wrap(i + N - r, N)];
792     invariant a[..] = old(a[..]);
793     {
794       b[d] := a[s];
795       s, d := s + 1, d + 1;
796       // wrap over a's bounds
797       if d = N { d := 0; }
798     }
799   // copy b's content back into a
800   copy(a, b);
801 }

```

Figure 37: Verified Dafny annotated implementation of the rotation by copy algorithm of Figure 3.

```

802 // Copy b's content into a
803 method copy(a: array<int>, b: array<int>)
804   requires a ≠ null ∧ b ≠ null;
805   requires a.Length = b.Length;
806   modifies a;
807   ensures a ≠ null;
808   ensures a[..] = b[..];
809 { ∀ (i | 0 ≤ i < b.Length) { a[i] := b[i]; } }

```

Figure 38: Array copy verified in Dafny.

uses wrap's definition consistently, and hence we can consider verification complete even without such an explicit check.

```

810 // Inductive definition of reversal of a sequence
811 function rev(S: seq<int>): seq<int>
812   ensures |rev(S)| = |S|;
813 { if |S| = 0 then S else rev(S[1..]) + [S[0]] }
814
815 // Position k maps to in a reversal of index range [low..high)
816 function rp(k: int, low: int, high: int): int
817   requires low ≤ k < high;
818   ensures low ≤ rp(k, low, high) < high;
819 { high + low - 1 - k }

```

Figure 39: Dafny definitions of reversed sequence `rev` and inverse index mapping `rp` in a reversal.

6.3 Rotation by reversal: inductive sequence definitions and splits

Rotation by reversal in Dafny is similar to the Boogie version of Section 5.3 in terms of used definitions and lemmas, but leverages inductive (that is, recursive) functional definitions which are higher level and match inductive proofs of lemmas as methods.

6.3.1 Reversal: definition and lemmas

We find it effective to define the reversal `rev` of a sequence recursively; the base case is the empty sequence, which is its own reversal. Figure 39 shows the complete definition, together with the definition of function `rp` which relates indexes in a reversal as per (5). The postconditions of `rev` and `rp` are useful to quickly discharge bounding constraints (about the length of a reversed sequence, and about the range of indexes in a reversal) wherever they functions will be used in specification.

Since `rev`'s and `rp`'s definitions are not obviously related, we introduce a lemma `rev_is_rp` stating that they provide equivalent representations. We also provide Lemma 1 as `lemma_rev_cat`; and the property that $(S^{-1})^{-1} = S$ as `lemma_rev_rev`. Figure 40 shows these three lemmas, which are *ghost* methods in Dafny since they do not belong to the executable part of the code. The native notation for sequences makes for readable specifications, close to the ones we use on paper (in Dafny, `+` also denotes sequence concatenation \circ). All three lemmas are proved through the same correspondence between imperative code and logic proofs [9] also underlying Boogie's lemma procedures. Specifically, the crucial step is providing a suitable split of sequences that matches `rev`'s inductive definition, and using it in a recursive call (`rev_is_rp`), in an assertion (`lemma_rev_cat`), or in a call to another lemma (`lemma_rev_rev`).

6.3.2 Mechanized proofs of reversal and rotation by reversal

The proofs of reversal and rotation by reversal depend on the lemmas and definitions we just introduced.

Proof of in-place reversal. Figure 41 shows the in-place reversal algorithm `reverse` in Dafny. Its postcondition is partially redundant, in that the third `ensures` clause `a[low..high] = rev(oid(a[.])[low..high])` and the next one are equivalent according to `rev_is_rp`, which is in fact called at the end of `reverse`'s body to prove one postcondition from the other. It turns out that this redundancy helps significantly

```

820 ghost method rev_is_rp(S: seq<int>, T: seq<int>)
821   requires |S| = |T|;
822   requires  $\forall i \bullet 0 \leq i < |S| \implies S[i] = T[\text{rp}(i, 0, |S|)];$ 
823   ensures T = rev(S);
824 { if |S| > 0 { rev_is_rp(S[1..], T[0..|S| - 1]); } }
825
826 ghost method lemma_rev_cat(S: seq<int>, T: seq<int>)
827   ensures rev(S + T) = rev(T) + rev(S);
828 { if |S| > 1 { assert (S + T)[1..] = S[1..] + T; } }
829
830 ghost method lemma_rev_rev(S: seq<int>)
831   ensures rev(rev(S)) = S;
832 { if |S| > 0 { lemma_rev_cat(rev(S[1..]), [S[0]]); } }

```

Figure 40: Dafny lemmas (ghost methods) about rotation and reversal. Method `rev_is_rp` asserts the equivalence between the pointwise definition `rp` of indexes and the inductive definition `rev` of reversal. Method `lemma_rev_cat` expresses Lemma 1. Method `lemma_rev_rev` proves that `rev` is idempotent.

to verify `reverse` and to effectively use it in `rotate_reverse`. In a nutshell, `reverse`'s loop invariants is best expressed in terms of `rp` and explicit quantification; however, the sequence representation `rev` is useful in other contexts. We retain both by proving their equivalence as part of `reverse`'s postcondition once and for all, so that Dafny can pick either one whenever reasoning about `reverse` in clients. The only other difference between `reverse` in Figure 7 and in Figure 41 is that Dafny's version has frame invariants (the last three clauses of the loop invariants) that specify the portions of `a` that are *not* modified by the loop.

Proof of rotation by reversal. Figure 42 displays Dafny's verified rotation by reversal algorithm. As we know from the previous proofs, the fundamental property needed for verification is `lemma_rev_cat`, which is called after the two partial reversals of `a[0..r]` and `a[r..a.Length]` and before the final reversal of the whole `a[0..a.Length]`. Dafny also needs to realize that `a[0..r]` and `a[r..a.Length]` have each been reversed twice (once in a partial reversal, and once in the final complete reversal), and hence their elements appear in the original order in `a`'s final state; to this end, we call `lemma_rev_rev` twice after asserting the double reversal explicitly. Finally, it is helpful to provide sequence representations of `a`'s content after each reversal in terms of how `a[...]` is split into the concatenation of slices, which provides intermediate goals that are proved by automatically instantiating Dafny's sequence axioms; this is the purpose of the remaining three `asserts` in `rotate_reverse`'s body. Compared to the Boogie solution of Figure 20, Dafny's needs more intermediate assertions and lemmas because reasoning occurs at the higher level of abstraction provided by sequences (whereas Boogie dealt with index arithmetic directly).

6.4 Rotation by swapping: sliced sequences

The main theme of the verified Dafny implementations of the rotation by swapping algorithms (recursive and iterative versions) is the necessity of expressing equivalent slicing of sequences, so as to guide the instantiations of sequence axioms into produc-

```

833 method reverse(a: array<int>, low: int, high: int)
834   requires a ≠ null;
835   requires 0 ≤ low ≤ high ≤ a.Length;
836   modifies a;
837   ensures a ≠ null;
838   ensures a.Length = old(a.Length);
839   ensures a[low..high] = rev(old(a[..])[low..high]);
840   ensures ∀ i •
841     low ≤ i < high ⇒ old(a[..])[i] = a[rp(i, low, high)];
842   ensures ∀ i • 0 ≤ i < low ⇒ a[i] = old(a[..])[i];
843   ensures ∀ i • high ≤ i < a.Length ⇒ a[i] = old(a[..])[i];
844 {
845   var p: int, q: int;
846   p, q := low, high - 1;
847   while p < q + 1
848     invariant low ≤ p ≤ q + 2 ≤ high + 1;
849     invariant q = high + low - 1 - p;
850     invariant ∀ i •
851       low ≤ i < p ⇒ old(a[..])[i] = a[rp(i, low, high)];
852     invariant ∀ i •
853       q < i < high ⇒ old(a[..])[i] = a[rp(i, low, high)];
854     // frame invariants
855     invariant ∀ i • p ≤ i ≤ q ⇒ old(a[..])[i] = a[i];
856     invariant ∀ i • 0 ≤ i < low ⇒ old(a[..])[i] = a[i];
857     invariant ∀ i • high ≤ i < a.Length ⇒ old(a[..])[i] = a[i];
858     {
859       // swap a[p] and a[q]
860       a[p], a[q] := a[q], a[p];
861       p, q := p + 1, q - 1;
862     }
863     rev_is_rp(old(a[..])[low..high], a[low..high]);
864 }

```

Figure 41: Verified Dafny implementation of the in-place reversal algorithm of Figure 7.

ing facts useful for the proofs at hand.

6.4.1 Mechanized proof of swapping sections

We start as usual with the verified implementation of `swap_sections` in Figure 43. In addition to the three postcondition clauses already present in the pseudo-code version of Figure 8, the Dafny implementation also includes framing clauses (the last two **ensures**) that assert the parts of `a` that are not changed (that is, those outside range `[low..high]`). For performance, it is also very useful to add a redundant postcondition clause that expresses `a[low..high]` as the concatenation of three slices of `old(a[low..high])`, so that the reasoning engine can seamlessly pass from integral to sliced representations. The rest of the annotations are straightforward, but it is worth pointing out that the loop invariants use explicit quantification (instead of sliced sequences) because it turns out to be much more efficient—notwithstanding the usage


```

865 // Left-rotate a by r by performing three reversals.
866 method rotate_reverse(a: array<int>, r: int)
867     requires a ≠ null;
868     requires 0 ≤ r < a.Length;
869     modifies a;
870     ensures a.Length = old(a.Length);
871     ensures a[..] = rot(old(a[..]), r);
872 {
873     reverse(a, 0, r);
874     assert old(a[..])[r..a.Length] = a[r..a.Length];
875     reverse(a, r, a.Length);
876     assert a[..] =
877         rev(old(a[..])[0..r]) + rev(old(a[..])[r..a.Length]);
878     lemma_rev_cat(a[0..r], a[r..a.Length]);
879     assert a[..] = a[0..a.Length];
880     reverse(a, 0, a.Length);
881     assert a[..] = rev(rev(old(a[..])[r..a.Length])) +
882         rev(rev(old(a[..])[0..r]));
883     lemma_rev_rev(old(a[..])[r..a.Length]);
884     lemma_rev_rev(old(a[..])[0..r]);
885 }

```

Figure 42: Verified Dafny implementation of the rotation by reversal algorithm of Figure 6.

of the sliced form in the postconditions to be proved—, probably because it facilitates direct reasoning about the assignments into a in the loop body without converting back and forth from its sequence representation.

6.4.2 Lemmas about swapping

As you can see in Figure 44, it is straightforward to express and to prove Lemma 2 for both case *left is smaller* (18a) and case *right is smaller* (18b): Dafny’s sequence axiomatization and our definition of rotation `rot` work with only one simple additional annotation: the clause `ensures |X| + |Y| + |Z| - 2*d < |X| + |Y| + |Z| - d`, which follows trivially from the precondition $d > 0$, but is needed to help verify consistency of definitions through arithmetic instantiations. Contrast this to the laborious details that had to be provided for the Boogie proofs of the same lemmas in Section 5.4.2.

Another important detail, not shown in Figure 44, is that we have to use a definition of `rot` that omits the postcondition clauses relating `rot` to `wrap` (the last two clauses in Figure 35). In fact, we have to completely omit `wrap` from the Dafny file with rotation by swapping. Otherwise, `wrap` triggers the discovery of very many irrelevant facts whenever `rot` is used in specifications, and hence the whole proof attempt times out.

6.4.3 Mechanized proof of rotation by swapping: recursive version

Figure 45 shows `rotate_swap`, the Dafny recursive version of rotation by swapping. It is all but trivial, with the only possible exception of having to assert the obvious equivalence between `a[..]` and `a[0..a.Length]`.

