The Floyd-Warshall Algorithm for Shortest Paths

Simon Wimmer and Peter Lammich

May 23, 2025

Abstract

The Floyd-Warshall algorithm [Flo62, Roy59, War62] is a classic dynamic programming algorithm to compute the length of all shortest paths between any two vertices in a graph (i.e. to solve the all-pairs shortest path problem, or *APSP* for short). Given a representation of the graph as a matrix of weights M, it computes another matrix M' which represents a graph with the same path lengths and contains the length of the shortest path between any two vertices i and j. This is only possible if the graph does not contain any negative cycles. However, in this case the Floyd-Warshall algorithm will detect the situation by calculating a negative diagonal entry. This entry includes a formalization of the algorithm and of these key properties. The algorithm is refined to an efficient imperative version using the Imperative Refinement Framework.

Contents

| 1 | Floy | d-Warshall Algorithm for the All-Pairs Shortest Paths | |
|---|------|--|----------|
| | Pro | blem | 2 |
| | 1.1 | Introduction | 2 |
| | 1.2 | Preliminaries | 3 |
| | 1.3 | Definition of the Algorithm | 6 |
| | 1.4 | Result Under The Absence of Negative Cycles | 9 |
| | 1.5 | Definition of Shortest Paths | 12 |
| | 1.6 | Intermezzo: Equivalent Characterizations of Cycle-Freeness . | 15 |
| | 1.7 | Result Under the Presence of Negative Cycles | 17 |
| | 1.8 | More on Canonical Matrices | 18 |
| | 1.9 | Additional Theorems | 19 |
| | 1.10 | Refinement to Efficient Imperative Code | 23 |

theory Floyd-Warshall imports Main begin

1 Floyd-Warshall Algorithm for the All-Pairs Shortest Paths Problem

1.1 Introduction

The Floyd-Warshall algorithm [Flo62, Roy59, War62] is a classic dynamic programming algorithm to compute the length of all shortest paths between any two vertices in a graph (i.e. to solve the all-pairs shortest path problem, or *APSP* for short). Given a representation of the graph as a matrix of weights M, it computes another matrix M' which represents a graph with the same path lengths and contains the length of the shortest path between any two vertices i and j. This is only possible if the graph does not contain any negative cycles (then the length of the shortest path is $-\infty$). However, in this case the Floyd-Warshall algorithm will detect the situation by calculating a negative diagonal entry corresponding to the negative cycle. In the following, we present a formalization of the algorithm and of the aforementioned key properties.

Abstractly, the algorithm corresponds to the following imperative pseudo-code:

for k = 1 .. n do
for i = 1 .. n do
for j = 1 .. n do
 m[i, j] := min(m[i, j], m[i, k] + m[k, j])

However, we will carry out the whole formalization on a recursive version of the algorithm, and refine it to an efficient imperative version corresponding to the above pseudo-code in the end. The main observation underlying the algorithm is that the shortest path from i to j which only uses intermediate vertices from the set $\{0 \dots k+1\}$, is: either the shortest path from i to j using intermediate vertices from the set $\{0 \dots k+1\}$, is: either the shortest path from i to j using intermediate vertices from the set $\{0 \dots k\}$; or a combination of the shortest path from i to k and the shortest path from k to j, each of them only using intermediate vertices from $\{0 \dots k\}$. Our presentation we be slightly more general than the typical textbook version, in that we will factor our the inner two loops as a separate algorithm and show that it has similar properties as the full algorithm for a single intermediate vertex k.

1.2 Preliminaries

1.2.1 Cycles in Lists

abbreviation *cnt* $x xs \equiv length$ (filter ($\lambda y. x = y$) xs)

fun remove-cycles :: 'a list \Rightarrow 'a \Rightarrow 'a list \Rightarrow 'a list where remove-cycles [] - acc = rev acc | remove-cycles (x#xs) y acc = (if x = y then remove-cycles xs y [x] else remove-cycles xs y (x#acc))

lemma cnt-rev: cnt x (rev xs) = cnt x xs $\langle proof \rangle$

value as @[x] @ bs @[x] @ cs @[x] @ ds

lemma remove-cycles-removes: cnt x (remove-cycles xs x ys) $\leq \max 1$ (cnt x ys) $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma remove-cycles-id: $x \notin set xs \implies remove-cycles xs x ys = rev ys @ xs$ $<math>\langle proof \rangle$

lemma remove-cycles-cnt-id:

 $x \neq y \Longrightarrow cnt \ y \ (remove-cycles \ xs \ x \ ys) \le cnt \ y \ ys + cnt \ y \ xs \ \langle proof \rangle$

lemma remove-cycles-ends-cycle: remove-cycles $xs \ x \ ys \neq rev \ ys @ xs \implies x \in set \ xs \ \langle proof \rangle$

lemma remove-cycles-begins-with: $x \in set xs \Longrightarrow \exists zs.$ remove-cycles xs x $ys = x \# zs \land x \notin set zs$ $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma remove-cycles-self:

 $x \in set \ xs \implies remove-cycles \ (remove-cycles \ xs \ x \ ys) \ x \ zs = remove-cycles \ xs \ x \ ys \ \langle proof \rangle$

lemma remove-cycles-one: remove-cycles (as @ x # xs) x ys = remove-cycles (x#xs) x ys (x#xs) x ys

lemma *remove-cycles-cycles*:

 $\exists xxs as. as @ concat (map (\lambda xs. x \# xs) xxs) @ remove-cycles xs x ys \\ = xs \land x \notin set as \\ \mathbf{if} x \in set xs \\ \langle proof \rangle \end{cases}$

fun start-remove :: 'a list \Rightarrow 'a \Rightarrow 'a list \Rightarrow 'a list where start-remove [] - acc = rev acc | start-remove (x#xs) y acc = (if x = y then rev acc @ remove-cycles xs y [y] else start-remove xs y (x # acc))

lemma *start-remove-decomp*:

 $x \in set \ xs \Longrightarrow \exists \ as \ bs. \ xs = as @ x \ \# \ bs \land start\text{-remove} \ xs \ x \ ys = rev \ ys @ as @ remove-cycles \ bs \ x \ [x] \langle proof \rangle$

lemma start-remove-removes: $cnt x (start-remove xs x ys) \leq Suc (cnt x ys)$ $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma start-remove-id[simp]: $x \notin set xs \implies start-remove xs x ys = rev ys$ @ xs $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *start-remove-cnt-id*:

 $x \neq y \Longrightarrow cnt \ y \ (start-remove \ xs \ x \ ys) \le cnt \ y \ ys + cnt \ y \ xs \ \langle proof \rangle$

fun remove-all-cycles :: 'a list \Rightarrow 'a list \Rightarrow 'a list where remove-all-cycles [] xs = xs | remove-all-cycles (x # xs) ys = remove-all-cycles xs (start-remove ys x [])

lemma cnt-remove-all-mono:cnt y (remove-all-cycles xs ys) $\leq max \ 1$ (cnt y ys)

