# The Development of a Toolkit to Support Probabilistic B-Method

## Introduction

B Method (B) is a formal development method that facilitates the refinement of specification to code. Our probabilistic B(pB) replaces Boolean predicates by real valued probabilities in the range 0..1. This allows probabilistic uncertainty to be modelled. Probabilistic choice

 $S_{p}\oplus T$ 

represents a choice between S and T in which S is taken with probability p and T is taken with probability 1 - p. Questions?

- $\star$  What is the expected running cost of a system?
- $\star$  What is the reliability for a system given some information about its components?

## **Probability-one termination**

### What is termination with probability one?

Consider the following programs:

n := 2;
while $n \neq 0$ do $n := n - 1$ end
Program A: <i>Absolute</i> correctness
Consider Program D:

n := 1;while  $n \neq 0$  do  $n := n - 1 \parallel \text{skip end}$ Program B: *Demonic* incorrectness



n := 1: while  $n \neq 0$  do n := n - 1 <sub>p</sub> $\oplus$  skip end Program D

Let t be the probability of termination for Program D:  $t = p + (1 - p) \times t$  $\equiv p = p \times t$ 

 $\equiv t = 1$  provided that  $p \neq 0$ 

## Abstract probabilistic choice substitution

Program D will still terminate with probability one without knowing the actual probability p, provided it is not 0 or 1.

n := 1; while $n \neq 0$ do	$n:=n-1~\oplus$ skip ${f end}$
Program E	

Consider Program E, where  $S \oplus T$  is the abstract probabilistic choice substitution between S and T. The  $\oplus$  should be implemented by "concrete" probabilistic choices  $_{p} \oplus$  that are bounded away from 0 and 1.

## Termination with probability-one proof rules for loops

For loops, we have to denote the upper bound B for the variant and prove the following:

	-		f
T1: Invariant is established	P	$\Rightarrow$	[init]I
T2: Invariant is maintained during executions	$G \wedge I$	$\Rightarrow$	$[\![S]\!]I$
T3: Post-condition is established on termination	$\neg  G \wedge I$	$\Rightarrow$	Q
T4: Variant is a natural number (bound below)	Ι	$\Rightarrow$	$V \in \mathbb{N} \land V \le B$
T5: Variant decreases with non-zero probability	$G \wedge I$	$\Rightarrow$	$[n := V] [\![ S ]\!] (V < n)$

Where  $\|S\|$  is the substitution S with the abstract choice interpreted demonically, and [S] is the substitution S with the abstract choice interpreted angelically.

## **Probabilistic invariants**

Example of probabilistic Library

The following illustrates a simple library in which books are lo	st with probability $p$ .		
StartLoan $\hat{=}$	$\mathbf{EndLoan} \widehat{=}$		
pre $booksInLibrary > 0$ then	$\mathbf{pre}\ loansEnded < loansStarted\ \mathbf{then}$		
$booksInLibrary := booksInLibrary - 1 \parallel$	$booksLost := booksLost + 1 \ _p \oplus \ booksI$		
loansStarted := loansStarted + 1	loansEnded := loansEnded + 1		
end	$\mathbf{end}$		

Invariants are replaced by *expectations*. For this specification, the expectation is defined by **expectation** clause

 $0 \Rightarrow p * loansEnded - booksLost$ 

We can conclude that the expected number of books lost is bounded above by p \* loansEnded



Thai Son Hoang

while  $n \neq 0$  do  $n := n - 1_{0.5} \oplus$  skip end Program C: Almost-certain correctness

 $ksInLibrary := booksInLibrary + 1 \parallel$ 

#### Proof obligations

stants):  $e \Rightarrow [Init]I$ .

Proof obligations are similar to those for standard specifications with the exception that the invariant is now a real-value, not a Boolean. In order to prove that the *real* invariant is bounded below, we have to prove the following: P1: The initialisation needs to establish the lower bound of the probabilistic invariant, given the context of the machine (information about sets and con-P2: The operations do not decrease the expected value of the probabilistic invariant, i.e. the expected value of the invariant after the operation is at least the

expected value before the operation:  $I \Rightarrow [Op]I$ 

## **Probabilistic specification substitution** Specification substitution

 $v: \{A, B\}, \text{ where } A$ and B are expectations over the state x and  $v \subseteq x$ . B can refer to the original state by  $x_0$ . Probabilistic specification substitution

The semantics of the specification  $v : \{A, B\}$  with respect to arbitrary post-expectation C is given by

 $[v: \{A, B\}]C \quad \widehat{=} \quad A$ 

where  $B^w \cong B \times \langle w = w_0 \rangle$  (*w* are unchanged variables in the substitution). Semantics of Probabilistic specification substitution

#### Fundamental theorem

Assume that  $S \cong v : \{A, B\}$ . For any program  $T, S \sqsubseteq T$  if and only if  $A \implies [x_0 := x][S]B^w$ , where  $B^w \cong B \times \langle w = w_0 \rangle$ . Probabilistic specification substitution

## **Terminating probabilistic specification substitution**

It turns out that we need to specify that the specification does in fact terminate. Terminating specification substitution

$v: \{\!\!\{p, \langle Q \rangle \}\!\!\}$ , where $p$ is a real expres-
sion between 0 and 1 and $Q$ is a predi-
cate over the state $x$ and $v \subseteq x$ . $Q$ can
refer to the original state by $x_0$ .
Probabilistic specification substitution

The semantics of the specification  $v : \{\!\!\{p, \langle Q \rangle \}\!\!\}$  is given as:  $v: \{\!\!\{p, \langle Q \rangle \}\!\!\} \equiv v: \{1, \langle Q \rangle \}_p \oplus v: \{1, 1\},$ 

where  $v : \{1, 1\}$  is the program to specify termination. Semantics of Probabilistic specification substitution

#### Fundamental theorem

Assume that  $S \cong v : \{\!\!\{p, \langle Q \rangle \}\!\!\}$ For any program  $T, S \sqsubseteq T$  if and only if  $v : \{p, \langle Q \rangle\} \sqsubseteq T$  and  $v : \{1, 1\} \sqsubseteq T$  (i.e. T terminates). Probabilistic specification substitution

## **Conclusion and future work**

#### Work done

The extended B (pB) and modified *B*-Toolkit supports the following:

- $\star$  Termination with probability-one;
- $\star$  Probabilistic invariant:
- $\star$  Probabilistic specification substitution;
- $\star$  Fundamental theorem for refinement;
- $\star$  Probabilistic loops.



email: htson@cse.unsw.edu.au

web: http://www.cse.unsw.edu.au/~htson

$$\mathbf{A} \times [x_0 := x] \left( \Box x \cdot \left( \frac{C}{B^w} \right) \right)$$

This definition is constructed to extend the standard case and it satisfies the fundamental theorem

#### Future work

More research needs to be done on:

- $\star$  Specification with multiple expectations;
- $\star$  Fundamental theorem for multiple expectation specification;
- $\star$  General data refinement for probabilistic programs

This project was supported by the Australian Research Council under the large grant A00103115.

