

Formalizing Push-Relabel Algorithms

Peter Lammich and S. Reza Sefidgar

March 6, 2017

Abstract

We present a formalization of push-relabel algorithms for computing the maximum flow in a network. We start with Goldberg’s et al. generic push-relabel algorithm, for which we show correctness and the time complexity bound of $O(V^2E)$. We then derive the relabel-to-front and FIFO implementation. Using stepwise refinement techniques, we derive an efficient verified implementation.

Our formal proof of the abstract algorithms closely follows a standard textbook proof, and is accessible even without being an expert in Isabelle/HOL— the interactive theorem prover used for the formalization.

Contents

1	Introduction	5
2	Generic Push Relabel Algorithm	5
2.1	Labeling	5
2.2	Basic Operations	6
2.2.1	Augmentation of Edges	6
2.2.2	Push Operation	7
2.2.3	Relabel Operation	8
2.2.4	Initialization	8
2.3	Abstract Correctness	8
2.3.1	Maintenance of Invariants	9
2.3.2	Maxflow on Termination	9
2.4	Convenience Lemmas	10
2.5	Complexity	11
2.5.1	Auxiliary Lemmas	11
2.5.2	Height Bound	11
2.5.3	Formulation of the Abstract Algorithm	13
2.5.4	Saturating and Non-Saturating Push Operations	13
2.5.5	Refined Labeled Transition System	14
2.5.6	Bounding the Relabel Operations	15
2.5.7	Bounding the Saturating Push Operations	16
2.5.8	Bounding the Non-Saturating Push Operations	17
2.5.9	Assembling the Final Theorem	18
2.6	Main Theorem: Correctness and Complexity	18
2.7	Convenience Tools for Implementation	19
2.8	Gap Heuristics	20
2.8.1	Termination with Gap Heuristics	21
3	Relabel-to-Front Algorithm	22
3.1	Admissible Network	22
3.2	Neighbor Lists	23
3.3	Discharge Operation	24
3.4	Main Algorithm	26
4	FIFO Push Relabel Algorithm	28
4.1	Implementing the Discharge Operation	29
4.2	Main Algorithm	31
5	Tools for Implementing Push-Relabel Algorithms	32
5.1	Basic Operations	32
5.1.1	Excess Map	32
5.1.2	Labeling	32

5.1.3	Label Frequency Counts for Gap Heuristics	33
5.2	Refinements to Basic Operations	33
5.2.1	Explicit Computation of the Excess	34
5.2.2	Algorithm to Compute Initial Excess and Flow	34
5.2.3	Computing the Minimal Adjacent Label	35
5.2.4	Refinement of Relabel	36
5.2.5	Refinement of Push	37
5.2.6	Adding frequency counters to labeling	37
5.2.7	Refinement of Gap-Heuristics	39
5.3	Refinement to Efficient Data Structures	41
5.3.1	Registration of Abstract Operations	41
5.3.2	Excess by Array	41
5.3.3	Labeling by Array	42
5.3.4	Label Frequency by Array	42
5.3.5	Combined Frequency Count and Labeling	43
5.3.6	Push	44
5.3.7	Relabel	44
5.3.8	Gap-Relabel	45
5.3.9	Initialization	45
6	Implementation of the FIFO Push/Relabel Algorithm	46
6.1	Basic Operations	46
6.1.1	Queue	46
6.2	Refinements to Basic Operations	47
6.2.1	Refinement of Push	47
6.2.2	Refinement of Gap-Relabel	48
6.2.3	Refinement of Discharge	49
6.2.4	Computing the Initial Queue	52
6.2.5	Refining the Main Algorithm	52
6.3	Separating out the Initialization of the Adjacency Matrix	53
6.4	Refinement To Efficient Data Structures	54
6.4.1	Registration of Abstract Operations	54
6.4.2	Queue by Two Stacks	55
6.4.3	Push	56
6.4.4	Gap-Relabel	56
6.4.5	Discharge	56
6.4.6	Computing the Initial State	57
6.4.7	Main Algorithm	57
6.5	Combining the Refinement Steps	58
6.6	Combination with Network Checker and Main Correctness Theorem	58
6.6.1	Justification of Splitting into Prepare and Run Phase	59
6.7	Usage Example: Computing Maxflow Value	60

1 Introduction

Computing the maximum flow of a network is an important problem in graph theory. Many other problems, like maximum-bipartite-matching, edge-disjoint-paths, circulation-demand, as well as various scheduling and resource allocating problems can be reduced to it.

The practically most efficient algorithms to solve the maximum flow problem are push-relabel algorithms [3]. In this entry, we present a formalization of Goldberg's et al. generic push-relabel algorithm [5], and two instances: The relabel-to-front algorithm [4] and the FIFO push-relabel algorithm [5]. Using stepwise refinement techniques [9, 1, 2], we derive efficient verified implementations. Moreover, we show that the generic push-relabel algorithm has a time complexity of $O(V^2E)$.

This entry re-uses and extends theory developed for our formalization of the Edmonds-Karp maximum flow algorithm [6, 7].

While there exists another formalization of the Ford-Fulkerson method in Mizar [8], we are, to the best of our knowledge, the first that verify a polynomial maximum flow algorithm, prove a polynomial complexity bound, or provide a verified executable implementation.

2 Generic Push Relabel Algorithm

```
theory Generic-Push-Relabel
imports
  ../Flow-Networks/Ford-Fulkerson
begin
```

2.1 Labeling

The central idea of the push-relabel algorithm is to add natural number labels $l : node \Rightarrow nat$ to each node, and maintain the invariant that for all edges (u,v) in the residual graph, we have $l\ u \leq l\ v + 1$.

```
type-synonym labeling = node  $\Rightarrow$  nat
```

```
locale Labeling = NPreflow +
  fixes  $l :: labeling$ 
  assumes valid:  $(u,v) \in cf.E \implies l(u) \leq l(v) + 1$ 
  assumes lab-src[simp]:  $l\ s = card\ V$ 
  assumes lab-sink[simp]:  $l\ t = 0$ 
begin
```

Generalizing validity to paths

```
lemma gen-valid:  $l(u) \leq l(x) + length\ p$  if cf.isPath  $u\ p\ x$ 
   $\langle proof \rangle$ 
```

In a valid labeling, there cannot be an augmenting path [Cormen 26.17].

The proof works by contradiction, using the validity constraint to show that any augmenting path would be too long for a simple path.

theorem *no-augmenting-path*: $\neg \text{isAugmentingPath } p$
 ⟨proof⟩

The idea of push relabel algorithms is to maintain a valid labeling, and, ultimately, arrive at a valid flow, i.e., no nodes have excess flow. We then immediately get that the flow is maximal:

corollary *no-excess-imp-maxflow*:
assumes $\forall u \in V - \{s, t\}. \text{excess } f \ u = 0$
shows *isMaxFlow* f
 ⟨proof⟩

end — Labeling

2.2 Basic Operations

The operations of the push relabel algorithm are local operations on single nodes and edges.

2.2.1 Augmentation of Edges

context *Network*
begin

We define a function to augment a single edge in the residual graph.

definition *augment-edge* :: 'capacity flow \Rightarrow -
where *augment-edge* $f \equiv \lambda(u, v) \Delta.$
if $(u, v) \in E$ *then* $f((u, v) := f((u, v) + \Delta)$
else if $(v, u) \in E$ *then* $f((v, u) := f((v, u) - \Delta)$
else f

lemma *augment-edge-zero[simp]*: *augment-edge* $f \ e \ 0 = f$
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma *augment-edge-same[simp]*: $e \in E \implies \text{augment-edge } f \ e \ \Delta \ e = f \ e + \Delta$
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma *augment-edge-other[simp]*: $\llbracket e \in E; e' \neq e \rrbracket \implies \text{augment-edge } f \ e \ \Delta \ e' = f \ e'$
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma *augment-edge-rev-same[simp]*:
 $(v, u) \in E \implies \text{augment-edge } f \ (u, v) \ \Delta \ (v, u) = f \ (v, u) - \Delta$
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma *augment-edge-rev-other*[simp]:

$\llbracket (u,v) \notin E; e' \neq (v,u) \rrbracket \implies \text{augment-edge } f (u,v) \Delta e' = f e'$
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma *augment-edge-cf*[simp]: $(u,v) \in E \cup E^{-1} \implies$

$\text{cf-of } (\text{augment-edge } f (u,v) \Delta)$
 $= (\text{cf-of } f)((u,v) := \text{cf-of } f (u,v) - \Delta, (v,u) := \text{cf-of } f (v,u) + \Delta)$
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma *augment-edge-cf'*: $(u,v) \in \text{cfE-of } f \implies$

$\text{cf-of } (\text{augment-edge } f (u,v) \Delta)$
 $= (\text{cf-of } f)((u,v) := \text{cf-of } f (u,v) - \Delta, (v,u) := \text{cf-of } f (v,u) + \Delta)$
 ⟨proof⟩

The effect of augmenting an edge on the residual graph

definition (in $-$) *augment-edge-cf* :: $- \text{ flow} \Rightarrow - \text{ where}$

$\text{augment-edge-cf } cf$
 $\equiv \lambda(u,v) \Delta. (\text{cf})((u,v) := \text{cf } (u,v) - \Delta, (v,u) := \text{cf } (v,u) + \Delta)$

lemma *cf-of-augment-edge*:

assumes $A: (u,v) \in \text{cfE-of } f$

shows $\text{cf-of } (\text{augment-edge } f (u,v) \Delta) = \text{augment-edge-cf } (\text{cf-of } f) (u,v) \Delta$
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma *cfE-augment-ss*:

assumes $EDGE: (u,v) \in \text{cfE-of } f$

shows $\text{cfE-of } (\text{augment-edge } f (u,v) \Delta) \subseteq \text{insert } (v,u) (\text{cfE-of } f)$

⟨proof⟩

end — Network

context *NPreflow* **begin**

Augmenting an edge (u,v) with a flow Δ that does not exceed the available edge capacity, nor the available excess flow on the source node, preserves the preflow property.

lemma *augment-edge-preflow-preserve*: $\llbracket 0 \leq \Delta; \Delta \leq \text{cf } (u,v); \Delta \leq \text{excess } f u \rrbracket$

$\implies \text{Preflow } c s t (\text{augment-edge } f (u,v) \Delta)$

⟨proof⟩

end — Network with Preflow

2.2.2 Push Operation

context *Network*

begin

The push operation pushes as much flow as possible flow from an active node over an admissible edge.

A node is called *active* if it has positive excess, and an edge (u,v) of the residual graph is called admissible, if $l\ u = l\ v + (1::'a)$.

definition *push-precond* :: 'capacity flow \Rightarrow labeling \Rightarrow edge \Rightarrow bool
where *push-precond f l*
 $\equiv \lambda(u,v). \text{excess } f\ u > 0 \wedge (u,v) \in \text{cfE-of } f \wedge l\ u = l\ v + 1$

The maximum possible flow is determined by the available excess flow at the source node and the available capacity of the edge.

definition *push-effect* :: 'capacity flow \Rightarrow edge \Rightarrow 'capacity flow
where *push-effect f*
 $\equiv \lambda(u,v). \text{augment-edge } f\ (u,v)\ (\min\ (\text{excess } f\ u)\ (\text{cf-of } f\ (u,v)))$

lemma *push-precondI*[intro?]:
 $\llbracket \text{excess } f\ u > 0; (u,v) \in \text{cfE-of } f; l\ u = l\ v + 1 \rrbracket \Longrightarrow \text{push-precond } f\ l\ (u,v)$
<proof>

2.2.3 Relabel Operation

An active node (not the sink) without any outgoing admissible edges can be relabeled.

definition *relabel-precond* :: 'capacity flow \Rightarrow labeling \Rightarrow node \Rightarrow bool
where *relabel-precond f l u*
 $\equiv u \neq t \wedge \text{excess } f\ u > 0 \wedge (\forall v. (u,v) \in \text{cfE-of } f \longrightarrow l\ u \neq l\ v + 1)$

The new label is computed from the neighbour's labels, to be the minimum value that will create an outgoing admissible edge.

definition *relabel-effect* :: 'capacity flow \Rightarrow labeling \Rightarrow node \Rightarrow labeling
where *relabel-effect f l u*
 $\equiv l\ (u := \text{Min } \{ l\ v \mid v. (u,v) \in \text{cfE-of } f \} + 1)$

2.2.4 Initialization

The initial preflow exhausts all outgoing edges of the source node.

definition *pp-init-f* $\equiv \lambda(u,v). \text{if } (u=s) \text{ then } c\ (u,v) \text{ else } 0$

The initial labeling labels the source with $|V|$, and all other nodes with 0.

definition *pp-init-l* $\equiv (\lambda x. 0)(s := \text{card } V)$

end — Network

2.3 Abstract Correctness

We formalize the abstract correctness argument of the algorithm. It consists of two parts:

1. Execution of push and relabel operations maintain a valid labeling
2. If no push or relabel operations can be executed, the preflow is actually a flow.

This section corresponds to the proof of [Cormen 26.18].

2.3.1 Maintenance of Invariants

context *Network*
begin

lemma *pp-init-invar*: *Labeling c s t pp-init-f pp-init-l*
 ⟨*proof*⟩

lemma *pp-init-f-preflow*: *NPreflow c s t pp-init-f*
 ⟨*proof*⟩

end — *Network*

context *Labeling*
begin

Push operations preserve a valid labeling [Cormen 26.16].

theorem *push-pres-Labeling*:

assumes *push-precond f l e*

shows *Labeling c s t (push-effect f e) l*

⟨*proof*⟩

lemma *finite-min-cf-outgoing[simp, intro!]*: *finite {l v | v. (u, v) ∈ cf.E}*
 ⟨*proof*⟩

Relabel operations preserve a valid labeling [Cormen 26.16]. Moreover, they increase the label of the relabeled node [Cormen 26.15].

theorem

assumes *PRE: relabel-precond f l u*

shows *relabel-increase-u: relabel-effect f l u u > l u (is ?G1)*

and *relabel-pres-Labeling: Labeling c s t f (relabel-effect f l u) (is ?G2)*

⟨*proof*⟩

lemma *relabel-preserve-other: u ≠ v ⇒ relabel-effect f l u v = l v*
 ⟨*proof*⟩

2.3.2 Maxflow on Termination

If no push or relabel operations can be performed any more, we have arrived at a maximal flow.

theorem *push-relabel-term-imp-maxflow*:

assumes *no-push*: $\forall (u,v) \in cf.E. \neg push\text{-precond } f\ l\ (u,v)$
assumes *no-relabel*: $\forall u. \neg relabel\text{-precond } f\ l\ u$
shows *isMaxFlow* *f*
 <proof>

end — Labeling

2.4 Convenience Lemmas

We define a locale to reflect the effect of a push operation

locale *push-effect-locale* = *Labeling* +
fixes *u v*
assumes *PRE*: *push-precond* *f l (u,v)*
begin
abbreviation *f'* $\equiv push\text{-effect } f\ (u,v)$
sublocale *l'*: *Labeling* *c s t f' l*
 <proof>

lemma *uv-cf-edge*[*simp, intro!*]: $(u,v) \in cf.E$
 <proof>

lemma *excess-u-pos*: *excess f u* > 0
 <proof>

lemma *l-u-eq*[*simp*]: $l\ u = l\ v + 1$
 <proof>

lemma *uv-edge-cases*:
obtains (*par*) $(u,v) \in E \quad (v,u) \notin E$
 | (*rev*) $(v,u) \in E \quad (u,v) \notin E$
 <proof>

lemma *uv-nodes*[*simp, intro!*]: $u \in V \quad v \in V$
 <proof>

lemma *uv-not-eq*[*simp*]: $u \neq v \quad v \neq u$
 <proof>

definition $\Delta = \min (excess\ f\ u) (cf\text{-of } f\ (u,v))$

lemma Δ -*positive*: $\Delta > 0$
 <proof>

lemma *f'-alt*: $f' = augment\text{-edge } f\ (u,v)\ \Delta$
 <proof>

lemma *cf'-alt*: $l'.cf = augment\text{-edge-cf } cf\ (u,v)\ \Delta$
 <proof>

lemma *excess'-u*[*simp*]: $excess\ f'\ u = excess\ f\ u - \Delta$
 <proof>

lemma *excess'-v[simp]*: $excess\ f'\ v = excess\ f\ v + \Delta$
 ⟨*proof*⟩

lemma *excess'-other[simp]*:
assumes $x \neq u \quad x \neq v$
shows $excess\ f'\ x = excess\ f\ x$
 ⟨*proof*⟩

lemma *excess'-if*:
 $excess\ f'\ x =$ (
 if $x=u$ then $excess\ f\ u - \Delta$
 else if $x=v$ then $excess\ f\ v + \Delta$
 else $excess\ f\ x$)
 ⟨*proof*⟩

end — Push Effect Locale

2.5 Complexity

Next, we analyze the complexity of the generic push relabel algorithm. We will show that it has a complexity of $O(V^2E)$ basic operations. Here, we often trade precise estimation of constant factors for simplicity of the proof.