 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma cnt-remove-all-cycles: $x \in set xs \Longrightarrow cnt x$ (remove-all-cycles xs ys) ≤ 1 $\langle proof \rangle$ **lemma** cnt-mono: cnt a $(b \# xs) \leq cnt a (b \# c \# xs)$ $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma cnt-distinct-intro: $\forall x \in set xs. cnt x xs \leq 1 \implies distinct xs \langle proof \rangle$

lemma remove-cycles-subs: set (remove-cycles $xs \ x \ ys$) \subseteq set $xs \cup$ set $ys \langle proof \rangle$

lemma start-remove-subs: set (start-remove xs x ys) \subseteq set xs \cup set ys $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma remove-all-cycles-subs: set (remove-all-cycles $xs \ ys$) \subseteq set $ys \langle proof \rangle$

lemma remove-all-cycles-distinct: set $ys \subseteq set xs \Longrightarrow distinct$ (remove-all-cycles $xs \ ys$) $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma distinct-remove-cycles-inv: distinct (xs @ ys) \Longrightarrow distinct (remove-cycles xs x ys) (proof)

definition

remove-all $x xs = (if x \in set xs then tl (remove-cycles xs x []) else xs)$

definition

remove-all-rev $x xs = (if x \in set xs then rev (tl (remove-cycles (rev xs) x [])) else xs)$

lemma remove-all-distinct: distinct $xs \implies$ distinct (x # remove-all x xs) $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma remove-all-removes: $x \notin set (remove-all \ x \ xs)$ $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma remove-all-subs: set (remove-all x xs) \subseteq set xs $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma remove-all-rev-distinct: distinct $xs \implies$ distinct (x # remove-all-rev x xs) $<math>\langle proof \rangle$

lemma remove-all-rev-removes: $x \notin set$ (remove-all-rev x xs) $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma remove-all-rev-subs: set (remove-all-rev x xs) \subseteq set xs $\langle proof \rangle$

abbreviation rem-cycles $i j xs \equiv remove-all i$ (remove-all-rev j (remove-all-cycles xs xs))

lemma rem-cycles-distinct': $i \neq j \Longrightarrow$ distinct $(i \# j \# rem-cycles i j xs) \langle proof \rangle$

lemma rem-cycles-removes-last: $j \notin set (rem-cycles \ i \ j \ xs) \langle proof \rangle$

lemma rem-cycles-distinct: distinct (rem-cycles i j xs) $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma rem-cycles-subs: set (rem-cycles i j xs) \subseteq set $xs \langle proof \rangle$

1.3 Definition of the Algorithm

1.3.1 Definitions

In our formalization of the Floyd-Warshall algorithm, edge weights are from a linearly ordered abelian monoid.

 ${\bf class}\ linordered-ab-monoid-add = linorder + \ ordered-comm-monoid-add \\ {\bf begin}$

subclass linordered-ab-semigroup-add $\langle proof \rangle$

 \mathbf{end}

subclass (in *linordered-ab-group-add*) *linordered-ab-monoid-add* $\langle proof \rangle$

context linordered-ab-monoid-add

begin

type-synonym 'c mat = nat \Rightarrow nat \Rightarrow 'c

definition $upd :: 'c \ mat \Rightarrow nat \Rightarrow nat \Rightarrow 'c \Rightarrow 'c \ mat$ where

upd m x y v = m (x := (m x) (y := v))

definition fw-upd :: 'a mat \Rightarrow nat \Rightarrow nat \Rightarrow nat \Rightarrow 'a mat where fw-upd m k i j \equiv upd m i j (min (m i j) (m i k + m k j))

Recursive version of the two inner loops.

Recursive version of the full algorithm.

fun $fw :: 'a \ mat \Rightarrow nat \Rightarrow nat \Rightarrow 'a \ mat$ **where** $fw \ m \ n \ 0 \qquad = fwi \ m \ n \ 0 \ n \ n \mid$ $fw \ m \ n \ (Suc \ k) = fwi \ (fw \ m \ n \ k) \ n \ (Suc \ k) \ n \ n$

1.3.2 Elementary Properties

lemma fw-upd-mono: fw-upd m k i j i' j' \leq m i' j' $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma fw-upd-out-of-bounds1: assumes i' > ishows (fw-upd M k i j) i' j' = M i' j' $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma fw-upd-out-of-bounds2: assumes j' > jshows (fw-upd M k i j) i' j' = M i' j' $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma fwi-out-of-bounds1: assumes $i' > n \ i \le n$ shows (fwi M n k i j) $i' \ j' = M \ i' \ j'$ $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *fw-out-of-bounds1*:

assumes i' > nshows $(fw \ M \ n \ k) \ i' \ j' = M \ i' \ j' \ \langle proof \rangle$

lemma fwi-out-of-bounds2: assumes $j' > n \ j \le n$ shows (fwi M n k i j) $i' \ j' = M \ i' \ j'$ $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma fw-out-of-bounds2: assumes j' > nshows (fw M n k) i' j' = M i' j' $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma fwi-invariant-aux-1: $j'' \leq j \Longrightarrow$ fwi m n k i j i' j' \leq fwi m n k i j'' i' j' $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma fwi-invariant: $j \le n \implies i'' \le i \implies j'' \le j$ $\implies fwi \ m \ n \ k \ i \ j \ i' \ j' \le fwi \ m \ n \ k \ i'' \ j'' \ i' \ j''$ $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma single-row-inv: $j' < j \Longrightarrow fwi \ m \ n \ k \ i' \ j \ i' \ j' = fwi \ m \ n \ k \ i' \ j' \ i' \ j'$ $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma single-iteration-inv': $i' < i \Longrightarrow j' \le n \Longrightarrow fwi \ m \ n \ k \ i \ j \ i' \ j' = fwi \ m \ n \ k \ i' \ j' \ i' \ j' \ \langle proof \rangle$

lemma single-iteration-inv: $i' \leq i \Longrightarrow j' \leq j \Longrightarrow j \leq n \Longrightarrow fwi \ m \ n \ k \ i \ j \ i' \ j' = fwi \ m \ n \ k \ i' \ j' \ i' \ j' \ \langle proof \rangle$

lemma fwi-innermost-id: $i' < i \Longrightarrow fwi \ m \ n \ k \ i' \ j' \ i \ j = m \ i \ j \ \langle proof \rangle$

lemma fwi-middle-id: $j' < j \implies i' \le i \implies fwi \ m \ n \ k \ i' \ j' \ i \ j = m \ i \ j$ $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *fwi-outermost-mono*:

