

Static Program Analysis

Lecture 16: Abstract Interpretation V (Application Example: 16-Bit Multiplication)

Thomas Noll

Lehrstuhl für Informatik 2
(Software Modeling and Verification)

RWTH Aachen University

noll@cs.rwth-aachen.de

<http://www-i2.informatik.rwth-aachen.de/i2/spa11/>

Summer Semester 2011

1 Repetition: Correctness of Abstract Semantics

2 Application Example: 16-Bit Multiplication

Abstract Semantics of WHILE I

Reminder: abstract domain is $Abs := 2^{Var \rightarrow A}$

Definition (Abstract execution relation for statements)

If $c \in Cmd$ and $abs \in Abs$, then $\langle c, abs \rangle$ is called an **abstract configuration**. The **abstract execution relation** is defined by the following rules:

$$(skip) \frac{}{\langle \text{skip}, abs \rangle \Rightarrow abs}$$

$$(\text{asgn}) \frac{}{\langle x := a, abs \rangle \Rightarrow \{ \rho[x \mapsto a'] \mid \rho \in abs, a' \in val_{\rho}^{\#}(a) \}}$$

$$(\text{seq1}) \frac{\langle c_1, abs \rangle \Rightarrow \langle c'_1, abs' \rangle}{\langle c_1 ; c_2, abs \rangle \Rightarrow \langle c'_1 ; c_2, abs' \rangle}$$

$$(\text{seq2}) \frac{\langle c_1, abs \rangle \Rightarrow abs'}{\langle c_1 ; c_2, abs \rangle \Rightarrow \langle c_2, abs' \rangle}$$

Abstract Semantics of WHILE II

Definition (Abstract execution relation for statements; cont.)

$$\text{(if1)} \frac{\exists \rho \in \text{abs} : \text{true} \in \text{val}_\rho^\#(b)}{\langle \text{if } b \text{ then } c_1 \text{ else } c_2, \text{abs} \rangle} \Rightarrow \langle c_1, \text{abs} \setminus \{\rho \in \text{abs} \mid \text{val}_\rho^\#(b) = \{\text{false}\}\} \rangle$$

$$\text{(if2)} \frac{\exists \rho \in \text{abs} : \text{false} \in \text{val}_\rho^\#(b)}{\langle \text{if } b \text{ then } c_1 \text{ else } c_2, \text{abs} \rangle} \Rightarrow \langle c_2, \text{abs} \setminus \{\rho \in \text{abs} \mid \text{val}_\rho^\#(b) = \{\text{true}\}\} \rangle$$

$$\text{(wh1)} \frac{\exists \rho \in \text{abs} : \text{true} \in \text{val}_\rho^\#(b)}{\langle \text{while } b \text{ do } c, \text{abs} \rangle} \Rightarrow \langle c; \text{while } b \text{ do } c, \text{abs} \setminus \{\rho \in \text{abs} \mid \text{val}_\rho^\#(b) = \{\text{false}\}\} \rangle$$

$$\text{(wh2)} \frac{\exists \rho \in \text{abs} : \text{false} \in \text{val}_\rho^\#(b)}{\langle \text{while } b \text{ do } c, \text{abs} \rangle} \Rightarrow \text{abs} \setminus \{\rho \in \text{abs} \mid \text{val}_\rho^\#(b) = \{\text{true}\}\}$$

Abstract Semantics of WHILE III

Definition (Abstract transition function)

The **abstract transition function** is defined by the family of mappings

$$\text{next}_{c,c'}^\# : \text{Abs} \rightarrow \text{Abs},$$

given by

$$\begin{aligned}\text{next}_{c,c'}^\#(\text{abs}) &:= \bigcup \{ \text{abs}' \in \text{Abs} \mid \langle c, \text{abs} \rangle \Rightarrow \langle c', \text{abs}' \rangle \} \\ \text{next}_{c,\downarrow}^\#(\text{abs}) &:= \bigcup \{ \text{abs}' \in \text{Abs} \mid \langle c, \text{abs} \rangle \Rightarrow \text{abs}' \}\end{aligned}$$

