



CIS1225 - Class Slides

- *Part 2 of 2*

Introduction to Structured Development



Quality and system attributes. Formal system behaviour specification.



The Meaning of Quality (Is there one?)

In general:

“A distinctive attribute or characteristic” ... “the degree of excellence of something as measured against other similar things” – Oxford Online.

“A peculiar and essential character” ... “An intelligible feature by which a thing may be identified” – Merriam Webster Online.

Software quality:

“Conformance to explicitly stated functional and performance requirements, explicitly documented development standards, and implicit characteristics that are expected of all professionally developed software” – Pressman, R.



Software Quality

Software Quality Considerations

- Product (solution) quality is dependent on process quality
- Quality control must be an ongoing process
- Quality is a direct result of good (i.e. correct) management
- Quality depends on the type of system in question
- Quality can be viewed as an internal or external property



Attempting to qualify software

This is not a straightforward issue due to such facts as:

- Very difficult if approached un-scientifically
- Akin to qualifying human thought/reasoning
- Various factors effect it (i.e. must be considered)
- There are multiple facets to a s/w product
- Very easy to qualify “incorrectly”
- There is considerable subjectivity in a s/w product
- A s/w product may be prone to changes




Some Generic Software Aspects

Software quality can be characterised by its:

- The development process
- End-products (with all their representative attributes)
- Interaction with humans (users, developers, process managers, vendors, etc.)
- Relation to the real-world process it is to implement
- Reviews and/or feedback (relating to the product).




Quality cannot be an “add-on”





Quality Must Permeate





The Actual Meaning of Quality

- Quality means different things to different people.
Consider the following:
 - **For the user** (reliable, efficient, user-friendly, etc.)
 - **For the producer** (maintainable, verifiable, portable, etc.)
 - **For the manager** (measureable, visible, controllable, etc.)
 - **For the client** (cost-effective, interoperable, effective, etc)
 - **For the vendor** (value-for-money, relevant, timely, etc)
- The main two categories of s/w qualities are:
 - **External** (qualities observable from “outside” the system)
 - **Internal** (qualities pertaining to internal system aspects)



The Process Makes the Product

- **Process:** “A series of activities undertaken to achieve a stipulated entity”
- **Product:** “An entity resulting from a given process”
- Quality applies to both process and product
- A software product can (typically) consist of:
 - The executable system
 - Installation guides
 - User manuals
 - Application documentation
 - User training plan/requirements
 - System cross-over and data migration strategies
 - Testing justification and logs
 - Etc.



Classification of Software Systems

A general system classification could be as follows:

- Information/Business (Batch-Processing)
- On-line
- Real-time
- Embedded
- Distributed

Quality for each of the above can have a different meaning.



Some Software Process & Product Quality Attributes

- Correctness (int/prd)
- Security (ext/prd)
- Reliability (ext/prd/prc)
- Robustness (ext/prd/prc)
- Efficiency (ext/prd/prc)
- User friendliness (ext/prd)
- Verifiability (int/prd)
- Maintainability (int/prd/prc)
- Reusability (int/prd)
- Portability (ext/prd)
- Understandability (int/prd)
- Interoperability (ext/prd)
- Productivity (prc)
- Timeliness (prc)
- Visibility (prc)
- Manageability (prc)

“ext”- external quality; “int”- internal quality

“prd”- product quality; “prc”- process quality



Briefly on Each Attribute (1/3)

- **Correctness**

Does the system do the right thing?

- **Security**

Can the system be trusted?

- **Reliability**

Is the system dependable? Is its production consistently acceptable?

- **Robustness**

Does the system have a margin of tolerance? Is its production flexible?

- **Efficiency**

Is the system helpful? Is its production well controlled?

- **User friendliness**

Is the system pleasant and conducive to use?



Briefly on Each Attribute (2/3)

- **Verifiability**

Is the system easy to verify in correctness and in required function?

- **Maintainability**

Is the system easy to alter and/or upgrade? Is its production adaptable?

- **Reusability**

Has the system been built based on past experience/effort?

- **Portability**

Can the system work on other computing platforms/environments?