```

886 method swap_sections(a: array<int>, low: int, high: int, d: int)
887   requires a ≠ null;
888   requires 0 ≤ low ≤ low + d ≤ high - d ≤ high ≤ a.Length;
889   modifies a;
890   ensures a[low..low + d] = old(a[high - d.. high]);
891   ensures a[low + d..high - d] = old(a[low + d..high - d]);
892   ensures a[high - d..high] = old(a[low..low + d]);
893   ensures a[low..high] =
894       old(a[high - d.. high]) +
895       old(a[low + d..high - d]) + old(a[low..low + d]);
896   ensures ∀ i • 0 ≤ i < low ⇒ a[i] = old(a[i]);
897   ensures ∀ i • high ≤ i < a.Length ⇒ a[i] = old(a[i]);
898 {
899   var x: int, z: int;
900   x, z := low, high - d;
901   while x < low + d
902     invariant low ≤ x ≤ low + d;
903     invariant high - d ≤ z ≤ high;
904     invariant x - low = z - (high - d);
905     invariant ∀ i •
906         low ≤ i < x ⇒ a[i] = old(a[..])[high - d + i - low];
907     invariant ∀ i • x ≤ i < high - d ⇒ a[i] = old(a[..])[i];
908     invariant ∀ i •
909         high - d ≤ i < z ⇒ a[i] = old(a[..])[low + i - (high - d)];
910     invariant ∀ i • z ≤ i < high ⇒ a[i] = old(a[..])[i];
911     // frame invariants
912     invariant ∀ i • 0 ≤ i < low ⇒ a[i] = old(a[i]);
913     invariant ∀ i • high ≤ i < a.Length ⇒ a[i] = old(a[i]);
914     {
915       // swap a[x] and a[z]
916       a[x], a[z] := a[z], a[x];
917       x, z := x + 1, z + 1;
918     }
919 }

```

Figure 43: Verified Dafny implementation of the in-place slice swapping algorithm of Figure 8.

The core of the algorithm is in `rotate_swap_helper` in Figure 46, which works recursively on smaller slices of the input `a`. The main conditional has three cases; the nontrivial branches correspond to the “left is smaller” and “right is smaller” branches. In each case, we call the corresponding “`_is_smaller`” lemma and assert a number of equivalences between concatenations of sequence slices. For example, when left is smaller: assert the effect of the call to `swap_sections`, recursively call—on the part yet to be swapped—`rotate_swap_helper`, recall lemma `left_is_smaller` on portions of `old(a[..])`, and suggest a decomposition of `old(a[..])` that matches the one of the lemma. The case right is smaller is slightly more involved because it has to connect a rotation by $p - \text{low}$ and one by $2 * p - (\text{low} + \text{high})$, but its overall structure is still similar.

```

920 ghost method left_is_smaller(X: seq<int>, Y: seq<int>, Z: seq<int>,
    d: int)
921   requires |X| = |Z| = d;
922   requires |Y| > 0;
923   ensures rot(X + Y + Z, d) = rot(Z + Y, d) + X;
924 { }
925
926 ghost method right_is_smaller(X: seq<int>, Y: seq<int>, Z: seq<int>,
    >, d: int)
927   requires 0 < |X| = |Z| = d;
928   requires |Y| > 0;
929   ensures |X| + |Y| + |Z| - 2*d < |X| + |Y| + |Z| - d;
930   ensures rot(X + Y + Z, |X| + |Y| + |Z| - d) =
931     Z + rot(Y + X, |X| + |Y| + |Z| - 2*d);
932 { }

```

Figure 44: Lemma 2 for cases *left is smaller* (18a) and *right is smaller* (18b).

```

933 // Left-rotate a by r by swapping equal segments
934 method rotate_swap(a: array<int>, r: int)
935   requires a ≠ null;
936   requires 0 ≤ r < a.Length;
937   modifies a;
938   ensures a.Length = old(a.Length);
939   ensures a[..] = rot(old(a[..]), r);
940 {
941   assert a[..] = a[0..a.Length];
942   rotate_swap_helper(a, 0, r, a.Length);
943 }

```

Figure 45: Verified Dafny implementation of the rotation by swapping recursive algorithm of Figure 10.

6.4.4 Mechanized proof of rotation by swapping: iterative version

When switching from the recursive to the iterative version of rotation by swapping, we can reuse the lemmas `left_is_smaller` and `right_is_smaller` as they're defined in Figure 44. In fact, the overall structure of the annotations in `rotate_swap_iterative` in Figures 47 and 48 looks similar to those in the recursive `rotate_swap`. We highlight the seemingly small differences, which required a number of experiments to figure out the slice representations that work best with Dafny's reasoning capabilities.

First, we added a postcondition clause to `swap_sections`:

```

ensures  $\forall i \bullet \text{low} + d \leq i < \text{high} - d \implies a[i] = \text{old}(a[i]);$ 

```

without changing its implementation or the rest of its specification. This is redundant, but it is needed to easily convert between the quantified and sliced representation of the portion of `a` over indexes `[low + d..high - d]`.

Then, consider the loop annotations of `rotate_swap_iterative` in Figure 47. Compared to the pseudo-code version of Figure 12, the Dafny version introduces a loop invariant that specifies the equivalence of `old(a[..])` and `old(a[0..a.Length])`. This is an invariant of any loop, since it relies on the very definition of `a[..]`; however,

having it explicitly is crucial for verification to terminate in reasonable time. The Dafny loop also has a *variant clause* `decreases` `high - low` to prove termination; Dafny is able to infer suitable variants in the other loops but needs an annotation in this case.

The body of the loop includes the by-now familiar three-way conditional with the “left is smaller” and “right is smaller” cases. The various assertions suggest suitable splittings of sequences into concatenation of slices; figuring out which splittings work best is a trial-and-error process: one normally starts with a detailed proof outline with many asserts, and then removes asserts one at a time, as long as the proof still goes through. Another new element is the usage of a local ghost variable `b`, which stores the content of `a` just before swapping sections. This ghost variable is needed to directly relate the state of `a` before and after the call to `swap_sections`. It was not needed in the recursive version, where `old(a[. .])` refers to the state of `a` right before each current swap, but it is instrumental here in avoiding overly complicated framing loop invariants.

6.5 Rotation by modular visit: abstraction in ghost code

The key challenge in building a Dafny verified implementation of the rotation by modular visit algorithm is providing suitable abstractions in defining and proving the functions used to characterize cycles.

6.5.1 Ghost functions and fundamental properties

The specification of rotation by modular visit in Figure 13 relies on functions $\text{gcd}(x, y)$, $\tau(x, y)$, and $\pi_N^M(S, p)$, which we define as `gcd`, `tau`, and `mp` in Dafny. As shown in Figure 29, `gcd` is an uninterpreted function whose postcondition captures the definition of greatest common divisor of `x` and `y`. One could provide a definition, for example a recursive one, and establish the postconditions from the definition; this would be an interesting exercise, but a detour from our goal of proving rotation by modular visit. By contrast, function `tau`’s definition follows (27); function `mp`’s is equivalent to (29) but is inductive (which works with `wrap`’s non-recursive definition). Dafny proves `tau`’s and `mp`’s postconditions from their definitions and `gcd`’s defining postconditions.

Directly using the definitions of Figure 29 in the proof of rotation by modular visit does not work. The availability of function bodies and postconditions involving non-trivial arithmetic (modulo and division) floods the proof environment with many facts that are not directly necessary in the algorithm’s correctness proof, and thus gobble down the SMT solver. Therefore, we provide complete definitions and their proofs in a separate file (using Dafny’s modules, which we don’t discuss here), and then import stripped-down definitions in the main file that also contains the algorithm. Figure 50 shows the stripped-down definitions: `gcd` and `tau` only retain “bounding” postconditions and the essential property that $\text{gcd}(x, y) \cdot \tau(x, y) = x$; `mp` has a definition that inlines `wrap`’s definition so as to have one less function to deal with. These stripped down facts are all that is necessary to know about `gcd`, `tau`, and `mp` for a correctness proof of the main algorithm.

Figure 51 displays four straightforward lemmas, which directly follow from the definitions of `rot`, `mp`, `gcd`, and `tau`. Even if their proofs are trivial given those definitions, it is useful to factor them out as lemmas and recall them in the main proof only where needed to provide suitable intermediate goals.

```

944 method rotate_swap_helper(a: array<int>, low: int, p: int, high:
      int)
945   requires a ≠ null;
946   requires 0 ≤ low ≤ p < high ≤ a.Length;
947   modifies a;
948   decreases high - low;
949   ensures a[low..high] = rot(old(a[low..high]), p - low);
950   ensures ∀ i • 0 ≤ i < low ⇒ a[i] = old(a[i]);
951   ensures ∀ i • high ≤ i < a.Length ⇒ a[i] = old(a[i]);
952 {
953   if low < p < high {
954     if p - low = high - p {
955       swap_sections(a, low, high, p - low);
956     } else {
957       if p - low < high - p { // left is smaller
958         swap_sections(a, low, high, p - low);
959         assert a[low..high - (p - low)] =
960             old(a[high - (p - low)..high]) +
961             old(a[p..high - (p - low)]);
962         rotate_swap_helper(a, low, p, high - (p - low));
963         left_is_smaller(old(a[low..p]), old(a[p..high - (p - low)
964             ]),
965             old(a[high - (p - low)..high]), p - low);
966         assert old(a[low..high]) =
967             old(a[low..p]) + old(a[p..high - (p - low)]) +
968             old(a[high - (p - low)..high]);
969       } else {
970         if p - low > high - p { // right is smaller
971           swap_sections(a, low, high, high - p);
972           assert a[low + (high - p)..high] =
973               old(a[low + (high - p)..p]) +
974               old(a[low..low + (high - p)]);
975           rotate_swap_helper(a, low + (high - p), p, high);
976           right_is_smaller(old(a[low..low + (high - p)]),
977               old(a[low + (high - p)..p]),
978               old(a[p..high]), high - p);
979           assert old(a[low..high]) =
980               old(a[low..low + (high - p)]) +
981               old(a[low + (high - p)..p]) + old(a[p..high]);
982           assert a[low..high] =
983               a[low..low + (high - p)] +
984               a[low + (high - p)..low + 2*(high - p)] +
985               a[low + 2*(high - p)..high];
986           assert a[low..low + (high - p)] = old(a[p..high]);
987         }}}
988   }
989 }

```

Figure 46: Verified Dafny implementation of the helper method of the rotation by swapping recursive algorithm of Figure 10.

