Correctness of Tarjan's Algorithm

Stephan Merz

October 17, 2018

Contents

1	Reachability in graphs	2
2	Strongly connected components	3
3	Auxiliary functions	3
4	Main functions used for Tarjan's algorithms4.1Function definitions4.2Well-definedness of the functions	4 4 5
5	Auxiliary notions for the proof of partial correctness	7
6	Predicates and lemmas about environments	9
7	Partial correctness of the main functions	10
the im	Theorems establishing total correctness eory Tarjan ports Main	14
ne	gin	

Tarjan's algorithm computes the strongly connected components of a finite graph using depth-first search. We formalize a functional version of the algorithm in Isabelle/HOL, following a development of Lvy et al. in Why3 that is available at http://pauillac.inria.fr/~levy/why3/graph/abs/scct/1-68bis/scc.html.

Make the simplifier expand let-constructions automatically

declare Let-def[simp]

Definition of an auxiliary data structure holding local variables during the execution of Tarjan's algorithm.

record 'v env = black :: 'v set $\begin{array}{l} gray \ :: \ 'v \ set \\ stack \ :: \ 'v \ list \\ sccs \ :: \ 'v \ set \ set \\ sn \ \ :: \ nat \\ num \ \ :: \ 'v \ \Rightarrow \ int \end{array}$

${\bf definition} \ colored \ {\bf where}$

colored $e \equiv black \ e \cup gray \ e$

locale graph = **fixes** vertices :: 'v set **and** successors :: 'v \Rightarrow 'v set **assumes** vfin: finite vertices **and** sclosed: $\forall x \in$ vertices. successors $x \subseteq$ vertices

context graph begin

1 Reachability in graphs

abbreviation edge where edge $x \ y \equiv y \in$ successors x

definition *xedge-to* where

— ys is a suffix of xs, y appears in ys, and there is an edge from some node in the prefix of xs to y xedge-to xs ys $y \equiv$ $y \in set ys$ $\land (\exists zs. xs = zs @ ys \land (\exists z \in set zs. edge z y))$

inductive reachable where

 $\begin{array}{l} \textit{reachable-refl[iff]: reachable x x} \\ \mid \textit{reachable-succ[elim]: [[edge x y; reachable y z]]} \implies \textit{reachable x z} \end{array}$

lemma reachable-edge: edge $x \ y \implies$ reachable $x \ y \ \langle proof \rangle$

lemma succ-reachable: assumes reachable x y and edge y zshows reachable x z $\langle proof \rangle$

```
lemma reachable-trans:

assumes y: reachable x y and z: reachable y z

shows reachable x z

\langle proof \rangle
```

Given some set S and two vertices x and y such that y is reachable from x, and x is an element of S but y is not, then there exists some vertices x' and y' linked by an edge such that x' is an element of S, y' is not, x' is reachable from x, and y is reachable from y'.

lemma reachable-crossing-set: **assumes** 1: reachable x y and 2: $x \in S$ and 3: $y \notin S$ **obtains** x' y' where $x' \in S y' \notin S$ edge x' y' reachable x x' reachable y' y $\langle proof \rangle$

2 Strongly connected components

```
definition is-subscc where
is-subscc S \equiv \forall x \in S. \forall y \in S. reachable x y
```

```
definition is-scc where
is-scc S \equiv S \neq \{\} \land is-subscc S \land (\forall S'. S \subseteq S' \land is-subscc S' \longrightarrow S' = S)
```

```
lemma subscc-add:
```

```
assumes is-subscc S and x \in S
and reachable x y and reachable y x
shows is-subscc (insert y S)
\langle proof \rangle
```

```
lemma sccE:
```

```
— Two vertices that are reachable from each other are in the same SCC.

assumes is-scc S and x \in S

and reachable x y and reachable y x

shows y \in S

\langle proof \rangle
```

```
lemma scc-partition:

— Two SCCs that contain a common element are identical.

assumes is-scc S and is-scc S' and x \in S \cap S'

shows S = S'

\langle proof \rangle
```

