Lightweight Verification For Computational Science Models

Dominic Orchard

Joint work with colleagues at the University of Cambridge: Mistral Contrastin, Matthew Danish, Andrew Rice









average bug-rate in industry software is 15-50 errors per 1000 lines**

* Z. Merali, Computational science: Error, why scientific programming does not compute, 2010 ** S. McConnell, *Code complete*, O'Reilly Media, Inc., 2004.

How to ensure correctness?

- Testing
 - Unit testing
 - Integration testing
 - Combine with code-coverage checkers
 - Requires significant effort
- Formal verification
 - Bug finding tools (e.g. Clang analyser for C <u>clang-analyzer.llvm.org</u>)
 - Specification-based systems

Specification-based approaches to verification

- User specifies some aspect of the program
- A verification tool checks conformance
- built into a language e.g. type systems
 - Specify the broad range values that should be input and output e.g. integer :: x; character :: y; x = x / y
- additional specification language
 - e.g. ACSL behaviour specs. for C (<u>https://frama-c.com/acsl.html</u>) relationship between input/outputs, ranges of values, and more

Specification-based approaches to verification





- Lightweight specification / verification of numerical Fortran
 - units-of-measure typing
 - stencil specifications (shape of array access)
- Specifications are comments
- Some specifications can be auto-generated for legacy code

Dimensional analysis

("Great Principle of Similitude", Isaac Newton, 1686)

x is a length (dimension)x is in metres (unit of measure)

unit(x * y) = (unit x) * (unit y)unit(x / y) = (unit x) / (unit y)unit(x + y) = unit x = unit yunit(x - y) = unit x = unit yunit $(x^R) = unit(x)^R$



photo from Andrew Kennedy's website http://research.microsoft.com/en-us/um/people/akenn/units/

```
1 program energy
2 real :: mass = 3.00, gravity = 9.91, height = 4.20
3 real :: potential_energy
4 
5 potential_energy = mass * gravity * height
6 end program energy
```

```
Suggest
```

\$ camfort units-suggest energy1.f90
energy1.f90:
 (2:22) mass
 (2:51) height
 (3:11) potential_energy

```
1
    program energy
2
      != unit kg :: mass
3
      != unit m :: height
      real :: mass = 3.00, gravity = 9.91, height = 4.20
4
5
      != unit kg m**2/s**2 :: potential_energy
6
      real :: potential_energy
7
8
      potential_energy = mass * gravity * height
9
    end program energy
```

Check

\$ camfort units-check energy1.f90

energy1.f90: Consistent. 4 variables checked.

```
1
    program energy
2
      != unit kg :: mass
3
      != unit m :: height
      real :: mass = 3.00, gravity = 9.91, height = 4.20
4
5
      != unit kg m**2/s**2 :: potential_energy
      real :: potential_energy
6
7
8
      potential_energy = mass * gravity * height
9
    end program energy
```

```
Synthesise
```

\$ camfort units-synth energy1.f90 energy1.f90

Synthesising units for energy1.f90

```
1
    program energy
2
      != unit kg :: mass
3
      != unit m :: height
4
      != unit m/s**2 :: gravity
5
      real :: mass = 3.00, gravity = 9.91, height = 4.20
      != unit kg m**2/s**2 :: potential_energy
6
7
      real :: potential_energy
8
9
      potential_energy = mass * gravity * height
10
    end program energy
```

Synthesise

\$ camfort units-synth energy1.f90 energy1.f90

Synthesising units for energy1.f90

\$ camfort units-check energy2.f90

```
energy2.f90 : Inconsistent:
 - at 17:38 'kinetic_energy' should be '(kg m**2.0) / s**2.0'
   instead 'kinetic_energy' is '1 kg (m / s)'
      := unit m/s**2 :: gravity
4
5
      real :: mass = 3.00, gravity = 9.91, height = 4.20
      != unit kg m**2/s**2 :: potential_energy
6
7
      real :: potential_energy
8
      real :: kinetic_energy, total_energy
9
10
      != unit 1 :: half 📢
                                             "Unitless" coefficients
11
      != unit m/s :: velocity
12
      real :: half = 0.5, velocity = 4.00
                                            BUG! should be velocity**2
13
14
      potential_energy = mass * gravity * height
15
      kinetic_energy = half * mass * velocity
16
17
      total_energy = potential_energy + kinetic_energy
18
    end program energy
```

Unit aliases

!= unit :: joule = kg m**2 / s**2
!= unit joule :: potential_energy

```
real :: potential_energy
```

Polymorphism

```
real function inch_to_cm(inch)
real, intent(in) :: inch
inch_to_cm = inch * 2.54;
end function inch_to_cm
```

Monomorphic

!= unit in :: inch
!= unit cm :: inch_to_cm

inch_to_cm : in \rightarrow cm

```
integer function absolute(x)
1
      integer, intent(in) :: x
\mathbf{2}
3
      if (x \ge 0) then
4
         absolute = x
\mathbf{5}
      else
6
         absolute = 0 - x
7
      end if
8
    end function absolute
9
       Polymorphic
!= unit 'u :: x
!= unit 'u :: absolute
absolute : \forall u \cdot u \rightarrow u
```

Check

Does it do what I think it does?

Infer What does it do?

Synthesise

Capture what it does for documentation & future-proofing

Suggest

Where should I add a specification to get the most information?

Units-of-measure in other languages

- F# built-in
- **Python** Pint <u>http://pint.readthedocs.io</u>
- C Osprey (not sure if available yet)



















\$ camfort stencils-infer heat.f90
Inferring stencil specifications for heat.f90

heat.f90
(9:6)-(9:43) stencil readOnce, (centered(depth=1, dim=1)) :: v



\$ camfort stencils-synth heat.f90
Synthesising stencil specifications for heat.f90

heat.f90
(9:6)-(9:43) stencil readOnce, (centered(depth=1, dim=1)) :: v

Two potential mistakes

8 do i=2, n-1
9
$$!=$$
 stencil readOnce, centered(dim=1, depth=1) :: v
10 $u(i) = r1*v(i-1) + r2*v(i) + r1*v(i+1) + r1*v(i+1)$
11 end do
Illegal repetition of access pattern

Out of bounds stencil access/ Does not conform with the shape.

More advanced specifications

- There are other primitive regions: pointwise, forward, and backward
- Two operators for composition: +, *
- Specifications acting on multiple dimensions

From a Navier-Stokes fluid simulation

natural & physical sciences



computer science

Let's bridge the chasm!

Future plans

- Test generation from properties
- Dependency specifications

Conclusions

- Correctness is <u>very</u> important
- Testing is good; automated verification better (reduce effort)
- Various tools for different languages
- More interaction needed between CS and sciences to build more effective tools e.g. CamFort

Follow CamFort updates http://github.com/camfort/camfort @camfort_tool

Thank you!



Mistral Contrastin



Matthew Danish



Dominic Orchard



Andrew Rice





https://www.software.ac.uk/