2.5.1 Auxiliary Lemmas

context *Network*
begin

lemma *cardE-nz-aux[simp, intro!]*:
 $card\ E \neq 0 \quad card\ E \geq Suc\ 0 \quad card\ E > 0$
 ⟨*proof*⟩

The number of nodes can be estimated by the number of edges. This estimation is done in various places to get smoother bounds.

lemma *card-V-est-E*: $card\ V \leq 2 * card\ E$
 ⟨*proof*⟩

end

2.5.2 Height Bound

A crucial idea of estimating the complexity is the insight that no label will exceed $2|V|-1$ during the algorithm.

We define a locale that states this invariant, and show that the algorithm maintains it. This corresponds to the proof of [Cormen 26.20].

locale *Height-Bounded-Labeling* = *Labeling* +
assumes *height-bound*: $\forall u \in V. l\ u \leq 2 * \text{card } V - 1$
begin
lemma *height-bound'*: $u \in V \implies l\ u \leq 2 * \text{card } V - 1$
 <proof>
end

lemma (**in** *Network*) *pp-init-height-bound*:
Height-Bounded-Labeling *c s t pp-init-f pp-init-l*
 <proof>

context *Height-Bounded-Labeling*
begin

As push does not change the labeling, it trivially preserves the height bound.

lemma *push-pres-height-bound*:
assumes *push-precond f l e*
shows *Height-Bounded-Labeling c s t (push-effect f e) l*
 <proof>

In a valid labeling, any active node has a (simple) path to the source node in the residual graph [Cormen 26.19].

lemma (**in** *Labeling*) *excess-imp-source-path*:
assumes *excess f u > 0*
obtains *p where cf.isSimplePath u p s*
 <proof>

Relabel operations preserve the height bound [Cormen 26.20].

lemma *relabel-pres-height-bound*:
assumes *relabel-precond f l u*
shows *Height-Bounded-Labeling c s t f (relabel-effect f l u)*
 <proof>

Thus, the total number of relabel operations is bounded by $O(V^2)$ [Cormen 26.21].

We express this bound by defining a measure function, and show that it is decreased by relabel operations.

definition (**in** *Network*) *sum-heights-measure* $l \equiv \sum_{v \in V}. 2 * \text{card } V - l\ v$

corollary *relabel-measure*:
assumes *relabel-precond f l u*
shows *sum-heights-measure (relabel-effect f l u) < sum-heights-measure l*
 <proof>

end — Height Bounded Labeling

lemma (**in** *Network*) *sum-height-measure-is-OV2*:
*sum-heights-measure l ≤ 2 * (card V)²*
 <proof>

2.5.3 Formulation of the Abstract Algorithm

We give a simple relational characterization of the abstract algorithm as a labeled transition system, where the labels indicate the type of operation (push or relabel) that have been executed.

context *Network*
begin

datatype *pr-operation* = *is-PUSH: PUSH* | *is-RELABEL: RELABEL*
inductive-set *pr-algo-lts*
 :: (('capacity flow × labeling) × *pr-operation* × ('capacity flow × labeling)) *set*
where
push: $\llbracket \text{push-precond } f \ l \ e \rrbracket$
 $\implies ((f, l), \text{PUSH}, (\text{push-effect } f \ e, l)) \in \text{pr-algo-lts}$
 | *relabel*: $\llbracket \text{relabel-precond } f \ l \ u \rrbracket$
 $\implies ((f, l), \text{RELABEL}, (f, \text{relabel-effect } f \ l \ u)) \in \text{pr-algo-lts}$

end — *Network*

We show invariant maintenance and correctness on termination

lemma (in *Height-Bounded-Labeling*) *pr-algo-maintains-hb-labeling*:
assumes $((f, l), a, (f', l')) \in \text{pr-algo-lts}$
shows *Height-Bounded-Labeling c s t f' l'*
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma (in *Height-Bounded-Labeling*) *pr-algo-term-maxflow*:
assumes $(f, l) \notin \text{Domain } \text{pr-algo-lts}$
shows *isMaxFlow f*
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

2.5.4 Saturating and Non-Saturating Push Operations

context *Network*
begin

For complexity estimation, it is distinguished whether a push operation saturates the edge or not.

definition *sat-push-precond* :: 'capacity flow \Rightarrow labeling \Rightarrow edge \Rightarrow bool
where *sat-push-precond f l*
 $\equiv \lambda(u, v). \text{excess } f \ u > 0$
 $\quad \wedge \text{excess } f \ u \geq \text{cf-of } f \ (u, v)$
 $\quad \wedge (u, v) \in \text{cfE-of } f$
 $\quad \wedge l \ u = l \ v + 1$

definition *nonsat-push-precond* :: 'capacity flow \Rightarrow labeling \Rightarrow edge \Rightarrow bool
where *nonsat-push-precond f l*
 $\equiv \lambda(u, v). \text{excess } f \ u > 0$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \wedge \text{excess } f \ u < \text{cf-of } f \ (u,v) \\
& \wedge (u,v) \in \text{cfE-of } f \\
& \wedge l \ u = l \ v + 1
\end{aligned}$$

lemma *push-precond-eq-sat-or-nonsat*:

$$\text{push-precond } f \ l \ e \longleftrightarrow \text{sat-push-precond } f \ l \ e \vee \text{nonsat-push-precond } f \ l \ e$$

<proof>

lemma *sat-nonsat-push-disj*:

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{sat-push-precond } f \ l \ e & \implies \neg \text{nonsat-push-precond } f \ l \ e \\
\text{nonsat-push-precond } f \ l \ e & \implies \neg \text{sat-push-precond } f \ l \ e
\end{aligned}$$

<proof>

lemma *sat-push-alt*: *sat-push-precond* $f \ l \ e$

$$\implies \text{push-effect } f \ e = \text{augment-edge } f \ e \ (\text{cf-of } f \ e)$$

<proof>

lemma *nonsat-push-alt*: *nonsat-push-precond* $f \ l \ (u,v)$

$$\implies \text{push-effect } f \ (u,v) = \text{augment-edge } f \ (u,v) \ (\text{excess } f \ u)$$

<proof>

end — Network

context *push-effect-locale*

begin

$$\text{lemma } \text{nonsat-push-}\Delta: \text{nonsat-push-precond } f \ l \ (u,v) \implies \Delta = \text{excess } f \ u$$

<proof>

$$\text{lemma } \text{sat-push-}\Delta: \text{sat-push-precond } f \ l \ (u,v) \implies \Delta = \text{cf} \ (u,v)$$

<proof>

end

2.5.5 Refined Labeled Transition System

context *Network*

begin

For simpler reasoning, we make explicit the different push operations, and integrate the invariant into the LTS

datatype *pr-operation'* =

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{is-RELABEL}': \text{RELABEL}' \\
& | \text{is-NONSAT-PUSH}': \text{NONSAT-PUSH}' \\
& | \text{is-SAT-PUSH}': \text{SAT-PUSH}' \text{ edge}
\end{aligned}$$

inductive-set *pr-algo-lts'* **where**

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{nonsat-push}': \llbracket \text{Height-Bounded-Labeling } c \ s \ t \ f \ l; \text{nonsat-push-precond } f \ l \ e \rrbracket \\
& \implies ((f,l), \text{NONSAT-PUSH}' \ e, (\text{push-effect } f \ e, l)) \in \text{pr-algo-lts}' \\
& | \text{sat-push}': \llbracket \text{Height-Bounded-Labeling } c \ s \ t \ f \ l; \text{sat-push-precond } f \ l \ e \rrbracket \\
& \implies ((f,l), \text{SAT-PUSH}' \ e, (\text{push-effect } f \ e, l)) \in \text{pr-algo-lts}'
\end{aligned}$$

| *relabel'*: $\llbracket \text{Height-Bounded-Labeling } c \ s \ t \ f \ l; \text{relabel-precond } f \ l \ u \rrbracket$
 $\implies ((f,l), \text{RELABEL}', (f, \text{relabel-effect } f \ l \ u)) \in \text{pr-algo-lts}'$

fun *project-operation* **where**
project-operation *RELABEL'* = *RELABEL*
| *project-operation* *NONSAT-PUSH'* = *PUSH*
| *project-operation* (*SAT-PUSH'* -) = *PUSH*

lemma *is-RELABEL-project-conv*[*simp*]:
is-RELABEL \circ *project-operation* = *is-RELABEL'*
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *is-PUSH-project-conv*[*simp*]:
is-PUSH \circ *project-operation* = $(\lambda x. \text{is-SAT-PUSH}' \ x \ \vee \ \text{is-NONSAT-PUSH}' \ x)$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

end — Network

context *Height-Bounded-Labeling*
begin

lemma (**in** *Height-Bounded-Labeling*) *xfer-run*:
assumes $((f,l), p, (f',l')) \in \text{trcl } \text{pr-algo-lts}$
obtains *p'* **where** $((f,l), p', (f',l')) \in \text{trcl } \text{pr-algo-lts}'$
and $p = \text{map } \text{project-operation } p'$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *xfer-relabel-bound*:
assumes *BOUND*: $\forall p'. ((f,l), p', (f',l')) \in \text{trcl } \text{pr-algo-lts}'$
 $\implies \text{length } (\text{filter } \text{is-RELABEL}' \ p') \leq B$
assumes *RUN*: $((f,l), p, (f',l')) \in \text{trcl } \text{pr-algo-lts}$
shows $\text{length } (\text{filter } \text{is-RELABEL} \ p) \leq B$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *xfer-push-bounds*:
assumes *BOUND-SAT*: $\forall p'. ((f,l), p', (f',l')) \in \text{trcl } \text{pr-algo-lts}'$
 $\implies \text{length } (\text{filter } \text{is-SAT-PUSH}' \ p') \leq B1$
assumes *BOUND-NONSAT*: $\forall p'. ((f,l), p', (f',l')) \in \text{trcl } \text{pr-algo-lts}'$
 $\implies \text{length } (\text{filter } \text{is-NONSAT-PUSH}' \ p') \leq B2$
assumes *RUN*: $((f,l), p, (f',l')) \in \text{trcl } \text{pr-algo-lts}$
shows $\text{length } (\text{filter } \text{is-PUSH} \ p) \leq B1 + B2$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

end — Height Bounded Labeling

2.5.6 Bounding the Relabel Operations

lemma (**in** *Network*) *relabel-action-bound'*:

assumes $A: (fxl, p, fxl') \in \text{trcl } pr\text{-algo-lts}'$
shows $\text{length } (\text{filter } (\text{is-RELABEL}') p) \leq 2 * (\text{card } V)^2$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma (in *Height-Bounded-Labeling*) *relabel-action-bound*:
assumes $A: ((f, l), p, (f', l')) \in \text{trcl } pr\text{-algo-lts}$
shows $\text{length } (\text{filter } (\text{is-RELABEL}') p) \leq 2 * (\text{card } V)^2$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

2.5.7 Bounding the Saturating Push Operations

context *Network*
begin

The basic idea is to estimate the saturating push operations per edge: After a saturating push, the edge disappears from the residual graph. It can only re-appear due to a push over the reverse edge, which requires relabeling of the nodes.

The estimation in [Cormen 26.22] uses the same idea. However, it invests some extra work in getting a more precise constant factor by counting the pushes for an edge and its reverse edge together.

lemma *labels-path-increasing*:
assumes $((f, l), p, (f', l')) \in \text{trcl } pr\text{-algo-lts}'$
shows $l u \leq l' u$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *edge-reappears-at-increased-labeling*:
assumes $((f, l), p, (f', l')) \in \text{trcl } pr\text{-algo-lts}'$
assumes $l u \geq l v + 1$
assumes $(u, v) \notin \text{cfE-of } f$
assumes $E': (u, v) \in \text{cfE-of } f'$
shows $l v < l' v$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *sat-push-edge-action-bound'*:
assumes $((f, l), p, (f', l')) \in \text{trcl } pr\text{-algo-lts}'$
shows $\text{length } (\text{filter } (\text{op} = (\text{SAT-PUSH}' e)) p) \leq 2 * \text{card } V$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *sat-push-action-bound'*:
assumes $A: ((f, l), p, (f', l')) \in \text{trcl } pr\text{-algo-lts}'$
shows $\text{length } (\text{filter } \text{is-SAT-PUSH}' p) \leq 4 * \text{card } V * \text{card } E$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

end — Network

2.5.8 Bounding the Non-Saturating Push Operations

For estimating the number of non-saturating push operations, we define a potential function that is the sum of the labels of all active nodes, and examine the effect of the operations on this potential:

- A non-saturating push deactivates the source node and may activate the target node. As the source node's label is higher, the potential decreases.
- A saturating push may activate a node, thus increasing the potential by $O(V)$.
- A relabel operation may increase the potential by $O(V)$.

As there are at most $O(V^2)$ relabel and $O(VE)$ saturating push operations, the above bounds suffice to yield an $O(V^2E)$ bound for the non-saturating push operations.

This argumentation corresponds to [Cormen 26.23].

Sum of heights of all active nodes

definition (in *Network*) *nonsat-potential* $fl \equiv \text{sum } l \{v \in V. \text{ excess } f v > 0\}$

context *Height-Bounded-Labeling*

begin

The potential does not exceed $O(V^2)$.

lemma *nonsat-potential-bound*:

shows *nonsat-potential* $fl \leq 2 * (\text{card } V)^2$
<proof>

A non-saturating push decreases the potential.

lemma *nonsat-push-decr-nonsat-potential*:

assumes *nonsat-push-precond* $fl e$
shows *nonsat-potential* (*push-effect* $f e$) $l < \text{nonsat-potential } fl$
<proof>

A saturating push increases the potential by $O(V)$.

lemma *sat-push-nonsat-potential*:

assumes *PRE: sat-push-precond* $fl e$
shows *nonsat-potential* (*push-effect* $f e$) l
 $\leq \text{nonsat-potential } fl + 2 * \text{card } V$
<proof>

A relabeling increases the potential by at most $O(V)$

lemma *relabel-nonsat-potential*:

assumes *PRE: relabel-precond* $fl u$

shows *nonsat-potential* f (*relabel-effect* $f l u$)
 \leq *nonsat-potential* $f l + 2 * \text{card } V$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

end — Height Bounded Labeling

context *Network*
begin

lemma *nonsat-push-action-bound'*:
assumes $A: ((f,l),p,(f',l')) \in \text{trcl } \text{pr-algo-lts}'$
shows *length* (*filter is-NONSAT-PUSH'* p) $\leq 18 * (\text{card } V)^2 * \text{card } E$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

end — Network

2.5.9 Assembling the Final Theorem

We combine the bounds for saturating and non-saturating push operations.

lemma (*in Height-Bounded-Labeling*) *push-action-bound*:
assumes $A: ((f,l),p,(f',l')) \in \text{trcl } \text{pr-algo-lts}$
shows *length* (*filter (is-PUSH)* p) $\leq 22 * (\text{card } V)^2 * \text{card } E$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

We estimate the cost of a push by $O(1)$, and of a relabel operation by $O(V)$

fun (*in Network*) *cost-estimate* $:: \text{pr-operation} \Rightarrow \text{nat}$ **where**
 $\text{cost-estimate } \text{RELABEL} = \text{card } V$
 $|\ \text{cost-estimate } \text{PUSH} = 1$

We show the complexity bound of $O(V^2E)$ when starting from any valid labeling [Cormen 26.24].

theorem (*in Height-Bounded-Labeling*) *pr-algo-cost-bound*:
assumes $A: ((f,l),p,(f',l')) \in \text{trcl } \text{pr-algo-lts}$
shows $(\sum a \leftarrow p. \text{cost-estimate } a) \leq 26 * (\text{card } V)^2 * \text{card } E$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

2.6 Main Theorem: Correctness and Complexity

Finally, we state the main theorem of this section: If the algorithm executes some steps from the beginning, then

1. If no further steps are possible from the reached state, we have computed a maximum flow [Cormen 26.18].
2. The cost of these steps is bounded by $O(V^2E)$ [Cormen 26.24]. Note that this also implies termination.

theorem (in *Network*) *generic-preflow-push-OV2E-and-correct*:
assumes $A: ((pp\text{-}init\text{-}f, pp\text{-}init\text{-}l), p, (f, l)) \in trcl\ pr\text{-}algo\text{-}lts$
shows $(\sum x \leftarrow p. cost\text{-}estimate\ x) \leq 26 * (card\ V)^2 * card\ E$ (is ?G1)
and $(f, l) \notin Domain\ pr\text{-}algo\text{-}lts \longrightarrow isMaxFlow\ f$ (is ?G2)
⟨proof⟩

