## Exercise 4F-2. VCGen for Let

The bug in the verification condition for let is because we are not allocating a new location in the let expression.

## Fixed rules

To address the shadowing of variables we will replace all new bindings in let expressions with fresh variables.

```
\begin{array}{lcl} VC(c_1;c_2,B) & = & VC(c_1,VC(c_2,B)) \\ VC(x:=e,B) & = & [e/x]B \\ VC(\text{let } x=e \text{ in } c,B) & = & [e/\alpha]VC([\alpha/x]c,B) \text{ where } \alpha \text{ is a fresh variable} \end{array}
```

## Exercise 4F-3. VCGen Mistakes

We will demonstrate the bug in VCGen for let with the following demonstration of unsoundness.

Let *c* be the following command:

```
(let x = 2 in skip); y := x * 2
```

Let *B* be a post-condition y = 4 and let the state  $\sigma = \{x \mapsto 0, y \mapsto 0\}$ .

Now we will calculate the verification condition of c with regards to B.

Since VC(c, B) is true,  $\sigma \models VC(c, B)$  is vacuous.

Now to evaluate c using IMP's operational semantic we get

$$\langle (\text{let x = 2 in skip}); y := x * 2, \{x \mapsto 0, y \mapsto 0\} \rangle$$
  
 $\downarrow \{x \mapsto 0, y \mapsto 0\}$ 

The full derivation is elided as it follows the normal large step rules.

Given  $\sigma' = \{x \mapsto 0, y \mapsto 0\}$  it follows that  $\sigma' \not\models y = 4$ . Therefore, the verification condition is unsound.

## Exercise 4F-4. Axiomatic Do-While

$$\frac{\vdash \{A\} \; c \; \{C\} \qquad \vdash \{C\} \; \text{while} \; \; b \; \; \text{do} \; \; c \; \{B\}}{\vdash \{A\} \; \text{do} \; \; c \; \; \text{while} \; \; b \; \; \{B\}}$$

The rule is sound and complete since our existing rules for commands and while are also sound and complete. We also have the rule of consequence which can extend/relax pre/post-conditions as appropriate to prove true statements in our system.