Correctness of Algorithms

Thomas Schwarz, SJ

Introduction

- Correctness is a fundamental part of the goodness of an algorithm
	- Correctness can be:
		- Deduced from extensive testing of implementations
			- But you are never sure that there are no errors
		- Proven mathematically
			- By proof systems
			- By human beings

Analysis of Euclidean Algorithm

Algorithms Thomas Schwarz, SJ

- Given two numbers $a, b \in \mathbb{N}$:
	- *a* divides *b* $a \mid b : \iff \exists x \in \mathbb{N} : b = ax$
		- Divisors are smaller than the dividend

$$
\bullet \ a \mid b \Longrightarrow a \leq b
$$

- *r* is a common divisor of a and b iff $r | a \wedge r | b$
- $gcd(a, b) = max{r : r | a \land r | b}$
	- Always exists because the set is finite
	- Any finite subset of the natural numbers has a maximum

- Lemma 1: For all numbers $a, b \in \mathbb{N}$: $gcd(a, b) = gcd(b, a)$
- Proof: The set of common divisors does not depend on the order in which a and b are given:
	- $\{r : r | a \wedge r | b\} = \{r : r | b \wedge r | a\}$ because the logical and operator is commutative

Hence: $gcd(a, b) = max\{r : r | a \wedge r | b\}$ $=$ max $\{r : r | b \wedge r | a\}$ $=$ gcd (b, a)

- Lemma 2: If $a \in \mathbb{N}$ and $a \mid b$ then $\gcd(a, b) = a$.
- Proof:
	- \bullet *a* is the largest divisor of itself.
	- a is also a divisor of b by assumption
	- Hence a is the largest element in the set of common divisors $\{r : r \mid a \wedge r \mid b\}$.
	- This means that

 $a = \max\{r : r | a \wedge r | b\} = \gcd(a, b)$

- Lemma 3: If $a \equiv c \pmod{b}$ then $\gcd(a, b) = \gcd(c, b)$
- Proof:
	- $a \equiv c \pmod{b} \Longleftrightarrow \exists r, s, t \in \mathbb{N}_0 : a = rb + t \land c = sb + t \land 0 \le t < b$
	- We show that $\{r : r | a \wedge r | b\} = \{r : r | c \wedge r | b\}$
	- Assume that $d \in \mathbb{N}$ is in the left side. We want to show that it is also in the right side. For this we need to show that d also divides ${\tt c}.$
		- What do we know: There exists $x, y \in \mathbb{N}_0$ such that
			- $b = xd$ because d divides b
			- $a = yd$ **because** *d* divides *a*
			- $a = rb + t, c = sb + t, 0 \le t < b$

• Proof (continued)

• $c = a + a$ $=$ $((sb + t) - (rb + t)) + a$ $(s - r)b + a$ $(s - r)x$ d + *yd* $((s - r)x + y)d$

- Proof: (cont)
	- Now we want to show that all elements on the right side of $\{r : r \mid a \wedge r \mid b\} = \{r : r \mid c \wedge r \mid b\}$ are in the left side.
	- However, since our assumptions are symmetric in *a* and c , the same proof applies.

- Informal Version:
	- To compute $gcd(a, b)$ put the larger number of a and b on the left
	- Then divide a by b with remainder r $(a = bx + r)$
		- If $r = 0$, then $b \mid a$ and $gcd(a, b) = b$.
		- Otherwise:
			- Notice that $r \equiv a \pmod{b}$.
			- Therefore $gcd(a, b) = gcd(r, b) = gcd(b, r)$ by the Lemma
		- Continue until the remainder becomes 0

- gcd(1043, 4321)
	- $=$ gcd(4321, 1043)
	- $=$ gcd(1043, 149)
	- \bullet = 149 because 1043 % 149 = 0.
- There is an interesting extension:
	- 4321=4*1043+149, ergo 149 = 4321-4*1043, a linear combination of 4321 and 1043

gcd(198, 168)

- $=$ gcd(168, 30) • 198-168=30
- $=$ gcd(30, 18)
- $=$ gcd(18,12)
- $=$ gcd $(12,6)$
- $= 6$
- $18 = 168 5*30$ $=168-5(198-168)=6*168-5*198$
- $12 = 30 18 = 198 168 6*168 + 5*198 =$ 6*198-7*168
- $6 = 18 12 = -5*198 + 6*168 6*198 + 7*168 =$ $-11*198 + 13*168$
- GCD is a linear combination of the two parameters!

• Pseudo-code

def gcd(a, b): if b==0: return a else: return gcd(b, a%b)

- How do we prove the correctness of an algorithm?
	- Especially if it contains a loop
		- Usually, need to use induction
			- Sometimes using a *loop invariant*

```
gcd(198, 168) 
= \text{gcd}(168, 30)= gcd(30, 18)
= gcd (18, 12)= gcd (12, 6)= \text{gcd}(6, 0)
```
- In this case: gcd(var1, var2) does not change between between calls
- That is Lemma 3!
- End if the algorithm ever ends, it prints out the correct value by Lemma 1.