2.7 Convenience Tools for Implementation

context *Network*
begin

In order to show termination of the algorithm, we only need a well-founded relation over push and relabel steps

inductive-set *pr-algo-rel* **where**
push: $\llbracket Height\text{-}Bounded\text{-}Labeling\ c\ s\ t\ f\ l; push\text{-}precond\ f\ l\ e \rrbracket$
 $\implies ((push\text{-}effect\ f\ e, l), (f, l)) \in pr\text{-}algo\text{-}rel$
relabel: $\llbracket Height\text{-}Bounded\text{-}Labeling\ c\ s\ t\ f\ l; relabel\text{-}precond\ f\ l\ u \rrbracket$
 $\implies ((f, relabel\text{-}effect\ f\ l\ u), (f, l)) \in pr\text{-}algo\text{-}rel$

lemma *pr-algo-rel-alt*: $pr\text{-}algo\text{-}rel =$
 $\{ ((push\text{-}effect\ f\ e, l), (f, l)) \mid f\ e\ l. Height\text{-}Bounded\text{-}Labeling\ c\ s\ t\ f\ l \wedge push\text{-}precond\ f\ l\ e \}$
 $\cup \{ ((f, relabel\text{-}effect\ f\ l\ u), (f, l)) \mid f\ u\ l. Height\text{-}Bounded\text{-}Labeling\ c\ s\ t\ f\ l \wedge relabel\text{-}precond\ f\ l\ u \}$
⟨proof⟩

definition *pr-algo-len-bound* $\equiv 2 * (card\ V)^2 + 22 * (card\ V)^2 * card\ E$

lemma (in *Height-Bounded-Labeling*) *pr-algo-lts-length-bound*:
assumes $A: ((f, l), p, (f', l')) \in trcl\ pr\text{-}algo\text{-}lts$
shows $length\ p \leq pr\text{-}algo\text{-}len\text{-}bound$
⟨proof⟩

lemma (in *Height-Bounded-Labeling*) *path-set-finite*:
finite $\{ p. \exists f' l'. ((f, l), p, (f', l')) \in trcl\ pr\text{-}algo\text{-}lts \}$
⟨proof⟩

definition *pr-algo-measure*
 $\equiv \lambda(f, l). Max\ \{ length\ p \mid p. \exists aa\ ba. ((f, l), p, aa, ba) \in trcl\ pr\text{-}algo\text{-}lts \}$

lemma *pr-algo-measure*:
assumes $(fl', fl) \in pr\text{-}algo\text{-}rel$
shows $pr\text{-}algo\text{-}measure\ fl' < pr\text{-}algo\text{-}measure\ fl$
⟨proof⟩

lemma *wf-pr-algo-rel[simp, intro]*: $wf\ pr\text{-}algo\text{-}rel$
⟨proof⟩

end — Network

2.8 Gap Heuristics

context *Network*

begin

If we find a label value k that is assigned to no node, we may relabel all nodes v with $k < l v < \text{card } V$ to $\text{card } V + 1$.

definition *gap-precond* $l k \equiv \forall v \in V. l v \neq k$

definition *gap-effect* $l k$

$\equiv \lambda v. \text{if } k < l v \wedge l v < \text{card } V \text{ then } \text{card } V + 1 \text{ else } l v$

The gap heuristics preserves a valid labeling.

lemma (in *Labeling*) *gap-pres-Labeling*:

assumes *PRE*: *gap-precond* $l k$

defines $l' \equiv \text{gap-effect } l k$

shows *Labeling* $c s t f l'$

<proof>

The gap heuristics also preserves the height bounds.

lemma (in *Height-Bounded-Labeling*) *gap-pres-hb-labeling*:

assumes *PRE*: *gap-precond* $l k$

defines $l' \equiv \text{gap-effect } l k$

shows *Height-Bounded-Labeling* $c s t f l'$

<proof>

We combine the regular relabel operation with the gap heuristics: If relabeling results in a gap, the gap heuristics is applied immediately.

definition *gap-relabel-effect* $f l u \equiv \text{let } l' = \text{relabel-effect } f l u \text{ in}$

if (gap-precond } l' (l u)) \text{ then } \text{gap-effect } l' (l u) \text{ else } l'

The combined gap-relabel operation preserves a valid labeling.

lemma (in *Labeling*) *gap-relabel-pres-Labeling*:

assumes *PRE*: *relabel-precond* $f l u$

defines $l' \equiv \text{gap-relabel-effect } f l u$

shows *Labeling* $c s t f l'$

<proof>

The combined gap-relabel operation preserves the height-bound.

lemma (in *Height-Bounded-Labeling*) *gap-relabel-pres-hb-labeling*:

assumes *PRE*: *relabel-precond* $f l u$

defines $l' \equiv \text{gap-relabel-effect } f l u$

shows *Height-Bounded-Labeling* $c s t f l'$

<proof>

2.8.1 Termination with Gap Heuristics

Intuitively, the algorithm with the gap heuristics terminates because relabeling according to the gap heuristics preserves the invariant and increases some labels towards their upper bound.

Formally, the simplest way is to combine a heights measure function with the already established measure for the standard algorithm:

lemma (in *Height-Bounded-Labeling*) *gap-measure*:

assumes *gap-precond l k*

shows $\text{sum-heights-measure } (\text{gap-effect } l k) \leq \text{sum-heights-measure } l$

<proof>

lemma (in *Height-Bounded-Labeling*) *gap-relabel-measure*:

assumes *PRE: relabel-precond f l u*

shows $\text{sum-heights-measure } (\text{gap-relabel-effect } f l u) < \text{sum-heights-measure } l$

<proof>

Analogously to *pr-algo-rel*, we provide a well-founded relation that overapproximates the steps of a push-relabel algorithm with gap heuristics.

inductive-set *gap-algo-rel* **where**

push: $\llbracket \text{Height-Bounded-Labeling } c s t f l; \text{push-precond } f l e \rrbracket$

$\implies ((\text{push-effect } f e, l), (f, l)) \in \text{gap-algo-rel}$

| *relabel*: $\llbracket \text{Height-Bounded-Labeling } c s t f l; \text{relabel-precond } f l u \rrbracket$

$\implies ((f, \text{gap-relabel-effect } f l u), (f, l)) \in \text{gap-algo-rel}$

lemma *wf-gap-algo-rel[simp, intro!]*: *wf gap-algo-rel*

<proof>

end — Network

end

theory *Prpu-Common-Inst*

imports

../Lib/Refine-Add-Fofu

Generic-Push-Relabel

begin

context *Network*

begin

definition *relabel f l u* \equiv *do* {

assert (*Height-Bounded-Labeling c s t f l*);

assert (*relabel-precond f l u*);

assert ($u \in V - \{s, t\}$);

return (*relabel-effect f l u*)

}

definition *gap-relabel f l u* \equiv *do* {

```

    assert (u ∈ V - {s, t});
    assert (Height-Bounded-Labeling c s t f l);
    assert (relabel-precond f l u);
    assert (l u < 2 * card V ∧ relabel-effect f l u u < 2 * card V);
    return (gap-relabel-effect f l u)
  }

```

```

definition push f l ≡ λ(u, v). do {
  assert (push-precond f l (u, v));
  assert (Labeling c s t f l);
  return (push-effect f (u, v))
}

```

end

end

3 Relabel-to-Front Algorithm

theory *Relabel-To-Front*

imports

../Lib/Refine-Add-Fofu

Prpu-Common-Inst

../Lib/Graph-Topological-Ordering

begin

As an example for an implementation, Cormen et al. discuss the relabel-to-front algorithm. It iterates over a queue of nodes, discharging each node, and putting a node to the front of the queue if it has been relabeled.

3.1 Admissible Network

The admissible network consists of those edges over which we can push flow.

context *Network*

begin

definition *adm-edges* :: 'capacity flow ⇒ (nat ⇒ nat) ⇒ -
where *adm-edges f l* ≡ {(u, v) ∈ cfE-of f. l u = l v + 1}

lemma *adm-edges-inv-disj*: *adm-edges f l* ∩ (*adm-edges f l*)⁻¹ = {}
 ⟨*proof*⟩

lemma *finite-adm-edges[simp, intro!]*: *finite (adm-edges f l)*
 ⟨*proof*⟩

end — Network

The edge of a push operation is admissible.

lemma (in *push-effect-locale*) *uv-adm*: $(u,v) \in \text{adm-edges } f l$
 ⟨*proof*⟩

A push operation will not create new admissible edges, but the edge that we pushed over may become inadmissible [Cormen 26.27].

lemma (in *Labeling*) *push-adm-edges*:
assumes *push-precond* $f l e$
shows $\text{adm-edges } f l - \{e\} \subseteq \text{adm-edges } (\text{push-effect } f e) l$ (is ?G1)
and $\text{adm-edges } (\text{push-effect } f e) l \subseteq \text{adm-edges } f l$ (is ?G2)
 ⟨*proof*⟩

After a relabel operation, there is at least one admissible edge leaving the relabeled node, but no admissible edges do enter the relabeled node [Cormen 26.28]. Moreover, the part of the admissible network not adjacent to the relabeled node does not change.

lemma (in *Labeling*) *relabel-adm-edges*:
assumes *PRE*: *relabel-precond* $f l u$
defines $l' \equiv \text{relabel-effect } f l u$
shows $\text{adm-edges } f l' \cap \text{cf.outgoing } u \neq \{\}$ (is ?G1)
and $\text{adm-edges } f l' \cap \text{cf.incoming } u = \{\}$ (is ?G2)
and $\text{adm-edges } f l' - \text{cf.adjacent } u = \text{adm-edges } f l - \text{cf.adjacent } u$ (is ?G3)
 ⟨*proof*⟩

3.2 Neighbor Lists

For each node, the algorithm will cycle through the adjacent edges when discharging. This cycling takes place across the boundaries of discharge operations, i.e. when a node is discharged, discharging will start at the edge where the last discharge operation stopped.

The crucial invariant for the neighbor lists is that already visited edges are not admissible.

Formally, we maintain a function $n :: \text{node} \Rightarrow \text{node set}$ from each node to the set of target nodes of not yet visited edges.

locale *neighbor-invar* = *Height-Bounded-Labeling* +
fixes $n :: \text{node} \Rightarrow \text{node set}$
assumes *neighbors-adm*: $\llbracket v \in \text{adjacent-nodes } u - n u \rrbracket \implies (u,v) \notin \text{adm-edges } f l$
assumes *neighbors-adj*: $n u \subseteq \text{adjacent-nodes } u$
assumes *neighbors-finite*[*simp, intro!*]: *finite* $(n u)$
begin

lemma *nbr-is-hbl*: *Height-Bounded-Labeling* *c s t f l* ⟨*proof*⟩

lemma *push-pres-nbr-invar*:
assumes *PRE*: *push-precond* $f l e$

shows *neighbor-invar c s t (push-effect f e) l n*
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma *relabel-pres-nbr-invar:*

assumes *PRE: relabel-precond f l u*

shows *neighbor-invar c s t f (relabel-effect f l u) (n(u:=adjacent-nodes u))*
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma *excess-nz-iff-gz: $\llbracket u \in V; u \neq s \rrbracket \implies excess\ f\ u \neq 0 \longleftrightarrow excess\ f\ u > 0$*
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma *no-neighbors-relabel-precond:*

assumes $n\ u = \{\}$ $u \neq t$ $u \neq s$ $u \in V$ $excess\ f\ u \neq 0$

shows *relabel-precond f l u*

⟨proof⟩

lemma *remove-neighbor-pres-nbr-invar: $(u,v) \notin adm\ edges\ f\ l$*

$\implies neighbor\ invar\ c\ s\ t\ f\ l\ (n\ (u := n\ u - \{v\}))$

⟨proof⟩

end

3.3 Discharge Operation

context *Network*

begin

The discharge operation performs push and relabel operations on a node until it becomes inactive. The lemmas in this section are based on the ideas described in the proof of [Cormen 26.29].

definition *discharge f l n u $\equiv do$ {*

assert $(u \in V - \{s,t\})$;

while_T $(\lambda(f,l,n). excess\ f\ u \neq 0)$ $(\lambda(f,l,n). do$ {

$v \leftarrow selectp\ v. v \in n\ u$;

case v of

None $\Rightarrow do$ {

$l \leftarrow relabel\ f\ l\ u$;

return $(f,l,n(u := adjacent-nodes\ u))$

}

| Some v $\Rightarrow do$ {

assert $(v \in V \wedge (u,v) \in E \cup E^{-1})$;

if $((u,v) \in cfE\text{-of}\ f \wedge l\ u = l\ v + 1)$ then do {

$f \leftarrow push\ f\ l\ (u,v)$;

return (f,l,n)

} else do {

assert $(u,v) \notin adm\ edges\ f\ l$;

return $(f,l,n(u := n\ u - \{v\}))$

}

}

}

}) (f,l,n)
}

end — Network

Invariant for the discharge loop

locale *discharge-invar* =
 neighbor-invar *c s t f l n*
 + *lo*: *neighbor-invar* *c s t fo lo no*
 for *c s t* **and** *u* :: *node* **and** *fo lo no f l n* +
 assumes *lu-incr*: $lo\ u \leq l\ u$
 assumes *u-node*: $u \in V - \{s, t\}$
 assumes *no-relabel-adm-edges*: $lo\ u = l\ u \implies adm\ edges\ f\ l \subseteq adm\ edges\ fo\ lo$
 assumes *no-relabel-excess*:
 $\llbracket lo\ u = l\ u; u \neq v; excess\ fo\ v \neq excess\ f\ v \rrbracket \implies (u, v) \in adm\ edges\ fo\ lo$
 assumes *adm-edges-leaving-u*: $(u', v) \in adm\ edges\ f\ l - adm\ edges\ fo\ lo \implies u' = u$
 assumes *relabel-u-no-incoming-adm*: $lo\ u \neq l\ u \implies (v, u) \notin adm\ edges\ f\ l$
 assumes *algo-rel*: $((f, l), (fo, lo)) \in pr\ algo\ rel^*$
begin

lemma *u-node-simp1*[*simp*]: $u \neq s \quad u \neq t \quad s \neq u \quad t \neq u$ *<proof>*

lemma *u-node-simp2*[*simp, intro!*]: $u \in V$ *<proof>*

lemma *dis-is-lbl*: *Labeling* *c s t f l* *<proof>*

lemma *dis-is-hbl*: *Height-Bounded-Labeling* *c s t f l* *<proof>*

lemma *dis-is-nbr*: *neighbor-invar* *c s t f l n* *<proof>*

lemma *new-adm-imp-relabel*:

$(u', v) \in adm\ edges\ f\ l - adm\ edges\ fo\ lo \implies lo\ u \neq l\ u$
<proof>

lemma *push-pres-dis-invar*:

assumes *PRE*: *push-precond* *f l (u, v)*
shows *discharge-invar* *c s t u fo lo no* (*push-effect* *f (u, v)*) *l n*
<proof>

lemma *relabel-pres-dis-invar*:

assumes *PRE*: *relabel-precond* *f l u*
shows *discharge-invar* *c s t u fo lo no f*
 (*relabel-effect* *f l u*) (*n(u := adjacent-nodes u)*)
<proof>

lemma *push-precondI-nz*:

$\llbracket excess\ f\ u \neq 0; (u, v) \in cfE\ of\ f; l\ u = l\ v + 1 \rrbracket \implies push\ precond\ f\ l\ (u, v)$
<proof>

lemma *remove-neighbor-pres-dis-invar*:

assumes *PRE*: $(u, v) \notin adm\ edges\ f\ l$

defines $n' \equiv n (u := n u - \{v\})$
shows *discharge-invar c s t u fo lo no fl n'*
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma *neighbors-in-V*: $v \in n u \implies v \in V$
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma *neighbors-in-E*: $v \in n u \implies (u, v) \in E \cup E^{-1}$
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma *reabeled-node-has-outgoing*:
assumes *relabel-precond fl u*
shows $\exists v. (u, v) \in c f E\text{-of } f$
 ⟨proof⟩

end

lemma (**in** *neighbor-invar*) *discharge-invar-init*:
assumes $u \in V - \{s, t\}$
shows *discharge-invar c s t u fl n fl n*
 ⟨proof⟩

context *Network* **begin**

The discharge operation preserves the invariant, and discharges the node.

lemma *discharge-correct*[*THEN order-trans, refine-vcg*]:
assumes *DINV*: *neighbor-invar c s t fl n*
assumes *NOT-ST*: $u \neq t \quad u \neq s$ **and** *UIV*: $u \in V$
shows *discharge fl n u*
 $\leq \text{SPEC } (\lambda(f', l', n'). \text{discharge-invar c s t u fl n f' l' n'}$
 $\quad \wedge \text{excess f' u} = 0)$
 ⟨proof⟩

end — Network

3.4 Main Algorithm

We state the main algorithm and prove its termination and correctness

context *Network*
begin

Initially, all edges are unprocessed.

definition *rtf-init-n u* \equiv *if* $u \in V - \{s, t\}$ *then* *adjacent-nodes u* *else* $\{\}$

lemma *rtf-init-n-finite*[*simp, intro!*]: *finite* (*rtf-init-n u*)

