Assignment 4

Exercise 1

Consider the following Alloy model of a counter:

```
module util/integer

sig Counter {
  n: Int
}

pred inc[c, c': Counter] {
  c'.n = c.n.add[Int[1]]
}
```

The predicate `inc` models the increment operation of the counter.

1. Use the abstract machine pattern that you have seen in the lecture to define the traces of the counter; see slides 148-149. For this task you must use the Alloy library `util/ordering`. Initially, the value of n must be 0. Define the initial state of the counter using the predicate `init[c: Counter]`.

2. Express the following two invariants using assertions:

   inv1: The counter's value is always greater than or equal to zero.

   inv2: The counter's value never decreases.

   The first invariant **inv1** is a state invariant. You must therefore check whether it holds for all states. The second invariant **inv2** is a temporal invariant. You must check whether for any two states c and c' where c is a predecessor of c', $c.n \leq c'.n$ holds. You can use the predicate `lt[c,c']` to check whether c is a predecessor of c'.

Exercise 2

Recall the two ImageFile class implementations from the lecture. You are given the Alloy model for the ImageFile implementation with eager initialization; see the file `imagefile_eager.als`. Consider the following two invariants:

inv1: `getImage()` always returns a non-null value.

inv2: `getImage()` always returns the same value.

You have two tasks:

1. Define the initial state and the traces for the ImageFile model. Model the two invariants as assertions and check whether they hold.

2. Create an Alloy model for the alternative ImageFile implementation which uses lazy initialization:

```
class ImageFile {
  String file;
  Image image;
  ImageFile(String f) {
    file = f;
  }
  Image getImage() {
    if(image == null) {
      // load the image
    }
    return image;
  }
}
```

   Observe several traces to ensure that your model has the intended behavior. Check whether the invariants that you defined in (1) hold for your model.

   Hint: You can model `getImage()` as a predicate as it may change the state. Note that we modeled `getImage()` in the eager version as a function as it does not change the state.

Exercise 3

Consider the following Alloy model:

```
sig Node {
  next: Node
}
assert demo {
  all n: Node | some m: Node | m.next = n
}
```

For the given model we have one constraint: each node must have exactly one next node.

The assertion `demo` holds iff it is satisfied in all instances that satisfy the model's constraints. To check whether the assertion holds, Alloy searches for a counter-example (i.e., an instance where the model's constraint is satisfied and the assertion `demo` is violated).

1. Encode the constraint and the assertion that correspond to checking `check demo for 1` into a boolean formula.

   Hint: Treat the universal and existential quantifiers as conjunction and disjunction, respectively.

   Check if the boolean formula has a satisfying assignment. If it is satisfiable, give a counter-example where the assertion is violated.

2. Repeat step (1) for `check demo for 2`.

3. Add a field `prev: Node` to the signature of `Node`, and also the fact `all n: Node | n.next.prev = n` to the Alloy model.

   Repeat steps (1) and (2).

   Does there exist a scope, possibly larger than 2, in which the assertion is violated?