3 Auxiliary functions

```
abbreviation infty (\infty) where

— integer exceeding any one used as a vertex number during the algorithm

\infty \equiv int \ (card \ vertices)

definition set-infty where

— set f x to \infty for all x in xs
```

```
set infty xs f = fold (\lambda x g. g (x := \infty)) xs f
lemma set-infty:
```

```
(set-infty xs f) x = (if x \in set xs then \infty else f x)
(proof)
```

Split a list at the first occurrence of a given element. Returns the two sublists of elements before (and including) the element and those strictly after the element. If the element does not occur in the list, returns a pair formed by the entire list and the empty list.

fun split-list where

split-list x [] = ([], [])| split-list x (y # xs) = (if x = y then ([x], xs) else (let (l, r) = split-list x xs in (y # l, r)))

lemma *split-list-concat*:

— Concatenating the two sublists produced by *split-list* yields back the original list.

assumes $x \in set xs$ shows (fst (split-list x xs)) @ (snd (split-list x xs)) = xs $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma fst-split-list: **assumes** $x \in set xs$ **shows** $\exists ys.$ fst (split-list x xs) = $ys @ [x] \land x \notin set ys$ $\langle proof \rangle$

Push a vertex on the stack and increment the sequence number. The pushed vertex is associated with the (old) sequence number. It is also added to the set of gray nodes.

definition add-stack-incr where

 $add\text{-stack-incr } x \ e = \\ e \ (| \ gray := insert \ x \ (gray \ e), \\ stack := x \ \# \ (stack \ e), \\ sn := sn \ e + 1, \\ num := (num \ e) \ (x := int \ (sn \ e)) \ |)$

Add vertex x to the set of black vertices in e and remove it from the set of gray vertices.

definition add-black where add-black $x \ e = e \ (| \ black := insert \ x \ (black \ e),$ $gray := (gray \ e) - \{x\} \ |)$

4 Main functions used for Tarjan's algorithms

4.1 Function definitions

We define two mutually recursive functions that contain the essence of Tarjan's algorithm. Their arguments are respectively a single vertex and a set of vertices, as well as an environment that contains the local variables of the algorithm, and an auxiliary parameter representing the set of "gray" vertices, which is used only for the proof. The main function is then obtained by specializing the function operating on a set of vertices.

function (domintros) dfs1 and dfs where

 $dfs1 \ x \ e =$ (let (n1, e1) = dfs (successors x) (add-stack-incr x e) inif $n1 < int (sn \ e)$ then $(n1, add-black \ x \ e1)$ else (let (l,r) = split-list x (stack e1) in $(\infty,$ (black = insert x (black e1),gray = gray e, stack = r, sccs = insert (set l) (sccs e1), $sn = sn \ e1$, $num = set\text{-infty } l (num \ e1) ||)))$ | dfs roots e =(if roots = {} then (∞, e) else(let x = SOME x. $x \in roots$; $res1 = (if num \ e \ x \neq -1 \ then \ (num \ e \ x, \ e) \ else \ dfs1 \ x \ e);$ $res2 = dfs \ (roots - \{x\}) \ (snd \ res1)$ in (min (fst res1) (fst res2), snd res2))) $\langle proof \rangle$

$init\text{-}env \equiv (black = \{\},$	$gray = \{\},\$
stack = [],	$sccs = \{\},\$
sn = 0,	$num = \lambda$ 1

```
definition tarjan where
```

 $tarjan \equiv sccs (snd (dfs vertices init-env))$

4.2 Well-definedness of the functions

We did not prove termination when we defined the two mutually recursive functions dfs1 and dfs defined above, and indeed it is easy to see that they do not terminate for arbitrary arguments. Isabelle allows us to define "partial" recursive functions, for which it introduces an auxiliary domain predicate that characterizes their domain of definition. We now make this more concrete and prove that the two functions terminate when called for nodes of the graph, also assuming an elementary well-definedness condition for environments. These conditions are met in the cases of interest, and in particular in the call to dfs in the main function tarjan. Intuitively, the reason is that every (possibly indirect) recursive call to dfs either decreases the set of roots or increases the set of nodes colored black or gray.

