

A Formally Verified IEEE 754 Floating-Point Implementation of Interval Iteration for MDPs

Bram Kohlen¹ , Maximilian Schäffeler², Mohammad Abdulaziz^{2,3},
Arnd Hartmanns¹ , and Peter Lammich¹ 

¹ University of Twente, The Netherlands b.kohlen@utwente.nl

² Technical University of Munich, Germany maximilian.schaeffeler@tum.de

³ King's College London, United Kingdom

Abstract. Reasoning about quantitative properties of Markov Decision Processes (MDPs) inevitably requires computations on real or rational numbers. On modern hardware, these are usually efficiently implemented by floating-point numbers. However, due to their finite precision, many floating-point operations lead to small imprecisions. Probabilistic model checkers claim trustworthiness on the ground of a solid theoretical basis, yet prior work has uncovered discrepancies between the claimed and actual accuracy of these systems. How can we trust implementations of model checkers? Our answer is an efficiently executable, formally verified implementation of interval iteration for MDPs. Our correctness proofs span the entire development from the high-level abstract semantics of MDPs to the low-level implementation in LLVM that uses floating-point arithmetic. We use the Isabelle/HOL proof assistant to verify the abstract definition of interval iteration. Next, we employ step-wise refinement to derive an efficient implementation in LLVM code. To that end, we extend the Isabelle Refinement Framework with support for reasoning about floating point arithmetic and directed rounding modes. We experimentally evaluate our implementation on a set of benchmark MDPs. Our results show that the verified implementation is competitive with state-of-the-art tools for MDPs, while providing formal guarantees on the correctness of the results.

1 Introduction

Probabilistic model checking (PMC) [4,5] is a formal verification technique for randomised systems and algorithms such as wireless communication protocols [39], network-on-chip (NoC) architectures [49], or reliability and performance models [6]. Typical properties checked by means of PMC relate to *reachability probabilities*: What is the probability for a file to eventually be transmitted successfully [17]? Is the probability for a NoC router's queue to overflow within c clock cycles below 10^{-5} ? What is the inspection and maintenance strategy that minimises service outages within a given cost budget [51,50]? The system models that PMC is applied to are specified in higher-level modelling languages such as Modest [12,27] or JANI [15] with a formal semantics in terms of (extensions of) Markov chains and Markov decision processes [11,47].

As a model checking approach, PMC delivers results with hard guarantees, typically that the computed and (unknown) true probabilities differ by at most a user-specified ϵ . PMC is thus well-suited for the design and evaluation of safety- and performance-critical systems. Over the past decade, however, we have witnessed several threats to the validity of PMC results. First and foremost, the most-used PMC algorithm, value iteration (VI) with an absolute- or relative-error stopping criterion, was shown to be *unsound*, i.e. produce arbitrarily wrong results for certain inputs [25]. Several sound replacements for VI were subsequently developed [26,48,33], yet their soundness proofs have so far been *pen-and-paper* style with room for human error. For example, the pseudocode for the *sound VI* algorithm as stated in [48] contains a subtle mistake that only surfaces on 1 of the 78 models of the Quantitative Verification Benchmark Set (QVBS) [34]. This calls for *formal specifications of the algorithms* accompanied by *machine-checked correctness proofs*. Even correct algorithms, however, may be incorrectly implemented in today’s manually-coded probabilistic model checking tools. As a case in point, the implementation of the *interval iteration* [26] variant for expected rewards [8] in the *mcsta* model checker of the MODEST TOOLSET [31] diverges on some inputs. We thus need *correct-by-construction implementations*, too.

VI-based algorithms are iterative numeric approximation schemes that need to be implemented via fixed machine-precision floating point arithmetic to obtain acceptable performance [16,32]. This introduces approximation and rounding errors that in turn may lead to PMC tools reporting properties as satisfied that are in fact not [60]. A solution lies in the careful use of the directed rounding modes provided by standard IEEE 754 floating-point implementations as in all of today’s common CPUs [30], which however needs careful *reasoning about floating-point errors and rounding* in all formal proofs and correctness-preserving implementation strategies.

Our contribution. We present a solution to all three of the above challenges based on the interval iteration (II) algorithm [26] for sound PMC on MDP models and the interactive theorem prover (ITP) Isabelle/HOL [46] with its Isabelle Refinement Framework (IRF) [42]:

- We formalise (i.e. model) II in Isabelle/HOL’s logic and formally prove its correctness in Isabelle/HOL (Sect. 4), making II the first sound PMC algorithm with machine-checked correctness.
- We extend the IRF with support for floating-point arithmetic, including directed rounding modes (Sect. 5.1), making the it the first ITP-based algorithm refinement approach suitable for II and similar algorithms.
- Using the IRF, we refine the formalisation of II into efficient LLVM bytecode (Sects. 5.2 and 5.3), delivering the first correct-by-construction implementation of a PMC algorithm.
- We embed the refined code into *mcsta* (Sect. 6) and experimentally evaluate its performance using the QVBS (Sect. 7), showing that it is also a highly efficient implementation.