```

989 method rotate_swap_iterative(a: array<int>, r: int)
990   requires a ≠ null;
991   requires 0 ≤ r ∧ r < a.Length;
992   modifies a;
993   ensures a.Length = old(a.Length);
994   ensures a[..] = rot(old(a[..]), r);
995 {
996   if r = 0 { return; }
997   var low: int, high: int, p: int;
998   low, p, high := 0, r, a.Length;
999   while low < p < high
1000    invariant 0 ≤ low ≤ p ≤ high ≤ a.Length;
1001    invariant low = p ⇔ p = high;
1002    invariant old(a[..]) = old(a[0..a.Length]);
1003    invariant ∀ i • 0 ≤ i < low ⇒ a[i] = rot(old(a[..]), r)[i];
1004    invariant ∀ i •
1005      high ≤ i < a.Length ⇒ a[i] = rot(old(a[..]), r)[i];
1006    invariant p - low < high - low ⇒
1007      rot(old(a[..]), r)[low..high] = rot(a[low..high], p - low);
1008    decreases high - low;
1009    { if p - low = high - p {
1010      swap_sections(a, low, high, p - low);
1011      assert a[low..high] = rot(old(a[..]), r)[low..high];
1012      assert rot(old(a[..]), r) =
1013        rot(old(a[..]), r)[0..low]
1014          + rot(old(a[..]), r)[low..high]
1015          + rot(old(a[..]), r)[high..a.Length];
1016      low, high := low + (p - low), high - (high - p);
1017    } else {
1018      if p - low < high - p { // left is smaller
1019        ghost var b := a[..];
1020        swap_sections(a, low, high, p - low);
1021        assert b[low..high] = b[low..p] + b[p..high - (p - low)] +
1022          b[high - (p - low)..high];
1023        left_is_smaller(b[low..p], b[p..high - (p - low)],
1024          b[high - (p - low)..high], p - low);
1025        assert a[low..p] + a[p..high - (p - low)] =
1026          a[low..high - (p - low)];
1027        assert rot(old(a[..]), r) =
1028          rot(old(a[..]), r)[0..low]
1029            + rot(old(a[..]), r)[low..high]
1030            + rot(old(a[..]), r)[high..a.Length];
1031        high := high - (p - low);
1032      } else {
1033        if p - low > high - p { // right is smaller
1034          // See code in Figure 48
1035        }}}
1036   }
1037 }

```

Figure 47: Verified Dafny implementation of the rotation by swapping iterative algorithm of Figure 12.

```

1038 ghost var b := a[..];
1039 swap_sections(a, low, high, high - p);
1040 assert b[low..high] = b[low..low + (high - p)] +
1041           b[low + (high - p)..p] + b[p..high];
1042 right_is_smaller(b[low..low + (high - p)], b[low + (high - p)..p
1043               ],
1044               b[p..high], high - p);
1045 assert rot(b[low..high], p - low) =
1046       b[p..high] + rot(b[low + (high - p)..p] +
1047       b[low..low + (high - p)], 2*p - (low + high));
1048 assert a[low + (high - p)..p] + a[p..high] =
1049       a[low + (high - p)..high];
1050 assert rot(old(a[..]), r) =
1051       rot(old(a[..]), r)[0..low]
1052       + rot(old(a[..]), r)[low..high]
1053       + rot(old(a[..]), r)[high..a.Length];
1054 low := low + (high - p);

```

Figure 48: “Right is smaller” code referenced in Figure 47.

```

1055 function gcd(x: int, y: int): int
1056   requires 0 < x ∧ 0 < y;
1057   ensures 0 < gcd(x, y) ≤ x ∧ gcd(x, y) ≤ y;
1058   ensures x % gcd(x, y) = 0 ∧ y % gcd(x, y) = 0;
1059   ensures ∀ z • 1 < z ∧ x % z = 0 ∧ y % z = 0 ⇒ z ≤ gcd(x, y);
1060
1061 function tau(x: int, y: int): int
1062   requires 0 < x ∧ 0 < y;
1063   ensures gcd(x, y) * tau(x, y) = x;
1064   ensures 0 < tau(x, y) ≤ x;
1065 { x / gcd(x, y) }
1066
1067 function mp(N: int, M: int, S: int, p: int): int
1068   requires 0 < M < N;
1069   requires 0 ≤ S < N;
1070   requires 0 ≤ p;
1071   ensures 0 ≤ mp(N, M, S, p) < N;
1072 { if p = 0 then S else wrap(mp(N, M, S, p - 1) + M, N) }

```

Figure 49: Dafny function definitions of gcd, tau, and mp.

```

1073 function gcd(x: int, y: int): int
1074   requires 0 < x ∧ 0 < y;
1075   ensures 0 < gcd(x, y) ≤ x ∧ gcd(x, y) ≤ y;
1076
1077 function tau(x: int, y: int): int
1078   requires 0 < x ∧ 0 < y;
1079   ensures gcd(x, y) * tau(x, y) = x;
1080   ensures 0 < tau(x, y) ≤ x;
1081
1082 function mp(N: int, M: int, S: int, p: int): int
1083   requires 0 < M < N;
1084   requires 0 ≤ S < N;
1085   requires 0 ≤ p;
1086   ensures 0 ≤ mp(N, M, S, p) < N;
1087 { if p = 0 then S else
1088   (if mp(N, M, S, p - 1) + M < N then mp(N, M, S, p - 1) + M
1089     else mp(N, M, S, p - 1) + M - N)
1090   }

```

Figure 50: Simplified function definitions of gcd, tau, and mp.

```

1090 ghost method rotate_zero(S: seq<int>)
1091   requires 0 < |S|;
1092   ensures rot(S, 0) = S;
1093 { }
1094
1095 ghost method lemma_lesseq(X: int, Y: int, F: int)
1096   requires X ≤ Y;
1097   requires 0 ≤ F;
1098   ensures X * F ≤ Y * F;
1099 { }
1100
1101 ghost method lemma_rotmp(A: seq<int>, r: int, S: int, K: int)
1102   requires 0 < r < |A|;
1103   requires 0 ≤ S < gcd(|A|, |A| - r);
1104   requires 0 < K ≤ tau(|A|, |A| - r);
1105   ensures rot(A, r)[mp(|A|, |A| - r, S, K)] =
1106     A[mp(|A|, |A| - r, S, K - 1)];
1107 { }
1108
1109 ghost method lemma_inverse_tau_gcd(N: int, M: int, S: int)
1110   requires 0 < M < N;
1111   requires 0 ≤ S;
1112   ensures S * tau(N, M) < N ⇒ S < gcd(N, M);
1113 { }

```

Figure 51: Lemmas about gcd, tau, mp, and rot in Dafny.


```

1114 ghost method lemma_mp_disjoint_cycles(N: int, M: int, S: int, K:
      int)
1115   requires  $0 < M < N$ ;
1116   requires  $0 \leq S < \text{gcd}(N, M)$ ;
1117   requires  $0 \leq K$ ;
1118   ensures  $\forall t, q \bullet 0 \leq q < \text{tau}(N, M) \wedge S < t < \text{gcd}(N, M)$ 
1119      $\implies \text{mp}(N, M, S, K) \neq \text{mp}(N, M, t, q)$ ;
1120
1121 ghost method lemma_mp_complete_cycle(N: int, M: int, S: int)
1122   requires  $0 < M < N$ ;
1123   requires  $0 \leq S < \text{gcd}(N, M)$ ;
1124   ensures  $\text{mp}(N, M, S, 0) = \text{mp}(N, M, S, \text{tau}(N, M))$ ;
1125
1126 ghost method lemma_mp_incomplete_cycle(N: int, M: int, S: int)
1127   requires  $0 < M < N$ ;
1128   requires  $0 \leq S < \text{gcd}(N, M)$ ;
1129   ensures  $\forall p, q \bullet 0 \leq p < q < \text{tau}(N, M)$ 
1130      $\implies \text{mp}(N, M, S, p) \neq \text{mp}(N, M, S, q)$ ;
1131
1132 ghost method lemma_complete_rotation(N: int, M: int, D: set<int>)
1133   requires  $0 < M < N$ ;
1134   requires  $\forall i, s \bullet 0 \leq i < \text{tau}(N, M) \wedge 0 \leq s < \text{gcd}(N, M)$ 
1135      $\implies \text{mp}(N, M, s, i) \text{ in } D$ ;
1136   ensures  $\forall i \bullet 0 \leq i < N \implies i \text{ in } D$ ;

```

Figure 52: Fundamental properties of cycles in Dafny.

6.5.2 Lemmas about cycles

The correctness argument of rotation by modular visit relies on the noteworthy properties of cycle decomposition discussed in Section 4.4. We express those properties as lemmas (ghost methods) in Dafny: see Figure 52. Lemma `mp_disjoint_cycles` says that cycles in the decomposition are disjoint, that is, the elements of a cycle that starts at s all differ from the elements of a cycle that starts at $t \neq s$. Lemma `mp_complete_cycle` says that cycles have length $\text{tau}(N, M)$, so that the $\text{tau}(N, M)$ th element is the same as the first one. Lemma `mp_incomplete_cycle` says that elements in a cycle are unique, that is, there are no repetition until the cycle is complete. Finally, lemma `complete_rotation` says that the union of cycles starting from positions $0 \leq s < \text{gcd}(N, M)$ includes all indexes $0 \leq i < N$; the lemma's statement mentions a set D of indexes, which will appear as a ghost variable in the algorithm's implementation. We leave proving these lemmas from the definitions of `mp`, `tau`, and `gcd` as an exercise in the programs-as-proofs paradigm.

6.5.3 Outer loop

We are finally ready to describe the verified implementation of rotation by modular visit in Dafny. We start at the top level: the outer loop outlined in Figure 53. There is a close similarity between the Dafny code and the pseudo-code of Figure 13. As usual, a mechanized proof requires more annotations. Similarly to what we did in Boogie, we keep track of what indexes in a are modified at any point using ghost state. The Boogie solution uses an array of Booleans; perhaps more elegantly, the Dafny solution uses a *set* done of integers (**sets** are another native immutable type for specifications available in Dafny). Correspondingly, the essential loop invariants specify which cyclic indexes are in done and which are not; and assert that $a[i]$ is rotated if i is in done, and is otherwise equal to $a[i]$ in the pre-state. Finally, the loop invariant $\text{moved} < a.Length \implies \text{start} < \text{gcd}(a.Length, a.Length - r)$ keeps track of the fact that the outer loop terminates precisely when start is incremented to $\text{gcd}(a.Length, a.Length - r)$. This relates the value of start to the exit condition $\text{moved} = a.Length$, so that, through lemma `complete_rotation`, we can conclude that the rotation is complete upon exiting the outer loop.

Since inductiveness of the outer loop's invariants crucially depends on the form of the inner loop's invariants, we discuss it in Section 6.5.5 after presenting the inner loop.

6.5.4 Inner loop

The inner loop is significantly more complex—not only because we have to repeat its body twice to replicate the semantics of a *repeat...until* using Dafny's **while** loops. As we did in Boogie, it is useful to keep track of the current position in the cycle using a variable k . The value of k is redundant since $k = \text{moved} - \text{start} * \text{tau}$ is a loop invariant; hence we make k ghost (not part of the executable code). Other loop invariants bound the value of k and relate it to the exit condition $v = \text{start}$, so that we know that: a) it is $k < \text{tau}$ in every execution of the inner loop body; and b) it is $k = \text{tau}$ when the inner loop terminates. The remaining loop invariant clauses define which indexes are in done and, as in the outer loop, assert that a position has been rotated if and only if its index belongs to done. The loop variant **decreases** clause completes the specification of the inner loop necessary to establish termination.

Dafny relies on calls to the fundamental lemmas in Figure 52 to prove both initiation and consecution of the inner loop's invariants. lemma `mp_disjoint_cycles`