The set of nodes colored black never decreases in the course of the compu-

tation.

```
lemma black-increasing:

dfs1-dfs-dom \ (Inl \ (x,e)) \Longrightarrow black \ e \subseteq black \ (snd \ (dfs1 \ x \ e))

dfs1-dfs-dom \ (Inr \ (roots,e)) \Longrightarrow black \ e \subseteq black \ (snd \ (dfs \ roots \ e))

\langle proof \rangle
```

Similarly, the set of nodes colored black or gray never decreases in the course of the computation.

```
lemma colored-increasing:

dfs1-dfs-dom (Inl (x,e)) \Longrightarrow

colored e \subseteq colored (snd (dfs1 x e)) \land

colored (add-stack-incr x e)

\subseteq colored (snd (dfs (successors x) (add-stack-incr x e)))

dfs1-dfs-dom (Inr (roots,e)) \Longrightarrow

colored e \subseteq colored (snd (dfs roots e))

\langle proof \rangle
```

The functions dfs1 and dfs never assign the number of a vertex to -1.

lemma dfs-num-defined: $\begin{bmatrix} dfs1 - dfs - dom (Inl (x,e)); num (snd (dfs1 x e)) v = -1 \end{bmatrix} \implies num e v = -1$ $\begin{bmatrix} dfs1 - dfs - dom (Inr (roots,e)); num (snd (dfs roots e)) v = -1 \end{bmatrix} \implies num e v = -1$ $\langle proof \rangle$

We are only interested in environments that assign positive numbers to colored nodes, and we show that calls to *dfs1* and *dfs* preserve this property.

```
\begin{array}{l} \textbf{definition } colored-num \ \textbf{where} \\ colored-num \ e \equiv \forall \ v \in colored \ e. \ v \in vertices \land num \ e \ v \neq -1 \\ \\ \textbf{lemma } colored-num: \\ \llbracket dfs1-dfs-dom \ (Inl \ (x,e)); \ x \in vertices; \ colored-num \ e \rrbracket \Longrightarrow \\ colored-num \ (snd \ (dfs1 \ x \ e)) \\ \llbracket dfs1-dfs-dom \ (Inr \ (roots,e)); \ roots \ \subseteq vertices; \ colored-num \ e \rrbracket \Longrightarrow \\ colored-num \ (snd \ (dfs \ roots \ e)) \\ \langle proof \rangle \end{array}
```

The following relation underlies the termination argument used for proving well-definedness of the functions dfs1 and dfs. It is defined on the disjoint sum of the types of arguments of the two functions and relates the arguments of (mutually) recursive calls.

```
\begin{array}{l} \text{definition } dfs1\text{-}dfs\text{-}term \text{ where} \\ dfs1\text{-}dfs\text{-}term \equiv \\ \left\{ \left( Inl(x, \ e::'v \ env), \ Inr(roots, e) \right) \mid \\ x \ e \ roots \ . \\ roots \subseteq vertices \land x \in roots \land colored \ e \subseteq vertices \end{array} \right\} \\ \cup \left\{ \left( Inr(roots, \ add\text{-}stack\text{-}incr \ x \ e), \ Inl(x, \ e) \right) \mid \end{array} \right.
```

 $x \ e \ roots \ .$ $colored \ e \subseteq vertices \land x \in vertices - colored \ e \ \}$ $\cup \{ (Inr(roots, \ e::'v \ env), \ Inr(roots', \ e')) \mid$ $roots \ roots' \ e \ e' \ .$ $roots' \subseteq vertices \land roots \subset roots' \land$ $colored \ e' \subseteq colored \ e \land colored \ e \subseteq vertices \ \}$