State-of-the-art: Verification of PMC Algorithms. A probabilistic model checker like `mcsta` also performs preprocessing and transformation steps to improve model-checking performance and bring the MDP into a shape suitable for II. Previously, the strongly connected component (SCC) [35] and maximal end component decomposition [36] algorithms, have been formalised, verified, and refined, replacing their previous unverified implementations inside `mcsta` by verified ones of comparable performance. These were comparatively simple and fully discrete graph algorithms, however, that neither required reasoning about numerical convergence in their correctness proofs nor floating-point arithmetic in their refinement to an efficient implementation. With this work, we contribute an essential piece for the incremental replacement of unverified by verified algorithms for probabilistic reachability in `mcsta`'s MDP model checking core.

State-of-the-art: Verification of Probabilistic Algorithms. The verification of probabilistic algorithms in theorem provers is a well-studied, albeit challenging, task. This includes both, algorithms that use randomness [19,3] and probabilistic analysis of otherwise classical algorithms [59,52,1]. Current state-of-the-art research themes include improving methodologies for modelling such algorithms (e.g. the Giry monad [23,20]) and improving ways to reason about these algorithms when modelled as programs (e.g. quantitative separation logic [54,40]). The closest related pieces of work to what we present here are those by Vajjha et. al. [59] and Schäßfeler and Abdulaziz [52], who formally verified, in Coq and Isabelle/HOL, respectively, the VI algorithm. In their work, they verified the classical version of VI, namely, the algorithm computing ε -optimal policies, that optimises the expected discounted values.

In almost all previous formal randomised analyses of algorithms, the authors stop at verifying the algorithms at the mathematical level (i.e. proving that a mathematical description of the algorithm satisfies expected properties). This is due to the sheer difficulty of performing such analyses, as they need substantial formal mathematical libraries on analysis, probabilities, asymptotics, and transition systems. An exception is Schäßfeler and Abdulaziz [52], who formally verified a practical implementation of VI. However, since their implementation used infinite precision arithmetic, it was far too slow to compete with state-of-the-art floating-point implementations. Thus, the work we present here is the first, up to our knowledge, where a full formal probabilistic mathematical analysis is performed and a competitive floating-point implementation is also verified.

State-of-the-art: Verification of Floating-Point Algorithms. The fact that floating-point implementations of algorithms deviate from the respective mathematical models of algorithms is widely recognised as a problem. Examples of bugs with potentially serious consequences were noted in the hardware and aerospace industry [29,45]. Due to the complexity of floating-point algorithms' behaviour, and the failure of testing to reliably catch bugs in those algorithms, there is a long tradition of applying formal methods to the verification of floating-point algorithms. This was done in formal systems like Z [10], HOL Light [29,28], PVS [44,14], and Coq [13,18]. Most of that previous work, however, focused on proving correctness

of fundamental arithmetic algorithms implemented in floating-point arithmetic. This included basic operations, like addition, multiplication, and division, but also somewhat more advanced mathematical computations, like square roots or approximating transcendental numbers. The confinement of previous work to such algorithms is, again, due to the sheer complexity of verifying even these rather elementary algorithms. Factors included mundane issues, like the difference between the formal representation of real numbers versus machine floating-point numbers. More fundamental issues include the complexity of reasoning about the behavioural differences between real and floating-point arithmetic due to things like rounding, especially when it changes the execution paths taken in algorithms. This makes it challenging to devise a general approach that is guaranteed to be successful at deriving a formal relationship between a real number versus a floating-point implementation of an algorithm.

Nonetheless, an exception to that status quo is the line of work by Moscato et al. [45,58,56,22,21,55], who formally verified higher-level algorithms in the area of flight control. The approach developed by them is largely automatic: one formalises an algorithm using real numbers in the theorem prover PVS, and then proves it correct at that mathematical level. Then their tool PRECiSA [57] automatically extracts a floating-point implementation in C, thus performing data refinement. The correctness of the C implementation is then proven automatically or interactively. The main distinction between their and our work is the scale of applicability: to this date, their approach was applied to algorithms that are substantially simpler, in terms of their mathematical justification and the needed formal mathematical libraries, than II. It would be interesting, nonetheless, to experiment with their tool in the context of VI algorithms.

2 Preliminaries

We now present the necessary background for the rest of the paper: we introduce Markov Decision Processes, followed by the Isabelle/HOL proof assistant, the Isabelle Refinement Framework and IEEE 754 floating-point numbers.