- **Understandability**

Is the way the system was built and its logic easy to understand?



Briefly on Each Attribute (3/3)

- **Interoperability**

Can the system work well in conjunction with other systems?

- **Productivity**

How stabilised and competitive is the production?

- **Timeliness**

How mature and controlled is the production to ensure timely delivery?

- **Visibility (prc)**

How clearly is the production life-cycle structured?

- **Manageability (prc)**

How well defined are all the stages and meta-products in the life-cycle?



Practical Formal Specification Fundamentals

Formal Specification

Why even bother when building modern commercial software?

Formally describing system data structures and functions paves the way to demonstrating the correctness (or not) of systems, and allows for the possible automation of this process. “Mission-critical” systems generally contain parts that have to be formally specified to achieve or meet obligatory regulatory certification.



General Agenda

- Generic introduction to formal specification
- Formalism in Software Engineering
- Sets and specification calculi
- Algebraic specifications
- Model-based specifications



What is Formal Specification

Generic introduction to formal specification

Using a description vocabulary, syntax and semantics, that have been formally defined, to specify behaviour of systems.

Therefore: The components of such a description **must** be based on mathematical principles!

Examples of such principles include the application of set theory, propositional and predicate calculi, algebraic specification, or their derivatives.



A well-known (cult) film





The “Good”

Generic introduction to formal specification



- Using them forces one to deeply understand the behaviour of a system and its manifestation as a software solution;
- The only approach available to prove correct conformance to functional specification, and consequently correct behaviour;
- System behaviour modelled using formal specifications can be reasoned about using proven mathematical techniques and relationships;
- Can be clear indicators towards defining useful prototypes and testing scenarios;
- Can be used, or considered, as an internal prognostic (peace-of-mind) tool for developers;
- Focus-oriented – problem discovery.



The “Bad”

Generic introduction to formal specification



- Their effective use is not simply an acquired talent, but does imply an affinity to such analytical methods;
- They are labour-intensive and may increase the overall cost of the software development process;
- Many modern software development courses skirt the whole domain of formal specification – so the talent is rare;
- Formal specifications are non-compressive and directly “non-evident”;
- Not applicable to every type of software solution;
- Mainstream software development deals with solutions whose benefit from formal treatment is unclear;
- Not ideal as a vehicle to convey development information to non-technical stakeholders.



The “Ugly”



Generic introduction to formal specification

- Software developers sometimes wrongly consider testing as a full or partial substitute for verification;
- Developers sometimes tend to reason about the correctness of a system through the lens of testing;
- Developers confuse validation with verification.
- It is not difficult to loosely understand formal specification and consequently loosely attribute it to a variety of specification models.
- They do not always scale up easily and evidently.


Always bear in mind...

Validation = Are we building the right solution?

Verification = Are we building the solution right?



Position of Formal methods in SE





Categories of Formal Specification in SE

- **Algebraic**

What can a system do; what can you expect from a system?

- **Model-based**

How does a system move from state to state?

Example: My whiskey collection!

Looking at it Algebraically:

Which operations can I perform on my collection?

Which outcomes can I predict from such operations?

Looking at it from a Model-based perspective:

How does the state of my collection change according to operations applied to it?

How can I determine the various states of my collection?



The Basic Concepts of Formal Specification

- **Set theory**

Reasoning about collections and their logical interactions

e.g. Cars, buses, trucks or motorbikes are all forms of vehicles.

Formally expressed as: $\{car, bus, truck, motorbike\} \subseteq \{vehicles\}$

- **Propositional calculus (Zeroth-order logic)**

Reasoning about statements and what can be inferred from them

e.g. p = A lab is a room; q = AC is off in an empty room; r = AC is off.

Formally expressed as: $p \wedge q \Rightarrow r$

- **Predicate calculus (First-order logic)**

Reasoning about the properties of propositional elements as groups of elements

e.g. “ x ” is a room of type “lab”; “ L ” is a specific empty Lab; “ O ” is an AC that is off;

For all labs that are empty labs, their AC is off.