 $i \leq n \Longrightarrow j \leq n \Longrightarrow fwi \ m \ n \ k \ i \ j \ i \ j \leq m \ i \ j \ \langle proof \rangle$

lemma fwi-mono: fwi m n k i' j' i $j \le m$ i j **if** $i \le n$ $j \le n$ $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma Suc-innermost-mono: $i \leq n \Longrightarrow j \leq n \Longrightarrow fw \ m \ n \ (Suc \ k) \ i \ j \leq fw \ m \ n \ k \ i \ j \ (proof)$

lemma *fw-mono*:

 $i \leq n \Longrightarrow j \leq n \Longrightarrow fw \ m \ n \ k \ i \ j \leq m \ i \ j \ \langle proof \rangle$

Justifies the use of destructive updates in the case that there is no negative cycle for k.

lemma fwi-step: $m \ k \ k \ge 0 \implies i \le n \implies j \le n \implies k \le n \implies fwi \ m \ n \ k \ i \ j \ i \ j = min$ $(m \ i \ j) \ (m \ i \ k + m \ k \ j)$ $\langle proof \rangle$

1.4 Result Under The Absence of Negative Cycles

If the given input graph does not contain any negative cycles, the Floyd-Warshall algorithm computes the **unique** shortest paths matrix corresponding to the graph. It contains the shortest path between any two nodes $i, j \leq n$.

1.4.1 Length of Paths

fun len :: 'a mat \Rightarrow nat \Rightarrow nat \Rightarrow nat list \Rightarrow 'a where len m u v [] = m u v | len m u v (w#ws) = m u w + len m w v ws

lemma len-decomp: $xs = ys @ y \# zs \Longrightarrow$ len m x z xs = len m x y ys + len m y z zs(proof)

lemma len-comp: len m a c (xs @ b # ys) = len m a b xs + len m b c ys $\langle proof \rangle$

1.4.2 Canonicality

The unique shortest path matrices are in a so-called *canonical form*. We will say that a matrix m is in canonical form for a set of indices I if the following holds:

definition canonical-subs :: nat \Rightarrow nat set \Rightarrow 'a mat \Rightarrow bool where canonical-subs n I m = $(\forall i j k. i \leq n \land k \leq n \land j \in I \longrightarrow m i k \leq m i j + m j k)$

Similarly we express that m does not contain a negative cycle which only uses intermediate vertices from the set I as follows:

abbreviation cyc-free-subs :: nat \Rightarrow nat set \Rightarrow 'a mat \Rightarrow bool where cyc-free-subs n I m $\equiv \forall$ i xs. $i \leq n \land$ set $xs \subseteq I \longrightarrow$ len m i i $xs \geq 0$

To prove the main result under *the absence of negative cycles*, we will proceed as follows:

- we show that an invocation of *fwi m n k n n* extends canonicality to index *k*,
- we show that an invocation of *fw m n n* computes a matrix in canonical form,
- and finally we show that canonical forms specify the lengths of *shortest paths*, provided that there are no negative cycles.

Canonical forms specify lower bounds for the length of any path.

lemma canonical-subs-len:

 $M \ i \ j \le len \ M \ i \ j \ xs \ \mathbf{if} \ canonical-subs \ n \ I \ M \ i \le n \ j \le n \ set \ xs \subseteq I \ I \subseteq \{0..n\} \ \langle proof \rangle$

This lemma justifies the use of destructive updates under the absence of negative cycles.

lemma fwi-step': fwi m n k i' j' i j = min (m i j) (m i k + m k j) if m k k ≥ 0 i' $\leq n$ j' $\leq n$ k $\leq n$ i $\leq i'$ j $\leq j'$ $\langle proof \rangle$

An invocation of *fwi* extends canonical forms.

lemma fwi-canonical-extend:

canonical-subs $n (I \cup \{k\})$ (fwi m n k n n) if canonical-subs n I m $I \subseteq \{0..n\}$ $0 \le m k k k \le n$ $\langle proof \rangle$ An invocation of fwi will not produce a negative diagonal entry if there is no negative cycle.

lemma fwi-cyc-free-diag: fwi m n k n n i $i \ge 0$ **if** cyc-free-subs n I m $0 \le m k k k \le n k \in I i \le n$ $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma cyc-free-subs-diag: $m \ i \ i \ge 0$ if cyc-free-subs $n \ I \ m \ i \le n$ $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma fwi-cyc-free-subs': cyc-free-subs $n \ (I \cup \{k\}) \ (fwi \ m \ n \ k \ n \ n)$ if cyc-free-subs $n \ I \ m \ canonical-subs \ n \ I \ m \ I \subseteq \{0..n\} \ k \le n$ $\forall \ i \le n. \ fwi \ m \ n \ k \ n \ n \ i \ i \ge 0$ $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma fwi-cyc-free-subs: cyc-free-subs $n \ (I \cup \{k\}) \ (fwi \ m \ n \ k \ n \ n)$ if cyc-free-subs $n \ (I \cup \{k\}) \ m$ canonical-subs $n \ I \ m \ I \subseteq \{0..n\} \ k \le n$ $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma canonical-subs-empty [simp]: canonical-subs n {} m $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma fwi-neg-diag-neg-cycle: $\exists i \leq n. \exists xs. set xs \subseteq \{0..k\} \land len m i i xs < 0$ if fwi m n k n n i i
 $0 i \leq n k \leq n$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

fwi preserves the length of paths.

lemma *fwi-len*:

 $\exists ys. set ys \subseteq set xs \cup \{k\} \land len (fwi m n k n n) i j xs = len m i j ys$ if $i \leq n j \leq n k \leq n m k k \geq 0 set xs \subseteq \{0..n\}$ $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *fwi-neg-cycle-neg-cycle*:

 $\exists i \leq n. \exists ys. set ys \subseteq set xs \cup \{k\} \land len m i i ys < 0 \text{ if} len (fwi m n k n n) i i xs < 0 i \leq n k \leq n set xs \subseteq \{0..n\} \langle proof \rangle$

If the Floyd-Warshall algorithm produces a negative diagonal entry, then there is a negative cycle. **lemma** *fw-neg-diag-neg-cycle*:

 $\exists i \leq n. \exists ys. set ys \subseteq set xs \cup \{0..k\} \land len m i i ys < 0 if len (fw m n k) i i xs < 0 i \leq n k \leq n set xs \subseteq \{0..n\} \langle proof \rangle$

Main theorem under the absence of negative cycles.

theorem fw-correct: canonical-subs $n \{0..k\}$ (fw m n k) \land cyc-free-subs $n \{0..k\}$ (fw m n k) **if** cyc-free-subs $n \{0..k\}$ m k $\leq n$ $\langle proof \rangle$

lemmas fw-canonical-subs = fw-correct[THEN conjunct1] **lemmas** fw-cyc-free-subs = fw-correct[THEN conjunct2] **lemmas** cyc-free-diag = cyc-free-subs-diag