```

1137 // Left-rotate a by r by modular visit of its elements
1138 method rotate_modulo(a: array<int>, r: int)
1139     requires a ≠ null;
1140     requires 0 ≤ r < a.Length;
1141     modifies a;
1142     ensures a.Length = old(a.Length);
1143     ensures a[..] = rot(old(a[..]), r);
1144 {
1145     if r = 0 {
1146         rotate_zero(old(a[..]));
1147         return;
1148     }
1149
1150     var start: int, v: int, moved: int;
1151     var displaced: int;
1152     ghost var done := {};
1153
1154     start := 0;
1155     moved := 0;
1156     while moved ≠ a.Length
1157     invariant 0 ≤ moved ≤ a.Length;
1158     invariant 0 ≤ start ≤ gcd(a.Length, a.Length - r);
1159     invariant moved < a.Length ⇒ start < gcd(a.Length, a.Length -
1160         r);
1161     invariant moved = start * tau(a.Length, a.Length - r);
1162     invariant ∀ i, s • 0 ≤ i ≤ tau(a.Length, a.Length - r) ∧
1163         start ≤ s < gcd(a.Length, a.Length - r)
1164         ⇒ mp(a.Length, a.Length - r, s, i) ∉ done;
1165     invariant ∀ i, s •
1166         0 ≤ i < tau(a.Length, a.Length - r) ∧ 0 ≤ s < start
1167         ⇒ mp(a.Length, a.Length - r, s, i) in done;
1168     invariant ∀ i •
1169         0 ≤ i < a.Length ∧ i ∉ done ⇒ a[i] = old(a[..])[i];
1170     invariant ∀ i • 0 ≤ i < a.Length ∧ i in done
1171         ⇒ a[i] = rot(old(a[..]), r)[i];
1172     {
1173         v, displaced := start, a[start];
1174         ghost var k := 0;
1175
1176         // Inner loop here: see Figure 54
1177
1178         start := start + 1;
1179
1180         // Concluding reasoning steps here: see Figure 55
1181     }
1182     lemma_complete_rotation(a.Length, a.Length - r, done);
1183 }

```

Figure 53: Verified Dafny implementation of the rotation by modular visit algorithm of Figure 13.

```

1183 // one unconditional iteration of the inner loop
1184 k := k + 1;
1185 v := v + a.Length - r;
1186 if v ≥ a.Length { v := v - a.Length; }
1187 a[v], displaced := displaced, a[v];
1188 moved := moved + 1;
1189 done := done + { v };
1190
1191 lemma_mp_disjoint_cycles(a.Length, a.Length - r, start, k);
1192 lemma_mp_incomplete_cycle(a.Length, a.Length - r, start);
1193 lemma_rotmp(old(a[..]), r, start, k);
1194
1195 while v ≠ start
1196 invariant k = moved - start * tau(a.Length, a.Length - r);
1197 invariant 0 ≤ v < a.Length;
1198 invariant 0 < k ≤ tau(a.Length, a.Length - r);
1199 invariant v = mp(a.Length, a.Length - r, start, k);
1200 invariant v ≠ start ⇔ k < tau(a.Length, a.Length - r);
1201 invariant ∀ i, s • 0 ≤ i < tau(a.Length, a.Length - r) ∧
1202   start < s < gcd(a.Length, a.Length - r)
1203   ⇒ mp(a.Length, a.Length - r, s, i) ∉ done;
1204 invariant ∀ i, s •
1205   0 ≤ i < tau(a.Length, a.Length - r) ∧ 0 ≤ s < start
1206   ⇒ mp(a.Length, a.Length - r, s, i) in done;
1207 invariant ∀ i • 0 < i ≤ k
1208   ⇒ mp(a.Length, a.Length - r, start, i) in done;
1209 invariant ∀ i • k < i ≤ tau(a.Length, a.Length - r)
1210   ⇒ mp(a.Length, a.Length - r, start, i) ∉ done;
1211 invariant displaced = old(a[..])[v];
1212 invariant ∀ i • 0 ≤ i < a.Length ∧ i ∉ done
1213   ⇒ a[i] = old(a[..])[i];
1214 invariant ∀ i • 0 ≤ i < a.Length ∧ i in done
1215   ⇒ a[i] = rot(old(a[..]), r)[i];
1216 decreases tau(a.Length, a.Length - r) - k;
1217 {
1218   k := k + 1;
1219   v := v + a.Length - r;
1220   if v ≥ a.Length { v := v - a.Length; }
1221   a[v], displaced := displaced, a[v];
1222   moved := moved + 1;
1223   done := done + { v };
1224
1225   lemma_mp_disjoint_cycles(a.Length, a.Length - r, start, k);
1226   lemma_mp_complete_cycle(a.Length, a.Length - r, start);
1227   lemma_mp_incomplete_cycle(a.Length, a.Length - r, start);
1228   lemma_rotmp(old(a[..]), r, start, k);
1229 }

```

Figure 54: Inner loop of the verified Dafny implementation of the rotation by modular visit algorithm of Figure 13.

upholds the “non-interference” of the current cycle with the other cycles: whatever has been established about cycles with a different starting position than the current one remains valid. `lemma_mp_incomplete_cycle` upholds progress in the current cycle: increasing `k` and moved by one, `v` by `a.Length - r`, and done by adding `v` to it extends the essential loop invariants to hold for the latest element assigned to position `v` in `a`. In last iteration, `lemma_mp_complete_cycle` kicks in to establish that the cycle is completed and the inner loop terminates. Finally, `lemma_rotmp` relates the indexes in `done` to their positions in a rotation of `a`, so that the last loop invariant clause can be proved.

```

1230 lemma_lesseq(start, gcd(a.Length, a.Length - r),
1231             tau(a.Length, a.Length - r));
1232 lemma_inverse_tau_gcd(a.Length, a.Length - r, start);
1233
1234 ∀ (s | start ≤ s < gcd(a.Length, a.Length - r)) {
1235     lemma_mp_complete_cycle(a.Length, a.Length - r, s);
1236 }
1237
1238 calc ⇒ {
1239     ∀ i, s • 0 < i ≤ tau(a.Length, a.Length - r) ∧
1240             start ≤ s < gcd(a.Length, a.Length - r)
1241             ⇒ mp(a.Length, a.Length - r, s, i) ∉ done;
1242     { ∀ (s | start ≤ s < gcd(a.Length, a.Length - r)) {
1243         lemma_mp_complete_cycle(a.Length, a.Length - r, s);
1244     }}
1245     ∀ i, s • 0 ≤ i < tau(a.Length, a.Length - r) ∧
1246             start ≤ s < gcd(a.Length, a.Length - r)
1247             ⇒ mp(a.Length, a.Length - r, s, i) ∉ done;
1248 }

```

Figure 55: Concluding reasoning steps in the verified Dafny implementation of the rotation by modular visit algorithm of Figure 13.

6.5.5 Outer loop: closing

Proving inductiveness of the outer loop’s invariants requires a number of intermediate assertions, shown in Figure 55. The lemmas `lesseq` and `inverse_tau_gcd` are trivial properties, which we proved separately. Then comes a *forall statement*, which recalls `lemma_mp_complete_cycle` for `s` between `start` and `gcd(a.Length, a.Length - r)`. In this case, the *forall statement* achieves an effect similar to Boogie’s `call` `∀` in that it provides multiple instantiations of a parametric assertion. Concretely, expresses the inner loop’s essential invariant about what is in `done` when the inner loop terminates, so that Dafny can conclude that the outer loop’s essential invariant

invariant $\forall i, s \bullet$
 $0 \leq i < \text{tau}(a.\text{Length}, a.\text{Length} - r) \wedge 0 \leq s < \text{start}$
 $\implies \text{mp}(a.\text{Length}, a.\text{Length} - r, s, i) \text{ in done};$

is inductive, as it now holds for the incremented value of `start`.

Its counterpart is the invariant about what is *not* in `done`. To prove its inductiveness, we have to bridge a sort of “off by one” difference: when the inner loop

terminates, k has reached $\text{tau}(\text{a.Length}, \text{a.Length} - r)$, and the inner loop predicates about the interval $(0..k]$ (left-open and right-closed); but the outer loop’s invariant uses an interval of the form $[0..\text{tau}(\text{a.Length}, \text{a.Length} - r))$ (left-closed and right-open). To bridge the gap, we use a *calculational proof* [17], which guides Dafny to establish the implication between the first and the second representation using `lemma_mp_complete_cycle` as justification.

7 Rotation: mechanized proofs in ESC/Java2

ESC/Java2 [4, 10] is an auto-active verifier for Java programs annotated using JML (the Java Modeling Language [12]). ESC/Java2’s support of Java and JML is substantial but incomplete; in our programs, we avoid language features that may exercise unsound behavior of the verifier, and we work around other shortcomings of ESC/Java2 and its back-end SMT solver Simplify [5].¹² In particular, we ignore overflows of machine integers in our specification, since ESC/Java2 does not check this feature.¹³ Another feature that is not readily supported in ESC/Java2 is reasoning about mathematical sequences or other kinds of maps (even though the idea of model-based annotations was introduced for JML [13]); this suggests using somewhat lower-level specifications that refer directly to concrete Java items.

As usual, the solutions in this sections may not be the only ways to carry out proofs of the rotation algorithms using ESC/Java2, but they capture fundamental steps necessary to prove correctness and make a reasonable usage of ESC/Java2’s capabilities. The presentation in this section is terse compared to the previous sections of the paper: we focus on what is different or new with JML and ESC/Java2.

7.1 Specifying rotation in JML

Our JML specifications often refer to static functions declared as **pure**, that is side-effect free. Figure 56 shows definitions in this style for `wrap` and `rotp`. The latter corresponds to the position a given k maps to in a rotation; that is, using the notation introduced in Section 2, the `rotp(k , $|S|$, r)`th element in $\rho^r S$ is S_k .

Based on these definitions, Figure 57 shows the specification of a generic rotation routine (a static method member of some enclosing class we do not show for brevity). This style of specification, which uses `rotp` directly in element-wise fashion, dispenses with introducing elements that model mathematical sequences.

Note that, even if we defined a predicate `is_rotation(int[] a, int[] b, r)` returning **true** iff b is a rotation of a by r , we could not use it in the specification of `rotate`: `\old(a)` always is the same as a since it refers to the value of *reference* a upon calling `rotate`, whereas we would need to pass to `is_rotation` the *sequence* of values in a at routine entry.¹⁴ As an alternative specification style, we could define `rotate` as a function returning a rotated array, and then relate a and `\result` in its postcondition (similarly to what we did in Boogie); however, this would require to change the implementations artificially, thus defeating the purpose of having in-place algorithms.

¹²Our experiments used ESC/Java2 v. 3049 and Simplify v. 1.5.4.

¹³We always call ESC/Java2 with the `-LoopSafe` flag for the sound analysis of loops.

¹⁴We omit `modifies` (also called `assignable`) clauses from rotation routines in JML, which corresponds to the default `modifies \everything`. A more precise framing specification would be necessary if the enclosing classes had static attributes, which could be modified by static routines.