In order to prove that the above relation is well-founded, we use the following function that embeds it into triples whose first component is the complement of the colored nodes, whose second component is the set of root nodes, and whose third component is 1 or 2 depending on the function being called. The third component corresponds to the first case in the definition of dfs1-dfs-term.

fun dfs1-dfs-to-tuple where

dfs1-dfs-to-tuple $(Inl(x::'v, e::'v env)) = (vertices - colored e, \{x\}, 1::nat)$ | dfs1-dfs-to-tuple (Inr(roots, e::'v env)) = (vertices - colored e, roots, 2)

lemma wf-term: wf dfs1-dfs-term $\langle proof \rangle$

The following theorem establishes sufficient conditions under which the two functions dfs1 and dfs terminate. The proof proceeds by well-founded induction using the relation dfs1-dfs-term and makes use of the theorem dfs1-dfs. domintros that was generated by Isabelle from the mutually recursive definitions in order to characterize the domain conditions for these functions.

theorem *dfs1-dfs-termination*:

 $\llbracket x \in vertices - colored \ e; \ colored-num \ e \rrbracket \Longrightarrow dfs1-dfs-dom \ (Inl(x, \ e)) \\ \llbracket roots \subseteq vertices; \ colored-num \ e \rrbracket \Longrightarrow dfs1-dfs-dom \ (Inr(roots, \ e)) \\ \langle proof \rangle$

5 Auxiliary notions for the proof of partial correctness

The proof of partial correctness is more challenging and requires some further concepts that we now define.

We need to reason about the relative order of elements in a list (specifically, the stack used in the algorithm).

definition precedes $(- \leq -in - [100, 100, 100] 39)$ where -x has an occurrence in xs that precedes an occurrence of y. $x \leq y$ in $xs \equiv \exists l r. xs = l @ (x \# r) \land y \in set (x \# r)$

lemma precedes-mem:

assumes $x \leq y$ in xs**shows** $x \in set xs y \in set xs$

```
\langle proof \rangle
lemma head-precedes:
 assumes y \in set (x \# xs)
  shows x \preceq y in (x \# xs)
  \langle proof \rangle
lemma precedes-in-tail:
  assumes x \neq z
  shows x \preceq y in (z \# zs) \longleftrightarrow x \preceq y in zs
  \langle proof \rangle
lemma tail-not-precedes:
  assumes y \preceq x in (x \# xs) x \notin set xs
 shows x = y
  \langle proof \rangle
lemma split-list-precedes:
  assumes y \in set (ys @ [x])
  shows y \preceq x in (ys @ x \# xs)
  \langle proof \rangle
lemma precedes-refl [simp]: (x \leq x \text{ in } xs) = (x \in set xs)
\langle proof \rangle
lemma precedes-append-left:
  assumes x \preceq y in xs
 shows x \leq y in (ys @ xs)
  \langle proof \rangle
lemma precedes-append-left-iff:
  assumes x \notin set ys
  shows x \leq y in (ys @ xs) \leftrightarrow x \leq y in xs (is ?lhs = ?rhs)
\langle proof \rangle
lemma precedes-append-right:
 assumes x \preceq y in xs
 shows x \preceq y in (xs @ ys)
  \langle proof \rangle
lemma precedes-append-right-iff:
  assumes y \notin set ys
  shows x \leq y in (xs @ ys) \leftrightarrow x \leq y in xs (is ?lhs = ?rhs)
\langle proof \rangle
```

Precedence determines an order on the elements of a list, provided elements have unique occurrences. However, consider a list such as [2::'a, 3::'a, 1::'a, 2::'a]: then 1 precedes 2 and 2 precedes 3, but 1 does not precede 3.

lemma precedes-trans:

assumes $x \leq y$ in xs and $y \leq z$ in xs and distinct xsshows $x \leq z$ in xs $\langle proof \rangle$ lemma precedes-antisym:

assumes $x \leq y$ in xs and $y \leq x$ in xs and distinct xsshows x = y $\langle proof \rangle$