1.5 Definition of Shortest Paths

We define the notion of the length of the shortest *simple* path between two vertices, using only intermediate vertices from the set $\{0...k\}$.

definition $D :: 'a \ mat \Rightarrow nat \Rightarrow nat \Rightarrow nat \Rightarrow 'a$ **where** $D \ m \ i \ j \ k \equiv Min \ \{len \ m \ i \ j \ xs. \ set \ xs \subseteq \{0..k\} \land i \notin set \ xs \land j \notin set \ xs \land distinct \ xs\}$

lemma distinct-length-le:finite $s \Longrightarrow set xs \subseteq s \Longrightarrow distinct xs \Longrightarrow length xs \leq card s$ $<math>\langle proof \rangle$

lemma finite-distinct: finite $s \Longrightarrow$ finite $\{xs : set xs \subseteq s \land distinct xs\}$ $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *D*-base-finite: finite {len m i j xs | xs. set $xs \subseteq \{0..k\} \land distinct xs$ } $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *D*-base-finite': finite {len m i j xs | xs. set $xs \subseteq \{0..k\} \land distinct (i \# j \# xs)\}$ $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *D*-base-finite'': finite {len m i j xs |xs. set xs \subseteq {0..k} \land i \notin set xs \land j \notin set xs \land distinct xs} $\langle proof \rangle$

definition cycle-free :: 'a mat \Rightarrow nat \Rightarrow bool where

 $\begin{array}{l} cycle-free \ m \ n \equiv \forall \ i \ xs. \ i \leq n \land set \ xs \subseteq \{0..n\} \longrightarrow \\ (\forall \ j. \ j \leq n \longrightarrow len \ m \ i \ j \ (rem-cycles \ i \ j \ xs) \leq len \ m \ i \ j \ xs) \land len \ m \ i \ i \ xs \geq 0 \end{array}$

lemma *D*-eq*I*:

fixes m n i j k **defines** $A \equiv \{len m i j xs \mid xs. set xs \subseteq \{0..k\}\}$ **defines** A-distinct $\equiv \{len m i j xs \mid xs. set xs \subseteq \{0..k\} \land i \notin set xs \land j \notin set xs \land distinct xs\}$ **assumes** cycle-free $m n i \leq n j \leq n k \leq n (\land y. y \in A$ -distinct $\Longrightarrow x \leq y$) $x \in A$ **shows** $D m i j k = x \langle proof \rangle$

lemma *D*-base-not-empty:

{len m i j xs |xs. set xs \subseteq {0..k} \land i \notin set xs \land j \notin set xs \land distinct xs} \neq {} $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma Min-elem-dest: finite $A \Longrightarrow A \neq \{\} \Longrightarrow x = Min \ A \Longrightarrow x \in A$ $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma D-dest: $x = D m i j k \Longrightarrow$ $x \in \{len m i j xs | xs. set xs \subseteq \{0..Suc k\} \land i \notin set xs \land j \notin set xs \land$ distinct xs $\}$ $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *D*-dest': $x = D \ m \ i \ j \ k \Longrightarrow x \in \{len \ m \ i \ j \ xs \ set \ xs \subseteq \{0..Suc \ k\}\}$ $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *D*-dest'': $x = D m i j k \Longrightarrow x \in \{len m i j xs | xs. set xs \subseteq \{0..k\}\}$ $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma cycle-free-loop-dest: $i \leq n \Longrightarrow$ set $xs \subseteq \{0..n\} \Longrightarrow$ cycle-free $m \ n \Longrightarrow$ len $m \ i \ i \ xs \geq 0$ (proof)

lemma cycle-free-dest:

 $\begin{array}{l} cycle-free \ m \ n \Longrightarrow i \leq n \Longrightarrow j \leq n \Longrightarrow set \ xs \subseteq \{0..n\} \\ \Longrightarrow \ len \ m \ i \ j \ (rem-cycles \ i \ j \ xs) \leq len \ m \ i \ j \ xs \\ \langle proof \rangle \end{array}$

definition cycle-free-up-to :: 'a mat \Rightarrow nat \Rightarrow nat \Rightarrow bool where cycle-free-up-to m k n $\equiv \forall$ i xs. $i \leq n \land set xs \subseteq \{0..k\} \longrightarrow$ $(\forall \ j. \ j \le n \longrightarrow len \ m \ i \ j \ (rem-cycles \ i \ j \ xs) \le len \ m \ i \ j \ xs) \land len \ m \ i \ i \ xs \ge 0$

lemma cycle-free-up-to-loop-dest:

 $i \leq n \Longrightarrow set \ xs \subseteq \{0..k\} \Longrightarrow cycle-free-up-to \ m \ k \ n \Longrightarrow len \ m \ i \ ixs \geq 0 \ \langle proof \rangle$

lemma cycle-free-up-to-diag: **assumes** cycle-free-up-to $m \ k \ n \ i \le n$ **shows** $m \ i \ i \ge 0$ $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma D-eqI2: **fixes** m n i j k **defines** $A \equiv \{len m i j xs \mid xs. set xs \subseteq \{0..k\}\}$ **defines** A-distinct $\equiv \{len m i j xs \mid xs. set xs \subseteq \{0..k\} \land i \notin set xs \land j$ $\notin set xs \land distinct xs\}$ **assumes** cycle-free-up-to $m k n i \leq n j \leq n k \leq n$ $(\bigwedge y. \ y \in A$ -distinct $\Longrightarrow x \leq y) x \in A$ **shows** $D m i j k = x \langle proof \rangle$

1.5.1 Connecting the Algorithm to the Notion of Shortest Paths

Under the absence of negative cycles, the Floyd-Warshall algorithm correctly computes the length of the shortest path between any pair of vertices i, j.

lemma canonical-D:

assumes cycle-free-up-to $m \ k \ n \ canonical-subs \ n \ \{0..k\} \ m \ i \le n \ j \le n \ k \le n$ shows $D \ m \ i \ j \ k = m \ i \ j$ $\langle proof \rangle$

theorem *fw-subs-len*:

(fw m n k) i j \leq len m i j xs if cyc-free-subs n $\{0..k\}$ m k \leq n i \leq n j \leq n set xs \subseteq I I \subseteq $\{0..k\}$ $\langle proof \rangle$

This shows that the value calculated by fwi for a pair i, j always corresponds to the length of an actual path between i and j.

lemma fwi-len': $\exists xs. set xs \subseteq \{k\} \land fwi m n k i' j' i j = len m i j xs if$ $m k k \ge 0 i' \le n j' \le n k \le n i \le i' j \le j'$ $\langle proof \rangle$ The same result for fw.

lemma fw-len: $\exists xs. set xs \subseteq \{0..k\} \land fw m n k i j = len m i j xs if$ cyc-free-subs $n \{0..k\} m i \le n j \le n k \le n$ $\langle proof \rangle$