Formally expressed as: $\forall x(Lx \Rightarrow Ox)$



Sets

- Are collections of elements
- Have elements that can be tangible or intangible entities
- Are represented by standard notation “{ }”
- Are manipulated by standard elementary operations
- Are entities which can interact with each other
- Can be denoted through meaningful or symbolic identifiers

Simple set examples:

Set of colours: {green,blue,yellow}

Set of sports: {tennis,football,skating}

Set of lecturers in this room: {ernest}

Empty set: { } or $\emptyset$



Main Set Operators

If more explanation is required, operator definitions can be found in most formal specification textbooks or Internet sources.

Examples:

Valletta $\in$ {Maltese towns}

Membership

Kiev $\notin$ {Maltese towns}

Membership

$\#\{\text{joe, veronica, mark}\} = 3$

Cardinality

$\{\text{paul, richard, claire, george}\} \subseteq \{\text{Group B}\}$

Inclusion

$\mathcal{P}\{\text{Dynamo, CSKA}\} = \{ \{ \}, \{\text{Dynamo}\}, \{\text{CSKA}\}, \{\text{Dynamo, CSKA}\} \}$

Power Set

$\{\text{ford, toyota, kia}\} \cup \{\text{toyota, audi}\} = \{\text{ford, toyota, kia, audi}\}$

Union

$\{\text{ford, toyota, mercedes}\} \cap \{\text{ford, audi}\} = \{\text{ford}\}$

Intersection

$\{\text{ford, toyota, subaru}\} \setminus \{\text{ford, toyota, kia}\} = \{\text{subaru}\}$

Complement

$\{\text{ford, toyota, subaru}\} \Delta \{\text{ford, toyota, kia}\} = \{\text{subaru, kia}\}$

Sym. Difference

$\{1, 2, 3\} \times \{2, 4\} = \{ \{1, 2\}, \{2, 2\}, \{3, 2\}, \{1, 4\}, \{2, 4\}, \{3, 4\} \}$

Cartesian prod.



Sets using Comprehensive Specification

Comprehensive Specification of resulting sets

- Direct (*as in the previous slide*)
- Resulting from operations on other sets, as follows:

Basically, we wish to state the following to specify a set:

Create a **new set** resulting from using **the original set** whose elements **are from a specific range**, **selecting elements** according to **a specific condition** and **applying to these elements a specific operation**.

In constructor form
 $\{\text{set} : \text{range} \mid \text{condition} \bullet \text{operation}\}$

In general:

$\{\textit{Signature} \mid \textit{Predicate} \bullet \textit{Term}\}$

...or in formal notation: $\{x : X \mid P(x) \bullet E(x)\}$



Set Construction Examples

Alternate even numbers:

$$\{x : \mathbb{N} \mid x \bmod 2 = 0 \cdot 2 * x\} = \{0, 4, 8, 12, 16, 20, \dots\}$$

Tens:

$$\{x : \mathbb{N} \mid x \cdot 10 * x\} = \{0, 10, 20, 30, 40, \dots\}$$

Squares of multiples of 4 (excluding zero):

$$\{x : \mathbb{Z} \mid (x \bmod 4 = 0) \wedge (x > 0) \cdot x * x\} = \{16, 64, 144, 256, \dots\}$$



Some Set-Based Specification Exercises

Write 3 elements from the sets specified by the following comprehensive specifications:

$$\{n : N \mid n > 10 \wedge n < 20 \bullet n\}$$

$$\{11, 12, 13, \dots\}$$

$$\{n : N \mid n^3 > 10 \bullet n\}$$

$$\{3, 4, 5, \dots\}$$

$$\{x, y : N \mid x + y = 100 \bullet (x, y)\}$$

$$\{(0, 100), (1, 99), (2, 98), \dots\}$$

$$\{x, y : N \mid x + y = 5 \bullet x^2 + y^2\}$$

$$\{25, 17, 13, \dots\}$$

Interpret the following:

$$\{m : \text{monitors} \mid \text{MonitorState}(m, \text{on}) \bullet m\}$$

Monitors that are on

$$\{f : \text{SysFiles} \mid f \in \text{DelFiles} \wedge f \in \text{ArcFiles} \bullet f\}$$