6 Predicates and lemmas about environments

definition subenv where

subenv $e e' \equiv$ $(\exists s. stack e' = s @ (stack e) \land set s \subseteq black e')$ $\land black e \subseteq black e' \land gray e = gray e'$ $\land sccs e \subseteq sccs e'$ $\land (\forall x \in set (stack e). num e x = num e' x)$

```
lemma subenv-refl [simp]: subenv e e \langle proof \rangle
```

lemma subenv-trans: assumes subenv e e' and subenv e' e'' shows subenv e e'' {proof}

${\bf definition} \ wf\mbox{-} color \ {\bf where}$

-- conditions about colors, part of the invariant of the algorithm wf-color $e \equiv$ colored $e \subseteq$ vertices \land black $e \cap$ gray $e = \{\}$ $\land (\bigcup \ sccs \ e) \subseteq \ black \ e$ $\land \ set \ (stack \ e) = \ gray \ e \cup (black \ e - \bigcup \ sccs \ e)$

definition wf-num where

 $\begin{array}{l} -- \text{ conditions about vertex numbers} \\ wf\text{-num } e \equiv \\ int \; (sn \; e) \leq \infty \\ \wedge \; (\forall x. \; -1 \leq num \; e \; x \land (num \; e \; x = \infty \lor num \; e \; x < int \; (sn \; e))) \\ \wedge \; sn \; e = \; card \; (colored \; e) \\ \wedge \; (\forall x. \; num \; e \; x = \infty \longleftrightarrow x \in \bigcup \; sccs \; e) \\ \wedge \; (\forall x. \; num \; e \; x = -1 \longleftrightarrow x \notin colored \; e) \\ \wedge \; (\forall x \in set \; (stack \; e). \; \forall y \in set \; (stack \; e). \\ \; (num \; e \; x \leq num \; e \; y \longleftrightarrow y \preceq x \; in \; (stack \; e)))) \end{array}$

lemma subenv-num:

— If e and e' are two well-formed environments, and e is a sub-environment of e' then the number assigned by e' to any vertex is at least that assigned by e.

assumes sub: subenv e e'

and e: wf-color e wf-num e and e': wf-color e' wf-num e' shows num e $x \le$ num e' x

 $\langle proof \rangle$

```
definition no-black-to-white where

— successors of black vertices cannot be white

no-black-to-white e \equiv \forall x \ y. edge x \ y \land x \in black e \longrightarrow y \in colored e
```

definition wf-env where

 $\begin{array}{l} wf\text{-}env \ e \equiv \\ wf\text{-}color \ e \land wf\text{-}num \ e \\ \land \ no\text{-}black\text{-}to\text{-}white \ e \land \ distinct \ (stack \ e) \\ \land \ (\forall x \ y. \ y \preceq x \ in \ (stack \ e) \longrightarrow reachable \ x \ y) \\ \land \ (\forall y \in set \ (stack \ e). \ \exists \ g \in gray \ e. \ y \preceq g \ in \ (stack \ e) \land reachable \ y \ g) \\ \land \ sccs \ e = \left\{ \ C \ . \ C \subseteq black \ e \land \ is\text{-}scc \ C \right\} \end{array}$

```
lemma num-in-stack:

assumes wf-env e and x \in set (stack e)

shows num e x \neq -1

num e x < int (sn e)

\langle proof \rangle
```

Numbers assigned to different stack elements are distinct.

```
lemma num-inj:

assumes wf-env e and x \in set (stack e)

and y \in set (stack e) and num e x = num e y

shows x = y

\langle proof \rangle
```

The set of black elements at the top of the stack together with the first gray element always form a sub-SCC. This lemma is useful for the "else" branch of dfs1.