```

1252 /*@
1253 @ requires  $0 \leq x \wedge 0 < y$ ;
1254 @
1255 @ ensures  $0 \leq \text{\result} \wedge \text{\result} < y$ ;
1256 @ ensures  $x < y \implies \text{\result} = x$ ;
1257 @ ensures  $y \leq x \wedge x < 2*y \implies \text{\result} = x - y$ ;
1258 @*/
1259 // x wrap y
1260 public static /*@ pure @*/ int wrap(int x, int y)
1261 { if (x < y) { return x; } else { return wrap(x - y, y); } }
1262
1263 /*@
1264 @ requires  $0 \leq r \wedge r < N$ ;
1265 @ requires  $0 \leq k \wedge k < N$ ;
1266 @
1267 @ ensures  $0 \leq \text{\result} \wedge \text{\result} < N$ ;
1268 @ ensures  $\text{\result} = \text{wrap}(k + N - r, N)$ ;
1269 @*/
1270 // position k maps to in a rotation of an N-element sequence by r
1271 public static /*@ pure @*/ int rotp(int k, int N, int r)
1272 { return wrap(k + N - r, N); }

```

Figure 56: JML definitions of wrap and rotation mapping rotp.

```

1273 /*@
1274 @ requires a  $\neq$  null;
1275 @ requires  $0 \leq r \wedge r < a.length$ ;
1276 @
1277 @ ensures  $(\forall \text{int } i; 0 \leq i \wedge i < a.length$ 
1278 @            $\implies a[\text{rotp}(i, a.length, r)] = \text{old}(a[i]))$ ;
1279 @*/
1280 public static void rotate(int[] a, int r)

```

Figure 57: Specification of rotation routines in JML.

```

1281 /*@
1282 @ requires a ≠ null;
1283 @ requires 0 ≤ r ∧ r < a.length;
1284 @
1285 @ ensures (∀ int i; 0 ≤ i ∧ i < a.length
1286 @           ⇒ a[rotp(i, a.length, r)] = \old(a[i]));
1287 @*/
1288 // Left-rotate a by r by copying
1289 public static void rotate_copy(int[] a, int r)
1290 {
1291     if (r = 0) return;
1292
1293     int[] b = new int[a.length];
1294     int s = 0, d = a.length - r;
1295
1296     //@ loop_invariant 0 ≤ s ∧ s ≤ a.length;
1297     //@ loop_invariant d = wrap(s + a.length - r, a.length);
1298     //@ loop_invariant (∀ int i;
1299         0 ≤ i ∧ i < a.length ⇒ a[i] = \old(a[i]));
1300     //@ loop_invariant (∀ int i; 0 ≤ i ∧ i < s
1301         ⇒ a[i] = b[wrap(i + a.length - r, a.length)]);
1302     while (s < a.length) {
1303         b[d] = a[s];
1304         s++; d++;
1305         // wrap over a's bounds
1306         if (d = a.length) d = 0;
1307     }
1308     // copy b's content back into a
1309     copy(b, a);
1310 }

```

Figure 58: ESC/Java2-verified JML-annotated implementation of the rotation by copy algorithm of Figure 3.

7.2 Rotation by copy

Figure 58 shows the JML implementation of rotation by copy, which ESC/Java2 can verify. The verified implementation of copy—called by `rotate_copy`—is straightforward, and hence omitted.

7.3 Rotation by reversal

We first present definitions and lemmas about reversal (and its relation to rotation), and then the verified algorithms annotated using these definitions.

```
1311 /*@
1312  @ requires low ≤ k ∧ k < high;
1313  @
1314  @ ensures low ≤ \result ∧ \result < high;
1315  @ ensures \result = high + low - 1 - k;
1316  @*/
1317 // Position k maps to in a reversal of index range [low..high)
1318 public static /*@ pure @*/ int rp(int k, int low, int high)
1319 { return high + low - 1 - k; }
```

Figure 59: JML definition of inverse index mapping `rp` in a reversal.

```
1320 /*@
1321  @ requires 0 ≤ x ∧ x ≤ y ∧ y ≤ z ∧ z ≤ A.length;
1322  @
1323  @ ensures (∀ int i;
1324            x ≤ i ∧ i < y ⇒ rp(i, x, z) = rp(i, x, y) + z - y);
1325  @ ensures (∀ int i;
1326            y ≤ i ∧ i < z ⇒ rp(i, x, z) = rp(i, y, z) - y + x);
1327  @*/
1328 public static /*@ pure @*/ void
1329   lemma_rev_cat(int[] A, int x, int y, int z)
1330 { }
1331
1332 /*@
1333  @ requires 0 ≤ x ∧ x ≤ z ∧ z ≤ A.length;
1334  @
1335  @ ensures (∀ int i;
1336            x ≤ i ∧ i < z ⇒ rp(rp(i, x, z), x, z) = i);
1337  @*/
1338 public static /*@ pure @*/
1339   void lemma_rev_rev(int[] A, int x, int z)
1340 { }
```

Figure 60: JML lemmas about rotation and reversal. Method `lemma_rev_cat` expresses Lemma 1. Method `lemma_rev_rev` proves that `rev` is idempotent.

7.3.1 Reversal: definition and lemmas

Figure 59 shows the JML definition of `rp`, which corresponds to the mapping of indexes introduced by a reversal. Based on it, Figure 60 shows the two usual lemmas: one relating rotation and reversal (Lemma 1), and one asserting that two reversals correspond to the identity mapping. The peculiarity of the JML version of these lemmas is that they refer exclusively to indexes without referencing actual array content (an array `A` is passed as argument but only for conveniently referring to its length).

Consider, for example, `lemma_rev_cat`. Concatenation is defined implicitly, by means of the two contiguous intervals $[x..y)$ and $[y..z)$ that make up the whole $[x..z)$; the two postconditions of the lemma predicate over either interval. Thus, the first postcondition asserts that the indexes in $[x..y)$ map to positions that correspond to the reversal of $[x..y)$ shifted to the right by $z - y$ (that is, the length of the other interval $[y..z)$). This style is in line with the somewhat low-level specification approach we are using with ESC/Java2; we will use it in all other JML specifications.

7.3.2 Mechanized proofs of reversal and rotation by reversal

Figure 61 shows the in-place reversal algorithm `reverse` verified by ESC/Java2. It is quite similar to the Dafny solution, the only noticeable difference being that swapping two elements in `a` requires introducing a temporary variable, as Java has no parallel assignment.

Figure 62 shows the rotation by reversal algorithm verified by ESC/Java2. The proof goes through also thanks to a pseudo-ghost variable `b`, storing a copy of `a`'s content after the two partial reversals before the final complete reversal. Even if `b` is not referenced directly in the lemma invocations or elsewhere in the annotations, its presence is still necessary to trigger the correct instantiations that drive towards a successful proof. While JML supports some form of ghost annotations, we found it more convenient to simply use regular Java code marked with comments (JML ghost variables have some restrictions in how they can be manipulated), with the understanding that such code should be stripped in an actual compiled version meant for production usage.

7.4 Rotation by swapping

Rotation by swapping operates on array slices that shrink as the rotation progresses. Hence, we need a variant of function `rotp` (defining the mapping induced by a rotation) that refers to arbitrary sub-ranges of the overall range $[0..N)$. Figure 63 shows such function: it is called `r1h` and reduces to `rotp` for `low=0` and `high=N`.

7.4.1 Mechanized proof of swapping sections

The verified JML implementation of in-place swapping is shown in Figure 64. It deserves no special comments as it follows closely the other versions, such as the Dafny one in Figure 43.

7.4.2 Lemmas about swapping

Figure 65 shows the JML version of the by-now familiar Lemma 2, which relates swapping and rotating. The level of abstraction is consistent with the choice of describing rotations—in this case, partial rotations—by means of their index mappings. Thus, for

```

1341 /*@
1342 @ requires a ≠ null;
1343 @ requires 0 ≤ low ∧ low ≤ high ∧ high ≤ a.length;
1344 @
1345 @ ensures (∀ int i;
1346           low ≤ i ∧ i < high ⇒ a[rp(i, low, high)] = \old(a[i]));
1347 @ ensures (∀ int i; 0 ≤ i ∧ i < low ⇒ a[i] = \old(a[i]));
1348 @ ensures (∀ int i;
1349           high ≤ i ∧ i < a.length ⇒ a[i] = \old(a[i]));
1350 @*/
1351 public static void reverse(int[] a, int low, int high)
1352 {
1353     int p = low, q = high - 1;
1354
1355     //@ loop_invariant low ≤ p ∧ p ≤ q + 2 ∧ q + 2 ≤ high + 1;
1356     //@ loop_invariant q = high + low - 1 - p;
1357     //@ loop_invariant (∀ int i;
1358                       low ≤ i ∧ i < p ⇒ \old(a[i]) = a[rp(i, low, high)]);
1359     //@ loop_invariant (∀ int i;
1360                       q < i ∧ i < high ⇒ \old(a[i]) = a[rp(i, low, high)]);
1361     //@ loop_invariant (∀ int i;
1362                       p ≤ i ∧ i ≤ q ⇒ \old(a[i]) = a[i]);
1363     //@ loop_invariant (∀ int i;
1364                       0 ≤ i ∧ i < low ⇒ \old(a[i]) = a[i]);
1365     //@ loop_invariant (∀ int i;
1366                       high ≤ i ∧ i < a.length ⇒ \old(a[i]) = a[i]);
1367     while (p < q + 1)
1368     {
1369         // swap a[p] and a[q]
1370         int tmp = a[p]; a[p] = a[q]; a[q] = tmp;
1371         p++; q--;
1372     }
1373 }

```

Figure 61: ESC/Java2-verified JML implementation of the in-place reversal algorithm of Figure 7.

```

1374 /*@
1375 @ requires a ≠ null;
1376 @ requires 0 ≤ r ∧ r < a.length;
1377 @
1378 @ ensures (∀ int i; 0 ≤ i ∧ i < a.length
1379 @           ⇒ a[rotp(i, a.length, r)] = \old(a[i]));
1380 @*/
1381 // Left-rotate a by r by performing three reversals.
1382 public static void rotate_reverse(int[] a, int r)
1383 {
1384     int[] b = new int[a.length]; // ghost
1385
1386     reverse(a, 0, r);
1387     reverse(a, r, a.length);
1388     copy(b, a); // ghost
1389     lemma_rev_cat(a, 0, r, a.length);
1390     reverse(a, 0, a.length);
1391     lemma_rev_rev(a, 0, r);
1392     lemma_rev_rev(a, r, a.length);
1393 }

```

Figure 62: ESC/Java2-verified JML implementation of the rotation by reversal algorithm of Figure 6.

```

1394 /*@
1395 @ requires low ≤ p ∧ p < high;
1396 @ requires low ≤ k ∧ k < high;
1397 @
1398 @ ensures low ≤ \result ∧ \result < high;
1399 @ ensures \result =
1400     low + wrap(k - low + (high - low) - (p - low), high - low);
1401 @ ensures \result = low + rotp(k - low, high - low, p - low);
1402 @*/
1403 // position k maps to in a rotation of index range [low..high) at p
1404 public static /*@ pure @*/ int rlh(int k, int low, int high, int p)
1405 { return low + wrap(k + (high - low) - p, high - low); }

```

Figure 63: JML definitions of partial rotation mapping rlh.

