#### Verification of computer systems thanks to state machines

#### Gaëtan Staquet

Theoretical computer science Computer Science Department Science Faculty University of Mons Formal Techniques in Software Engineering Computer Science Department Science Faculty University of Antwerp

May 24, 2023

















### Coffee Machine – Error



### Coffee Machine – Error



How can we detect the fault as soon as possible?

Unit tests?

Needs to implement the tests "manually".

- Needs to implement the tests "manually".
- Risk of forgetting important cases.

- Needs to implement the tests "manually".
- Risk of forgetting important cases.
- Impossible to test everything.

- Needs to implement the tests "manually".
- Risk of forgetting important cases.
- Impossible to test everything.
- $\hookrightarrow$  Does not prove the system is correct.

Unit tests?

- Needs to implement the tests "manually".
- Risk of forgetting important cases.
- Impossible to test everything.
- $\hookrightarrow$  Does not prove the system is correct.

We will rely on formal methods.

Unit tests?

- Needs to implement the tests "manually".
- Risk of forgetting important cases.
- Impossible to test everything.
- $\hookrightarrow$  Does not prove the system is correct.

We will rely on formal methods.

Idea:

- Construct a model  $\mathcal{M}$  of the system.
- $\blacktriangleright$  Verify if  $\mathcal{M}$  satisfies the desired properties, over all possible executions.

Unit tests?

- Needs to implement the tests "manually".
- Risk of forgetting important cases.
- Impossible to test everything.
- $\hookrightarrow$  Does not prove the system is correct.

We will rely on formal methods.

Idea:

- Construct a model  $\mathcal{M}$  of the system.
- $\blacktriangleright$  Verify if  $\mathcal{M}$  satisfies the desired properties, over all possible executions.

Here, we focus on the construction of the model.

#### A model for the coffee machine



#### A model for the coffee machine



An alphabet, noted  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma},$  is a finite and non-empty set of symbols.

#### Example 1

 $\Sigma = \{a, b\}$  is an alphabet.

An alphabet, noted  $\Sigma$ , is a finite and non-empty set of symbols. A word  $w = a_1 a_2 \dots a_n$   $(n \in \mathbb{N})$  over an alphabet  $\Sigma$  is a finite sequence of symbols,  $a_i \in \Sigma$ . The empty word is denoted by  $\varepsilon$ .

#### Example 1

 $\Sigma = \{a, b\}$  is an alphabet. w = ababb is a word over  $\Sigma$ .

An alphabet, noted  $\Sigma$ , is a finite and non-empty set of symbols. A word  $w = a_1 a_2 \dots a_n$   $(n \in \mathbb{N})$  over an alphabet  $\Sigma$  is a finite sequence of symbols,  $a_i \in \Sigma$ . The empty word is denoted by  $\varepsilon$ . A language L over an alphabet  $\Sigma$  is a set of words.

#### Example 1

$$\begin{split} \Sigma &= \{a,b\} \text{ is an alphabet.} \\ w &= ababb \text{ is a word over } \Sigma. \\ L' &= \{\varepsilon,a,b\} \text{ and } L = \{w \mid w \text{ has an even number of } a \text{ and an odd number of } b\} \text{ are two languages over } \Sigma. \end{split}$$

# A deterministic finite automaton (DFA) is a tuple $\mathcal{A}=(Q,\Sigma,\delta,q_0,F)$ where

 $\blacktriangleright$   $\Sigma$  an alphabet;

# A deterministic finite automaton (DFA) is a tuple $\mathcal{A}=(Q,\Sigma,\delta,q_0,F)$ where

- $\blacktriangleright$   $\Sigma$  an alphabet;
- Q a finite set of states;



A deterministic finite automaton (DFA) is a tuple  $\mathcal{A}=(Q,\Sigma,\delta,q_0,F)$  where

- $\blacktriangleright$   $\Sigma$  an alphabet;
- Q a finite set of states;
- $\blacktriangleright \ \delta: (Q \times \Sigma) \to Q \text{ a transition function};$



# A deterministic finite automaton (DFA) is a tuple $\mathcal{A}=(Q,\Sigma,\delta,q_0,F)$ where

- $\blacktriangleright$   $\Sigma$  an alphabet;
- ▶ Q a finite set of states;
- $\blacktriangleright \ \delta: (Q \times \Sigma) \to Q \text{ a transition function};$
- ▶  $q_0 \in Q$  the initial state;



# A deterministic finite automaton (DFA) is a tuple $\mathcal{A}=(Q,\Sigma,\delta,q_0,F)$ where

- $\blacktriangleright$   $\Sigma$  an alphabet;
- ▶ Q a finite set of states;
- $\blacktriangleright \ \delta: (Q \times \Sigma) \to Q \text{ a transition function};$
- ▶  $q_0 \in Q$  the initial state;
- ▶  $F \subseteq Q$  the set of final states.



