Consider the following SIMPL program, which computes \( y \) to be the sum of 1..\( x \):

\[
w = (\text{while } 1 \leq x \text{ do } (y := y + x; x := x - 1))
\]

We wish to prove the partial-correctness of program \( w \). That is, we wish to prove the following partial-correctness assertion:

\[
\{(x = i) \land (i \geq 1) \land (y = 0)\} w \{y = \frac{1}{2}i(i + 1)\}
\]

The first step is to find a suitable loop invariant \( I \) for the while-loop. Suitable loop invariants always satisfy three criteria:

1. \( I \) must be true at the start of the loop.
2. Executing the loop body in any store \( \sigma \in \Sigma \) where \( I \) and the loop condition are both true results in a state \( \sigma' \) for which \( I \) is still true. (This includes stores \( \sigma \) that are never actually visited by the loop!)
3. \( I \) and the negation of the loop condition must together imply the postcondition.

If you choose an invariant that is too weak, it will not be strong enough to prove the postcondition and condition 3 will fail. If you choose one that is too strong, it will be falsified on some loop iterations and conditions 1 or 2 will fail.

For example, suppose we choose \( y = \frac{1}{2}i(i + 1) \) as our invariant. This is clearly strong enough to prove the postcondition (since it is identical to the postcondition) but it is not true on every iteration (conditions 1 and 2 both fail). Instead, we might try \( y = \frac{1}{2}i(i + 1) - \frac{1}{2}x(x + 1) \). This is true on every iteration (conditions 1 and 2 succeed) but it is not quite strong enough to prove the postcondition (condition 3 fails). To prove the postcondition we would also need to know that \( x = 0 \) at the end of the loop. The negation of the loop condition is \( x < 1 \), so to infer that \( x = 0 \) we can add \( x \geq 0 \). This leads us to the invariant \( I \equiv ((x \geq 0) \land (y = \frac{1}{2}i(i + 1) - \frac{1}{2}x(x + 1))) \), which satisfies all three criteria.

Armed with this invariant, we can begin our proof as follows:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\frac{\{I \land (1 \leq x)\} y := y + x; x := x - 1 \{I\}}{\{I\} w \{(1 \leq x) \land I\}^{(5)} \; \models A_1} \\
\frac{\{I \land (1 \leq x)\} y := y + x; x := x - 1 \{I\}}{\{(x = i) \land (i \geq 1) \land (y = 0)\} w \{y = \frac{1}{2}i(i + 1)\}^{(6)} \; \models A_2}
\end{array}
\]
where assertions $A_1$ and $A_2$ are defined by

\[
A_1 \equiv (x = \bar{i}) \land (\bar{i} \geq 1) \land (y = 0) \implies I
\]

\[
A_2 \equiv -(1 \leq x) \land I \implies (y = \frac{1}{2} \bar{i}(\bar{i} + 1))
\]

(You should convince yourself that $A_1$ and $A_2$ are both tautological before continuing.)

Next we must fill in derivation $D$. Rule 2 says that to prove a partial-correctness assertion involving a sequence of commands, we must find an assertion $C$ that can serve as a postcondition for the first command and a precondition for the second. So we want a derivation of the form:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
D = \frac{D_1}{D_2}
\end{array}
\]

\[\begin{array}{c}
\{ I \land (1 \leq x) \} y := y + x \{ C \}
\{ C \} x := x - 1 \{ I \}
\{ I \land (1 \leq x) \} y := y + x; x := x - 1 \{ I \}
\end{array}\]

(2)

for some assertion $C$. If we use Rule 4 to complete sub-derivation $D_2$, then $C$ must be

\[
C \equiv I[x - 1/x] \equiv (x - 1 \geq 0) \land (y = \frac{1}{2} \bar{i}(\bar{i} + 1) - \frac{1}{2}(x - 1)(x - 1 + 1))
\]

To complete the proof, we only need to finish derivation $D_1$ for our chosen $C$. Rule 4 says that if the postcondition is $C$ then the precondition must be $C' \equiv C[y + x/y] \equiv (x - 1 \geq 0) \land (y + x = \frac{1}{2} \bar{i}(\bar{i} + 1) - \frac{1}{2}(x - 1)(x - 1 + 1))$. Completing the proof therefore requires using the rule of consequence to show that $I \land (1 \leq x)$ implies $C'$:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\{ I \land (1 \leq x) \} y := y + x \{ C \}
\end{array}
\]

(4)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\{ I \land (1 \leq x) \} y := y + x; x := x - 1 \{ I \}
\end{array}
\]

(6)

where assertion $A_3$ is given by

\[
A_3 \equiv I \land (1 \leq x) \implies C'
\]

(Once again, you should convince yourself that this assertion is really valid.)

The final proof therefore looks like this:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\{ I \land (1 \leq x) \} y := y + x \{ C \}
\end{array}
\]

(4)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\{ I \land (1 \leq x) \} y := y + x; x := x - 1 \{ I \}
\end{array}
\]

(2)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\{ I \land (1 \leq x) \} y := y + x \{ C \}
\end{array}
\]

(6)

where assertions $I$, $C$, $C'$, $A_1$, $A_2$, and $A_3$ are defined by:

\[
I \equiv (x \geq 0) \land (y = \frac{1}{2} \bar{i}(\bar{i} + 1) - \frac{1}{2} x(x + 1))
\]

\[
C \equiv (x - 1 \geq 0) \land (y = \frac{1}{2} \bar{i}(\bar{i} + 1) - \frac{1}{2}(x - 1)(x - 1 + 1))
\]

\[
C' \equiv (x - 1 \geq 0) \land (y + x = \frac{1}{2} \bar{i}(\bar{i} + 1) - \frac{1}{2}(x - 1)(x - 1 + 1))
\]

\[
A_1 \equiv (x = \bar{i}) \land (\bar{i} \geq 1) \land (y = 0) \implies I
\]

\[
A_2 \equiv -(1 \leq x) \land I \implies (y = \frac{1}{2} \bar{i}(\bar{i} + 1) - \frac{1}{2} x(x + 1))
\]

\[
A_3 \equiv I \land (1 \leq x) \implies C'
\]