```

1406 /*@
1407 @ requires a ≠ null;
1408 @ requires 0 ≤ low ∧ low ≤ low + d ∧ low + d ≤ high - d
1409           ∧ high - d ≤ high ∧ high ≤ a.length;
1410 @
1411 @ ensures (∀ int i; low ≤ i ∧ i < low + d
1412           ⇒ a[i] = \old(a[high - d + i - low]));
1413 @ ensures (∀ int i; low + d ≤ i ∧ i < high - d
1414           ⇒ a[i] = \old(a[i]));
1415 @ ensures (∀ int i; high - d ≤ i ∧ i < high
1416           ⇒ a[i] = \old(a[low + i - (high - d)]));
1417 @ ensures (∀ int i; 0 ≤ i ∧ i < low ⇒ a[i] = \old(a[i]));
1418 @ ensures (∀ int i;
1419           high ≤ i ∧ i < a.length ⇒ a[i] = \old(a[i]));
1420 @*/
1421 public static void swap_sections(int[] a, int low, int high, int d)
1422 {
1423     int x = low, z = high - d;
1424
1425     //@ loop_invariant low ≤ x ∧ x ≤ low + d;
1426     //@ loop_invariant high - d ≤ z ∧ z ≤ high;
1427     //@ loop_invariant x - low = z - (high - d);
1428     //@ loop_invariant (∀ int i; low ≤ i ∧ i < x
1429                       ⇒ a[i] = \old(a[high - d + i - low]));
1430     //@ loop_invariant (∀ int i; x ≤ i ∧ i < high - d
1431                       ⇒ a[i] = \old(a[i]));
1432     //@ loop_invariant (∀ int i; high - d ≤ i ∧ i < z
1433                       ⇒ a[i] = \old(a[low + i - (high - d)]));
1434     //@ loop_invariant (∀ int i; z ≤ i ∧ i < high
1435                       ⇒ a[i] = \old(a[i]));
1436     //@ loop_invariant (∀ int i; 0 ≤ i ∧ i < low
1437                       ⇒ a[i] = \old(a[i]));
1438     //@ loop_invariant (∀ int i; high ≤ i ∧ i < a.length
1439                       ⇒ a[i] = \old(a[i]));
1440     while (x < low + d)
1441     {
1442         // swap a[x] and a[z]
1443         int tmp = a[x]; a[x] = a[z]; a[z] = tmp;
1444         x++; z++;
1445     }
1446 }

```

Figure 64: ESC/Java2-verified JML implementation of the in-place slice swapping algorithm of Figure 8.

```

1447 /*@
1448 @ requires  $0 \leq \text{low} \wedge \text{low} < p \wedge p < \text{high} \wedge \text{high} \leq A.\text{length};$ 
1449 @ requires  $p - \text{low} < \text{high} - p;$ 
1450 @ // X in place:
1451 @ ensures ( $\forall \text{int } i; \text{low} \leq i \wedge i < p$ 
1452            $\implies \text{rlh}(i, \text{low}, \text{high}, p) = i + (\text{high} - p));$ 
1453 @ // Z after sub-rotation:
1454 @ ensures ( $\forall \text{int } i; \text{high} - (p - \text{low}) \leq i \wedge i < \text{high}$ 
1455            $\implies \text{rlh}(i, \text{low}, \text{high}, p) =$ 
1456            $\text{rlh}(i - (\text{high} - p), \text{low}, \text{high} - (p - \text{low}), p));$ 
1457 @ // Y after sub-rotation:
1458 @ ensures ( $\forall \text{int } i; p \leq i \wedge i < \text{high} - (p - \text{low})$ 
1459            $\implies \text{rlh}(i, \text{low}, \text{high}, p) =$ 
1460            $\text{rlh}(i, \text{low}, \text{high} - (p - \text{low}), p));$ 
1461 @*/
1462 public static /*@ pure @*/
1463   boolean lemma_left(int[] A, int low, int p, int high)
1464 { }
1465
1466 /*@
1467 @ requires  $0 \leq \text{low} \wedge \text{low} < p \wedge p < \text{high} \wedge \text{high} \leq A.\text{length};$ 
1468 @ requires  $p - \text{low} > \text{high} - p;$ 
1469 @ // Z in place:
1470 @ ensures ( $\forall \text{int } i; p \leq i \wedge i < \text{high}$ 
1471            $\implies \text{rlh}(i, \text{low}, \text{high}, p) = i - (p - \text{low});$ 
1472 @ // X after sub-rotation:
1473 @ ensures ( $\forall \text{int } i; \text{low} \leq i \wedge i < \text{low} + (\text{high} - p)$ 
1474            $\implies \text{rlh}(i, \text{low}, \text{high}, p) =$ 
1475            $\text{rlh}(i + (p - \text{low}), \text{low} + (\text{high} - p), \text{high}, p));$ 
1476 @ // Y after sub-rotation:
1477 @ ensures ( $\forall \text{int } i; \text{low} + (\text{high} - p) \leq i \wedge i < p$ 
1478            $\implies \text{rlh}(i, \text{low}, \text{high}, p) =$ 
1479            $\text{rlh}(i, \text{low} + (\text{high} - p), \text{high}, p));$ 
1480 @*/
1481 public static /*@ pure @*/
1482   boolean lemma_right(int[] A, int low, int p, int high)
1483 { }

```

Figure 65: Lemma 2 for cases *left is smaller* (18a) and *right is smaller* (18b) in JML.

example, the first **ensures** of `lemma_left` in Figure 65 asserts that the elements of the leftmost slice `a[low..p)` (corresponding to X in Lemma 2) end up as the rightmost slice in a rotation, that is their indexes are shifted by $high - p$. The two other **ensures** refer to `rlh` on both sides of the equality to express the combined effect of swapping and recursively partially rotating. ESC/Java2 proves these lemmas without help (they reduce to linear arithmetic constraints).

7.4.3 Mechanized proof of rotation by swapping: recursive version

Figures 66 and 67 show the verified JML implementation of the rotation by swapping algorithm. The structure of the code and the usage of the lemma methods are the usual ones.

```

1484 /*@
1485  @ requires a ≠ null;
1486  @ requires 0 ≤ low ∧ low ≤ p ∧ p < high ∧ high ≤ a.length;
1487  @
1488  @ ensures (∀ int i; low ≤ i ∧ i < high
1489           ⇒ a[rlh(i, low, high, p)] = \old(a[i]));
1490  @*/
1491 public static void rotate_swap_helper(int[] a, int low, int p, int
      high)
1492 {
1493   if (low < p ∧ p < high) {
1494     if (p - low = high - p) {
1495       swap_sections(a, low, high, p - low);
1496     }
1497     else if (p - low < high - p) {
1498       swap_sections(a, low, high, p - low);
1499       rotate_swap_helper(a, low, p, high - (p - low));
1500       lemma_left(a, low, p, high);
1501     }
1502     else if (p - low > high - p) {
1503       swap_sections(a, low, high, high - p);
1504       rotate_swap_helper(a, low + (high - p), p, high);
1505       lemma_right(a, low, p, high);
1506     }
1507   }
1508 }

```

Figure 66: ESC/Java2-verified JML implementation of the helper method of the rotation by swapping recursive algorithm of Figure 10.

Compared to the Dafny implementation (Figures 46 and 45), ESC/Java2 requires no additional asserts (besides those implicit in calling the lemmas) to verify each branch; we attribute this to the lighter specification style we’re using with JML, where there is no notion of sequence and all reasoning is done on indexes. Another difference with respect to the Dafny solution is that the invocations of lemma methods `left` and `right` refer to `a` rather than `\old(a)`, which seems incongruous at first since the lemmas should be able to refer to the sequence before the latest swap. Note, however, that the

```

1509 /*@
1510 @ requires a ≠ null;
1511 @ requires 0 ≤ r ∧ r < a.length;
1512 @
1513 @ ensures (∀ int i; 0 ≤ i ∧ i < a.length
1514 @           ⇒ a[rotp(i, a.length, r)] = \old(a[i]));
1515 @*/
1516 // Left-rotate a by r by swapping equal segments
1517 public static void rotate_swap(int[] a, int r)
1518 {
1519     rotate_swap_helper(a, 0, r, a.length);
1520 //@ assert (∀ int i; 0 ≤ i ∧ i < a.length
1521           ⇒ a[rh(i, 0, a.length, r)] = \old(a[i]));
1522 //@ assert (∀ int i; 0 ≤ i ∧ i < a.length
1523           ⇒ rh(i, 0, a.length, r) = rotp(i, a.length, r));
1524 //@ assert (∀ int i; 0 ≤ i ∧ i < a.length
1525           ⇒ a[rh(i, 0, a.length, r)] = a[rotp(i, a.length, r)]);
1526 //@ assert
1527     (∀ int i; 0 ≤ i ∧ i < a.length
1528     ⇒ a[rh(i, 0, a.length, r)] = a[rotp(i, a.length, r)])
1529     ∧
1530     (∀ int i; 0 ≤ i ∧ i < a.length
1531     ⇒ a[rh(i, 0, a.length, r)] = \old(a[i]))
1532     ⇒
1533     (∀ int i; 0 ≤ i ∧ i < a.length
1534     ⇒ a[rotp(i, a.length, r)] = \old(a[i]));
1535 // ESC/Java2 cannot apply modus ponens to the previous
1536 // implication
1537 //@ assume (∀ int i; 0 ≤ i ∧ i < a.length
1538           ⇒ a[rotp(i, a.length, r)] = \old(a[i]));

```

Figure 67: ESC/Java2-verified JML implementation of the rotation by swapping recursive algorithm of Figure 10.

formal array argument `A` in `lemma_left` and `lemma_right` is immaterial, as it is only used to refer to the length `A.length`; obviously, `a.length = \old(a.length)`, and hence the lemma method invocations are correctly applicable in their context.

Concluding the proof in the wrapper function `rotate_swap` is surprisingly cumbersome. As apparent by the sequence of **asserts** in Figure 67, ESC/Java2 can establish all the basic facts but ultimately fails to connect `rotp(i, a.length, r)` and `rlh(i, 0, a.length, r)`, even if the latter reduces to the former. Precisely, even if it proves that one implies the other, it cannot apply modus ponens to deduce the consequent from the established antecedent. This is clearly only an idiosyncrasy of the prover, and hence we safely assume the last, straightforward step.

```

1539 /*@
1540 @ requires low ≤ p ∧ p < high;
1541 @ requires low ≤ k ∧ k < high;
1542 @
1543 @ ensures low ≤ \result ∧ \result < high;
1544 @ ensures \result = low + wrap((k - low) + (p - low), high - low)
      ;
1545 @*/
1546 // position that maps to k in a rotation of
1547 // index range [low..high) at p
1548 public static /*@ pure @*/ int llh(int k, int low, int high, int p)
1549 { return low + wrap((k - low) + (p - low), high - low); }

```

Figure 68: JML definitions of partial rotation inverse mapping `llh`.

7.4.4 Mechanized proof of rotation by swapping: iterative version

Figure 69 shows the verified JML implementation of the iterative version of rotation by swapping. The annotations use a new function `llh(i, low, high, p)`, which denotes the index that maps to `i` in a rotation of index range `[low..high)` at `p`. Therefore, `llh` and `rlh` are each other’s inverse: `llh(rlh(k, l, h, p), l, h, p) = k` and `rlh(llh(k, l, h, p), l, h, p) = k`. We introduce `llh` because the “natural” form of loop invariants for iterative rotation by swapping is one that relates contiguous slices of `a` to other slices of `a` in its original state through `\old`. For example, to capture the fact that `a[0..low)` is rotated, the third loop invariant clause in Figure 69 asserts that each element at index $0 \leq i < \text{low}$ equals `\old(a[llh(i, 0, a.length, p)])`, that is exactly the element that should end up at index `i` in such a rotation. In contrast, using `rlh` would refer to the slice `a[0..low)` only indirectly.

Using `llh` also simplifies reasoning: ESC/Java2 verifies `rotate_swap_iterative` without need of variants of the lemmas “left is smaller” and “right is smaller”. In comparing the JML solution to, say, Dafny’s, we should remember that eschewing an explicit representation of sequences and rotated sequences, as well as other checks that Dafny performs but ESC/Java2 bypasses such as for framing, is also likely crucial in supporting a proof with lightweight annotations.