Deleted system archive files

Write the comprehensive specification of:

$$\{(10, 100), (11, 121), (12, 144), (13, 169), (14, 196)\} \quad \{x : N \mid x \geq 10 \bullet (x, x^2)\}$$




Propositional Calculus

- Deals with straightforward logical reasoning
- Basically consists of statements which can be true *or* false (*the “Excluded Middle” law*)
- Are mutually exclusive, i.e. never true or false at the same time (*the “Contradiction” law*)
- Is fundamental, i.e. forms the basis of higher-order logic
- Is axiomatic, i.e. not in itself subject to further proof
- In theory, can be used to describe anything that can be represented in the form of statements




Proposition (and non) Examples

- Some birds can fly
- The nation of Malta is in Asia
- Dogs are mammals
- All fish live in water
- All fish live in sea water
- Mary is the only lady in our group



ARE

-
- Sit down.
 - How are you today?
 - Get my tea, please.
 - What is the weather like?



ARE NOT



Representing Propositions

Consider the following propositions that all make the same statement

- 10 is greater than 8
- 8 is less than 10
- $8 < 10$
- $10 > 8$
- There is a positive number such that if we add it to eight the result would be ten.



Propositional Calculus Notation

- Negation (not): $\neg$
- Conjunction (and): $\wedge$
- Disjunction (or): $\vee$
- Material implication (if...then): $\rightarrow$
- Biconditional (if and only if): $\leftrightarrow$

Some symbolic examples:

$$\neg ((P \vee Q) \rightarrow Q) \text{ true}$$

$$\neg ((P \wedge Q) \vee \neg R) \leftrightarrow P \text{ false}$$

$$\neg P \wedge (P \vee (Q \rightarrow P)) \text{ false}$$

$$((P \rightarrow Q) \wedge (R \rightarrow S) \wedge (P \vee R)) \rightarrow (Q \vee S) \text{ true}$$

Taking:

P as true

Q as false

R as false

S as true



Contradictions and Tautologies

- A *contradiction* is a proposition that is always false for all possible values and variables in it.
- A *tautology* is a proposition that is always true for all possible values and variables in it.

Examples:

$$a \wedge \neg a$$

contradiction

$$a \vee \neg a$$

tautology

$$(a \wedge b \wedge c) \Rightarrow (c \Rightarrow a)$$

tautology



De Morgan's Laws (at the heart of transformation)

$$\neg (P \wedge Q) \leftrightarrow \neg P \vee \neg Q$$

$$\neg (P \vee Q) \leftrightarrow \neg P \wedge \neg Q$$

Some other propositional calculus transformation rules regularly used:

- Implication (IF) $(P \rightarrow Q) \wedge (Q \rightarrow R) \rightarrow (P \rightarrow R)$
- Bicondition (IF AND ONLY IF) $(P \rightarrow Q) \wedge (Q \rightarrow P) \rightarrow (P \leftrightarrow Q)$
- Conjunction $(P \wedge Q)$
- Disjunction introduction $P \rightarrow (P \vee Q)$
- Disjunctive syllogism $((P \vee Q) \wedge \neg P) \rightarrow Q$
- Constructive $((P \rightarrow Q) \wedge (R \rightarrow S)) \wedge (P \vee R) \rightarrow (Q \vee S)$
- Absorption $(P \rightarrow Q) \leftrightarrow (P \rightarrow (P \wedge Q))$
- Hypothetical syllogism $((P \rightarrow Q) \wedge (Q \rightarrow R)) \rightarrow (P \rightarrow R)$



Using propositions to describe behaviour

Consider the following text fragment describing an aspect of the behaviour of an intruder alarm system *(adapted from Sommerville, I.)*:

"The system should be considered to be ready for intruders (alert) only when it is armed and in practice alert mode. If the system is in teaching mode and in practice alert mode, then it is considered to be alert. The system should be able to be in teaching mode and in practice alert mode while still being not alert."



Specifying the text using Propositions

Consider the following text:

The system should be considered to be ready for intruders (alert) only when it is armed and in practice alert mode.