1.6 Intermezzo: Equivalent Characterizations of Cycle-Freeness

1.6.1 Shortening Negative Cycles

```
lemma remove-cycles-neg-cycles-aux:

fixes i xs ys

defines xs' \equiv i \# ys

assumes i \notin set ys

assumes i \in set xs

assumes xs = as @ concat (map ((#) i) xss) @ xs'

assumes len m i j ys > len m i j xs

shows \exists ys. set ys \subseteq set xs \land len m i i ys < 0 \langle proof \rangle

lemma add-lt-neutral: a + b < b \Longrightarrow a < 0

\langle proof \rangle

lemma remove-cycles-neg-cycles-aux':

fixes j xs ys

assumes j \notin set ys
```

assumes $j \in set ys$ assumes $j \in set xs$ assumes $xs = ys @ j \# concat (map (<math>\lambda xs. xs @ [j]$) xss) @ asassumes len m i j ys > len m i j xsshows $\exists ys. set ys \subseteq set xs \land len m j j ys < 0 \langle proof \rangle$

lemma add-le-impl: $a + b < a + c \Longrightarrow b < c$ (proof)

lemma *start-remove-neg-cycles*:

len m i j (start-remove xs k []) > len m i j xs $\Longrightarrow \exists$ ys. set ys \subseteq set xs \land len m k k ys < 0 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma remove-all-cycles-neg-cycles:

len m i j (remove-all-cycles ys xs) > len m i j xs $\implies \exists ys k. set ys \subseteq set xs \land k \in set xs \land len m k k ys < 0$ $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma concat-map-cons-rev:

rev (concat (map ((#) j) xss)) = concat (map (λ xs. xs @ [j]) (rev (map rev xss))) (proof)

lemma negative-cycle-dest: len m i j (rem-cycles i j xs) > len m i j xs $\implies \exists i' ys. len m i' i' ys < 0 \land set ys \subseteq set xs \land i' \in set (i \# j \# xs)$ $\langle proof \rangle$

1.6.2 Cycle-Freeness

lemma cycle-free-alt-def: cycle-free $M \ n \leftrightarrow$ cycle-free-up-to $M \ n \ n \ \langle proof \rangle$

lemma negative-cycle-dest-diag: \neg cycle-free-up-to $m \ k \ n \Longrightarrow k \le n \Longrightarrow \exists i \ xs. \ i \le n \land set \ xs \subseteq \{0..k\}$ $\land len \ m \ i \ ixs < 0$ $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma negative-cycle-dest-diag':

 $\neg cycle-free \ m \ n \Longrightarrow \exists \ i \ xs. \ i \le n \land set \ xs \subseteq \{0..n\} \land len \ m \ i \ i \ xs < 0 \ \langle proof \rangle$

abbreviation cyc-free :: 'a mat \Rightarrow nat \Rightarrow bool where cyc-free $m \ n \equiv \forall \ i \ xs. \ i \leq n \land set \ xs \subseteq \{0..n\} \longrightarrow len \ m \ i \ i \ xs \geq 0$

lemma cycle-free-diag-intro: cyc-free $m \ n \Longrightarrow$ cycle-free $m \ n \land (proof)$

lemma cycle-free-diag-equiv: cyc-free $m \ n \iff$ cycle-free $m \ n \ (proof)$

lemma cycle-free-diag-dest: cycle-free $m \ n \Longrightarrow$ cyc-free $m \ n \land (proof)$

lemma cycle-free-upto-diag-equiv: cycle-free-up-to $m \ k \ n \leftrightarrow cyc$ -free-subs $n \ \{0..k\} \ m \ \text{if} \ k \le n \ \langle proof \rangle$

theorem fw-shortest-path-up-to: D m i j k = fw m n k i j **if** cyc-free-subs n $\{0..k\}$ m i \leq n j \leq n k \leq n

$\langle proof \rangle$

We do not need to prove this because the definitions match.

lemma

cyc-free $m \ n \longleftrightarrow$ cyc-free-subs $n \ \{0..n\} \ m \ (proof)$

lemma cycle-free-cycle-free-up-to: cycle-free $m \ n \Longrightarrow k \le n \Longrightarrow$ cycle-free-up-to $m \ k \ n \ \langle proof \rangle$

lemma cycle-free-diag: cycle-free $m \ n \Longrightarrow i \le n \Longrightarrow 0 \le m \ i \ i \ \langle proof \rangle$

corollary fw-shortest-path: cyc-free $m \ n \Longrightarrow i \le n \Longrightarrow j \le n \Longrightarrow k \le n \Longrightarrow D \ m \ i \ j \ k = fw \ m \ n \ k \ i \ j \ \langle proof \rangle$

corollary fw-shortest: **assumes** cyc-free $m \ n \ i \le n \ j \le n \ k \le n$ **shows** fw $m \ n \ n \ i \ j \le fw \ m \ n \ n \ i \ k + fw \ m \ n \ n \ k \ j$ $\langle proof \rangle$

1.7 Result Under the Presence of Negative Cycles

Under the presence of negative cycles, the Floyd-Warshall algorithm will detect the situation by computing a negative diagonal entry.

lemma not-cylce-free-dest: \neg cycle-free $m \ n \Longrightarrow \exists k \leq n. \neg$ cycle-free-up-to $m \ k \ n \ \langle proof \rangle$

lemma D-not-diag-le:

 $(x :: 'a) \in \{len \ m \ i \ j \ xs. \ set \ xs \subseteq \{0..k\} \land i \notin set \ xs \land j \notin set \ xs \land distinct \ xs \}$

 $\implies D \ m \ i \ j \ k \le x \ \langle proof \rangle$

lemma *D*-not-diag-le': set $xs \subseteq \{0..k\} \Longrightarrow i \notin set xs \Longrightarrow j \notin set xs \Longrightarrow$ distinct xs $\Longrightarrow D \ m \ i \ j \ k \leq len \ m \ i \ j \ xs \ \langle proof \rangle$

lemma nat-upto-subs-top-removal': $S \subseteq \{0..Suc \ n\} \Longrightarrow Suc \ n \notin S \Longrightarrow S \subseteq \{0..n\}$ $\langle proof \rangle$ **lemma** *nat-upto-subs-top-removal*: $S \subseteq \{0..n::nat\} \implies n \notin S \implies S \subseteq \{0..n-1\}$ $\langle proof \rangle$

Monotonicity with respect to k.

lemma fw-invariant: $k' \leq k \implies i \leq n \implies j \leq n \implies k \leq n \implies fw \ m \ n \ k \ i \ j \leq fw \ m \ n \ k' \ i \ j$ $\langle proof \rangle$

```
lemma negative-len-shortest:
```