7 Partial correctness of the main functions

We now define the pre- and post-conditions for proving that the functions dfs1 and dfs are partially correct. The parameters of the preconditions, as well as the first parameters of the postconditions, coincide with the parame-

ters of the functions dfs1 and dfs. The final parameter of the postconditions represents the result computed by the function.

definition dfs1-pre where

 $\begin{array}{l} dfs1\text{-}pre \ x \ e \ \equiv \\ x \ \in \ vertices \\ \land \ x \ \notin \ colored \ e \\ \land \ (\forall \ g \ \in \ gray \ e. \ reachable \ g \ x) \\ \land \ wf\text{-}env \ e \end{array}$

definition dfs1-post where

 $\begin{array}{l} dfs1\text{-post } x \ e \ res \equiv \\ let \ n = fst \ res; \ e' = \ snd \ res \\ in \ wf\text{-}env \ e' \\ \land \ subenv \ e \ e' \\ \land \ x \in black \ e' \\ \land \ n \le num \ e' \ x \\ \land \ (n = \infty \lor (\exists \ y \in set \ (stack \ e'). \ num \ e' \ y = n \land reachable \ x \ y)) \\ \land (\forall \ y. \ xedge\text{-}to \ (stack \ e') \ (stack \ e) \ y \longrightarrow n \le num \ e' \ y) \end{array}$

definition dfs-pre where

 $\begin{array}{l} dfs\text{-}pre\ roots\ e \equiv \\ roots\ \subseteq\ vertices \\ \land\ (\forall\ x\ \in\ roots.\ \forall\ g\ \in\ gray\ e.\ reachable\ g\ x) \\ \land\ wf\text{-}env\ e \end{array}$

definition dfs-post where

 $\begin{array}{l} dfs\text{-post roots } e \ res \equiv \\ let \ n = \ fst \ res; \ e' = \ snd \ res \\ in \ wf\text{-}env \ e' \\ \land \ subenv \ e \ e' \\ \land \ roots \subseteq \ colored \ e' \\ \land \ (\forall \ x \in \ roots. \ n \le \ num \ e' \ x) \\ \land \ (\forall \ x \in \ roots. \ n \le \ num \ e' \ x) \\ \land \ (n = \infty \lor (\exists \ x \in \ roots. \ \exists \ y \in \ set \ (stack \ e'). \ num \ e' \ y = \ n \land \ reachable \ x \\ y)) \\ \land \ (\forall \ y. \ xedge\ to \ (stack \ e') \ (stack \ e) \ y \longrightarrow n \le \ num \ e' \ y) \end{array}$

The following lemmas express some useful consequences of the pre- and postconditions. In particular, the preconditions ensure that the function calls terminate.

lemma dfs1-pre-domain: **assumes** dfs1-pre x e **shows** colored $e \subseteq$ vertices $x \in$ vertices - colored e $x \notin$ set (stack e) int (sn e) $< \infty$ $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma dfs1-pre-dfs1-dom: dfs1-pre $x \ e \implies dfs1$ -dfs-dom (Inl(x,e)) $\langle proof \rangle$

```
lemma dfs-pre-dfs-dom:
dfs-pre roots e \implies dfs1-dfs-dom (Inr(roots, e))
\langle proof \rangle
```

```
lemma dfs-post-stack:
 assumes dfs-post roots e res
 obtains s where
   stack (snd res) = s @ stack e
   set s \subseteq black (snd res)
   \forall x \in set (stack e). num (snd res) x = num e x
  \langle proof \rangle
lemma dfs-post-split:
 fixes x \ e \ res
 defines n' \equiv fst res
 defines e' \equiv snd res
 defines l \equiv fst (split-list x (stack e'))
 defines r \equiv snd (split-list x (stack e'))
 assumes post: dfs-post (successors x) (add-stack-incr x e) res
            (is dfs-post ?roots ?e res)
  obtains ys where
   l = ys @ [x]
   x \notin set ys
   set ys \subseteq black e'
   stack e' = l @ r
   is-subscc (set l)
   r = stack \ e
\langle proof \rangle
```