<proof>

lemma *init-no-adm-edges[simp]*: *adm-edges pp-init-f pp-init-l = {}*
<proof>

lemma *rtf-init-neighbor-invar*:
neighbor-invar c s t pp-init-f pp-init-l rtf-init-n
<proof>

definition *relabel-to-front* \equiv *do* {
 let *f* = *pp-init-f*;
 let *l* = *pp-init-l*;
 let *n* = *rtf-init-n*;

 let *L-left* = [];
 L-right \leftarrow *spec l. distinct l \wedge set l = V - {s,t}*;

 (*f,l,n,L-left,L-right*) \leftarrow *while_T*
 ($\lambda(f,l,n,L-left,L-right). L-right \neq []$)
 ($\lambda(f,l,n,L-left,L-right). do$ {
 let *u* = *hd L-right*;
 assert (*u* \in *V*);
 let old-lu = *l u*;

 (*f,l,n*) \leftarrow *discharge f l n u*;

 if (*l u* \neq *old-lu*) *then do* {
 (* *Move u to front of l, and restart scanning L* *)
 let (*L-left,L-right*) = (*[u],L-left @ tl L-right*);
 return (*f,l,n,L-left,L-right*)
 } *else do* {
 (* *Goto next node in l* *)
 let (*L-left,L-right*) = (*L-left@[u], tl L-right*);
 return (*f,l,n,L-left,L-right*)
 }

 }) (*f,l,n,L-left,L-right*);

 assert (*neighbor-invar c s t f l n*);

 return f
}

end — Network

Invariant for the main algorithm:

1. Nodes in the queue left of the current node are not active

2. The queue is a topological sort of the admissible network
3. All nodes except source and sink are on the queue

```

locale rtf-invar = neighbor-invar +
  fixes L-left L-right :: node list
  assumes left-no-excess:  $\forall u \in \text{set } (L\text{-left}). \text{excess } f \ u = 0$ 
  assumes L-sorted: is-top-sorted (adm-edges f l) (L-left @ L-right)
  assumes L-set:  $\text{set } L\text{-left} \cup \text{set } L\text{-right} = V - \{s, t\}$ 
begin
  lemma rtf-is-nbr: neighbor-invar c s t f l n  $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$ 

  lemma L-distinct: distinct (L-left @ L-right)
     $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$ 

  lemma terminated-imp-maxflow:
    assumes [simp]: L-right = []
    shows isMaxFlow f
     $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$ 

end

context Network begin
lemma rtf-init-invar:
  assumes DIS: distinct L-left and L-set:  $\text{set } L\text{-left} = V - \{s, t\}$ 
  shows rtf-invar c s t pp-init-f pp-init-l rtf-init-n [] L-left
   $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$ 

theorem relabel-to-front-correct:
  relabel-to-front  $\leq$  SPEC isMaxFlow
   $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$ 

end — Network

end

```

4 FIFO Push Relabel Algorithm

```

theory Fifo-Push-Relabel
imports
  ../Lib/Refine-Add-Fofu
  Generic-Push-Relabel
begin

```

The FIFO push-relabel algorithm maintains a first-in-first-out queue of active nodes. As long as the queue is not empty, it discharges the first node of the queue.

Discharging repeatedly applied push operations from the node. If no more push operations are possible, and the node is still active, it is relabeled and enqueued.

Moreover, we implement the gap heuristics, which may accelerate relabeling if there is a gap in the label values, i.e., a label value that is assigned to no node.

4.1 Implementing the Discharge Operation

context *Network*
begin

First, we implement push and relabel operations that maintain a queue of all active nodes.

definition *fifo-push* $f\ l\ Q \equiv \lambda(u,v). \text{ do } \{$
 $\text{ assert } (\text{push-precond } f\ l\ (u,v));$
 $\text{ assert } (\text{Labeling } c\ s\ t\ f\ l);$
 $\text{ let } Q = (\text{if } v \neq s \wedge v \neq t \wedge \text{excess } f\ v = 0 \text{ then } Q@[v] \text{ else } Q);$
 $\text{ return } (\text{push-effect } f\ (u,v), Q)$
 $\}$

For the relabel operation, we assume that only active nodes are relabeled, and enqueue the relabeled node.

definition *fifo-gap-relabel* $f\ l\ Q\ u \equiv \text{ do } \{$
 $\text{ assert } (u \in V - \{s, t\});$
 $\text{ assert } (\text{Height-Bounded-Labeling } c\ s\ t\ f\ l);$
 $\text{ let } Q = Q@[u];$
 $\text{ assert } (\text{relabel-precond } f\ l\ u);$
 $\text{ assert } (l\ u < 2 * \text{card } V \wedge \text{relabel-effect } f\ l\ u\ u < 2 * \text{card } V);$
 $\text{ let } l = \text{gap-relabel-effect } f\ l\ u;$
 $\text{ return } (l, Q)$
 $\}$

The discharge operation iterates over the edges, and pushes flow, as long as then node is active. If the node is still active after all edges have been saturated, the node is relabeled.

definition *fifo-discharge* $f_0\ l\ Q \equiv \text{ do } \{$
 $\text{ assert } (Q \neq []);$
 $\text{ let } u = \text{hd } Q; \text{ let } Q = \text{tl } Q;$
 $\text{ assert } (u \in V \wedge u \neq s \wedge u \neq t);$
 $(f, l, Q) \leftarrow \text{FOREACHc } \{v \cdot (u, v) \in \text{cfE-of } f_0\} (\lambda(f, l, Q). \text{ excess } f\ u \neq 0) (\lambda v$
 $(f, l, Q). \text{ do } \{$
 $\text{ if } (l\ u = l\ v + 1) \text{ then do } \{$
 $(f', Q) \leftarrow \text{fifo-push } f\ l\ Q\ (u, v);$
 $\text{ assert } (\forall v'. v' \neq v \longrightarrow \text{cf-of } f' (u, v') = \text{cf-of } f (u, v'));$
 $\text{ return } (f', l, Q)$
 $\}$
 $\}$

```

    } else return (f,l,Q)
  }) (f_0,l,Q);

  if excess f u ≠ 0 then do {
    (l,Q) ← fifo-gap-relabel f l Q u;
    return (f,l,Q)
  } else do {
    return (f,l,Q)
  }
}

```

We will show that the discharge operation maintains the invariant that the queue is disjoint and contains exactly the active nodes:

definition $Q\text{-invar } f Q \equiv \text{distinct } Q \wedge \text{set } Q = \{ v \in V - \{s,t\}. \text{ excess } f v \neq 0 \}$

Inside the loop of the discharge operation, we will use the following version of the invariant:

definition $QD\text{-invar } u f Q \equiv u \in V - \{s,t\} \wedge \text{distinct } Q \wedge \text{set } Q = \{ v \in V - \{s,t,u\}. \text{ excess } f v \neq 0 \}$

lemma $Q\text{-invar-when-discharged1}$: $\llbracket QD\text{-invar } u f Q; \text{ excess } f u = 0 \rrbracket \implies Q\text{-invar } f Q$
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma $Q\text{-invar-when-discharged2}$: $\llbracket QD\text{-invar } u f Q; \text{ excess } f u \neq 0 \rrbracket \implies Q\text{-invar } f (Q@[u])$
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma (in *Labeling*) $\text{push-no-activate-pres-}QD\text{-invar}$:

fixes v
assumes INV : $QD\text{-invar } u f Q$
assumes PRE : $\text{push-precond } f l (u,v)$
assumes VC : $s=v \vee t=v \vee \text{ excess } f v \neq 0$
shows $QD\text{-invar } u (\text{push-effect } f (u,v)) Q$
 ⟨proof⟩

lemma (in *Labeling*) $\text{push-activate-pres-}QD\text{-invar}$:

fixes v
assumes INV : $QD\text{-invar } u f Q$
assumes PRE : $\text{push-precond } f l (u,v)$
assumes VC : $s \neq v \quad t \neq v$ **and** $[simp]$: $\text{ excess } f v = 0$
shows $QD\text{-invar } u (\text{push-effect } f (u,v)) (Q@[v])$
 ⟨proof⟩

Main theorem for the discharge operation: It maintains a height bounded labeling, the invariant for the FIFO queue, and only performs valid steps due to the generic push-relabel algorithm with gap-heuristics.

theorem $\text{fifo-discharge-correct}$ [*THEN* order-trans , refine-vcg]:

assumes *DINV*: *Height-Bounded-Labeling c s t f l*
assumes *QINV*: *Q-invar f Q* **and** *QNE*: $Q \neq []$
shows *fifo-discharge f l Q* \leq *SPEC* ($\lambda(f', l', Q')$.
Height-Bounded-Labeling c s t f' l'
 \wedge *Q-invar f' Q'*
 $\wedge ((f', l'), (f, l)) \in \text{gap-algo-rel}^+$
))
<proof>

end — Network

4.2 Main Algorithm

context *Network*
begin

The main algorithm initializes the flow, labeling, and the queue, and then applies the discharge operation until the queue is empty:

definition *fifo-push-relabel* \equiv *do* {
 let $f = \text{pp-init-}f$;
 let $l = \text{pp-init-}l$;

 $Q \leftarrow \text{spec } l. \text{ distinct } l \wedge \text{ set } l = \{v \in V - \{s, t\}. \text{ excess } f v \neq 0\}$; (* *TODO*: *This is exactly* $E^{\{s\} - \{t\}}$! *)

 ($f, l, -$) \leftarrow *while*_T ($\lambda(f, l, Q). Q \neq []$) ($\lambda(f, l, Q). \text{ do}$ {
 fifo-discharge f l Q
 }) (f, l, Q);

 assert (*Height-Bounded-Labeling c s t f l*);
 return f
}

Having proved correctness of the discharge operation, the correctness theorem of the main algorithm is straightforward: As the discharge operation implements the generic algorithm, the loop will terminate after finitely many steps. Upon termination, the queue that contains exactly the active nodes is empty. Thus, all nodes are inactive, and the resulting preflow is actually a maximal flow.

theorem *fifo-push-relabel-correct*:
fifo-push-relabel \leq *SPEC isMaxFlow*
<proof>

end — Network

end

5 Tools for Implementing Push-Relabel Algorithms

```
theory Prpu-Common-Impl
imports
  Prpu-Common-Inst
  ../Flow-Networks/Network-Impl
  ../Net-Check/NetCheck
begin
```

5.1 Basic Operations

```
type-synonym excess-impl = node  $\Rightarrow$  capacity-impl
```

```
context Network-Impl
begin
```

5.1.1 Excess Map

Obtain an excess map with all nodes mapped to zero.

```
definition x-init :: excess-impl nres where x-init  $\equiv$  return ( $\lambda$ -. 0)
```

Get the excess of a node.

```
definition x-get :: excess-impl  $\Rightarrow$  node  $\Rightarrow$  capacity-impl nres
where x-get x u  $\equiv$  do {
  assert (u  $\in$  V);
  return (x u)
}
```

Add a capacity to the excess of a node.

```
definition x-add :: excess-impl  $\Rightarrow$  node  $\Rightarrow$  capacity-impl  $\Rightarrow$  excess-impl nres
where x-add x u  $\Delta$   $\equiv$  do {
  assert (u  $\in$  V);
  return (x(u := x u +  $\Delta$ ))
}
```

5.1.2 Labeling

Obtain the initial labeling: All nodes are zero, except the source which is labeled by $|V|$. The exact cardinality of V is passed as a parameter.

```
definition l-init :: nat  $\Rightarrow$  (node  $\Rightarrow$  nat) nres
where l-init C  $\equiv$  return (( $\lambda$ -. 0)(s := C))
```

Get the label of a node.

```
definition l-get :: (node  $\Rightarrow$  nat)  $\Rightarrow$  node  $\Rightarrow$  nat nres
where l-get l u  $\equiv$  do {
  assert (u  $\in$  V);
  return (l u)
}
```


}

Set the label of a node.

definition *l-set* :: (node ⇒ nat) ⇒ node ⇒ nat ⇒ (node ⇒ nat) nres
where *l-set l u a* ≡ do {
 assert (u ∈ V);
 assert (a < 2 * card V);
 return (l(u := a))
}

5.1.3 Label Frequency Counts for Gap Heuristics

Obtain the frequency counts for the initial labeling. Again, the cardinality of $|V|$, which is required to determine the label of the source node, is passed as an explicit parameter.

definition *cnt-init* :: nat ⇒ (nat ⇒ nat) nres
where *cnt-init C* ≡ do {
 assert (C < 2 * N);
 return ((λ-. 0)(0 := C - 1, C := 1))
}

Get the count for a label value.

definition *cnt-get* :: (nat ⇒ nat) ⇒ nat ⇒ nat nres
where *cnt-get cnt lv* ≡ do {
 assert (lv < 2 * N);
 return (cnt lv)
}

Increment the count for a label value by one.

definition *cnt-incr* :: (nat ⇒ nat) ⇒ nat ⇒ (nat ⇒ nat) nres
where *cnt-incr cnt lv* ≡ do {
 assert (lv < 2 * N);
 return (cnt (lv := cnt lv + 1))
}

Decrement the count for a label value by one.

definition *cnt-decr* :: (nat ⇒ nat) ⇒ nat ⇒ (nat ⇒ nat) nres
where *cnt-decr cnt lv* ≡ do {
 assert (lv < 2 * N ∧ cnt lv > 0);
 return (cnt (lv := cnt lv - 1))
}

end — Network Implementation Locale

5.2 Refinements to Basic Operations

context *Network-Impl*
begin

In this section, we refine the algorithm to actually use the basic operations.

5.2.1 Explicit Computation of the Excess

definition $xf\text{-rel} \equiv \{ ((\text{excess } f, \text{cf-of } f), f) \mid f. \text{True} \}$

lemma $xf\text{-rel-RELATES}[\text{refine-dref-RELATES}]$: $RELATES\ xf\text{-rel}$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

definition $pp\text{-init-}x$

$\equiv \lambda u. (\text{if } u=s \text{ then } (\sum_{(u,v) \in \text{outgoing } s} c(u,v)) \text{ else } c(s,u))$

lemma $\text{excess-pp-init-}f[\text{simp}]$: $\text{excess } pp\text{-init-}f = pp\text{-init-}x$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

definition $pp\text{-init-}cf$

$\equiv \lambda(u,v). \text{if } (v=s) \text{ then } c(v,u) \text{ else if } u=s \text{ then } 0 \text{ else } c(u,v)$

lemma $\text{cf-of-pp-init-}f[\text{simp}]$: $\text{cf-of } pp\text{-init-}f = pp\text{-init-}cf$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma $pp\text{-init-}x\text{-rel}$: $((pp\text{-init-}x, pp\text{-init-}cf), pp\text{-init-}f) \in xf\text{-rel}$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

5.2.2 Algorithm to Compute Initial Excess and Flow

definition $pp\text{-init-}xcf2\text{-aux} \equiv \text{do } \{$

$\text{let } x = (\lambda-. 0);$

$\text{let } cf = c;$

$\text{foreach } (\text{adjacent-nodes } s) (\lambda v (x, cf). \text{do } \{$

$\text{assert } ((s, v) \in E);$

$\text{assert } (s \neq v);$

$\text{let } a = cf(s, v);$

$\text{assert } (x\ v = 0);$

$\text{let } x = x(s := x\ s - a, v := a);$

$\text{let } cf = cf((s, v) := 0, (v, s) := a);$

$\text{return } (x, cf)$

$\}) (x, cf)$

$\}$

lemma $pp\text{-init-}xcf2\text{-aux-spec}$:

shows $pp\text{-init-}xcf2\text{-aux} \leq SPEC(\lambda(x, cf). x = pp\text{-init-}x \wedge cf = pp\text{-init-}cf)$

$\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

applyS $(\text{auto intro!} : \text{sum.reindex-cong}[\text{where } l = \text{snd}] \text{ intro} : \text{inj-onI})$

applyS $(\text{metis } (\text{mono-tags, lifting}) \text{ Compl-iff Graph.zero-cap-simp insertE}$

$\text{mem-Collect-eq})$

$\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

definition $pp\text{-init-}xcf2\ \text{am} \equiv \text{do } \{$

```

x ← x-init;
cf ← cf-init;

assert (s ∈ V);
adj ← am-get am s;
nfoldli adj (λ-. True) (λv (x,cf). do {
  assert ((s,v) ∈ E);
  assert (s ≠ v);
  a ← cf-get cf (s,v);
  x ← x-add x s (-a);
  x ← x-add x v a;
  cf ← cf-set cf (s,v) 0;
  cf ← cf-set cf (v,s) a;
  return (x,cf)
}) (x,cf)
}

```

lemma *pp-init-xcf2-refine-aux*:
assumes *AM*: *is-adj-map am*
shows *pp-init-xcf2 am* ≤ \Downarrow *Id* (*pp-init-xcf2-aux*)
<proof>

lemma *pp-init-xcf2-refine[refine2]*:
assumes *AM*: *is-adj-map am*
shows *pp-init-xcf2 am* ≤ \Downarrow *xf-rel* (*RETURN pp-init-f*)
<proof>