 $\begin{array}{l} length \ xs = n \implies len \ m \ i \ i \ xs < 0 \\ \implies \exists \ j \ ys. \ distinct \ (j \ \# \ ys) \land len \ m \ j \ j \ ys < 0 \land j \in set \ (i \ \# \ xs) \land set \\ ys \subseteq set \ xs \\ \langle proof \rangle \end{array}$

lemma *fw-upd-leI*:

 $\begin{array}{l} fw\text{-}upd \ m' \ k \ i \ j \ i \ j \ \leq fw\text{-}upd \ m \ k \ i \ j \ i \ j \ \mathbf{if} \\ m' \ i \ k \ \leq m \ i \ k \ m' \ k \ j \ \leq m \ k \ j \ m' \ i \ j \ \leq m \ i \ j \\ \langle proof \rangle \end{array}$

```
lemma fwi-fw-upd-mono:
```

fwi m n k i j i j \leq fw-upd m k i j i j if k \leq n i \leq n j \leq n $\langle proof \rangle$

The Floyd-Warshall algorithm will always detect negative cycles. The argument goes as follows: In case there is a negative cycle, then we know that there is some smallest k for which there is a negative cycle containing only intermediate vertices from the set $\{0...k\}$. We will show that then *fwi m n k* computes a negative entry on the diagonal, and thus, by monotonicity, *fw m n n* will compute a negative entry on the diagonal.

theorem *FW-neg-cycle-detect*:

 $\neg cyc\text{-free } m \ n \Longrightarrow \exists \ i \leq n. \ fw \ m \ n \ i \ i < 0$ $\langle proof \rangle$

end

1.8 More on Canonical Matrices

abbreviation

canonical M $n\equiv\forall~i\,j\,k.~i\leq n\,\wedge\,j\leq n\,\wedge\,k\leq n\,\longrightarrow\,M\,i\,k\leq M\,i\,j\,+\,M\,j\,k$

lemma canonical-alt-def:

 $\begin{array}{l} canonical \ M \ n \longleftrightarrow canonical \text{-subs } n \ \{0..n\} \ M \\ \langle proof \rangle \end{array}$

lemma fw-canonical: canonical (fw m n n) n **if** cyc-free m n $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma canonical-len: canonical $M \ n \Longrightarrow i \le n \Longrightarrow j \le n \Longrightarrow set \ xs \subseteq \{0..n\} \Longrightarrow M \ i \ j \le len$ $M \ i \ j \ xs$ $\langle proof \rangle$

1.9 Additional Theorems

lemma D-cycle-free-len-dest:

 $\begin{array}{l} cycle-free \ m \ n \\ \implies \forall \ i \leq n. \ \forall \ j \leq n. \ D \ m \ i \ j \ n = m' \ i \ j \Longrightarrow i \leq n \Longrightarrow j \leq n \Longrightarrow set \\ xs \subseteq \{0..n\} \\ \implies \exists \ ys. \ set \ ys \subseteq \{0..n\} \land len \ m' \ i \ j \ xs = len \ m \ i \ j \ ys \\ \langle proof \rangle \end{array}$

lemma *D-cyc-free-preservation*:

cyc-free $m \ n \Longrightarrow \forall i \le n. \forall j \le n. D \ m \ i \ j n = m' \ i \ j \Longrightarrow$ cyc-free $m' \ n \ \langle proof \rangle$

abbreviation $FW m n \equiv fw m n n$

lemma FW-out-of-bounds1: assumes i > nshows (FW M n) i j = M i j $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma FW-out-of-bounds2: assumes j > nshows (FW M n) i j = M i j $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma FW-cyc-free-preservation: cyc-free $m \ n \Longrightarrow cyc$ -free $(FW \ m \ n) \ n$ $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma FW-diag-neutral-preservation: $\forall i \leq n. \ M \ i i = 0 \implies cyc$ -free $M \ n \implies \forall i \leq n. \ (FW \ M \ n) i i = 0$ $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma FW-fixed-preservation: fixes M :: ('a::linordered-ab-monoid-add) mat assumes $A: i \leq n \ M \ 0 \ i + M \ i \ 0 = 0$ canonical (FW M n) n cyc-free (FW M n) n shows FW M n $0 \ i + FW \ M \ n \ i \ 0 = 0$ $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma diag-cyc-free-neutral: cyc-free $M \ n \Longrightarrow \forall k \le n$. $M \ k \ k \le 0 \Longrightarrow \forall i \le n$. $M \ i \ i = 0$ $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma fw-upd-canonical-subs-id: canonical-subs $n \{k\} M \Longrightarrow i \le n \Longrightarrow j \le n \Longrightarrow$ fw-upd $M k i j = M \langle proof \rangle$

lemma fw-upd-canonical-id: canonical $M \ n \Longrightarrow i \le n \Longrightarrow j \le n \Longrightarrow k \le n \Longrightarrow$ fw-upd $M \ k \ i \ j = M$ $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma fwi-canonical-id: fwi M n k i j = M if canonical-subs n {k} M i $\leq n j \leq n k \leq n$ $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma fw-canonical-id: fw M n k = M if canonical-subs $n \{0..k\} M k \le n \langle proof \rangle$

lemmas FW-canonical-id = fw-canonical-id[OF - order.refl, unfolded canon-ical-alt-def[symmetric]]

definition FWI $M n k \equiv fwi M n k n n$

The characteristic property of *fwi*.

theorem fwi-characteristic: canonical-subs $n (I \cup \{k::nat\})$ (FWI M n k) $\lor (\exists i \leq n. FWI M n k i i < 0)$ if canonical-subs $n I M I \subseteq \{0..n\} k \leq n$ $\langle proof \rangle$

 \mathbf{end}

theory Recursion-Combinators imports Refine-Imperative-HOL.IICF begin

context begin

private definition for-comb where

for-comb f a0 n = nfoldli [0..< n + 1] (λx . True) ($\lambda k a$. (f a k)) a0

fun for-rec :: $('a \Rightarrow nat \Rightarrow 'a nres) \Rightarrow 'a \Rightarrow nat \Rightarrow 'a nres where$ for-rec f a 0 = f a 0 | $for-rec f a (Suc n) = for-rec f a n <math>\gg$ ($\lambda x. f x$ (Suc n))

private lemma for-comb-for-rec: for-comb f a n = for-rec f a n $\langle proof \rangle$ definition for-rec2' where for-rec2' f a n i j = (if i = 0 then RETURN a else for-rec ($\lambda a i$. for-rec ($\lambda a . f a i$) a n) a (i - 1)) $\gg (\lambda a. \text{ for-rec } (\lambda a . f a i) a j)$

fun for-rec2 :: ('a \Rightarrow nat \Rightarrow nat \Rightarrow 'a nres) \Rightarrow 'a \Rightarrow nat \Rightarrow nat \Rightarrow nat \Rightarrow 'a nres where for-rec2 f a n 0 0 = f a 0 0 | for-rec2 f a n (Suc i) 0 = for-rec2 f a n i n \gg (λ a. f a (Suc i) 0) | for-rec2 f a n i (Suc j) = for-rec2 f a n i j \gg (λ a. f a i (Suc j))

