



The Use of Rippling to Automate Event-B Invariant Preservation Proofs

Yuhui Lin, Alan Bundy & Gudmund Grov

School of Informatics
University of Edinburgh

Background

- Proof automation is a bottleneck for industrial use of formal method
 - large number of proofs (e.g 43K/28K)
 - requires user expertise
 - High-proportion (e.g. 59%) are invariant preservation, which follows a particular pattern $f(x) \vdash f(g(x))$
- Here, we show how an automatic proof technique called rippling is applicable to these POs
- Outline a novel approach combining rippling with scheme-based theory exploration to automate required lemma discovery

Event-B INV proofs

Consider the invariant $\&$ the event **any** x, y
 $T = \text{dom}(R; f)$ **when** $x \in T$
then $R := R \cup \{(x \mapsto y)\}$

$x \mapsto y$ a pair

$\text{dom}(r) \quad \{x.\exists y.(x \mapsto y) \in r\}$

$p; q \quad \{(x \mapsto y).\exists z.(x \mapsto z) \in p \wedge (z \mapsto y) \in q\}$

Event-B INV proofs

Proof :

$$x \in T$$

$$T = \text{dom}(R; f)$$

\vdash

$$T = \text{dom}((R \cup \{(x \mapsto y)\}); f)$$

$$(A \cup B); C = A; C \cup B; C$$

$$T = \text{dom}((R; f) \cup (\{(x \mapsto y)\}; f))$$

$$\text{dom}(A \cup B) = \text{dom}(A) \cup \text{dom}(B)$$

$$T = \text{dom}(R; f) \cup \text{dom}(\{(x \mapsto y)\}; f) \quad \text{Apply Assumption}$$

$$T = T \cup \text{dom}(\{(x \mapsto y)\}; f)$$

Rippling

- *Rippling* is developed for step cases of inductive proofs
 - guides searching by moving the goal towards the *induction hypothesis* (e.g. invariants in Event-B)
 - skeleton (embedding of the invariant) is intact
 - meta-level annotations called wave fronts only moves in certain desirable directions

$$f(x) \vdash f(\boxed{g(x)}) \quad f(g(x)) = h(f(x)) \quad \longrightarrow \quad f(x) \vdash \boxed{h(f(x))}$$

- Allows rewrite rules in both directions with termination guaranteed (e.g. associative and distributive rules)
- Have strong expectation of the following proofs steps



Event-B invariant proofs by rippling

$$x \in T$$

$$T = \text{dom}(R ; f)$$

⊢

$$T = \text{dom}(R \cup \{(x \mapsto y)\} ; f) \quad (A \cup B); C = A; C \cup B; C$$

$$T = \text{dom}((R ; f) \cup (\{(x \mapsto y)\} ; f)) \quad \text{dom}(A \cup B) = \text{dom}(A) \cup \text{dom}(B)$$

$$T = \text{dom}(R ; f) \cup \text{dom}(\{(x \mapsto y)\} ; f) \quad \text{Apply Assumption}$$

$$T = T \cup \text{dom}(\{(x \mapsto y)\} ; f)$$

Lemma discovery in rippling

- Proof can be blocked by lacks of lemmas
- Suppose our proof is blocked at:

$$T = \text{dom}(R \cup S ; f)$$

- We can then follow a 4 step process which discovers the missing lemma

$$(A \cup B); C = A; C \cup B; C$$

Lemma discovery steps

1. **Generate the left hand side:** pick terms of blocked goals which are expected to change in the next rewriting step, e.g.

$$R \cup S ; f$$

2. **Conjecture right hand side:** do it with strong expectation and patterns of scheme (e.g. distributive pattern)

$$?F_1((R ; f), (?F_2 S f))$$

Where $?F_n$ is a 2nd order meta-variables

- since skeleton must be preserved
- wave-front must move outwards.,

Lemma discovery steps

3. Instantiate scheme: then feed the scheme, i.e.

$R \cup S ; f = ?F_1((R ; f), (?F_2 S f))$, together with a set of terms for instantiation to IsaScheme which

- is a tool which discovers conjectures
- with counter-examples checks
- with proof attempts

4. Prove conjecture: one of the “sensible” instantiations is $(R \cup S) ; f = (R ; f) \cup (S ; f)$. But in more complex cases the process recurses or the user must provide a proof

Evaluation & Further work

Num of POs	9
Rodin only or only Isabelle tactics	0
Rippling + Isabelle tactics	1
Rippling + IsaScheme + Isabelle tactics (R + I + I)	2
R + I + I with some interaction still required	6

- Our further works are:
 - dynamic scheme generation
 - proper set of terms for meta-variables to instantiate
 - conditional lemmas- generic
 - piecewise fertilisation