5.2.3 Computing the Minimal Adjacent Label

definition (in *Network*) *min-adj-label-aux cf l u* ≡ do {
 assert (u ∈ V);
 x ← foreach (adjacent-nodes u) (λv x. do {
 assert ((u,v) ∈ E ∪ E⁻¹);
 assert (v ∈ V);
 if (cf (u,v) ≠ 0) then
 case x of
 None ⇒ return (Some (l v))
 | Some xx ⇒ return (Some (min (l v) (xx)))
 else
 return x
 }) None;
 assert (x ≠ None);
 return (the x)
}

lemma (in $-$) *set-filter-xform-aux*:
 $\{ f x \mid x. (x = a \vee x \in S \wedge x \notin it) \wedge P x \}$
 $= (\text{if } P a \text{ then } \{ f a \} \text{ else } \{ \}) \cup \{ f x \mid x. x \in S - it \wedge P x \}$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma (in *Labeling*) *min-adj-label-aux-spec*:
assumes *PRE*: *relabel-precond f l u*
shows *min-adj-label-aux cf l u* \leq *SPEC* $(\lambda x. x = \text{Min } \{ l v \mid v. (u,v) \in cf.E \})$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

definition *min-adj-label am cf l u* \equiv *do* {
assert $(u \in V)$;
adj \leftarrow *am-get am u*;
x \leftarrow *nfoldli adj* $(\lambda-. \text{True}) (\lambda v x. \text{do } \{$
assert $((u,v) \in E \cup E^{-1})$;
assert $(v \in V)$;
cfuv \leftarrow *cf-get cf (u,v)*;
if $(cfuv \neq 0)$ *then do* {
lv \leftarrow *l-get l v*;
case x of
None \Rightarrow *return (Some lv)*
| Some xx \Rightarrow *return (Some (min lv xx))*
} *else*
return x
 $\}$ *None*;

assert $(x \neq \text{None})$;
return (the x)
 $\}$

lemma *min-adj-label-refine*[*THEN order-trans, refine-vcg*]:
assumes *Height-Bounded-Labeling c s t f l*
assumes *AM*: $(am, \text{adjacent-nodes}) \in \text{nat-rel} \rightarrow \langle \text{nat-rel} \rangle \text{list-set-rel}$
assumes *PRE*: *relabel-precond f l u*
assumes [*simp*]: *cf = cf-of f*
shows *min-adj-label am cf l u* \leq *SPEC* $(\lambda x. x = \text{Min } \{ l v \mid v. (u,v) \in cf.E\text{-of } f \})$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

5.2.4 Refinement of Relabel

Utilities to Implement Relabel Operations

definition *relabel2 am cf l u* \equiv *do* {
assert $(u \in V - \{s,t\})$;
nl \leftarrow *min-adj-label am cf l u*;
l \leftarrow *l-set l u (nl+1)*;
return l
 $\}$

lemma *relabel2-refine*[*refine*]:
assumes $((x,cf),f) \in xf\text{-rel}$
assumes *AM*: $(am, \text{adjacent-nodes}) \in \text{nat-rel} \rightarrow \langle \text{nat-rel} \rangle \text{list-set-rel}$
assumes [*simplified, simp*]: $(li, l) \in Id \quad (ui, u) \in Id$
shows $\text{relabel2 } am \ cf \ li \ ui \leq \Downarrow Id \ (\text{relabel } f \ l \ u)$
<proof>

5.2.5 Refinement of Push

definition *push2-aux* $x \ cf \equiv \lambda(u,v). \text{ do } \{$
 $\text{assert } (u,v) \in E \cup E^{-1};$
 $\text{assert } (u \neq v);$
 $\text{let } \Delta = \text{min } (x \ u) \ (cf \ (u,v));$
 $\text{return } ((x \ u := x \ u - \Delta, v := x \ v + \Delta), \text{augment-edge-cf } cf \ (u,v) \ \Delta))$
 $\}$

lemma *push2-aux-refine*:
 $\llbracket ((x,cf),f) \in xf\text{-rel}; (ei,e) \in Id \times_r Id \rrbracket$
 $\implies \text{push2-aux } x \ cf \ ei \leq \Downarrow xf\text{-rel} \ (\text{push } f \ l \ e)$
<proof>

definition *push2* $x \ cf \equiv \lambda(u,v). \text{ do } \{$
 $\text{assert } (u,v) \in E \cup E^{-1};$
 $xu \leftarrow x\text{-get } x \ u;$
 $cfuw \leftarrow cf\text{-get } cf \ (u,v);$
 $cfvu \leftarrow cf\text{-get } cf \ (v,u);$
 $\text{let } \Delta = \text{min } xu \ cfuw;$
 $x \leftarrow x\text{-add } x \ u \ (-\Delta);$
 $x \leftarrow x\text{-add } x \ v \ \Delta;$

 $cf \leftarrow cf\text{-set } cf \ (u,v) \ (cfuw - \Delta);$
 $cf \leftarrow cf\text{-set } cf \ (v,u) \ (cfvu + \Delta);$

 $\text{return } (x,cf)$
 $\}$

lemma *push2-refine*[*refine*]:
assumes $((x,cf),f) \in xf\text{-rel} \quad (ei,e) \in Id \times_r Id$
shows $\text{push2 } x \ cf \ ei \leq \Downarrow xf\text{-rel} \ (\text{push } f \ l \ e)$
<proof>

5.2.6 Adding frequency counters to labeling

definition *l-invar* $l \equiv \forall v. l \ v \neq 0 \longrightarrow v \in V$

definition *clc-invar* $\equiv \lambda(cnt,l).$
 $(\forall lv. cnt \ lv = \text{card } \{ u \in V . l \ u = lv \})$
 $\wedge (\forall u. l \ u < 2 * N) \wedge l\text{-invar } l$

definition *clc-rel* $\equiv br \ \text{snd} \ \text{clc-invar}$

definition *clc-init* $C \equiv do \{$
 $l \leftarrow l-init\ C;$
 $cnt \leftarrow cnt-init\ C;$
 $return\ (cnt, l)$
 $\}$

definition *clc-get* $\equiv \lambda(cnt, l)\ u.\ l-get\ l\ u$

definition *clc-set* $\equiv \lambda(cnt, l)\ u\ a.\ do \{$
 $assert\ (a < 2 * N);$
 $lu \leftarrow l-get\ l\ u;$
 $cnt \leftarrow cnt-decr\ cnt\ lu;$
 $l \leftarrow l-set\ l\ u\ a;$
 $lu \leftarrow l-get\ l\ u;$
 $cnt \leftarrow cnt-incr\ cnt\ lu;$
 $return\ (cnt, l)$
 $\}$

definition *clc-has-gap* $\equiv \lambda(cnt, l)\ lu.\ do \{$
 $nlu \leftarrow cnt-get\ cnt\ lu;$
 $return\ (nlu = 0)$
 $\}$

lemma *cardV-le-N*: $card\ V \leq N$ *<proof>*

lemma *N-not-Z*: $N \neq 0$ *<proof>*

lemma *N-ge-2*: $2 \leq N$ *<proof>*

lemma *clc-init-refine*[*refine*]:
assumes [*simplified, simp*]: $(Ci, C) \in nat-rel$
assumes [*simp*]: $C = card\ V$
shows *clc-init* $Ci \leq \Downarrow clc-rel\ (l-init\ C)$
<proof>

lemma *clc-get-refine*[*refine*]:
 $\llbracket (clc, l) \in clc-rel; (ui, u) \in nat-rel \rrbracket \implies clc-get\ clc\ ui \leq \Downarrow Id\ (l-get\ l\ u)$
<proof>

definition *l-get-rlx* $:: (node \Rightarrow nat) \Rightarrow node \Rightarrow nat\ nres$
where *l-get-rlx* $l\ u \equiv do \{$
 $assert\ (u < N);$
 $return\ (l\ u)$
 $\}$

definition *clc-get-rlx* $\equiv \lambda(cnt, l)\ u.\ l-get-rlx\ l\ u$

lemma *clc-get-rlx-refine*[*refine*]:
 $\llbracket (clc, l) \in clc-rel; (ui, u) \in nat-rel \rrbracket$
 $\implies clc-get-rlx\ clc\ ui \leq \Downarrow Id\ (l-get-rlx\ l\ u)$
<proof>

lemma *card-insert-disjointI*:
 $\llbracket \text{finite } Y; X = \text{insert } x \ Y; x \notin Y \rrbracket \implies \text{card } X = \text{Suc } (\text{card } Y)$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *clc-set-refine*[*refine*]:
 $\llbracket (clc, l) \in \text{clc-rel}; (ui, u) \in \text{nat-rel}; (ai, a) \in \text{nat-rel} \rrbracket \implies$
 $\text{clc-set } clc \ ui \ ai \ \leq \downarrow \text{clc-rel } (l\text{-set } l \ u \ a)$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$
applyS *auto*
applyS (*auto simp: simp: card-gt-0-iff*)

$\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *clc-has-gap-correct*[*THEN order-trans, refine-vcg*]:
 $\llbracket (clc, l) \in \text{clc-rel}; k < 2 * N \rrbracket$
 $\implies \text{clc-has-gap } clc \ k \ \leq \ (\text{spec } r. \ r \longleftrightarrow \text{gap-precond } l \ k)$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

5.2.7 Refinement of Gap-Heuristics

Utilities to Implement Gap-Heuristics

definition *gap-aux* $C \ l \ k \equiv \text{do } \{$
 $\text{nfoldli } [0..<N] \ (\lambda-. \ \text{True}) \ (\lambda v \ l. \ \text{do } \{$
 $\quad l \leftarrow l\text{-get-rlx } l \ v;$
 $\quad \text{if } (k < l \ \wedge \ l < C) \ \text{then } \text{do } \{$
 $\quad \quad \text{assert } (C+1 < 2 * N);$
 $\quad \quad l \leftarrow l\text{-set } l \ v \ (C+1);$
 $\quad \quad \text{return } l$
 $\quad \quad \}$ *else return* l
 $\quad \quad \}$ $\}$ l
 $\}$

lemma *gap-effect-invar*[*simp*]: $l\text{-invar } l \implies l\text{-invar } (\text{gap-effect } l \ k)$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *relabel-effect-invar*[*simp*]: $\llbracket l\text{-invar } l; u \in V \rrbracket \implies l\text{-invar } (\text{relabel-effect } f \ l \ u)$

$\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *gap-aux-correct*[*THEN order-trans, refine-vcg*]:
 $\llbracket l\text{-invar } l; C = \text{card } V \rrbracket \implies \text{gap-aux } C \ l \ k \ \leq \ \text{SPEC } (\lambda r. \ r = \text{gap-effect } l \ k)$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

definition *gap2* $C \ clc \ k \equiv \text{do } \{$
 $\text{nfoldli } [0..<N] \ (\lambda-. \ \text{True}) \ (\lambda v \ clc. \ \text{do } \{$
 $\quad l \leftarrow clc\text{-get-rlx } clc \ v;$
 $\quad \text{if } (k < l \ \wedge \ l < C) \ \text{then } \text{do } \{$
 $\quad \quad clc \leftarrow clc\text{-set } clc \ v \ (C+1);$
 $\quad \quad \text{return } clc$
 $\quad \quad \}$
 $\quad \quad \}$
 $\quad \quad \}$
 $\}$

```

    } else return clc
  }) clc
}

```

lemma *gap2-refine*[*refine*]:
assumes [*simplified,simp*]: $(Ci, C) \in \text{nat-rel}$ $(ki, k) \in \text{nat-rel}$
assumes *CLC*: $(clc, l) \in \text{clc-rel}$
shows *gap2 Ci clc ki* $\leq \Downarrow \text{clc-rel}$ (*gap-aux C l k*)
<proof>

definition *gap-relabel-aux C f l u* \equiv *do* {
lu \leftarrow *l-get l u*;
l \leftarrow *relabel f l u*;
if gap-precond l lu then
 gap-aux C l lu
else return l
}

lemma *gap-relabel-aux-refine*:
assumes [*simp*]: $C = \text{card } V$ *l-invar l*
shows *gap-relabel-aux C f l u* \leq *gap-relabel f l u*
<proof>

definition *min-adj-label-clc am cf clc u* \equiv *case clc of* $(-, l) \Rightarrow$ *min-adj-label am cf l u*

definition *clc-relabel2 am cf clc u* \equiv *do* {
 assert ($u \in V - \{s, t\}$);
 nl \leftarrow *min-adj-label-clc am cf clc u*;
 clc \leftarrow *clc-set clc u (nl+1)*;
 return clc
}

lemma *clc-relabel2-refine*[*refine*]:
assumes *XF*: $((x, cf), f) \in \text{xf-rel}$
assumes *CLC*: $(clc, l) \in \text{clc-rel}$
assumes *AM*: $(am, \text{adjacent-nodes}) \in \text{nat-rel} \rightarrow \langle \text{nat-rel} \rangle \text{list-set-rel}$
assumes [*simplified,simp*]: $(ui, u) \in \text{Id}$
shows *clc-relabel2 am cf clc ui* $\leq \Downarrow \text{clc-rel}$ (*relabel f l u*)
<proof>

definition *gap-relabel2 C am cf clc u* \equiv *do* {
 lu \leftarrow *clc-get clc u*;
 clc \leftarrow *clc-relabel2 am cf clc u*;
 has-gap \leftarrow *clc-has-gap clc lu*;


```

    if has-gap then gap2 C clc lu
    else
      RETURN clc
  }

```

lemma *gap-relabel2-refine-aux*:

```

assumes XCF:  $((x, cf), f) \in xf\text{-rel}$ 
assumes CLC:  $(clc, l) \in clc\text{-rel}$ 
assumes AM:  $(am, adjacent\text{-nodes}) \in nat\text{-rel} \rightarrow \langle nat\text{-rel} \rangle list\text{-set}\text{-rel}$ 
assumes [simplified, simp]:  $(Ci, C) \in Id \quad (ui, u) \in Id$ 
shows gap-relabel2 Ci am cf clc ui  $\leq \Downarrow clc\text{-rel}$  (gap-relabel-aux C f l u)
<proof>

```

lemma *gap-relabel2-refine[refine]*:

```

assumes XCF:  $((x, cf), f) \in xf\text{-rel}$ 
assumes CLC:  $(clc, l) \in clc\text{-rel}$ 
assumes AM:  $(am, adjacent\text{-nodes}) \in nat\text{-rel} \rightarrow \langle nat\text{-rel} \rangle list\text{-set}\text{-rel}$ 
assumes [simplified, simp]:  $(ui, u) \in Id$ 
assumes CC:  $C = card\ V$ 
shows gap-relabel2 C am cf clc ui  $\leq \Downarrow clc\text{-rel}$  (gap-relabel f l u)
<proof>

```

5.3 Refinement to Efficient Data Structures

5.3.1 Registration of Abstract Operations

We register all abstract operations at once, auto-rewriting the capacity matrix type

```

context includes Network-Impl-Sepref-Register
begin
sepref-register x-get x-add

sepref-register l-init l-get l-get-rlx l-set

sepref-register clc-init clc-get clc-set clc-has-gap clc-get-rlx

sepref-register cnt-init cnt-get cnt-incr cnt-decr
sepref-register gap2 min-adj-label min-adj-label-clc

sepref-register push2 relabel2 clc-relabel2 gap-relabel2

sepref-register pp-init-xcf2

end — Anonymous Context

```

5.3.2 Excess by Array

definition *x-assn* $\equiv is\text{-nf}\ N\ (0::capacity\text{-impl})$

lemma $x\text{-init-hnr}$ [sepref-fr-rules]:
 $(\text{uncurry0 } (\text{Array.new } N \ 0), \text{uncurry0 } x\text{-init}) \in \text{unit-assn}^k \rightarrow_a x\text{-assn}$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma $x\text{-get-hnr}$ [sepref-fr-rules]:
 $(\text{uncurry } \text{Array.nth}, \text{uncurry } (\text{PR-CONST } x\text{-get}))$
 $\in x\text{-assn}^k *_a \text{node-assn}^k \rightarrow_a \text{cap-assn}$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

definition $(\text{in } -) x\text{-add-impl } x \ u \ \Delta \equiv \text{do } \{$
 $xu \leftarrow \text{Array.nth } x \ u;$
 $x \leftarrow \text{Array.upd } u \ (xu + \Delta) \ x;$
 $\text{return } x$
 $\}$

lemma $x\text{-add-hnr}$ [sepref-fr-rules]:
 $(\text{uncurry2 } x\text{-add-impl}, \text{uncurry2 } (\text{PR-CONST } x\text{-add}))$
 $\in x\text{-assn}^d *_a \text{node-assn}^k *_a \text{cap-assn}^k \rightarrow_a x\text{-assn}$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