private lemma for-rec2-for-rec2':

for-rec2 f a n i j = for-rec2' f a n i j $\langle proof \rangle$

fun for-rec3 :: ('a \Rightarrow nat \Rightarrow nat \Rightarrow nat \Rightarrow 'a nres) \Rightarrow 'a \Rightarrow nat \Rightarrow nat \Rightarrow $nat \Rightarrow nat \Rightarrow 'a nres$ where for-rec3 f m n 0= f m 0 0 00 0 for-rec3 f m n (Suc k) 0 0 = for-rec3 f m n k n n \gg (λ a. f a $(Suc \ k) \ 0 \ 0) \mid$ = for-rec3 f m n k i n \gg (λ a. f a k for-rec3 f m n k $(Suc \ i) \ 0$ $(Suc \ i) \ \theta) \mid$ $(Suc \ j) = for - rec3 \ f \ m \ n \ k \ i \ j \gg (\lambda \ a. \ f \ a \ k)$ for-rec3 f m n kii (Suc j)

private definition *for-rec3* ' where

 $for - rec3' f a \ n \ k \ i \ j =$ $(if \ k = 0 \ then \ RETURN \ a \ else \ for - rec \ (\lambda a \ k. \ for - rec2' \ (\lambda \ a. \ f \ a \ k) \ a \ n$ $n \ n) \ a \ (k - 1))$ $> = (\lambda \ a. \ for - rec2' \ (\lambda \ a. \ f \ a \ k) \ a \ n \ i \ j)$

private lemma for-rec3-for-rec3':

for-rec3 f a n k i j = for-rec3' f a n k i j $\langle proof \rangle$ lemma for-rec2'-for-rec: for-rec2' f a n n n = for-rec (λa i. for-rec (λa . f a i) a n) a n $\langle proof \rangle$ lemma for-rec3'-for-rec: for-rec3' f a n n n n = for-rec (λa k. for-rec (λa i. for-rec (λa . f a k i) a n) a n) a n $\langle proof \rangle$

theorem for-rec-eq:

for-rec f a n = nfoldli [0..<n + 1] (λx . True) (λk a. f a k) a (proof)

```
 \begin{array}{l} \textbf{theorem for-rec2-eq:} \\ \textit{for-rec2 f a n n n} = \\ \textit{nfoldli } [0..<\!n+1] \ (\lambda x. \ \textit{True}) \\ (\lambda i. \ \textit{nfoldli } [0..<\!n+1] \ (\lambda x. \ \textit{True}) \ (\lambda j \ a. \ f \ a \ i \ j)) \ a \\ \langle \textit{proof} \rangle \end{array}
```

theorem for-rec3-eq:

```
 \begin{array}{l} \textit{for-rec3 f a n n n n =} \\ \textit{nfoldli [0..<n+1] (\lambda x. True)} \\ (\lambda k. \textit{nfoldli [0..<n+1] (\lambda x. True)} \\ (\lambda i. \textit{nfoldli [0..<n+1] (\lambda x. True) (\lambda j a. f a k i j))} ) \\ a \\ \langle \textit{proof} \rangle \end{array}
```

\mathbf{end}

lemmas [intf-of-assn] = intf-of-assnI[where <math>R = is-mtx n and 'a = 'b i-mtx for n]

declare param-upt[sepref-import-param]

end theory FW-Code imports Recursion-Combinators Floyd-Warshall begin

1.10 Refinement to Efficient Imperative Code

We will now refine the recursive version of the Floyd-Warshall algorithm to an efficient imperative version. To this end, we use the Sepref framework, yielding an implementation in Imperative HOL.

 $\begin{array}{l} \textbf{definition } \textit{fw-upd'} :: ('a::linordered-ab-monoid-add) \ \textit{mtx} \Rightarrow \textit{nat} \Rightarrow \textit{nat$

```
lemma fw-upd'-alt-def:
```

definition $fwi' :: ('a::linordered-ab-monoid-add) mtx \Rightarrow nat \Rightarrow$

 $\begin{aligned} fwi' \ m \ n \ k \ i \ j &= RECT \ (\lambda \ fw \ (m, \ k, \ i, \ j). \\ case \ (i, \ j) \ of \\ (0, \ 0) &\Rightarrow fw \ upd' \ m \ k \ 0 \ 0 \ | \\ (Suc \ i, \ 0) &\Rightarrow do \ \{m' \leftarrow fw \ (m, \ k, \ i, \ n); \ fw \ upd' \ m' \ k \ (Suc \ i) \ 0\} \ | \\ (i, \ Suc \ j) &\Rightarrow do \ \{m' \leftarrow fw \ (m, \ k, \ i, \ j); \ fw \ upd' \ m' \ k \ i \ (Suc \ j)\} \\) \ (m, \ k, \ i, \ j) \end{aligned}$

lemma *fwi'-simps*:

 $\begin{array}{ll} fwi' \ m \ n \ k \ 0 & 0 \\ fwi' \ m \ n \ k \ (Suc \ i) \ 0 & = do \ \{m' \leftarrow fwi' \ m \ n \ k \ i \ n; \ fw-upd' \ m' \ k \ (Suc \ i) \ 0 \} \\ fwi' \ m \ n \ k \ i & (Suc \ j) & = do \ \{m' \leftarrow fwi' \ m \ n \ k \ i \ j; \ fw-upd' \ m' \ k \ i \ (Suc \ j) \} \\ \langle proof \rangle \end{array}$

lemma

 $fwi' m \ n \ k \ i \ j \leq SPEC \ (\lambda \ r. \ r = uncurry \ (fwi \ (curry \ m) \ n \ k \ i \ j)) \ \langle proof \rangle$

lemma *fw-upd'-spec*:

fw-upd' $M \ k \ i \ j \leq SPEC \ (\lambda \ M'. \ M' = uncurry \ (fw$ -upd $(curry \ M) \ k \ i \ j))$ $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma for-rec2-fwi:

for-rec2 (λ M. fw-upd' M k) M n i j \leq SPEC (λ M'. M' = uncurry (fwi (curry M) n k i j)) (proof)

definition fw' :: ('a::linordered-ab-monoid-add) $mtx \Rightarrow nat \Rightarrow nat \Rightarrow 'a$ mtx nres where

 $fw' m n k = nfoldli [0..< k + 1] (\lambda -. True) (\lambda k M. for-rec2 (\lambda M. fw-upd' M k) M n n n) m$

lemma fw'-spec:

 $fw' m n k \leq SPEC \ (\lambda M'. M' = uncurry \ (fw \ (curry m) n k)) \\ \langle proof \rangle$