Theorem (Soundness of abstract semantics)

For each $c \in \text{Cmd}$ and $c' \in \text{Cmd} \cup \{\downarrow\}$, $\text{next}_{c,c'}^\#$ is a **safe approximation** of $\text{next}_{c,c'}$, i.e., for every $\text{abs} \in \text{Abs}$,

$$\alpha(\text{next}_{c,c'}(\gamma(\text{abs}))) \subseteq \text{next}_{c,c'}^\#(\text{abs}).$$

1 Repetition: Correctness of Abstract Semantics

2 Application Example: 16-Bit Multiplication

A 16-Bit Multiplier

Example 16.1 (16-bit multiplier)

```
c = [out := 0]1;  
    [ovf := 0]2;  
    while [¬(f1=0) ∧ ovf=0]3 do  
        if [lsb(f1)=1]4 then  
            [(ovf,out) := (out:17)+f2]5;  
        else  
            [skip]6;  
        [f1 := f1>>1]7;  
        if [¬(f1=0) ∧ ovf=0]8 then  
            [(ovf,f2) := (f2:17)<<1]9;  
        else  
            [skip]10;
```

- **f1, f2**: 16-bit input factors
- **out**: 16-bit result
- **ovf**: overflow bit
- **lsb(z)**: least significant bit of z
- **(z:k)**: extension of z to k bits by adding leading zeros
- **(x,y) := z**: simultaneous assignment with split of z
- **<<1/>>1**: left/right shift

Procedure: in each iteration,

- ① if LSB of **f1** is set (4),
add **f2** to **out** (5)
- ② shift **f1** right (7)
- ③ shift **f2** left (9)

Expected result: if $\langle c, \sigma \rangle \rightarrow^+ \sigma'$, then

- $\sigma'(\text{out}) = \sigma(\text{f1}) \cdot \sigma(\text{f2})$ or
- $\sigma'(\text{ovf}) = 1$

(termination is trivial)

Example run: on the board

The Abstraction

(see E.M. Clarke, O. Grumberg, D.A. Peled: *Model Checking*, MIT Press, 1999, pp. 205)

- **f1**: no abstraction (as **f1** controls multiplication)
- **f2**: congruence modulo m
(for specific values of m – see Theorem 16.4)
 - extraction function: $\beta : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \{0, \dots, m-1\} : z \mapsto z \bmod m$
(see Exercise 6.1)
 - congruence: $z_1 \equiv z_2 \pmod{m}$ iff $z_1 \bmod m = z_2 \bmod m$
- **out**: congruence modulo m
- **ovf**: no abstraction (single bit)

Lemma 16.2 (Properties of modulo congruence)

For every $z_1, z_2 \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $m \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}(z_1 + z_2) \bmod m &\equiv ((z_1 \bmod m) + (z_2 \bmod m)) \bmod m \\ (z_1 - z_2) \bmod m &\equiv ((z_1 \bmod m) - (z_2 \bmod m)) \bmod m \\ (z_1 \cdot z_2) \bmod m &\equiv ((z_1 \bmod m) \cdot (z_2 \bmod m)) \bmod m\end{aligned}$$

Thus: modulo value of expression determined by modulo values of subexpressions

Example 16.3 (Abstraction of 16-bit multiplier (cf. Example 16.1))

Abstract execution for

- $f1 = 101_2 (= 5)$
- $f2 = 1001010_2 (= 74)$
- $m = 5, 74 \bmod 5 = 4$
- out, ovf initially undefined

⇒ initial abstract value:

$$abs = \{[f1 \mapsto 101_2, f2 \mapsto 4, out \mapsto r, ovf \mapsto b] \mid r \in \{0, \dots, 4\}, b \in \mathbb{B}\}$$