5.3.3 Labeling by Array

definition $l\text{-assn} \equiv \text{is-nf } N \ (0::\text{nat})$

definition $(\text{in } -) l\text{-init-impl } N \ s \ \text{cardV} \equiv \text{do } \{$
 $l \leftarrow \text{Array.new } N \ (0::\text{nat});$
 $l \leftarrow \text{Array.upd } s \ \text{cardV} \ l;$
 $\text{return } l$
 $\}$

lemma $l\text{-init-hnr}$ [sepref-fr-rules]:
 $(l\text{-init-impl } N \ s, (\text{PR-CONST } l\text{-init})) \in \text{nat-assn}^k \rightarrow_a l\text{-assn}$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma $l\text{-get-hnr}$ [sepref-fr-rules]:
 $(\text{uncurry } \text{Array.nth}, \text{uncurry } (\text{PR-CONST } l\text{-get}))$
 $\in l\text{-assn}^k *_a \text{node-assn}^k \rightarrow_a \text{nat-assn}$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma $l\text{-get-rlx-hnr}$ [sepref-fr-rules]:
 $(\text{uncurry } \text{Array.nth}, \text{uncurry } (\text{PR-CONST } l\text{-get-rlx}))$
 $\in l\text{-assn}^k *_a \text{node-assn}^k \rightarrow_a \text{nat-assn}$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma $l\text{-set-hnr}$ [sepref-fr-rules]:
 $(\text{uncurry2 } (\lambda a \ i \ x. \text{Array.upd } i \ x \ a), \text{uncurry2 } (\text{PR-CONST } l\text{-set}))$
 $\in l\text{-assn}^d *_a \text{node-assn}^k *_a \text{nat-assn}^k \rightarrow_a l\text{-assn}$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

5.3.4 Label Frequency by Array

definition $\text{cnt-assn } (f::\text{node} \Rightarrow \text{nat}) \ a$

$\equiv \exists Al. a \mapsto_a l * \uparrow(\text{length } l = 2*N \wedge (\forall i < 2*N. !i = f i) \wedge (\forall i \geq 2*N. f i = 0))$

definition (**in** $-$) *cnt-init-impl* $N C \equiv \text{do } \{$
 $a \leftarrow \text{Array.new } (2*N) (0::\text{nat});$
 $a \leftarrow \text{Array.upd } 0 (C-1) a;$
 $a \leftarrow \text{Array.upd } C 1 a;$
 $\text{return } a$
 $\}$

definition (**in** $-$) *cnt-incr-impl* $a k \equiv \text{do } \{$
 $\text{freq} \leftarrow \text{Array.nth } a k;$
 $a \leftarrow \text{Array.upd } k (\text{freq}+1) a;$
 $\text{return } a$
 $\}$

definition (**in** $-$) *cnt-decr-impl* $a k \equiv \text{do } \{$
 $\text{freq} \leftarrow \text{Array.nth } a k;$
 $a \leftarrow \text{Array.upd } k (\text{freq}-1) a;$
 $\text{return } a$
 $\}$

lemma *cnt-init-hnr*[*sepref-fr-rules*]: $(\text{cnt-init-impl } N, \text{PR-CONST cnt-init}) \in \text{nat-assn}^k$
 $\rightarrow_a \text{cnt-assn}$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *cnt-get-hnr*[*sepref-fr-rules*]: $(\text{uncurry } \text{Array.nth}, \text{uncurry } (\text{PR-CONST cnt-get}))$
 $\in \text{cnt-assn}^k *_a \text{nat-assn}^k \rightarrow_a \text{nat-assn}$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *cnt-incr-hnr*[*sepref-fr-rules*]: $(\text{uncurry } \text{cnt-incr-impl}, \text{uncurry } (\text{PR-CONST}$
 $\text{cnt-incr})) \in \text{cnt-assn}^d *_a \text{nat-assn}^k \rightarrow_a \text{cnt-assn}$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma *cnt-decr-hnr*[*sepref-fr-rules*]: $(\text{uncurry } \text{cnt-decr-impl}, \text{uncurry } (\text{PR-CONST}$
 $\text{cnt-decr})) \in \text{cnt-assn}^d *_a \text{nat-assn}^k \rightarrow_a \text{cnt-assn}$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

5.3.5 Combined Frequency Count and Labeling

definition *clc-assn* $\equiv \text{cnt-assn} \times_a \text{l-assn}$

sepref-thm *clc-init-impl is PR-CONST clc-init* :: $\text{nat-assn}^k \rightarrow_a \text{clc-assn}$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

concrete-definition (**in** $-$) *clc-init-impl*
uses *Network-Impl.clc-init-impl.refine-raw*

lemmas [*sepref-fr-rules*] = *clc-init-impl.refine*[*OF Network-Impl-axioms*]

sepref-thm *clc-get-impl* **is** *uncurry* (*PR-CONST* *clc-get*)
 $:: \text{clc-assn}^k *_{\alpha} \text{node-assn}^k \rightarrow_{\alpha} \text{nat-assn}$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$
concrete-definition (**in** $-$) *clc-get-impl*
uses *Network-Impl.clc-get-impl.refine-raw* **is** (*uncurry* $?f, -$) \in -
lemmas [*sepref-fr-rules*] = *clc-get-impl.refine*[*OF Network-Impl-axioms*]

sepref-thm *clc-get-rlx-impl* **is** *uncurry* (*PR-CONST* *clc-get-rlx*)
 $:: \text{clc-assn}^k *_{\alpha} \text{node-assn}^k \rightarrow_{\alpha} \text{nat-assn}$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$
concrete-definition (**in** $-$) *clc-get-rlx-impl*
uses *Network-Impl.clc-get-rlx-impl.refine-raw* **is** (*uncurry* $?f, -$) \in -
lemmas [*sepref-fr-rules*] = *clc-get-rlx-impl.refine*[*OF Network-Impl-axioms*]

sepref-thm *clc-set-impl* **is** *uncurry2* (*PR-CONST* *clc-set*)
 $:: \text{clc-assn}^d *_{\alpha} \text{node-assn}^k *_{\alpha} \text{nat-assn}^k \rightarrow_{\alpha} \text{clc-assn}$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$
concrete-definition (**in** $-$) *clc-set-impl*
uses *Network-Impl.clc-set-impl.refine-raw* **is** (*uncurry2* $?f, -$) \in -
lemmas [*sepref-fr-rules*] = *clc-set-impl.refine*[*OF Network-Impl-axioms*]

sepref-thm *clc-has-gap-impl* **is** *uncurry* (*PR-CONST* *clc-has-gap*)
 $:: \text{clc-assn}^k *_{\alpha} \text{nat-assn}^k \rightarrow_{\alpha} \text{bool-assn}$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$
concrete-definition (**in** $-$) *clc-has-gap-impl*
uses *Network-Impl.clc-has-gap-impl.refine-raw* **is** (*uncurry* $?f, -$) \in -
lemmas [*sepref-fr-rules*] = *clc-has-gap-impl.refine*[*OF Network-Impl-axioms*]

5.3.6 Push

sepref-thm *push-impl* **is** *uncurry2* (*PR-CONST* *push2*)
 $:: x\text{-assn}^d *_{\alpha} cf\text{-assn}^d *_{\alpha} \text{edge-assn}^k \rightarrow_{\alpha} (x\text{-assn} \times_{\alpha} cf\text{-assn})$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$
concrete-definition (**in** $-$) *push-impl*
uses *Network-Impl.push-impl.refine-raw* **is** (*uncurry2* $?f, -$) \in -
lemmas [*sepref-fr-rules*] = *push-impl.refine*[*OF Network-Impl-axioms*]

5.3.7 Relabel

sepref-thm *min-adj-label-impl* **is** *uncurry3* (*PR-CONST* *min-adj-label*)
 $:: am\text{-assn}^k *_{\alpha} cf\text{-assn}^k *_{\alpha} l\text{-assn}^k *_{\alpha} \text{node-assn}^k \rightarrow_{\alpha} \text{nat-assn}$
 $\langle \text{proof} \rangle$
concrete-definition (**in** $-$) *min-adj-label-impl*
uses *Network-Impl.min-adj-label-impl.refine-raw* **is** (*uncurry3* $?f, -$) \in -
lemmas [*sepref-fr-rules*] = *min-adj-label-impl.refine*[*OF Network-Impl-axioms*]

sepref-thm *relabel-impl* **is** *uncurry3* (*PR-CONST* *relabel2*)
 $:: am\text{-assn}^k *_{\alpha} cf\text{-assn}^k *_{\alpha} l\text{-assn}^d *_{\alpha} \text{node-assn}^k \rightarrow_{\alpha} l\text{-assn}$

$\langle proof \rangle$
concrete-definition (in $-$) *relabel-impl*
 uses *Network-Impl.relabel-impl.refine-raw* **is** (*uncurry3* ?f,-)∈-
lemmas [*sepref-fr-rules*] = *relabel-impl.refine*[*OF Network-Impl-axioms*]

5.3.8 Gap-Relabel

sepref-thm *gap-impl* **is** *uncurry2* (*PR-CONST gap2*)
 $:: nat\text{-}assn^k *_{\alpha} clc\text{-}assn^d *_{\alpha} nat\text{-}assn^k \rightarrow_{\alpha} clc\text{-}assn$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

concrete-definition (in $-$) *gap-impl*
 uses *Network-Impl.gap-impl.refine-raw* **is** (*uncurry2* ?f,-)∈-
lemmas [*sepref-fr-rules*] = *gap-impl.refine*[*OF Network-Impl-axioms*]

sepref-thm *min-adj-label-clc-impl* **is** *uncurry3* (*PR-CONST min-adj-label-clc*)
 $:: am\text{-}assn^k *_{\alpha} cf\text{-}assn^k *_{\alpha} clc\text{-}assn^k *_{\alpha} nat\text{-}assn^k \rightarrow_{\alpha} nat\text{-}assn$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

concrete-definition (in $-$) *min-adj-label-clc-impl*
 uses *Network-Impl.min-adj-label-clc-impl.refine-raw* **is** (*uncurry3* ?f,-)∈-
lemmas [*sepref-fr-rules*] = *min-adj-label-clc-impl.refine*[*OF Network-Impl-axioms*]

sepref-thm *clc-relabel-impl* **is** *uncurry3* (*PR-CONST clc-relabel2*)
 $:: am\text{-}assn^k *_{\alpha} cf\text{-}assn^k *_{\alpha} clc\text{-}assn^d *_{\alpha} node\text{-}assn^k \rightarrow_{\alpha} clc\text{-}assn$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

concrete-definition (in $-$) *clc-relabel-impl*
 uses *Network-Impl.clc-relabel-impl.refine-raw* **is** (*uncurry3* ?f,-)∈-
lemmas [*sepref-fr-rules*] = *clc-relabel-impl.refine*[*OF Network-Impl-axioms*]

sepref-thm *gap-relabel-impl* **is** *uncurry4* (*PR-CONST gap-relabel2*)
 $:: nat\text{-}assn^k *_{\alpha} am\text{-}assn^k *_{\alpha} cf\text{-}assn^k *_{\alpha} clc\text{-}assn^d *_{\alpha} node\text{-}assn^k$
 $\rightarrow_{\alpha} clc\text{-}assn$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

concrete-definition (in $-$) *gap-relabel-impl*
 uses *Network-Impl.gap-relabel-impl.refine-raw* **is** (*uncurry4* ?f,-)∈-
lemmas [*sepref-fr-rules*] = *gap-relabel-impl.refine*[*OF Network-Impl-axioms*]

5.3.9 Initialization

sepref-thm *pp-init-xcf2-impl* **is** (*PR-CONST pp-init-xcf2*)
 $:: am\text{-}assn^k \rightarrow_{\alpha} x\text{-}assn \times_{\alpha} cf\text{-}assn$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

concrete-definition (in $-$) *pp-init-xcf2-impl*
 uses *Network-Impl.pp-init-xcf2-impl.refine-raw* **is** (?f,-)∈-
lemmas [*sepref-fr-rules*] = *pp-init-xcf2-impl.refine*[*OF Network-Impl-axioms*]

end — Network Implementation Locale

end

6 Implementation of the FIFO Push/Relabel Algorithm

```
theory Fifo-Push-Relabel-Impl2
imports
  Fifo-Push-Relabel
  Prpu-Common-Impl
  ../Net-Check/NetCheck
begin
```

6.1 Basic Operations

```
context Network-Impl
begin
```

6.1.1 Queue

Obtain the empty queue.

```
definition q-empty :: node list nres where
  q-empty  $\equiv$  return []
```

Check whether a queue is empty.

```
definition q-is-empty :: node list  $\Rightarrow$  bool nres where
  q-is-empty Q  $\equiv$  return ( Q = [] )
```

Enqueue a node.

```
definition q-enqueue :: node  $\Rightarrow$  node list  $\Rightarrow$  node list nres where
  q-enqueue v Q  $\equiv$  do {
    assert (v  $\in$  V);
    return (Q@[v])
  }
```

Dequeue a node.

```
definition q-dequeue :: node list  $\Rightarrow$  (node  $\times$  node list) nres where
  q-dequeue Q  $\equiv$  do {
    assert (Q  $\neq$  []);
    return (hd Q, tl Q)
  }
```

end — Network Implementation Locale

6.2 Refinements to Basic Operations

context *Network-Impl*
begin

In this section, we refine the algorithm to actually use the basic operations.

6.2.1 Refinement of Push

definition *fifo-push2-aux* x *cf* $Q \equiv \lambda(u,v)$. *do* {
assert ($(u,v) \in E \cup E^{-1}$);
assert ($u \neq v$);
let $\Delta = \min(x\ u)$ (*cf* (u,v));
let $Q =$ (*if* $v \neq s \wedge v \neq t \wedge xv = 0$ *then* $Q@[v]$ *else* Q);
return ($(x(u := x\ u - \Delta, v := x\ v + \Delta), \text{augment-edge-cf } cf(u,v)\ \Delta), Q$)
}

lemma *fifo-push2-aux-refine*:

$\llbracket ((x,cf),f) \in xf\text{-rel}; (ei,e) \in Id \times_r Id; (Qi,Q) \in Id \rrbracket$
 $\implies \text{fifo-push2-aux } x\ cf\ Qi\ ei \leq \Downarrow(xf\text{-rel} \times_r Id) (\text{fifo-push } f\ l\ Q\ e)$
<proof>

definition *fifo-push2* x *cf* $Q \equiv \lambda(u,v)$. *do* {
assert ($(u,v) \in E \cup E^{-1}$);
 $xu \leftarrow x\text{-get } x\ u$;
 $xv \leftarrow x\text{-get } x\ v$;
 $cfuw \leftarrow cf\text{-get } cf(u,v)$;
 $cfvu \leftarrow cf\text{-get } cf(v,u)$;
let $\Delta = \min xu\ cfuw$;
 $x \leftarrow x\text{-add } x\ u\ (-\Delta)$;
 $x \leftarrow x\text{-add } x\ v\ \Delta$;

$cf \leftarrow cf\text{-set } cf(u,v)\ (cfuw - \Delta)$;
 $cf \leftarrow cf\text{-set } cf(v,u)\ (cfvu + \Delta)$;

if $v \neq s \wedge v \neq t \wedge xv = 0$ *then do* {
 $Q \leftarrow q\text{-enqueue } v\ Q$;
return ($(x,cf), Q$)
} *else*
return ($(x,cf), Q$)
}

lemma *fifo-push2-refine[refine]*:

assumes $((x,cf),f) \in xf\text{-rel} \quad (ei,e) \in Id \times_r Id \quad (Qi,Q) \in Id$
shows $\text{fifo-push2 } x\ cf\ Qi\ ei \leq \Downarrow(xf\text{-rel} \times_r Id) (\text{fifo-push } f\ l\ Q\ e)$
<proof>

6.2.2 Refinement of Gap-Relabel

definition *fifo-gap-relabel-aux* $C\ f\ l\ Q\ u \equiv \text{do } \{$
 $Q \leftarrow q\text{-enqueue } u\ Q;$
 $lu \leftarrow l\text{-get } l\ u;$
 $l \leftarrow \text{relabel } f\ l\ u;$
if gap-precond $l\ lu$ *then do* $\{$
 $l \leftarrow \text{gap-aux } C\ l\ lu;$
 $\text{return } (l, Q)$
 $\}$ *else return* (l, Q)
 $\}$

lemma *fifo-gap-relabel-aux-refine*:

assumes $[simp]: C = \text{card } V \quad l\text{-invar } l$
shows $\text{fifo-gap-relabel-aux } C\ f\ l\ Q\ u \leq \text{fifo-gap-relabel } f\ l\ Q\ u$
<proof>

definition *fifo-gap-relabel2* $C\ am\ cf\ clc\ Q\ u \equiv \text{do } \{$
 $Q \leftarrow q\text{-enqueue } u\ Q;$
 $lu \leftarrow clc\text{-get } clc\ u;$
 $clc \leftarrow clc\text{-relabel2 } am\ cf\ clc\ u;$
 $has\text{-gap} \leftarrow clc\text{-has-gap } clc\ lu;$
if has-gap then do $\{$
 $clc \leftarrow \text{gap2 } C\ clc\ lu;$
 $\text{RETURN } (clc, Q)$
 $\}$ *else*
 $\text{RETURN } (clc, Q)$
 $\}$

lemma *fifo-gap-relabel2-refine-aux*:

assumes $XCF: ((x, cf), f) \in xf\text{-rel}$
assumes $CLC: (clc, l) \in clc\text{-rel}$
assumes $AM: (am, \text{adjacent-nodes}) \in \text{nat-rel} \rightarrow \langle \text{nat-rel} \rangle \text{list-set-rel}$
assumes $[simplified, simp]: (Ci, C) \in Id \quad (Qi, Q) \in Id \quad (ui, u) \in Id$
shows $\text{fifo-gap-relabel2 } Ci\ am\ cf\ clc\ Qi\ ui \leq \Downarrow (clc\text{-rel} \times_r Id) (\text{fifo-gap-relabel-aux } C\ f\ l\ Q\ u)$
<proof>

lemma *fifo-gap-relabel2-refine[refine]*:

assumes $XCF: ((x, cf), f) \in xf\text{-rel}$
assumes $CLC: (clc, l) \in clc\text{-rel}$
assumes $AM: (am, \text{adjacent-nodes}) \in \text{nat-rel} \rightarrow \langle \text{nat-rel} \rangle \text{list-set-rel}$
assumes $[simplified, simp]: (Qi, Q) \in Id \quad (ui, u) \in Id$
assumes $CC: C = \text{card } V$
shows $\text{fifo-gap-relabel2 } C\ am\ cf\ clc\ Qi\ ui \leq \Downarrow (clc\text{-rel} \times_r Id) (\text{fifo-gap-relabel } f\ l\ Q\ u)$
<proof>