```

1550 /*@
1551 @ requires a ≠ null;
1552 @ requires 0 ≤ r ∧ r < a.length;
1553 @
1554 @ ensures (∀ int i; 0 ≤ i ∧ i < a.length
1555 @           ⇒ a[rotp(i, a.length, r)] = \old(a[i]));
1556 @*/
1557 public static void rotate_swap_iterative(int[] a, int r)
1558 {
1559
1560     if (r = 0) return;
1561
1562     int low, high, p;
1563     low = 0; p = r; high = a.length;
1564
1565     //@ loop_invariant 0 ≤ low ∧ low ≤ p ∧
1566                       p ≤ high ∧ high ≤ a.length;
1567     //@ loop_invariant low = p ⇔ p = high;
1568     //@ loop_invariant (∀ int i; 0 ≤ i ∧ i < low
1569                       ⇒ a[i] = \old(a[llh(i, 0, a.length, p)]));
1570     //@ loop_invariant (∀ int i; high ≤ i ∧ i < a.length
1571                       ⇒ a[i] = \old(a[llh(i, 0, a.length, p)]));
1572     //@ loop_invariant (∀ int i; low ≤ i ∧ i < high
1573                       ⇒ a[i] = \old(a[i]));
1574     //@ loop_invariant p - low < high - low ⇒ (∀ int i;
1575                       low ≤ i ∧ i < high ⇒ \old(a[llh(i, 0, a.length, p)])
1576                       = a[llh(i, low, high, p)]);
1577     while (low < p ∧ p < high)
1578     {
1579         if (p - low = high - p) {
1580             swap_sections(a, low, high, p - low);
1581             low = low + (p - low);
1582             high = high - (high - p);
1583         }
1584         else if (p - low < high - p) {
1585             swap_sections(a, low, high, p - low);
1586             high = high - (p - low);
1587         }
1588         else if (p - low > high - p) {
1589             swap_sections(a, low, high, high - p);
1590             low = low + (high - p);
1591         }
1592     }
1593 }

```

Figure 69: ESC/Java2-verified JML implementation of the rotation by swapping iterative algorithm of Figure 12.

```

1594 /*@ requires  $\theta < x \wedge \theta < y$ ;
1595   @ ensures  $\theta < \text{\result} \wedge \text{\result} \leq x \wedge \text{\result} \leq y$ ; */
1596 public static /*@ pure @*/ int gcd(int x, int y)
1597 {
1598   if (x = y) return x;
1599   if (x > y) return gcd(x - y, y);
1600   else return gcd(x, y - x);
1601 }
1602
1603 /*@ requires  $\theta < x \wedge \theta < y$ ;
1604   @ ensures gcd(x, y) * \result = x;
1605   @ ensures  $\theta < \text{\result} \wedge \text{\result} \leq x$ ; */
1606 public static /*@ pure @*/ int tau(int x, int y)
1607 {
1608   //@ assume gcd(x, y) * (x / gcd(x, y)) = x;
1609   //@ assert  $\theta < x / \text{gcd}(x, y)$ ;
1610   return x / gcd(x, y);
1611 }
1612
1613 /*@ requires  $\theta < M \wedge M < N$ ;
1614   @ requires  $\theta \leq S \wedge S < N$ ;
1615   @ requires  $\theta \leq p$ ;
1616   @ ensures  $\theta \leq \text{\result} \wedge \text{\result} < N$ ;
1617   @ ensures  $p = \theta \implies \text{\result} = S$ ;
1618   @ ensures  $p \neq \theta \wedge \text{mp}(N, M, S, p - 1) + M < N$ 
1619      $\implies \text{\result} = \text{mp}(N, M, S, p - 1) + M$ ;
1620   @ ensures  $p \neq \theta \wedge \text{mp}(N, M, S, p - 1) + M \geq N$ 
1621      $\implies \text{\result} = \text{mp}(N, M, S, p - 1) + M - N$ ; */
1622 public static /*@ pure @*/ int mp(int N, int M, int S, int p)
1623 {
1624   if (p = 0) return S;
1625   return wrap(mp(N, M, S, p - 1) + M, N);
1626 }

```

Figure 70: JML function definitions of gcd, tau, and mp.

7.5 Rotation by modular visit

Figure 70 shows the functions used to specify the rotation by modular visit algorithm: gcd, tau, and mp. We express their fundamental properties as postconditions; for simplicity, we **assume** arithmetic facts that ESC/Java2 has difficulties establishing. Similarly, we do not prove the lemmas about properties of cycles (in Figure 71) but use them as available facts whenever necessary.

```

1627 /*@ requires  $\theta < M \wedge M < N$ ;
1628    @ requires  $\theta \leq S \wedge S < \text{gcd}(N, M)$ ;
1629    @ requires  $\theta \leq K$ ;
1630    @ ensures  $(\forall \text{ int } t, q;$ 
1631                $\theta \leq q \wedge q < \text{tau}(N, M) \wedge S < t \wedge t < \text{gcd}(N, M)$ 
1632                $\implies \text{mp}(N, M, S, K) \neq \text{mp}(N, M, t, q))$ ; */
1633 public static /*@ pure @*/
1634    boolean lemma_mp_disjoint_cycles(int N, int M, int S, int K)
1635
1636 /*@ requires  $\theta < M \wedge M < N$ ;
1637    @ requires  $\theta \leq S \wedge S < \text{gcd}(N, M)$ ;
1638    @ ensures  $\text{mp}(N, M, S, \theta) = \text{mp}(N, M, S, \text{tau}(N, M))$ ; */
1639 public static /*@ pure @*/
1640    boolean lemma_mp_complete_cycle(int N, int M, int S)
1641
1642 /*@ requires  $\theta < M \wedge M < N$ ;
1643    @ requires  $\theta \leq S \wedge S < \text{gcd}(N, M)$ ;
1644    @ ensures  $(\forall \text{ int } p, q;$ 
1645                $\theta \leq p \wedge p < q \wedge q < \text{tau}(N, M)$ 
1646                $\implies \text{mp}(N, M, S, p) \neq \text{mp}(N, M, S, q))$ ; */
1647 public static /*@ pure @*/
1648    boolean lemma_mp_incomplete_cycle(int N, int M, int S)
1649
1650 /*@ requires  $\theta < r \wedge r < S.\text{length}$ ;
1651    @ requires  $(\forall \text{ int } i, s;$ 
1652                $\theta \leq i \wedge i < \text{tau}(S.\text{length}, S.\text{length} - r) \wedge$ 
1653                $\theta \leq s \wedge s < \text{gcd}(S.\text{length}, S.\text{length} - r)$ 
1654                $\implies S[\text{mp}(S.\text{length}, S.\text{length} - r, s, i)]$ );
1655    @ ensures  $(\forall \text{ int } i; \theta \leq i \wedge i < S.\text{length} \implies S[i])$ ; */
1656 public static /*@ pure @*/ boolean lemma_onto(boolean[] S, int r)

```

Figure 71: Fundamental properties of cycles, formalized in JML.

Before describing the JML-annotated rotation by modular visit implementation, we introduce one more function for specification. Shown in Figure 72, ptor is the inverse of rotp, in the same way llh is the inverse of rlh. In fact, we could define ptor in terms of llh, but since we do not need to deal with sub-ranges of $[0..a.\text{length})$ in the annotations of rotation by modular visit, we only introduce the simpler ptor.

Finally, Figures 73 and 74 show the rotation by modular visit algorithm that ESC/Java2 verifies. As usual in this section, we focus on the aspects that differ from the other solutions and reflect peculiarities of ESC/Java2, Simplify, or the specification style we adopt.

```

1657 /*@
1658 @ requires  $0 \leq r \wedge r < N$ ;
1659 @ requires  $0 \leq k \wedge k < N$ ;
1660 @
1661 @ ensures  $0 \leq \text{\result} \wedge \text{\result} < N$ ;
1662 @ ensures  $\text{\result} = \text{wrap}(k + r, N)$ ;
1663 @*/
1664 // position that maps to k in a rotation of an N-element sequence
      by r
1665 public static /*@ pure @*/ int ptor(int k, int N, int r)
1666 { return wrap(k + r, N); }

```

Figure 72: JML definition of inverse rotation mapping ptor.

The first observation is that the JML executable implementation now relies on elements that were declared as ghost in Dafny. The outer loop’s exit condition involves gcd—a function we used normally only in specifications—instead of testing for $\text{moved} \neq a.\text{length}$. Similarly, the inner loop’s exit condition involves k—a ghost variable in other implementations of the algorithm—instead of v. We found both changes, which do not affect the semantics of the program as they are equivalent to the concrete ones, significantly help ESC/Java2 to reason about the loops. In contrast, using moved and v made reasoning ineffective even about seemingly straightforward implications. Given this choice of exit conditions, we can also get rid of moved altogether, which saves us from expressing invariants involving nonlinear arithmetic, such as $\text{moved} = \text{start} * \text{tau}$. Changing the exit condition of the inner loop does not warrant getting rid of any variable, but it makes it straightforward to prove the invariance of the upper bound on k (that is, $k \leq \text{tau}$); in contrast, ESC/Java2 cannot derive the same bound on k from the relation between v and k through mp.

For framing, we use a Boolean array **set** as we did in Boogie.¹⁵ We notice, however, that ESC/Java2 has difficulties reasoning about the invariants that relate **set** and a’s content in relation to $\text{\old}(a)$ ’s. As a simple solution, we introduce a pseudo-ghost variable olda, which stores the content of a upon method entry. With this trick, ESC/Java2 can prove the loop invariants involving **set**, a, and olda that express the fundamental progress in rotating. The drawback of this trick is that it fails to eventually relate olda to $\text{\old}(a)$ ’s content, even if we add invariants asserting that olda does not change after it is initialized. Since olda is local, it cannot appear in the postcondition either; hence we just **assume** the final, trivial step in the correctness proof.

The inner loop of Figure 74 uses Java’s **do...while** loop. It turns out that ESC/Java2 requires invariants of **do...while** loops to hold also *before* the first unconditional iteration. To exemplify, consider the loop:

```

int x = 0
/*@ loop_invariant  $0 \leq x$ ;
do {
  x = x + 1;
} while (x < 10);

```

Even though $0 < x$ holds after the first unconditional iteration, ESC/Java2 only accepts

¹⁵Given the modifications to the exit conditions, **set** is the only genuinely ghost variable in the JML implementation.