2.1 Markov Decision Processes

Markov Decision Processes (MDPs) are a formalism to model probabilistic systems with nondeterministic choices [47]. They are widely used in probabilistic model checking, planning, operations research and reinforcement learning [53,7]. Intuitively, an *agent* interacts with an environment by choosing *actions* that, together with random elements, influence the *state* of the system. The agent has an *objective*, e.g. to avoid a certain set of states. It therefore needs to choose actions in a way that optimizes the probability of reaching the objective. We now give a formal definition:

Definition 1 (Markov Decision Process). *A finite MDP is a pair $\mathcal{M} = (S, K)$ where*

- S is a finite and non-empty set of states.
- K is the transition kernel, a function $K : S \rightarrow 2^{\mathcal{P}(S)}$ that assigns to every state a set of actions that represent its transition probabilities to successor states. $\mathcal{P}(S)$ denotes the set of probability measures on S , i.e. functions $p : S \rightarrow [0, 1]$ where $\sum_{s \in S} p(s) = 1$. If we view the MDP as a graph, the states are the nodes and the actions are transitions. Every action has a set of outgoing edges, called branches, combined with a transition probability. We assume that the number of actions is finite but non-empty, so $K(s) \neq \emptyset$ for all $s \in S$. Furthermore, $K(s)$ is closed w.r.t. S : for all $a \in K(s)$, we have $a(s') > 0$ implies $s' \in S$.

At every state, the agent chooses an action based on the current state and the history of visited states. The agent’s choices are captured by a *policy* (aka scheduler, strategy, or adversary):

Definition 2 (Policy). A history is a sequence of states $s_0, s_1, \dots, s_n \in S^n$. The set of all (finite) histories is denoted by $S^* = \bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}_0} S^i$. A (deterministic) policy π is a function $\pi : S^* \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(S)$ that assigns to every history s_0, \dots, s_n an action $a \in K(s_n)$. The set of all policies is denoted by Π .

A policy is called *stationary* if it only depends on the current state, i.e., $\pi(h, s) = \pi(h', s)$ for all $h, h' \in S^*$. The set of all stationary policies is denoted by D . Pairing a policy π and an MDP \mathcal{M} induces a Markov chain (DTMC) \mathcal{M}_π , where the transition probabilities are determined by the policy. A DTMC can be seen as a special kind of MDP where every state has exactly one action. Given a DTMC, we can define a stochastic process with a unique probability distribution over the states at every time step. We refer to [47] for a more detailed construction of the probability space.




Fig. 1. A simple MDP with four states and five actions.

Example 1. Fig. 1 shows an MDP with four states, $S = \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$. The outgoing transitions from each state represent the actions in the MDP. Each transition leads to a black dot and branches into the successor states with corresponding probabilities. For example in state 0, $K(0) = \{\alpha, \beta\}$. The agent can choose α to move to state 2, or β to have a 10% chance to move to state 1.

In our setting, the objective of the agent is to optimize (maximize or minimize) the reachability probabilities of a set of target states. Reachability properties are an important objective in probabilistic model checking. The dual objective are safety properties, where the agent aims to avoid a set of unsafe states forever. These can also be formulated as reachability properties by considering the complement of the unsafe states as target states.

Definition 3 (Reachability Problem). An MDP Reachability Problem is a pair $\mathcal{R} = (\mathcal{M}, U)$ where $\mathcal{M} = (S, K)$ is an MDP in the sense of Def. 1 and $U \subseteq S$ is a set of target states. The objective is to optimize the policy in order

to determine the minimal or maximal probability of reaching a target state in U . Given a policy π , the probability of reaching a target state from an initial state $s \in S$ is denoted by $\mathbb{P}_\pi(\diamond U)(s)$. It is defined as the probability of reaching a target state in the induced Markov Chain \mathcal{M}_π , starting from s and following the policy π .

Minimal and maximal reachability probabilities are denoted by $\mathbb{P}_{\text{inf}}(\diamond U)$ and $\mathbb{P}_{\text{sup}}(\diamond U)$ respectively. It is well-known that stationary policies are sufficient to optimize the reachability probabilities, for detailed proofs we refer to [2]. Given an initial state $s \in S$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}_{\text{inf}}(\diamond U)(s) := \inf_{\pi \in \Pi} \mathbb{P}_\pi(\diamond U)(s) = \inf_{\pi \in D} \mathbb{P}_\pi(\diamond U)(s) \quad (1)$$

$$\mathbb{P}_{\text{sup}}(\diamond U)(s) := \sup_{\pi \in \Pi} \mathbb{P}_\pi(\diamond U)(s) = \sup_{\pi \in D} \mathbb{P}_\pi(\diamond U)(s). \quad (2)$$

The study of subcomponents of MDPs plays an important role in the analysis of interval iteration. Given an MDP \mathcal{M} , a *sub-MDP* $\mathcal{M}' = (S', K')$ consists of a subset of states $S' \subseteq S$ and a restricted kernel K' where $\forall s \in S'. K'(s) \subseteq K(s)$. A sub-MDP is called *closed* if K' is closed w.r.t. S' , i.e. for all $a \in K'(s)$, we have $a(s') > 0$ implies $s' \in S'$. A sub-MDP is *strongly connected* if every state is reachable from every other state via a sequence of actions. A closed and strongly connected sub-MDP is an *end component*. A *maximal end component* (MEC) is an end component that is not a sub-MDP of any other end component. Finally, *trivial MECs* are MECs with only one state and no actions, and a *bottom MEC* is a MEC that cannot reach any other MEC, i.e. $\forall s \in S'. K'(s) = K(s)$.