6.2.3 Refinement of Discharge

context begin

Some lengthy, multi-step refinement of discharge, changing the iteration to iteration over adjacent nodes with filter, and showing that we can do the filter wrt. the current state, rather than the original state before the loop.

lemma *am-nodes-as-filter*:

assumes *is-adj-map am*

shows $\{v . (u,v) \in cfE\text{-of } f\} = set (filter (\lambda v. cf\text{-of } f (u,v) \neq 0) (am\ u))$

<proof> **lemma** *adjacent-nodes-iterate-refine1*:

fixes *ff u f*

assumes *AMR*: $(am, adjacent\text{-nodes}) \in Id \rightarrow \langle Id \rangle list\text{-set-rel}$

assumes *CR*: $\bigwedge s\ si. (si, s) \in Id \implies cci\ si \longleftrightarrow cc\ s$

assumes *FR*: $\bigwedge v\ vi\ s\ si. \llbracket (vi, v) \in Id; v \in V; (u, v) \in E \cup E^{-1}; (si, s) \in Id \rrbracket \implies$

$ffi\ vi\ si \leq \Downarrow Id (do \{$
 $\quad if\ (cf\text{-of } f (u, v) \neq 0) \text{ then } ff\ v\ s \text{ else } RETURN\ s$
 $\quad \}) (is\ \bigwedge v\ vi\ s\ si. \llbracket -; -; - \rrbracket \implies - \leq \Downarrow - (?ff'\ v\ s))$

assumes *SOR*: $(s0i, s0) \in Id$

assumes *UR*: $(ui, u) \in Id$

shows $nfoldli\ (am\ ui)\ cci\ ffi\ s0i \leq \Downarrow Id (FOREACHc\ \{v . (u, v) \in cfE\text{-of } f\}\ cc\ ff\ s0)$

<proof> **definition** *dis-loop-aux am f₀ l Q u* $\equiv do \{$

$assert\ (u \in V - \{s, t\});$

$assert\ (distinct\ (am\ u));$

$nfoldli\ (am\ u)\ (\lambda(f, l, Q). excess\ f\ u \neq 0)\ (\lambda v\ (f, l, Q). do \{$

$assert\ ((u, v) \in E \cup E^{-1} \wedge v \in V);$

$if\ (cf\text{-of } f_0 (u, v) \neq 0) \text{ then } do \{$

$if\ (l\ u = l\ v + 1) \text{ then } do \{$

$(f', Q) \leftarrow fifo\text{-push } f\ l\ Q\ (u, v);$

$assert\ (\forall v'. v' \neq v \longrightarrow cf\text{-of } f' (u, v') = cf\text{-of } f (u, v));$

$return\ (f', l, Q)$

$\} \text{ else } return\ (f, l, Q)$

$\} \text{ else } return\ (f, l, Q)$

$\}) (f_0, l, Q)$

$\}$

private definition *fifo-discharge-aux am f₀ l Q* $\equiv do \{$

$(u, Q) \leftarrow q\text{-dequeue } Q;$

$assert\ (u \in V \wedge u \neq s \wedge u \neq t);$

$(f, l, Q) \leftarrow dis\text{-loop-aux } am\ f_0\ l\ Q\ u;$

$if\ excess\ f\ u \neq 0 \text{ then } do \{$

$(l, Q) \leftarrow fifo\text{-gap-relabel } f\ l\ Q\ u;$

$return\ (f, l, Q)$

$\} \text{ else } do \{$

$return\ (f, l, Q)$

$\}$

}

private lemma *fifo-discharge-aux-refine*:

assumes $AM: (am, adjacent\text{-}nodes) \in Id \rightarrow \langle Id \rangle list\text{-}set\text{-}rel$
assumes $[simplified, simp]: (fi, f) \in Id \quad (li, l) \in Id \quad (Qi, Q) \in Id$
shows $fifo\text{-}discharge\text{-}aux\ am\ fi\ li\ Qi \leq \Downarrow Id\ (fifo\text{-}discharge\ f\ l\ Q)$
 $\langle proof \rangle$ **definition** $dis\text{-}loop\text{-}aux2\ am\ f_0\ l\ Q\ u \equiv do \{$
 $assert\ (u \in V - \{s, t\});$
 $assert\ (distinct\ (am\ u));$
 $unfoldli\ (am\ u)\ (\lambda(f, l, Q).\ excess\ f\ u \neq 0)\ (\lambda v\ (f, l, Q).\ do \{$
 $assert\ ((u, v) \in E \cup E^{-1} \wedge v \in V);$
 $if\ (cf\text{-}of\ f\ (u, v) \neq 0)\ then\ do \{$
 $if\ (l\ u = l\ v + 1)\ then\ do \{$
 $(f', Q) \leftarrow fifo\text{-}push\ f\ l\ Q\ (u, v);$
 $assert\ (\forall v'.\ v' \neq v \rightarrow cf\text{-}of\ f'\ (u, v') = cf\text{-}of\ f\ (u, v));$
 $return\ (f', l, Q)$
 $\} else\ return\ (f, l, Q)$
 $\} else\ return\ (f, l, Q)$
 $\}) (f_0, l, Q)$
 $\}$

private lemma *dis-loop-aux2-refine*:

shows $dis\text{-}loop\text{-}aux2\ am\ f_0\ l\ Q\ u \leq \Downarrow Id\ (dis\text{-}loop\text{-}aux\ am\ f_0\ l\ Q\ u)$
 $\langle proof \rangle$ **definition** $dis\text{-}loop\text{-}aux3\ am\ x\ cf\ l\ Q\ u \equiv do \{$
 $assert\ (u \in V \wedge distinct\ (am\ u));$
 $monadic\text{-}unfoldli\ (am\ u)$
 $(\lambda((x, cf), l, Q).\ do \{ xu \leftarrow x\text{-}get\ x\ u; return\ (xu \neq 0) \})$
 $(\lambda v\ ((x, cf), l, Q).\ do \{$
 $cfv \leftarrow cf\text{-}get\ cf\ (u, v);$
 $if\ (cfv \neq 0)\ then\ do \{$
 $lu \leftarrow l\text{-}get\ l\ u;$
 $lv \leftarrow l\text{-}get\ l\ v;$
 $if\ (lu = lv + 1)\ then\ do \{$
 $((x, cf), Q) \leftarrow fifo\text{-}push2\ x\ cf\ Q\ (u, v);$
 $return\ ((x, cf), l, Q)$
 $\} else\ return\ ((x, cf), l, Q)$
 $\} else\ return\ ((x, cf), l, Q)$
 $\}) ((x, cf), l, Q)$
 $\}$

private lemma *dis-loop-aux3-refine*:

assumes $[simplified, simp]: (ami, am) \in Id \quad (li, l) \in Id \quad (Qi, Q) \in Id \quad (ui, u) \in Id$
assumes $XF: ((x, cf), f) \in xf\text{-}rel$
shows $dis\text{-}loop\text{-}aux3\ ami\ x\ cf\ li\ Qi\ ui \leq \Downarrow (xf\text{-}rel \times_r Id \times_r Id)\ (dis\text{-}loop\text{-}aux2\ am\ f\ l\ Q\ u)$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

definition $dis\text{-}loop2\ am\ x\ cf\ clc\ Q\ u \equiv do \{$
 $assert\ (distinct\ (am\ u));$

```

amu ← am-get am u;
monadic-nfoldli amu
  (λ((x,cf),clc,Q). do { xu ← x-get x u; return (xu ≠ 0) })
  (λv ((x,cf),clc,Q). do {
    cfuv ← cf-get cf (u,v);
    if (cfuv ≠ 0) then do {
      lu ← clc-get clc u;
      lv ← clc-get clc v;
      if (lu = lv + 1) then do {
        ((x,cf),Q) ← fifo-push2 x cf Q (u,v);
        return ((x,cf),clc,Q)
      } else return ((x,cf),clc,Q)
    } else return ((x,cf),clc,Q)
  }) ((x,cf),clc,Q)
}

```

private lemma *dis-loop2-refine-aux*:

```

assumes [simplified,simp]: (xi,x)∈Id    (cfi,cf)∈Id    (ami,am)∈Id    (li,l)∈Id
(Qi,Q)∈Id    (ui,u)∈Id
assumes CLC: (clc,l)∈clc-rel
shows dis-loop2 ami xi cfi clc Qi ui ≤↓(Id ×r clc-rel ×r Id) (dis-loop-aux3 am
x cf l Q u)
⟨proof⟩

```

lemma *dis-loop2-refine[refine]*:

```

assumes XF: ((x,cf),f)∈xf-rel
assumes CLC: (clc,l)∈clc-rel
assumes [simplified,simp]: (ami,am)∈Id    (Qi,Q)∈Id    (ui,u)∈Id
shows dis-loop2 ami x cf clc Qi ui ≤↓(xf-rel ×r clc-rel ×r Id) (dis-loop-aux am
f l Q u)
⟨proof⟩

```

definition *fifo-discharge2* C am x cf clc Q ≡ do {

```

(u,Q) ← q-dequeue Q;
assert (u∈V ∧ u≠s ∧ u≠t);

```

```

((x,cf),clc,Q) ← dis-loop2 am x cf clc Q u;

```

```

xu ← x-get x u;
if xu ≠ 0 then do {
  (clc,Q) ← fifo-gap-relabel2 C am cf clc Q u;
  return ((x,cf),clc,Q)
} else do {
  return ((x,cf),clc,Q)
}
}

```

lemma *fifo-discharge2-refine[refine]*:

```

assumes AM:  $(am, adjacent-nodes) \in nat-rel \rightarrow \langle nat-rel \rangle list-set-rel$ 
assumes XCF:  $((x, cf), f) \in xf-rel$ 
assumes CLC:  $(clc, l) \in clc-rel$ 
assumes [simplified, simp]:  $(Qi, Q) \in Id$ 
assumes CC:  $C = card\ V$ 
shows fifo-discharge2 C am x cf clc Qi  $\leq \Downarrow (xf-rel \times_r clc-rel \times_r Id)$  (fifo-discharge
f l Q)
 $\langle proof \rangle$ 
  applyS assumption
   $\langle proof \rangle$ 

```

end — Anonymous Context

6.2.4 Computing the Initial Queue

```

definition q-init am  $\equiv do \{$ 
  Q  $\leftarrow q-empty;$ 
  ams  $\leftarrow am-get\ am\ s;$ 
  nfoldli ams  $(\lambda-. True) (\lambda v Q. do \{$ 
    if  $v \neq t$  then q-enqueue v Q else return Q
   $\}) Q$ 
 $\}$ 

```

lemma *q-init-correct*[*THEN order-trans, refine-vcg*]:

```

assumes AM: is-adj-map am
shows q-init am  $\leq (spec\ l. distinct\ l \wedge set\ l = \{v \in V - \{s, t\}. excess\ pp-init-f$ 
 $v \neq 0\})$ 
 $\langle proof \rangle$ 

```

6.2.5 Refining the Main Algorithm

```

definition fifo-push-relabel-aux am  $\equiv do \{$ 
  cardV  $\leftarrow init-C\ am;$ 
  assert  $(cardV = card\ V);$ 
  let f  $= pp-init-f;$ 
  l  $\leftarrow l-init\ cardV;$ 

  Q  $\leftarrow q-init\ am;$ 

   $(f, l, -) \leftarrow monadic-WHILEIT (\lambda-. True)$ 
   $(\lambda(f, l, Q). do \{qe \leftarrow q-is-empty\ Q; return (\neg qe)\})$ 
   $(\lambda(f, l, Q). do \{$ 
    fifo-discharge f l Q
   $\})$ 
   $(f, l, Q);$ 

  assert (Height-Bounded-Labeling c s t f l);
  return f
 $\}$ 

```

lemma *fifo-push-relabel-aux-refine*:
assumes *AM*: *is-adj-map am*
shows *fifo-push-relabel-aux am* $\leq \Downarrow Id$ (*fifo-push-relabel*)
<proof>

definition *fifo-push-relabel2 am* \equiv *do* {
cardV \leftarrow *init-C am*;
(x,cf) \leftarrow *pp-init-xcf2 am*;
clc \leftarrow *clc-init cardV*;
Q \leftarrow *q-init am*;

((x,cf),clc,Q) \leftarrow *monadic-WHILEIT* (λ -. *True*)
($\lambda((x,cf),clc,Q)$). *do* {*qe* \leftarrow *q-is-empty Q*; *return* (\neg *qe*)}
($\lambda((x,cf),clc,Q)$). *do* {
fifo-discharge2 cardV am x cf clc Q
}
}
((x,cf),clc,Q);

return cf
}

lemma *fifo-push-relabel2-refine*:
assumes *AM*: *is-adj-map am*
shows *fifo-push-relabel2 am* $\leq \Downarrow$ (*br (flow-of-cf) (RPreGraph c s t)*) *fifo-push-relabel*
<proof>

end — Network Impl. Locale

6.3 Separating out the Initialization of the Adjacency Matrix

context *Network-Impl*
begin

We split the algorithm into an initialization of the adjacency matrix, and the actual algorithm. This way, the algorithm can handle pre-initialized adjacency matrices.

definition *fifo-push-relabel-init2* \equiv *cf-init*

definition *pp-init-xcf2'* *am cf* \equiv *do* {
x \leftarrow *x-init*;

assert (*s* \in *V*);
adj \leftarrow *am-get am s*;
nfoldli adj (λ -. *True*) (λv (*x,cf*). *do* {
assert (*(s,v)* \in *E*);
assert (*s* \neq *v*);
a \leftarrow *cf-get cf (s,v)*;
x \leftarrow *x-add x s (-a)*;

```

    x ← x-add x v a;
    cf ← cf-set cf (s,v) 0;
    cf ← cf-set cf (v,s) a;
    return (x,cf)
  }) (x,cf)
}

```

definition *fifo-push-relabel-run2* am cf ≡ do {
 cardV ← init-C am;
 (x,cf) ← pp-init-xcf2' am cf;
 clc ← clc-init cardV;
 Q ← q-init am;