$\text{alert} \leftrightarrow \text{armed} \wedge \text{practice}$

If the system is in teaching mode and in practice alert mode, then it is considered to be alert.

$\text{teaching} \wedge \text{practice} \rightarrow \text{alert}$

The system should be able to be in teaching mode and in practice alert mode while still being not alert.

$\text{teaching} \wedge \text{practice} \wedge \neg \text{alert}$

Therefore...



Detecting Contradictions

From the previous analysed specification:

$\text{alert} \leftrightarrow \text{armed} \wedge \text{practice}$

$\text{teaching} \wedge \text{practice} \rightarrow \text{alert}$

$\text{teaching} \wedge \text{practice} \wedge \neg \text{alert}$

The second and third propositions yield a contradiction:

$\text{teaching} \wedge \text{practice} \rightarrow \text{alert}$

$\text{teaching} \wedge \text{practice} \wedge \neg \text{alert}$

$\text{alert} \wedge \neg \text{alert}$...*contradiction!*

Furthermore, the first proposition yields another contradiction:

$\text{teaching} \wedge \text{practice} \wedge \neg(\text{armed} \wedge \text{practice})$ *simplifies to...*

$\text{alert} \wedge \neg \text{armed} \vee \neg \text{practice}$...*contradiction because being alert requires being armed!*



Consider This Statement

"Fido is a dog, dogs like bones, so Fido likes bones".

Propositional analysis of this sentence yields three propositions, namely:

Fido is a dog (propos. 1) ...let's call this "P"

Dogs like bones (propos. 2) ... "Q"

Fido likes bones (propos. 3) ... "R"

Can we derive "R" from "P" and "Q" using purely propositional calculus? – Naturally, no (we can only infer it), as no properties of "P" and "Q" are known, apart from them being true or false.

Therefore...



Introducing the notion of “a predicate”

We resort to predicate calculus.

Formally, predicates can be seen as direct indicators of object properties and relationships. Denoted as $P(x)$, where P denotes the predicate on the term(s) represented by x .

- Examples of *unary* predicates:

$\text{dog}(\text{fido})$	$=\text{true};$	Df	
$\text{dog}(\text{lecturer})$	$=\text{false}.$	Dl	$\dots(?)$

- Examples of *n-ary* predicates:

$\text{owned}(\text{Labrador}, \text{Boxer});$	$O(l, b)$
$\text{father}(\text{John}, \text{Mary});$	$F(j, m)$
$\text{team}(\text{Paul}, \text{Albert}, \text{Vincent}).$	$T(p, a, v)$



Introducing Quantification

(making predicate calculus)

Quantification Places bounds on free variables (i.e. names of objects)

$P(x)$ *Is a unary predicate*

⁽¹⁾ $\exists x \cdot P(x)$ and ⁽²⁾ $\forall x \cdot P(x)$ *Produce propositions*

1. There exists an object 'x' to which the predicate 'P(x)' applies.
2. For all objects 'x', the predicate 'P(x)' applies.

Some examples:

$\exists x:\text{staff_age} \cdot x > 50$ meaning, there is staff who is older than 50;

$\forall x:\text{names} \cdot \text{relatives}(x)$ meaning, the persons by these names are all relatives.



Predicate calculus example

Predicate logic employs variables for specific objects, function and relation symbols, and quantifiers ($\forall, \exists$). So, using our previous “Fido” example:

Fido is a dog	“P”	Df
Dogs like bones	“Q”	Bd
Fido likes bones	“R”	Bf

Denoting “any dog” by “ d ”, “is a dog” by “ D ” and “likes bones” by “ B ”:


$$\forall d \cdot (Df \wedge Bd) \rightarrow Bf \text{ or...}$$

$$\forall d:dog \cdot (Df \wedge Bd) \rightarrow Bf$$



Predicate Calculus in Definitions

- Can be viewed as conditional statements obeying propositional behaviour with specific values.
- **Consider a triangle** - We can say the following...



For any triangle:

1. It will consist of three sides;
2. Any of its sides will be greater than zero length;
3. The sum of the length of any two of its sides will be greater than the length of the remaining side.