Let  $w = a_1 a_2 \dots, a_n \in \Sigma^*$ . The run of  $\mathcal{A}$  over w is the sequence of states

$$p_1 \xrightarrow{a_1} p_2 \xrightarrow{a_2} p_3 \xrightarrow{a_3} \dots \xrightarrow{a_n} p_{n+1}$$

such that  $p_1 = q_0$  and  $\forall i, \delta(p_i, a_i) = p_{i+1}$ .

#### Example 2

Let w = ababb. The corresponding run is

$$q_0 \xrightarrow{a} q_1 \xrightarrow{b} q_3 \xrightarrow{a} q_2 \xrightarrow{b} q_0 \xrightarrow{b} q_2.$$



Figure 1: A DFA  $\mathcal{A}$ .

Let  $w = a_1 a_2 \dots, a_n \in \Sigma^*$ . The run of  $\mathcal{A}$  over w is the sequence of states

$$p_1 \xrightarrow{a_1} p_2 \xrightarrow{a_2} p_3 \xrightarrow{a_3} \dots \xrightarrow{a_n} p_{n+1}$$

such that  $p_1 = q_0$  and  $\forall i, \delta(p_i, a_i) = p_{i+1}$ . If  $p_{n+1} \in F$ , then w is accepted by  $\mathcal{A}$ .

#### Example 2

Let w = ababb. The corresponding run is

$$q_0 \xrightarrow{a} q_1 \xrightarrow{b} q_3 \xrightarrow{a} q_2 \xrightarrow{b} q_0 \xrightarrow{b} q_2,$$

and w is accepted by  $\mathcal{A}$ .



Figure 1: A DFA  $\mathcal{A}$ .

The language of  ${\mathcal A}$  is the set of all accepted words, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A}) = \{ w \mid \exists p \in F, q_0 \xrightarrow{w} p \}.$$

Example 3

The language of  ${\cal A}$  is

$$\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A}) = \{w \mid w \text{ has an even number of } a \text{ and} \\ an odd number of } b\}.$$



Figure 1: A DFA  $\mathcal{A}$ .

Let  $L = \{w \mid w \text{ has an even number of } a \text{ and an odd number of } b\}.$ 

Let  $u \in \Sigma^*$ . For all  $w \in \Sigma^*$ , we check whether  $uw \in L$ . We construct a table where the rows are the u and the columns the w.

Let  $L = \{w \mid w \text{ has an even number of } a \text{ and an odd number of } b\}.$ 

	ε	a	b	aa	ab	ba	bb	
ε	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	
a	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	
b	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	
aa	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	
ab	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	
ba	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	
÷	÷	÷	÷	÷	÷	÷	÷	·

Let  $L = \{w \mid w \text{ has an even number of } a \text{ and an odd number of } b\}.$ 



The table contains in fact four different rows.

Let  $L = \{w \mid w \text{ has an even number of } a \text{ and an odd number of } b\}.$ 





The table contains in fact four different rows.

Let  $L = \{w \mid w \text{ has an even number of } a \text{ and an odd number of } b\}.$ 





The table contains in fact four different rows.  $\hookrightarrow$  A finite table is enough.



Figure 2: Angluin's framework.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Angluin, "Learning Regular Sets from Queries and Counterexamples", 1987.

G. Staquet

Constructing a model



Figure 2: Angluin's framework.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Angluin, "Learning Regular Sets from Queries and Counterexamples", 1987.

G. Staquet

Constructing a model



Figure 2: Angluin's framework.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Angluin, "Learning Regular Sets from Queries and Counterexamples", 1987.

• Membership queries: execute the system on w and provide the answer.

- Membership queries: execute the system on w and provide the answer.
- Equivalence queries:
  - If we can manipulate the system as a black box, then we can approximate the equivalence queries.

- Membership queries: execute the system on w and provide the answer.
- Equivalence queries:
  - If we can manipulate the system as a black box, then we can approximate the equivalence queries.
  - If we know how the system behaves (white box), then the equivalence queries can be more precise.

- Membership queries: execute the system on w and provide the answer.
- Equivalence queries:
  - If we can manipulate the system as a black box, then we can approximate the equivalence queries.
  - If we know how the system behaves (white box), then the equivalence queries can be more precise.
  - ▶ We can mix both approaches (grey box).