```

1667 /*@
1668 @ requires a ≠ null;
1669 @ requires 0 ≤ r ∧ r < a.length;
1670 @
1671 @ ensures (∀ int i; 0 ≤ i ∧ i < a.length
1672 @           ⇒ a[rotp(i, a.length, r)] = \old(a[i]));
1673 @*/
1674 // Left-rotate a by r by modular visit of its elements
1675 public static void rotate_modulo(int[] a, int r)
1676 {
1677     if (r = 0) return;
1678
1679     int olda[] = new int[a.length];
1680     // Copy a's content into olda (omitted)
1681
1682     int start = 0;
1683     boolean set[] = new boolean[a.length]; // ghost
1684     int k;
1685
1686     //@ loop_invariant
1687         0 ≤ start ∧ start ≤ gcd(a.length, a.length - r);
1688     //@ loop_invariant (∀ int i;
1689         0 ≤ i ∧ i < a.length ∧ ¬ set[i] ⇒ a[i] = olda[i]);
1690     //@ loop_invariant (∀ int i, s;
1691         0 ≤ i ∧ i < tau(a.length, a.length - r) ∧
1692         start ≤ s ∧ s < gcd(a.length, a.length - r)
1693         ⇒ ¬ set[mp(a.length, a.length - r, s, i)]);
1694     //@ loop_invariant (∀ int i, s;
1695         0 ≤ i ∧ i < tau(a.length, a.length - r) ∧
1696         0 ≤ s ∧ s < start
1697         ⇒ set[mp(a.length, a.length - r, s, i)]);
1698     //@ loop_invariant (∀ int i; 0 ≤ i ∧ i < a.length ∧ set[i]
1699         ⇒ a[i] = olda[ptor(i, a.length, r)]);
1700     while (start < gcd(a.length, a.length - r))
1701     {
1702         int displaced = a[start], v = start;
1703         k = 0;
1704
1705         // Inner loop here: see Figure 74
1706
1707         start = start + 1;
1708     }
1709     lemma_onto(set, r);
1710     // Connecting olda back to \old(a)
1711     //@ assume (∀ int i; 0 ≤ i ∧ i < a.length
1712         ⇒ olda[ptor(i, a.length, r)] = \old(a[ptor(i, a.length, r)
1713         ]));
1713 }

```

Figure 73: ESC/Java2-verified JML implementation of the rotation by modular visit algorithm of Figure 13.

```

1714 //@ loop_invariant  $0 \leq v \wedge v < a.length$ ;
1715 //@ loop_invariant  $0 \leq k \wedge k \leq \text{tau}(a.length, a.length - r)$ ;
1716 //@ loop_invariant  $v = \text{mp}(a.length, a.length - r, \text{start}, k)$ ;
1717 //@ loop_invariant  $0 < k \wedge v \neq \text{start}$ 
1718            $\iff 0 < k \wedge k < \text{tau}(a.length, a.length - r)$ ;
1719 //@ loop_invariant  $(\forall \text{int } i; 0 \leq i \wedge i < a.length \wedge \neg \text{set}[i]$ 
1720            $\implies a[i] = \text{olda}[i])$ ;
1721 //@ loop_invariant  $\text{displaced} = \text{olda}[v]$ ;
1722 //@ loop_invariant  $(\forall \text{int } i;$ 
1723            $k < i \wedge i < \text{tau}(a.length, a.length - r)$ 
1724            $\implies \neg \text{set}[\text{mp}(a.length, a.length - r, \text{start}, i)])$ ;
1725 //@ loop_invariant  $(\forall \text{int } i; 0 < i \wedge i \leq k$ 
1726            $\implies \text{set}[\text{mp}(a.length, a.length - r, \text{start}, i)])$ ;
1727 //@ loop_invariant  $(\forall \text{int } i, s;$ 
1728            $0 \leq i \wedge i < \text{tau}(a.length, a.length - r) \wedge$ 
1729            $\text{start} < s \wedge s < \text{gcd}(a.length, a.length - r)$ 
1730            $\implies \neg \text{set}[\text{mp}(a.length, a.length - r, s, i)])$ ;
1731 //@ loop_invariant  $(\forall \text{int } i, s;$ 
1732            $0 \leq i \wedge i < \text{tau}(a.length, a.length - r) \wedge$ 
1733            $0 \leq s \wedge s < \text{start}$ 
1734            $\implies \text{set}[\text{mp}(a.length, a.length - r, s, i)])$ ;
1735 //@ loop_invariant  $(\forall \text{int } i; 0 \leq i \wedge i < a.length \wedge \text{set}[i]$ 
1736            $\implies a[i] = \text{olda}[\text{ptor}(i, a.length, r)])$ ;
1737 do
1738 {
1739   k = k + 1;
1740   v = v + a.length - r;
1741   if (v  $\geq$  a.length) { v = v - a.length; }
1742   int tmp = a[v]; a[v] = displaced; displaced = tmp;
1743   set[v] = true; // ghost
1744   lemma_mp_complete_cycle(a.length, a.length - r, start);
1745   lemma_mp_incomplete_cycle(a.length, a.length - r, start);
1746   lemma_mp_disjoint_cycles(a.length, a.length - r, start, k);
1747 } while (k < tau(a.length, a.length - r));

```

Figure 74: Inner loop of the verified JML implementation of the rotation by modular visit algorithm of Figure 13.

the weaker $0 \leq x$ as invariant. This explains the lower bounds of some of the invariants in Figure 74.

8 Discussion

We have seen that the four main algorithms require increasingly more complex correctness proofs—both on paper and, even more so, when mechanizing them. This verification complexity does have relevant practical implications: the more complex the correctness argument, the more complex it is to get an implementation correct or to modify an existing implementation (for example to work on a different kind of data structure) without introducing subtle errors. In my own experience of implementing the algorithms in Java, getting rotation by reversal right is straightforward, rotation by swapping requires more attention mostly to corner cases, rotation by modular visit can be tricky to implement correctly at the first attempt. The likelihood of introducing errors is yet another feature to be traded off against others such as performance when choosing which algorithm to implement.

Auto-active verifiers such as Boogie generate verification conditions in multiple steps, often involving heuristics that may be hard to express and opaque to users. We have seen several cases in the mechanized proofs, especially of the more complex algorithms, were changing seemingly irrelevant details of the input (such as the order or names of declarations) transformed a successful proof into a very slow or even nonterminating one. Similarly but in a different dimension, changes in how Boogie (or the underlying Z3 SMT solver) encodes verification conditions and simplifies programs may break previously successful proofs, for example because the new heuristics to generate triggers do not work with the same assertions.¹⁶ The best defense against such brittleness is to put great care into modularizing proofs into files and procedures that are as separate as possible: provided each individual input to the verifier is sufficiently small (or large but structurally simple) the sensitivity on low-level details is kept at bay and does not interfere with the high-level goals of the prover.

By providing a higher level of abstraction and idiomatic specification features (ghost state, immutable sets and sequences, and so on), Dafny supports proofs much closer to those done on paper. It also provides a more stable tool, where changing little details in how assertions and instructions and formulated normally does not have significant impact on the prover’s behavior. Nonetheless, some brittleness remains depending on how variables are named, or on the order in which variables and instructions are introduced. Deciding which definitions to expose and which to factor out and prove separately is also crucial for good performance as soon as one tackles nontrivial programs and specifications. Thanks to its low-level nature, the preliminary experience with Boogie has been extremely useful to outline the criticalities of verifying the rotation algorithms, and to guide an efficient construction of verified implementations in Dafny or other similar provers.

References

- [1] Nada Amin, K. Rustan M. Leino, and Tiark Rompf. Computing with an SMT solver. In *Proceedings of the 8th International Conference on Tests and Proofs*

¹⁶In fact, some of the Boogie examples in Section 5 do not seem to work with more recent (with respect to when this report was first written) versions of Boogie (v. 2.2.3, October 2014) and Z3 (v. 4.3.2).

- (TAP), Lecture Notes in Computer Science. Springer, 2014.
- [2] Jon Bentley. *Programming Pearls*. Addison-Wesley Professional, 2nd edition, 1999.
 - [3] Richard Bornat. Lecture slides on algorithms (circular shift). http://www.eis.mdx.ac.uk/staffpages/r_bornat/oldteaching/I2A/, 1998.
 - [4] Lilian Burdy, Yoonsik Cheon, David R. Cok, Michael D. Ernst, Joseph R. Kiniry, Gary T. Leavens, K. Rustan M. Leino, and Erik Poll. An overview of JML tools and applications. *Int. J. Softw. Tools Technol. Transf.*, 7(3):212–232, June 2005.
 - [5] David Detlefs, Greg Nelson, and James B. Saxe. Simplify: a theorem prover for program checking. *Journal of the ACM*, 52(3):365–473, 2005.
 - [6] Carlo A. Furia, Bertrand Meyer, and Sergey Velder. Loop invariants: Analysis, classification, and examples. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 46(3):Article 34, January 2014.
 - [7] Ronald L. Graham, Donald E. Knuth, and Oren Patashnik. *Concrete Mathematics: A foundation for computer science*. Addison-Wesley, 2nd edition, 1994.
 - [8] David Gries and Harlan Mills. Swapping sections. Technical Report TR 81-452, Cornell University, January 1981. <http://hdl.handle.net/1813/6292>.
 - [9] Bart Jacobs, Jan Smans, and Frank Piessens. VeriFast: Imperative programs as proofs. In *VS-Tools workshop at VSTTE*, 2010.
 - [10] Joseph R. Kiniry, Alan E. Morkan, and Barry Denby. Soundness and completeness warnings in ESC/Java2. In *Proceedings of the 2006 Conference on Specification and Verification of Component-based Systems, SAVCBS '06*, pages 19–24, New York, NY, USA, 2006. ACM.
 - [11] Jason Koenig and K. Rustan M. Leino. Getting started with Dafny: A guide. In *Software Safety and Security – Tools for Analysis and Verification*, volume 33 of *NATO Science for Peace and Security Series – D: Information and Communication Security*, pages 152–181. IOS Press, 2012.
 - [12] Gary T. Leavens, Albert L. Baker, and Clyde Ruby. Preliminary design of JML: a behavioral interface specification language for Java. *ACM SIGSOFT Software Engineering Notes*, 31(3):1–38, 2006.
 - [13] Gary T. Leavens, Yoonsik Cheon, Curtis Clifton, Clyde Ruby, and David R. Cok. How the design of JML accommodates both runtime assertion checking and formal verification. *Science of Computer Programming*, 55(1-3):185–208, 2005.
 - [14] K. Rustan M. Leino. This is Boogie 2, 2008. <http://goo.gl/QsH6g>.
 - [15] K. Rustan M. Leino. Developing verified programs with Dafny. In *35th International Conference on Software Engineering, ICSE '13, San Francisco, CA, USA, May 18–26, 2013*, pages 1488–1490. IEEE / ACM, 2013.
 - [16] K. Rustan M. Leino and Rosemary Monahan. Reasoning about comprehensions with first-order SMT solvers. In *Proceedings of the 2009 ACM Symposium on Applied Computing (SAC)*, pages 615–622. ACM, 2009.

- [17] K. Rustan M. Leino and Nadia Polikarpova. Verified calculations. In *Verified Software: Theories, Tools, Experiments – 5th International Conference, VSTTE 2013, Menlo Park, CA, USA, May 17-19, 2013, Revised Selected Papers*, volume 8164 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 170–190. Springer, 2013.
- [18] Joseph J. Rotman. *Advanced Modern Algebra*. American Mathematical Society, 2nd edition, 2010.
- [19] Song Y. Yan. *Number Theory for Computing*. Springer, 2nd edition, 2002.