Therefore...



Predicate Calculus Example

In predicate calculus form the basic properties of any triangle “T” could be written as follows (using qualification and predicate notation):

$T := \text{if } 1 \wedge 2 \wedge 3,$ or more formally...

$T := \forall a, b, c \in \mathcal{R} \bullet P(a, b, c),$ and more specifically...

taking $P(a, b, c) := ((a > 0) \wedge (b > 0) \wedge (c > 0)) \wedge ((a + b > c) \wedge (b + c > a) \wedge (a + c > b))$

yields...

$T := \forall a, b, c \in \mathcal{R} \bullet ((a > 0) \wedge (b > 0) \wedge (c > 0)) \wedge ((a + b > c) \wedge (b + c > a) \wedge (a + c > b))$



A More Familiar Predicate Form

Consider the predicates:

numerically_bigger_than(x,y)

are_equal(a,b)

Can be written as...

$x > y$

$a = b$



Quantification Examples

$$\exists i : 1..10 \cdot i^2 = 64$$

$$\exists \text{proc} : \text{processors} \cdot \text{ProcessorState}(\text{proc}, \text{active})$$

$$\exists i : \mathbb{N} \cdot i > 10 \quad \text{MonitorTemp} = i$$

$$\exists m : \text{AllocatedMonitors} \cdot \text{MonState}(m, \text{ready})$$

$$\exists i : 1..100; m : \text{AllocatedMonitors} \cdot \text{activity}(m, \text{functioning}) \wedge \\ \text{AmbientTemp} = i$$

$$\exists r : \text{CurrentReactors}; m : \text{AllocatedMonitors} \cdot \\ \text{MonState}(m, \text{functioning}) \wedge \text{connected}(r, m)$$



More Examples *(loosely adopted from Behforooz, A.)*

$$\forall x, y, z \bullet x > y \wedge y > z \rightarrow x > z$$

$$\exists x \ni x > 10 \vee x + y < 100$$

$$\forall x, y \in \mathbb{N} \rightarrow x + y \in \mathbb{N}$$

$$\exists x, y \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\} \ni x + y \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$$

$$\forall x, y \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\} \bullet x > y \rightarrow x - y \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$$

$$\neg(p \wedge q) \leftrightarrow \neg p \vee \neg q$$

$$x > y \leftrightarrow x - y > 0$$

$$x + y > 0 \nrightarrow x > 0 \wedge y > 0$$

There exist x and y from the set $\{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ such that the sum of x and y is also a member of the set $\{1, 2, 3, 4\}$

For all values x and y from the set $\{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, the complement (negation of) two conditions are true:
The numeric value x is greater than y if and only if $x - y > 0$.
If the sum of x and y is positive, it cannot be concluded that both x and y are positive.



Algebraic Specifications

- A specification technique mainly used for abstract data types
- Based on a strong mathematical foundation – namely algebraic relationships and logical equivalence
- Have been in use for relatively long periods of time
- Are universal in their application
- Employ fundamental principles



Building Algebraic Specifications

- Clearly comprehend the system to model
- Determine the operations necessary for the system you have in mind
- Specify the relationship between the system's operations
- Write the specification down according to adopted standard (most are based on the foundational concepts of the Common Algebraic Specification Language – CASL)



Algebraic Specification Schema Structure

Type: <resulting type>

Imports: <what it uses/assumes>

Signatures:

<a list of the abstract types that result from every relevant operation specified within the axiomatic part schema>

Axioms:

<a list of the relevant operations that will be used to prove situations based on logical equivalence>



Algebraic Specification Example

(1/2) (loosely adopted from Sommerville, I - 2009)

A list of elements:

Operations:

<u>Action</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Classification</u>
Create a new list	[Create]	<i>Basic</i>
Add an an element	[Add]	<i>Basic</i>
Get the first list element	[Get]	<i>Inspector</i>
Retain the list except the first element	[Tail]	<i>Extra</i>
Count length of list	[Count]	<i>Inspector</i>