- Membership queries: execute the system on w and provide the answer.
- Equivalence queries:
  - If we can manipulate the system as a black box, then we can approximate the equivalence queries.
  - If we know how the system behaves (white box), then the equivalence queries can be more precise.
  - We can mix both approaches (grey box).
- $\hookrightarrow$  It depends on the exact problem.

```
{
   "title": "Verification by state machines",
   "place": {
      "town": "Mons",
      "country": "Belgium"
   },
   "date": [24, 05, 2023]
}
```

```
{
   "title": "Verification by state machines",
   "place": {
      "town": "Mons",
      "country": "Belgium"
   },
   "date": [24, 05, 2023]
}
We want to verify that the document satisfies some constraints.
```

```
{
  "title": "Verification by state machines",
  "place": {
    "town": "Mons",
    "country": "Belgium"
  },
  "date": [24, 05, 2023]
}
  "title" → string of characters
  "place" → object such that
    "town" → string of characters
    "country" → string of characters
    "date" → array of integers
```

We want to verify that the document satisfies some constraints.

```
{
  "title": "Verification by state machines",
  "place": {
    "town": "Mons",
    "country": "Belgium"
  },
    "date": [24, 05, 2023]
}
  "title" → string of characters
  "place" → object such that
    "town" → string of characters
    "country" → string of characters
    "date" → array of integers
```

We want to verify that the document satisfies some constraints.

$$\rightarrow \begin{array}{c} q_0 \\ \hline q_1 \\ \hline \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \text{"town": str} \\ \hline q_2 \\ \hline \end{array} \begin{array}{c} q_3 \\ \hline \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \text{"country": str} \\ \hline q_4 \\ \hline \end{array} \begin{array}{c} q_5 \\ \hline \end{array} \end{array}$$

Figure 3: An automaton for the value of "place".

```
{
  "title": "Verification by state machines",
  "place": {
  "town": "Mons",
  "country": "Belgium"
  },
  "date": [24, 05, 2023]
}
  "title" → string of characters
  "town" → string of characters
  "date" → array of integers
```

An object is a non-ordered collection of key-value paires.

```
{
  "title": "Verification by state machines",
  "place": {
    "town": "Mons",
    "country": "Belgium"
    },
    "date": [24, 05, 2023]
}
  "title" → string of characters
    "town" → string of characters
    "date" → array of integers
```

- An object is a non-ordered collection of key-value paires.
- An array is an ordered collection of values.

```
{
  "title": "Verification by state machines",
  "place": {
    "town": "Mons",
    "country": "Belgium"
    },
    "date": [24, 05, 2023]
}
  "title" → string of characters
    "place" → object such that
    "town" → string of characters
    "country" → string of characters
    "date" → array of integers
```

- An object is a non-ordered collection of key-value paires.
- An array is an ordered collection of values.

Our approach<sup>a</sup>:

```
{
  "title": "Verification by state machines",
  "place": {
    "town": "Mons",
    "country": "Belgium"
    },
    "date": [24, 05, 2023]
}
  "title" → string of characters
    "place" → object such that
    "town" → string of characters
    "country" → string of characters
    "date" → array of integers
```

- An object is a non-ordered collection of key-value paires.
- An array is an ordered collection of values.

Our approach<sup>a</sup>:

 $\blacktriangleright$  We learn an automaton  ${\cal A}$  with a fixed order on the keys.

```
{
  "title": "Verification by state machines",
  "place": {
    "town": "Mons",
    "country": "Belgium"
    },
    "date": [24, 05, 2023]
}
  "title" → string of characters
    "place" → object such that
    "town" → string of characters
    "country" → string of characters
    "date" → array of integers
```

- An object is a non-ordered collection of key-value paires.
- An array is an ordered collection of values.

Our approach<sup>a</sup>:

- We learn an automaton  $\mathcal{A}$  with a fixed order on the keys.
- We abstract  $\mathcal{A}$  to allow any order.



Figure 4: Experimental results for our JSON documents validation algorithm. Blue crosses give the values for our algorithm, and the red circles for the "classical" algorithm.

# Thank you!

- Angluin, Dana. "Learning Regular Sets from Queries and Counterexamples". In: Inf. Comput. 75.2 (1987), pp. 87–106. DOI: 10.1016/0890-5401(87)90052-6. URL: https://doi.org/10.1016/0890-5401(87)90052-6.
- Bruyère, Véronique, Guillermo A. Pérez, and Gaëtan Staquet. "Validating Streaming JSON Documents with Learned VPAs". In: *Tools and Algorithms for the Construction and Analysis of Systems*. Ed. by Sriram Sankaranarayanan and Natasha Sharygina. Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland, 2023, pp. 271–289. ISBN: 978-3-031-30823-9.