((x,cf),clc,Q) ← monadic-WHILEIT (λ-. True)
 (λ((x,cf),clc,Q). do {qe ← q-is-empty Q; return (¬qe)})
 (λ((x,cf),clc,Q). do {
 fifo-discharge2 cardV am x cf clc Q
 })
 ((x,cf),clc,Q);

return cf
}

lemma *fifo-push-relabel2-alt*:
fifo-push-relabel2 am = do {
 cf ← fifo-push-relabel-init2;
 fifo-push-relabel-run2 am cf
}
⟨proof⟩

end — Network Impl. Locale

6.4 Refinement To Efficient Data Structures

context *Network-Impl*
begin

6.4.1 Registration of Abstract Operations

We register all abstract operations at once, auto-rewriting the capacity matrix type

context includes *Network-Impl-Sepref-Register*
begin

sepref-register *q-empty q-is-empty q-enqueue q-dequeue*

sepref-register *fifo-push2*

sepref-register *fifo-gap-relabel2*

sepref-register *dis-loop2 fifo-discharge2*

sepref-register *q-init pp-init-xf2'*

sepref-register *fifo-push-relabel-run2 fifo-push-relabel-init2*

sepref-register *fifo-push-relabel2*

end — Anonymous Context

6.4.2 Queue by Two Stacks

definition (**in** $-$) $q\text{-}\alpha \equiv \lambda(L,R). L@rev R$

definition (**in** $-$) $q\text{-empty-impl} \equiv ([],[])$

definition (**in** $-$) $q\text{-is-empty-impl} \equiv \lambda(L,R). is\text{-Nil } L \wedge is\text{-Nil } R$

definition (**in** $-$) $q\text{-enqueue-impl} \equiv \lambda x (L,R). (L,x\#R)$

definition (**in** $-$) $q\text{-dequeue-impl} \equiv \lambda(x\#L,R) \Rightarrow (x,(L,R)) \mid ([],R) \Rightarrow case\ rev\ R$
of $(x\#L) \Rightarrow (x,(L,[]))$

lemma $q\text{-empty-impl-correct}[simp]: q\text{-}\alpha\ q\text{-empty-impl} = [] \langle proof \rangle$

lemma $q\text{-enqueue-impl-correct}[simp]: q\text{-}\alpha\ (q\text{-enqueue-impl } x\ Q) = q\text{-}\alpha\ Q @ [x]$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma $q\text{-is-empty-impl-correct}[simp]: q\text{-is-empty-impl } Q \longleftrightarrow q\text{-}\alpha\ Q = []$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma $q\text{-dequeue-impl-correct-aux}: [q\text{-}\alpha\ Q = x\#xs] \Longrightarrow apsnd\ q\text{-}\alpha\ (q\text{-dequeue-impl } Q) = (x,xs)$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma $q\text{-dequeue-impl-correct}[simp]:$
assumes $q\text{-dequeue-impl } Q = (x,Q')$
assumes $q\text{-}\alpha\ Q \neq []$
shows $x = hd\ (q\text{-}\alpha\ Q)$ **and** $q\text{-}\alpha\ Q' = tl\ (q\text{-}\alpha\ Q)$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

definition $q\text{-assn} \equiv pure\ (br\ q\text{-}\alpha\ (\lambda\text{-}. True))$

lemma $q\text{-empty-impl-hnr}[sepref-fr-rules]: (uncurry0\ (return\ q\text{-empty-impl}), un-$
 $curry0\ q\text{-empty}) \in unit\text{-assn}^k \rightarrow_a\ q\text{-assn}$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma $q\text{-is-empty-impl-hnr}[sepref-fr-rules]: (return\ o\ q\text{-is-empty-impl}, q\text{-is-empty})$
 $\in q\text{-assn}^k \rightarrow_a\ bool\text{-assn}$

<proof>

lemma *q-enqueue-impl-hnr*[*sepref-fr-rules*]:

$(\text{uncurry} (\text{return} \text{oo } q\text{-enqueue-impl}), \text{uncurry} (\text{PR-CONST } q\text{-enqueue})) \in \text{nat-assn}^k$
 $*_a q\text{-assn}^d \rightarrow_a q\text{-assn}$

<proof>

lemma *q-dequeue-impl-hnr*[*sepref-fr-rules*]:

$(\text{return } o \text{ } q\text{-dequeue-impl}, q\text{-dequeue}) \in q\text{-assn}^d \rightarrow_a \text{nat-assn} \times_a q\text{-assn}$

<proof>

6.4.3 Push

sepref-thm *fifo-push-impl* **is** *uncurry3* (*PR-CONST* *fifo-push2*)

$:: x\text{-assn}^d *_a cf\text{-assn}^d *_a q\text{-assn}^d *_a \text{edge-assn}^k \rightarrow_a ((x\text{-assn} \times_a cf\text{-assn}) \times_a q\text{-assn})$

<proof>

concrete-definition (**in** $-$) *fifo-push-impl*

uses *Network-Impl.fifo-push-impl.refine-raw* **is** (*uncurry3* *?f,-*) $\in-$

lemmas [*sepref-fr-rules*] = *fifo-push-impl.refine*[*OF Network-Impl-axioms*]

6.4.4 Gap-Relabel

sepref-thm *fifo-gap-relabel-impl* **is** *uncurry5* (*PR-CONST* *fifo-gap-relabel2*)

$:: \text{nat-assn}^k *_a \text{am-assn}^k *_a cf\text{-assn}^k *_a \text{clc-assn}^d *_a q\text{-assn}^d *_a \text{node-assn}^k$
 $\rightarrow_a \text{clc-assn} \times_a q\text{-assn}$

<proof>

concrete-definition (**in** $-$) *fifo-gap-relabel-impl*

uses *Network-Impl.fifo-gap-relabel-impl.refine-raw* **is** (*uncurry5* *?f,-*) $\in-$

lemmas [*sepref-fr-rules*] = *fifo-gap-relabel-impl.refine*[*OF Network-Impl-axioms*]

6.4.5 Discharge

sepref-thm *fifo-dis-loop-impl* **is** *uncurry5* (*PR-CONST* *dis-loop2*)

$:: \text{am-assn}^k *_a x\text{-assn}^d *_a cf\text{-assn}^d *_a \text{clc-assn}^d *_a q\text{-assn}^d *_a \text{node-assn}^k$
 $\rightarrow_a (x\text{-assn} \times_a cf\text{-assn}) \times_a \text{clc-assn} \times_a q\text{-assn}$

<proof>

concrete-definition (**in** $-$) *fifo-dis-loop-impl*

uses *Network-Impl.fifo-dis-loop-impl.refine-raw* **is** (*uncurry5* *?f,-*) $\in-$

lemmas [*sepref-fr-rules*] = *fifo-dis-loop-impl.refine*[*OF Network-Impl-axioms*]

sepref-thm *fifo-fifo-discharge-impl* **is** *uncurry5* (*PR-CONST* *fifo-discharge2*)

$:: \text{nat-assn}^k *_a \text{am-assn}^k *_a x\text{-assn}^d *_a cf\text{-assn}^d *_a \text{clc-assn}^d *_a q\text{-assn}^d$
 $\rightarrow_a (x\text{-assn} \times_a cf\text{-assn}) \times_a \text{clc-assn} \times_a q\text{-assn}$

<proof>

concrete-definition (**in** $-$) *fifo-fifo-discharge-impl*

uses *Network-Impl.fifo-fifo-discharge-impl.refine-raw* **is** (*uncurry5* *?f,-*) $\in-$

lemmas [*sepref-fr-rules*] = *fifo-fifo-discharge-impl.refine*[*OF Network-Impl-axioms*]

6.4.6 Computing the Initial State

sepref-thm *fifo-init-C-impl* **is** (*PR-CONST* *init-C*)
 $:: am\text{-}assn^k \rightarrow_a nat\text{-}assn$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

concrete-definition (**in** $-$) *fifo-init-C-impl*

uses *Network-Impl.fifo-init-C-impl.refine-raw* **is** ($?f, -$) $\in-$

lemmas [*sepref-fr-rules*] = *fifo-init-C-impl.refine*[*OF Network-Impl-axioms*]

sepref-thm *fifo-q-init-impl* **is** (*PR-CONST* *q-init*)
 $:: am\text{-}assn^k \rightarrow_a q\text{-}assn$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

concrete-definition (**in** $-$) *fifo-q-init-impl*

uses *Network-Impl.fifo-q-init-impl.refine-raw* **is** ($?f, -$) $\in-$

lemmas [*sepref-fr-rules*] = *fifo-q-init-impl.refine*[*OF Network-Impl-axioms*]

sepref-thm *pp-init-xf2'-impl* **is** *uncurry* (*PR-CONST* *pp-init-xf2'*)
 $:: am\text{-}assn^k *_a cf\text{-}assn^d \rightarrow_a x\text{-}assn \times_a cf\text{-}assn$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

concrete-definition (**in** $-$) *pp-init-xf2'-impl*

uses *Network-Impl.pp-init-xf2'-impl.refine-raw* **is** (*uncurry* $?f, -$) $\in-$

lemmas [*sepref-fr-rules*] = *pp-init-xf2'-impl.refine*[*OF Network-Impl-axioms*]

6.4.7 Main Algorithm

sepref-thm *fifo-push-relabel-run-impl*
is *uncurry* (*PR-CONST* *fifo-push-relabel-run2*)
 $:: am\text{-}assn^k *_a cf\text{-}assn^d \rightarrow_a cf\text{-}assn$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

concrete-definition (**in** $-$) *fifo-push-relabel-run-impl*

uses *Network-Impl.fifo-push-relabel-run-impl.refine-raw* **is** (*uncurry* $?f, -$) $\in-$

lemmas [*sepref-fr-rules*] = *fifo-push-relabel-run-impl.refine*[*OF Network-Impl-axioms*]

sepref-thm *fifo-push-relabel-init-impl*
is *uncurry0* (*PR-CONST* *fifo-push-relabel-init2*)
 $:: unit\text{-}assn^k \rightarrow_a cf\text{-}assn$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

concrete-definition (**in** $-$) *fifo-push-relabel-init-impl*

uses *Network-Impl.fifo-push-relabel-init-impl.refine-raw*

is (*uncurry0* $?f, -$) $\in-$

lemmas [*sepref-fr-rules*] = *fifo-push-relabel-init-impl.refine*[*OF Network-Impl-axioms*]

sepref-thm *fifo-push-relabel-impl* **is** (*PR-CONST* *fifo-push-relabel2*)
 $:: am\text{-}assn^k \rightarrow_a cf\text{-}assn$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

concrete-definition (**in** $-$) *fifo-push-relabel-impl*

uses *Network-Impl.fifo-push-relabel-impl.refine-raw* **is** ($?f, -$) $\in-$

lemmas [*sepref-fr-rules*] = *fifo-push-relabel-impl.refine*[*OF Network-Impl-axioms*]

end — Network Impl. Locale

export-code *fifo-push-relabel-impl checking SML-imp*

6.5 Combining the Refinement Steps

theorem (in *Network-Impl*) *fifo-push-relabel-impl-correct*[*sep-heap-rules*]:

assumes *AM*: *is-adj-map am*

shows

$\langle am\text{-}assn\ am\ ami \rangle$

$fifo\text{-}push\text{-}relabel\text{-}impl\ c\ s\ t\ N\ ami$

$\langle \lambda cf. \exists_A cf.$

$am\text{-}assn\ am\ ami\ * \ cf\text{-}assn\ cf\ cf$

$* \uparrow(isMaxFlow\ (flow\text{-}of\text{-}cf\ cf) \wedge RGraph\text{-}Impl\ c\ s\ t\ N\ cf) \rangle_t$

$\langle proof \rangle$

6.6 Combination with Network Checker and Main Correctness Theorem

definition *fifo-push-relabel-impl-tab-am* $c\ s\ t\ N\ am \equiv do \{$

$ami \leftarrow Array.make\ N\ am; (*\ TODO/DUP:\ Called\ init\text{-}ps\ in\ Edmonds\text{-}Karp\ impl\ *)$

$cfi \leftarrow fifo\text{-}push\text{-}relabel\text{-}impl\ c\ s\ t\ N\ ami;$

$return\ (ami, cfi)$

$\}$

theorem *fifo-push-relabel-impl-tab-am-correct*[*sep-heap-rules*]:

assumes *NW*: *Network c s t*

assumes *VN*: $Graph.V\ c \subseteq \{0..<N\}$

assumes *ABS-PS*: *Graph.is-adj-map c am*

shows

$\langle emp \rangle$

$fifo\text{-}push\text{-}relabel\text{-}impl\text{-}tab\text{-}am\ c\ s\ t\ N\ am$

$\langle \lambda(ami, cfi). \exists_A cf.$

$am\text{-}assn\ N\ am\ ami\ * \ cf\text{-}assn\ N\ cf\ cf$

$* \uparrow(Network.isMaxFlow\ c\ s\ t\ (Network.flow\text{-}of\text{-}cf\ c\ cf)$

$\wedge RGraph\text{-}Impl\ c\ s\ t\ N\ cf$

$) \rangle_t$

$\langle proof \rangle$

definition *fifo-push-relabel* $el\ s\ t \equiv do \{$

$case\ prepareNet\ el\ s\ t\ of$

$None \Rightarrow return\ None$

$| Some\ (c, am, N) \Rightarrow do \{$

$(ami, cfi) \leftarrow fifo\text{-}push\text{-}relabel\text{-}impl\text{-}tab\text{-}am\ c\ s\ t\ N\ am;$

$return\ (Some\ (c, ami, N, cfi))$

```

}
}
export-code fifo-push-relabel checking SML-imp

```

Main correctness statement: If *fifo-push-relabel* returns *None*, the edge list was invalid or described an invalid network. If it returns *Some (c, am, N, cfi)*, then the edge list is valid and describes a valid network. Moreover, *cfi* is an integer square matrix of dimension *N*, which describes a valid residual graph in the network, whose corresponding flow is maximal. Finally, *am* is a valid adjacency map of the graph, and the nodes of the graph are integers less than *N*.

theorem *fifo-push-relabel-correct*[*sep-heap-rules*]:

```

<emp>
fifo-push-relabel el s t
<λ
  None ⇒ ↑(¬ln-invar el ∨ ¬Network (ln-α el) s t)
| Some (c, am, N, cfi) ⇒
  ↑(c = ln-α el ∧ ln-invar el ∧ Network c s t)
  * (∃A am cf. am-assn N am ami * cf-assn N cf cfi
    * ↑(RGraph-Impl c s t N cf ∧ Graph.is-adj-map c am
      ∧ Network.isMaxFlow c s t (Network.flow-of-cf c cf))
  )
>t

<proof>

```

6.6.1 Justification of Splitting into Prepare and Run Phase

definition *fifo-push-relabel-prepare-impl* el s t ≡ do {
 case prepareNet el s t of
 None ⇒ return None
 | Some (c, am, N) ⇒ do {
 ami ← Array.make N am;
 cfi ← *fifo-push-relabel-init-impl* c N;
 return (Some (N, ami, c, cfi))
 }
}

theorem *justify-fifo-push-relabel-prep-run-split*:

```

fifo-push-relabel el s t =
do {
  pr ← fifo-push-relabel-prepare-impl el s t;
  case pr of
  None ⇒ return None
| Some (N, ami, c, cf) ⇒ do {
  cf ← fifo-push-relabel-run-impl s t N ami cf;
  return (Some (c, ami, N, cf))
}
}

```

<proof>

6.7 Usage Example: Computing Maxflow Value

We implement a function to compute the value of the maximum flow.

definition *fifo-push-relabel-compute-flow-val* $el\ s\ t \equiv do \{$
 $r \leftarrow \text{fifo-push-relabel } el\ s\ t;$
 case r *of*
 $None \Rightarrow \text{return } None$
 $| \text{Some } (c, am, N, cf) \Rightarrow do \{$
 $v \leftarrow \text{compute-flow-val-impl } s\ N\ am\ cf;$
 $\text{return } (\text{Some } v)$
 $\}$
 $\}$

The computed flow value is correct

theorem *fifo-push-relabel-compute-flow-val-correct*:

$<emp>$
 $\text{fifo-push-relabel-compute-flow-val } el\ s\ t$
 $<\lambda$
 $None \Rightarrow \uparrow(\neg \text{ln-invar } el \vee \neg \text{Network } (\text{ln-}\alpha\ el)\ s\ t)$
 $| \text{Some } v \Rightarrow \uparrow(\text{ln-invar } el$
 $\wedge (\text{let } c = \text{ln-}\alpha\ el \text{ in}$
 $\text{Network } c\ s\ t \wedge \text{Network.is-max-flow-val } c\ s\ t\ v$
 $))$
 $>t$
<proof>

export-code *fifo-push-relabel-compute-flow-val* **checking** *SML-imp*

end

7 Conclusion

We have presented a verification of two push-relabel algorithms for solving the maximum flow problem. Starting with a generic push-relabel algorithm, we have used stepwise refinement techniques to derive the relabel-to-front and FIFO push-relabel algorithms. Further refinement yields verified efficient imperative implementations of the algorithms.

References

- [1] R.-J. Back. *On the correctness of refinement steps in program development*. PhD thesis, Department of Computer Science, University of Helsinki, 1978.

- [2] R.-J. Back and J. von Wright. *Refinement Calculus — A Systematic Introduction*. Springer, 1998.
- [3] B. V. Cherkassky and A. V. Goldberg. On implementing the push—relabel method for the maximum flow problem. *Algorithmica*, 19(4):390–410, 1997.
- [4] T. H. Cormen, C. E. Leiserson, R. L. Rivest, and C. Stein. *Introduction to Algorithms, Third Edition*. The MIT Press, 3rd edition, 2009.
- [5] A. V. Goldberg and R. E. Tarjan. A new approach to the maximum-flow problem. *J. ACM*, 35(4), Oct. 1988.
- [6] P. Lammich and S. R. Sefidgar. Formalizing the edmonds-karp algorithm. In *Interactive Theorem Proving*. Springer, 2016. to appear.
- [7] P. Lammich and S. R. Sefidgar. Formalizing the edmonds-karp algorithm. *Archive of Formal Proofs*, Aug. 2016. http://isa-afp.org/entries/EdmondsKarp_Maxflow.shtml, Formal proof development.
- [8] G. Lee. Correctness of ford-fulkersons maximum flow algorithm1. *Formalized Mathematics*, 13(2):305–314, 2005.
- [9] N. Wirth. Program development by stepwise refinement. *Commun. ACM*, 14(4), Apr. 1971.