Algebraic Specification Example

(2/2) (loosely adopted from Sommerville, I - 2009)

Type: list

Imports: Z, Boolean

Signatures:

Create() → list

Add(list, elem) → list

Get(list) → elem

Tail(list) → list

Count(list) → Z

Axiom construction:

Basics x ((Extras+B[a]) + (Inspectors+B[a]))

Therefore: $2x((1+0)+(2+0)) = 6$ Axioms

Extras & Inspectors “act” on Basics

Axioms:

1) Count(Create()) = 0;

2) Count(Add(l, e)) = if Count(l) = 0 then 1
else count(l)+1;

3) Get(Create()) = error;

4) Get(Add(l, e)) = if count(l) = 0 then e else
get(l);

5) Tail(Create()) = create();

6) Tail(Add(l, e)) = if count(l) = 0 then create()
else l;



Algebraic Specification Example

(1/2) (loosely adopted from Pressman, R. S.)

A queue of integers:

Operations:

<u>Action</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Classification</u>
Add an item to end of queue	[Add]	<i>Basic</i>
Remove an item from end of queue	[Rem]	<i>Extra</i>
Check if queue empty	[IsEmpty]	<i>Inspector</i>
Read first queue item	[ReadFirst]	<i>Inspector</i>
Read last queue item	[RaadLast]	<i>Inspector</i>
Create a new queue	[Create]	<i>Basic</i>



Algebraic Specification Example

(2/2) (loosely adopted from Pressman, R. S.)

Type: queue

Imports: Z, Boolean

Signatures:

Create() → queue

Add(int, queue) → queue

Rem(int, queue) → queue

ReadFirst(queue) → Z

ReadLast(queue) → Z

IsEmpty(queue) → Boolean

Axiom construction:

Basics x ((Extras+B[a]) + (Inspectors+B[a]))

Therefore: $2 \times ((1+0) + (3+0)) = 8$ Axioms

Extras & Inspectors “act” on Basics

Axioms:

1) IsEmpty(Create()) = TRUE;

2) IsEmpty(Add(z, q)) = FALSE;

3) Rem(Create()) = error;

4) Rem(z, Add(z, q)) = q;

5) ReadFirst(Create()) = error;

6) ReadFirst(Add(z, q)) = if IsEmpty(q) then z
else ReadFirst(q);

7) ReadLast(Create()) = error

8) ReadLast(Add(z, q)) = if IsEmpty(q) then z
else ReadLast(q);



Algebraic Specification Example

(1/2) (dopted from Ghezzi, et al.)

String manipulation:

Operations:

<u>Action</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Classification</u>
Create a new string	[Create]	<i>Basic</i>
Concatenate strings	[Con]	<i>Extra</i>
Add a character	[Add]	<i>Basic</i>
Check string equality	[Equal]	<i>Inspector</i>
Count string length	[Count]	<i>Inspector</i>
Check for zero length	[isEmpty]	<i>Inspector</i>



Algebraic Specification Example

(2/2) (adopted from Ghezzi, et al.)

Type: char, string

Imports: N, Boolean

Signatures:

Create() → string

Con(str1, str2) → string

Add(char, str) → string

Equal(str1, str2) → Boolean

Count(str) → N

IsEmpty(str) → Boolean

Axiom construction:

Basics x ((Extras+B[a]) + (Inspectors+B[a]))

Therefore: $2 \times ((1+0) + (1+2)) = 10$ Axioms

Extras & Inspectors “act” on Basics

Axioms:

1) IsEmpty(Create()) = TRUE;

2) IsEmpty(Add(c, s)) = FALSE;

3) Count(Create()) = 0;

4) Count(Add(c, s)) = if count(s) = 0 then 1 else Count(s)+1;

5) Con(s, Create()) = s;

6) Con(s₁, Add(c, s₂)) = Add(c, con(s₁, s₂));

7) Equal(Create(), Create()) = TRUE;

8) Equal(Create(), Add(c, s)) = FALSE;

9) Equal(Add(c, s₁), Add(c, s₂)) = Equal(s₁, s₂)

10) Equal(Add(c, s), create()) = FALSE;