$\operatorname{context}$

fixes n :: nat
fixes dummy :: 'a::{linordered-ab-monoid-add,zero,heap}
begin

lemma [sepref-import-param]: $((+), (+):: 'a \Rightarrow -) \in Id \to Id \to Id \langle proof \rangle$ **lemma** [sepref-import-param]: $(min, min:: 'a \Rightarrow -) \in Id \to Id \to Id \langle proof \rangle$

abbreviation node- $assn \equiv nat$ -assn**abbreviation** mtx- $assn \equiv asmtx$ -assn (Suc n) id- $assn::('a mtx \Rightarrow -)$

sepref-definition *fw-upd-impl1* is

 $uncurry2 \ (uncurry \ fw-upd') :: \\ [\lambda \ (((-,k),i),j). \ k \le n \land i \le n \land j \le n]_a \ mtx-assn^d \ *_a \ node-assn^k \ *_a \\ node-assn^k \ *_a \ node-assn^k \\ \rightarrow \ mtx-assn \\ \langle proof \rangle$

sepref-definition fw-upd-impl is
uncurry2 (uncurry fw-upd') ::

 $\begin{array}{l} [\lambda \ (((\cdot,k),i),j). \ k \leq n \ \land \ i \leq n \ \land \ j \leq n]_a \ mtx\text{-}assn^d \ \ast_a \ node\text{-}assn^k \ \ast_a \\ node\text{-}assn^k \ \ast_a \ node\text{-}assn^k \\ \rightarrow \ mtx\text{-}assn \\ \langle proof \rangle \end{array}$

sepref-register fw-upd':: 'a i-mtx \Rightarrow nat \Rightarrow nat \Rightarrow nat \Rightarrow 'a i-mtx nres

definition

 $fwi-impl'(M :: 'a mtx) \ k = for-rec2 \ (\lambda \ M. \ fw-upd' \ M \ k) \ M \ n \ n \ n$

definition

fw-impl'(M :: 'a mtx) = fw' M n n

$\mathbf{context}$

notes [*id-rules*] = *itypeI*[*of n TYPE* (*nat*)] **and** [*sepref-import-param*] = *IdI*[*of n*] **begin**

sepref-definition fw-impl is fw-impl' :: mtx- $assn^d \rightarrow_a mtx$ - $assn \langle proof \rangle$

sepref-definition fw-impl1 is fw-impl' :: mtx- $assn^d \rightarrow_a mtx$ - $assn \langle proof \rangle$

sepref-definition *fwi-impl* is

uncurry fwi-impl' :: $[\lambda (-,k), k \leq n]_a mtx-assn^d *_a node-assn^k \to mtx-assn \langle proof \rangle$

sepref-definition *fwi-impl1* is

uncurry fwi-impl' :: $[\lambda (-,k), k \leq n]_a mtx-assn^d *_a node-assn^k \to mtx-assn \langle proof \rangle$

end

end

export-code fw-impl in SML-imp

A compact specification for the characteristic property of the Floyd-Warshall algorithm.

definition fw-spec where

 $\begin{array}{l} \textit{fw-spec } n \ M \equiv SPEC \ (\lambda \ M'. \\ \textit{if } (\exists \ i \leq n. \ M' \ i \ i < 0) \\ \textit{then } \neg \ cyc\text{-free } M \ n \\ \textit{else } \forall \ i \leq n. \ \forall \ j \leq n. \ M' \ i \ j = D \ M \ i \ j \ n \ \land \ cyc\text{-free } M \ n) \end{array}$

lemma *D*-diag-nonnegI: **assumes** cycle-free M n $i \le n$ **shows** D M i i $n \ge 0$ $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma fw-fw-spec: RETURN (FW M n) \leq fw-spec n M $\langle proof \rangle$

definition

mat-curry-rel = {(Mu, Mc). curry Mu = Mc}

definition

mtx-curry-assn n = hr-comp (mtx-assn n) (br curry (λ -. True))

declare *mtx-curry-assn-def*[*symmetric*, *fcomp-norm-unfold*]

```
lemma fw-impl'-correct:
```

```
(fw\text{-}impl', fw\text{-}spec) \in Id \rightarrow br \ curry \ (\lambda \ -. \ True) \rightarrow \langle br \ curry \ (\lambda \ -. \ True) \rangle
nres-rel
\langle proof \rangle
```

1.10.1 Main Result

This is one way to state that the *fw-impl* fulfills the specification *fw-spec*.

```
theorem fw-impl-correct:
```

```
(fw\text{-}impl\ n,\ fw\text{-}spec\ n) \in (mtx\text{-}curry\text{-}assn\ n)^d \rightarrow_a mtx\text{-}curry\text{-}assn\ n \ \langle proof \rangle
```

An alternative version: a Hoare triple for total correctness.

corollary

 $\begin{array}{l} < mtx-curry-assn \ n \ Mi > fw\text{-}impl \ n \ Mi < \lambda \ Mi'. \ \exists_A \ M'. \ mtx-curry-assn \\ n \ M' \ Mi' * \uparrow \\ (if \ (\exists \ i \leq n. \ M' \ i \ i < 0) \\ then \ \neg \ cyc\text{-}free \ M \ n \\ else \ \forall \ i \leq n. \ \forall \ j \leq n. \ M' \ i \ j = D \ M \ i \ j \ n \ \land \ cyc\text{-}free \ M \ n) >_t \\ \langle proof \rangle \end{array}$

1.10.2 Alternative versions for Uncurried Matrices.

definition $FWI' = uncurry \ ooo \ FWI \ o \ curry$

lemma fwi-impl'-refine-FWI': (fwi-impl' n, RETURN oo PR-CONST (λ M. FWI' M n)) \in Id \rightarrow Id \rightarrow (Id) nres-rel (proof)

lemmas fwi-impl-refine-FWI' = fwi-impl.refine[FCOMP fwi-impl'-refine-FWI']

definition FW' = uncurry oo FW o curry

definition FW'' n M = FW' M n

lemma fw-impl'-refine-FW'': (fw-impl' n, RETURN o PR-CONST (FW'' n)) \in Id $\rightarrow \langle Id \rangle$ nres-rel $\langle proof \rangle$

lemmas fw-impl-refine-FW'' = fw-impl.refine[FCOMP fw-impl'-refine-FW''] **lemmas** fw-impl1-refine-FW'' = fw-impl1.refine[FCOMP fw-impl'-refine-FW'']

end

References

- [Flo62] Robert W. Floyd. Algorithm 97: Shortest path. Commun. ACM, 5(6):345–, June 1962.
- [Roy59] Bernard Roy. Transitivité et connexité. In Extrait des comptes rendus des séances de lAcadémie des Sciences, pages 216–218.
 Gauthier-Villars, July 1959. http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/ bpt6k3201c/f222.image.langFR.
- [War62] Stephen Warshall. A theorem on boolean matrices. J. ACM, 9(1):11–12, January 1962.