A crucial lemma establishing a condition after the "then" branch following the recursive call in function dfs1.

lemma *dfs-post-reach-gray*:

```
fixes x e res

defines n' \equiv fst res

defines e' \equiv snd res

assumes e: wf-env e

and post: dfs-post (successors x) (add-stack-incr x e) res

(is dfs-post ?roots ?e res)

and n': n' < int (sn e)

obtains g where

g \neq x g \in gray e' x \leq g in (stack e')

reachable x g reachable g x

\langle proof \rangle
```

The following lemmas represent steps in the proof of partial correctness.

```
lemma dfs1-pre-dfs-pre:

— The precondition of dfs1 establishes that of the recursive call to dfs.

assumes dfs1-pre x e

shows dfs-pre (successors x) (add-stack-incr x e)

        (is dfs-pre ?roots' ?e')

(proof)
```

lemma dfs-pre-dfs1-pre:

 $\langle proof \rangle$

— The precondition of dfs establishes that of the recursive call to dfs1, for any $x \in roots$ such that num e x = -1. **assumes** dfs-pre roots e and $x \in roots$ and num e x = -1**shows** dfs1-pre x e

Prove the post-condition of dfs1 for the "then" branch in the definition of dfs1, assuming that the recursive call to dfs establishes its post-condition.

```
lemma dfs-post-dfs1-post-case1:

fixes x e

defines res1 \equiv dfs (successors x) (add-stack-incr x e)

defines n1 \equiv fst res1

defines e1 \equiv snd res1

defines res \equiv dfs1 \ x e

assumes pre: dfs1-pre x e

and post: dfs-post (successors x) (add-stack-incr x e) res1

and lt: fst res1 < int (sn e)

shows dfs1-post x e res

\langle proof \rangle
```

Prove the post-condition of dfs1 for the "else" branch in the definition of dfs1, assuming that the recursive call to dfs establishes its post-condition.

```
lemma dfs-post-dfs1-post-case2:

fixes x e

defines res1 \equiv dfs (successors x) (add-stack-incr x e)

defines n1 \equiv fst res1

defines e1 \equiv snd res1

defines res \equiv dfs1 \ x e

assumes pre: dfs1-pre x e

and post: dfs-post (successors x) (add-stack-incr x e) res1

and nlt: \neg(n1 < int (sn e))

shows dfs1-post x e res

\langle proof \rangle
```

The following main lemma establishes the partial correctness of the two mutually recursive functions. The domain conditions appear explicitly as hypotheses, although we already know that they are subsumed by the preconditions. They are needed for the application of the "partial induction" rule generated by Isabelle for recursive functions whose termination was not proved. We will remove them in the next step.

```
lemma dfs-partial-correct:

fixes x roots e

shows

\llbracket dfs1-dfs-dom (Inl(x,e)); dfs1-pre x e \rrbracket \implies dfs1-post x e (dfs1 x e)

\llbracket dfs1-dfs-dom (Inr(roots,e)); dfs-pre roots e \rrbracket \implies dfs-post roots e (dfs roots e)

\langle proof \rangle
```

8 Theorems establishing total correctness

Combining the previous theorems, we show total correctness for both the auxiliary functions and the main function *tarjan*.

theorem *dfs-correct*:

 $\begin{aligned} dfs1\text{-}pre \ x \ e \implies dfs1\text{-}post \ x \ e \ (dfs1 \ x \ e) \\ dfs\text{-}pre \ roots \ e \implies dfs\text{-}post \ roots \ e \ (dfs \ roots \ e) \\ \langle proof \rangle \end{aligned}$

theorem tarjan-correct: tarjan = { C . is-scc $C \land C \subseteq$ vertices } $\langle proof \rangle$

 $\begin{array}{l} \mathbf{end} & -- \operatorname{context} \operatorname{graph} \\ \mathbf{end} & -- \operatorname{theory} \operatorname{Tarjan} \end{array}$