

Programming (Econometrics)

Lecture 4: Program correctness

Tommi Tervonen

Econometric Institute, Erasmus University Rotterdam

Counting sum of the elements of an integer array

```
public static int countSum(int [] array) {  
    for (int i=1;i<array.length;i++) {  
        array[i] = array[i] + array[i-1];  
    }  
    return array[array.length-1];  
}
```

- Returns the correct value, but also modifies the parameter array as a *side effect*.
- What would you expect from:

```
public static int countSum(int [] array)
```

- Unexpected side effects make code difficult to understand
- There are also *desired* side effects, e.g. sorting the contents of an array
- In Java we have
 - Accessor methods: returning a value but not modifying contents of the object (`public int getAge()`)
 - Mutator methods: modifying the contents of the object but not returning a value (`public void setAge(int age)`)

- In imperative programming we classify methods into
 - **Functions**, that return a value but do not alter the parameters in any way
 - **Procedures**, that alter some of the parameters but do not return a value

```
void setElement(Matrix m, int rInd , int cInd ,  
                double newElement)
```

```
double getElement(Matrix m, int rInd , int cInd)
```

- Note: if the language does not support exceptions (e.g. C), procedures often do return a value for signifying error conditions

- For side effects to be possible, parameters have to be passed *by reference*: only a reference (memory address) of the variable is passed to the called method
- Other main technique for parameter passing is to pass *by value*: a local copy of the variable is created within the called method
- Example: pass by reference vs pass by value

- Matlab passes everything by value
- Matrices are passed by reference until they are modified the first time, at which point a local copy is created (!)
- The OO-extension allows to pass references by value by using the handle class

There are no procedures in Matlab: only functions

- Pros:
 - No undesired side effects
- Cons:
 - No desired side effects
 - Many algorithms can be expressed more clearly with procedures
 - Recursive algorithms become slow without procedures

```
function A = sort(A)
    leftList = A(1:middle);
    rightList = A((middle+1):length(A));
    leftList = sort(leftList);
    rightList = sort(rightList);
    A = merge(leftList , rightList);
end
```

- Methods define a *contract* between the supplier (you) and the consumer (you or someone else)
- Contract **partially** defined through the signature:

```
function arr = sortArrayFromIndex(array , index)
```

Contract:

- 1 The `index` has to be in the range `[1, length(array)]`
(responsibility of the consumer)
- 2 If consumer calls the method adhering to (1), then after the method call the following holds:
`array[index] < array[index+1] < ... < array[length(array)]` (responsibility of the supplier)


```
% Sorts the array in ascending order starting  
% from index  
%  
% PRECOND:  $0 < \text{index} \leq \text{length}(\text{array})$   
% POSTCOND:  $\text{arr}(\text{index}) < \dots$   
%  $\dots < \text{arr}(\text{length}(\text{array}))$   
function arr = sortArrayFromIndex(array, index)
```

- Responsibilities of the consumer are method *pre-conditions* (“Requires”)
- Responsibilities of the supplier are method *post-conditions* (“Ensures”)
- (PRECOND, METHOD) \Rightarrow POSTCOND

Violating pre-conditions

- As a supplier, if the pre-condition is violated, you are not responsible for what happens
- In practice you should crash the program execution, as the mistake is in the logic

```
function array = sortFromIndex(array , index)  
    assert(index > 0 && index <= length(array));  
    ... % do the actual sorting  
end
```

When to use pre- and post-conditions

- If you cannot handle a possible parameter value, you should declare the accepted range as a pre-conditions
- Post-conditions are often stated in a more informal manner in the method documentations
- Document post-conditions when doing more complex programs, and when you have problems finding bugs

$(\text{PRECOND}, \text{METHOD}) \Rightarrow \text{POSTCOND}$

How do we know that METHOD ever terminates execution?
How do we know that METHOD does what it's supposed to?

Stop or not?

```
for (i=1:10)  
    printf("%d th integer\n", i);  
end
```

```
nr = input("How many integers you want?");  
for (i=1:nr)  
    printf("%d th integer\n", i);  
    pause(10*i);  
end
```

```
green = true;  
while(green)  
    green = false;  
    pause(10);  
    green = true;  
end
```

Alan Turing (1912-54)



- Designed the computer that cracked German Enigma in WW2
- Invented LU decomposition
- Invented the Turing test
- Proved the following

The halting problem

Given programs indexed using x , input i , assume that there is a computable function $h(x, i)$:

$$h(x, i) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x \text{ halts with input } i \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

As we have von Neumann computers (programs = data), we can also call $h(x, x)$

The halting problem

Now, take an arbitrary total computable function f , and construct a partial computable function

$$g(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } f(x, x) = 0 \\ \text{undefined} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

g is computable by a program e that loops forever on the undefined case ($\implies h$ is defined on e)

$$\begin{aligned} g(e) = f(e, e) = 0 &\implies h(e, e) = 1 \\ g(e) = \text{undefined} &\implies f(e, e) \neq 0 \implies h(e, e) = 0 \end{aligned}$$

$$\implies h \neq f$$

\implies no such computable function as h

\implies the halting problem is undecidable

We cannot algorithmically determine whether a program stops execution