- How do we prove the correctness of the algorithm?
	- It is possible that an algorithm will never stop
		- (on some inputs, or on all inputs)
	- In our case, the smaller of the variables becomes strictly smaller
		- with the exception of the first step
	- Thus, we will run out of variables for our recursive calls sooner or later
- Algorithm will eventually return the correct number

- **Performance**
	- Obviously, proportional to the number of recursive calls
	- Given two random inputs:
		- Can stop in one iteration
			- If second variable divides the first
		- Or can stop after many
	- In a case like this: look for the worst case scenario

• Theorem: If gcd(a,b) makes *N* recursive calls and a > b then $a \ge f_{N+2}$ and $b \ge f_{N+1}$

- Proof:
	- By induction

def gcd(a, b): if $b == 0$: return a else: return gcd(b, a%b)

- Base case: $N = 1$:
	- In this case $b \neq 0$, hence $b \geq 1 = f_1$
	- In this case $a > b$, so $a > b = 1 \Longrightarrow a \geq 2 = f_2$

- Induction step
	- Induction hypothesis:

def gcd(a, b): if b==0: return a else: return gcd(b, a%b)

- If gcd has N recursive calls then $a \ge f_{N+2}$ and $b \ge f_{N+1}$
- To show:
	- If gcd has $N + 1$ recursive calls, then $a \ge f_{N+3}$ and $b \geq f_{N+2}$

- Assume that gcd(a,b) makes N+1 calls.
- The first step calls gcd(b,a%b)
	- This call calls the function recursively N times
		- Thus, by Induction Hypothesis
			- $b \ge f_{N+2}$ and $a \% b \ge f_{N+1}$
			- By division with reminder $a = rb + a\%b$ with $0 \le a\%b < b$
				- Because $a > b$ we have $r \geq 1$.
			- Therefore: $a \ge b + a \% b \ge f_{N+2} + f_{N+1} \ge f_{N+3}$.
			- We already know that $b \ge f_{N+2}$

Can find a closed form of Fibonacci

$$
\bullet \quad \Phi = \frac{1 + \sqrt{5}}{2} \approx 1.68
$$

def gcd(a, b): if $b == 0$: return a else: return gcd(b, a%b)

- $b \ge f_{N+2} \ge \Phi^N$
- This implies that $\log_{\Phi}(b) \geq N 1$ and $N = O(\log b)$

Loop Invariants as a Proof Technique

- Recursion usually demands induction proofs to assert properties of an algorithm
- For loops, use loop invariant:
	- A property that is true before the loop starts
	- A property that remains true after each loop iteration
	- And is therefore true after the loop terminates

- Working with loop invariants:
	- Need to come up with a loop invariant
	- Prove that it is true before the loop starts (induction base)
	- Prove that it remains true after each iteration of the loop

- Trivial Example:
	- Small C-program

```
extern int c; 
int x = c, y = 0;
while (x>=0):
   X<sup>--</sup>;
   y++;print(y)
```
• Step 1: Guessing a loop invariant

```
extern int c; 
int x = c, y = 0;
while (x>=0):
   X--;y++;print(y)
```
- Needs to involve x, y, c
	- $x + y = c$

- Step 2:
	- Show that it is true before the loop starts
		- Simple: before the loop starts, we have $x = c, y = 0$ therefore $x + y = c$

- Step 3: Show that the truth does not change after one iteration
	- Induction step: Assume $x_b + y_b = c$ before the loop iteration
		- After the iteration, we have $x_a = x_b 1$, $y_a = y_b + 1$.
		- This implies
		- $x_a + y_a = (x_b 1) + (y_b + 1) = x_b + y_b 1 + 1 = x_b + y_b = c$

- Step 4: Evaluate with the loop invariant
	- When the loop is terminated, $x = 0$.
		- (Question: why do we now that the loop terminates?)

• Therefore, the value of y is

$$
y = x + y - x = c - 0 = c
$$

• Thus, the function prints out the value of c .

Examples

- Given an array, sort it
- Idea:
	- Find the minimum of the elements in the array
		- Swap the first element with the minimum
	- Now find the minimum of the remaining elements
		- Swap the second element with the minimum
		- etc.

• Python = Pseudo Code

```
def selection(array): 
     for i in range(0, len(array)): 
        value = array[i] index = i 
        for j in range(i, len(array)):
             if array[j] < value: 
                 index = 1value = array[j]array[i], array[index] = array[index], array[index]
```
• Insert two loop invariants

```
def selection(array): 
     for i in range(0, len(array)): 
        value = array[i] index = i 
         for j in range(i, len(array)): 
              if array[j] < value: 
                 index = jvalue = array[j] ## value and index are min(array) and argmin(array)
```

```
array[i], array[index] = array[index], xrray[i] ## array[0:i] is ordered
```
• From these two invariants, it follows that the array is well sorted