First transitions: on the board

Theorem 16.4 (Chinese Remainder Theorem)

Let $m_1, \dots, m_k \geq 1$ be pairwise relatively prime (i.e., $\gcd(m_i, m_j) = 1$ for $1 \leq i < j \leq k$). Let $m := m_1 \cdot \dots \cdot m_k$, and let $z_1, \dots, z_k \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then there is a unique $z \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that

$$0 \leq z < m \quad \text{and} \quad z \equiv z_i \pmod{m_i} \text{ for all } i \in \{1, \dots, k\}.$$

Application: for fixed initial (abstract) value of `f1` and `f2`,

- z = concrete final value of `out`
- z_i = abstract final value of `out` $\pmod{m_i}$
- $k := 5$, $m_1 := 5$, $m_2 := 7$, $m_3 := 9$, $m_4 := 11$, $m_5 := 32$
(thus $m = 5 \cdot 7 \cdot 9 \cdot 11 \cdot 32 = 110880 > 2^{16}$)
- Theorem 16.4 yields unique $z < m$ with $z \equiv z_i \pmod{m_i}$
- $m > 2^{16} \implies z$ is correct result of multiplication (see next slide)
- thus termination implies correct result or overflow

Efficiency:

- Exhaustive testing: $2^{16} \cdot 2^{16} = 2^{32} = 4.29 \cdot 10^9$ runs
- Abstract interpretation: $2^{16} \cdot (5 + 7 + 9 + 11 + 32) = 4.19 \cdot 10^6$ runs

Ensuring Completeness II

Proof.

To show: $\forall y_1, y_2 \in \mathbb{B}^{16}, \sigma, \sigma' \in \Sigma :$

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma(\text{f1}) &= y_1, \sigma(\text{f2}) = y_2, \langle c, \sigma \rangle \rightarrow^+ \sigma', \sigma'(\text{ovf}) = 0 \\ \implies \sigma'(\text{out}) &= y_1 \cdot y_2\end{aligned}$$

Known: $\forall i \in \{1, \dots, 5\}, y_1, y_2 \in \mathbb{B}^{16}, \text{abs}, \text{abs}' \in \text{Abs} :$

$$\begin{aligned}\text{abs} &= \{[\text{f1} \mapsto y_1, \text{f2} \mapsto y_2^\#, \text{out} \mapsto r, \text{ovf} \mapsto b] \mid \\ &\quad r \in \{0, \dots, m_i - 1\}, b \in \mathbb{B}\}, \langle c, \text{abs} \rangle \Rightarrow^+ \text{abs}' \\ \implies & \left(\forall \rho' \in \text{abs}' : \rho'(\text{ovf}) = 0 \implies \rho'(\text{out}) \stackrel{(*)}{=} (y_1 \cdot y_2^\#)^\# \right)\end{aligned}$$

(where $x^\# := x \bmod m_i$)

Proof:

- Let $y_1, y_2 \in \mathbb{B}^{16}$, $\sigma(\text{f1}) = y_1$, $\sigma(\text{f2}) = y_2$, $\langle c, \sigma \rangle \rightarrow^+ \sigma'$, $\sigma'(\text{ovf}) = 0$, and $z_i := (y_1 \cdot y_2)^\#$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, 5\}$
- Theorem 16.4 yields unique $z < m$ such that $z \equiv z_i \pmod{m_i}$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, 5\}$
- On the other hand, correctness of modulo abstraction implies $\rho'(\text{ovf}) = 0$ and

$$(\sigma'(\text{out}))^\# = \rho'(\text{out}) \quad (\text{correctness of abstraction})$$

$$= (y_1 \cdot y_2^\#)^\# \quad (*)$$

$$= (y_1 \cdot y_2)^\# \quad (\text{Lemma 16.2})$$

$$\implies \sigma'(\text{out}) = z = y_1 \cdot y_2$$