Example 2. Consider the MDP from Fig. 1 with target states $U = \{3\}$. The minimal reachability probability $\mathbb{P}_{\text{inf}}(\diamond U)(2) = 0.5$ and $\mathbb{P}_{\text{sup}}(\diamond U)(2) = 1$. The MDP has a single bottom MEC $\{3\}$ with action $\{\epsilon\}$, and a single trivial MEC $\{2\}$. The states $\{0, 1\}$ form a MEC with the actions β and γ .

2.2 Isabelle/HOL

An *interactive theorem prover* (ITP) is a program that implements a formal mathematical system in which definitions and theorem statements are written. Proofs are constructed from a set of axioms (derivation rules). To prove a theorem in an ITP, the user provides high-level steps of a proof, and the ITP fills in the details at the level of axioms.

We perform the formalization presented in this paper using the interactive theorem prover Isabelle/HOL [46], which is a proof assistant for Higher-Order Logic (HOL). Roughly speaking, HOL can be seen as a combination of functional programming with logic. Isabelle is designed to be highly trustworthy: following the LCF approach (Logic for Computable Functions) [24], a small trusted kernel implements the inference rules of the logic. Outside the kernel, a large set of tools implement proof automation and high-level concepts like algebraic data types and recursive functions. Bugs in these tools cannot lead to inconsistent theorems being proved, as the kernel refuses flawed proofs.

The notation in Isabelle/HOL is similar to functional programming languages like ML or Haskell mixed with mathematical notation. We introduce the notation used in the following sections. Function application is written as juxtaposition: we write $f x$ instead of the usual $f(x)$. Functions can be Curried, i.e. function f applied to arguments $x_1 \dots x_n$ is written as $f x_1 \dots x_n$ instead of the standard notation $f(x_1, \dots, x_n)$. Where required, we annotate the type of a variable x as $x :: \text{type}$. The notations \sqcap and \sqcup are used for the infimum and supremum, e.g. $\sqcap x \in A. f x$ is the infimum of the image of A under f . The notation $\int x. f x \partial D$ is used for the Lebesgue integral over the nonnegative reals, i.e. the expected value of a random variable.

We aim to represent our formalization as faithfully as possible to Isabelle/HOL, but we have optimized the presentation for readability. Our formalization, including all definitions, theorems, proofs, and our verified implementation is available in the supplementary material.

In the following sections, definitions are introduced using the **definition** keyword. For partial functions, we use the notation $f = (\lambda x \in X. g x)$, to explicitly restrict the domain of the function to X . Recursive functions are defined using the **fun** keyword and pattern matching. Theorems and lemmas are introduced using the **theorem** and **lemma** keyword respectively.

Isabelle/HOL provides a *locale* mechanism (keyword **locale**) to define a named context with assumptions, e.g. an MDP with well-formedness assumptions [9]. Locales can be interpreted and extended in different contexts, e.g. a locale for MDPs can be instantiated for a specific MDP, which yields all theorems proved within the locale.

2.3 Isabelle Refinement Framework

Our verification spans the whole way from the mathematical foundations of MDPs, over algorithms and data structures, their implementation and optimizations, down to the rather low-level LLVM intermediate language [43]. To keep this verification manageable, we use a stepwise refinement approach: starting with the abstract mathematical specification, we incrementally add more and more implementation details, proving that each addition preserves correctness. The addition steps are mostly independent of each other, and typically focus on a single aspect of the implementation, like computing a fixed-point by iteration, or implementing MDPs by a sparse-matrix data structure.

This approach is supported by the Isabelle Refinement Framework (IRF) [42]. Algorithms are modelled in the *nondeterministic result (nres) monad*: they can either fail or return a set of possible results. Given an algorithm m and a *refinement relation* R , we say that an implementation mi *refines* m (written $mi \leq \Downarrow R m$) if either m fails, or each possible result of mi is related via R to some possible result of m .

Many refinement relations can be expressed by an *invariant* I on the implementation type, and an abstraction function α that maps implementations to their abstract counterparts. To this end, we define the relation $br \alpha I = \{(c, \alpha c) \mid I c\}$. We lift refinement relations to functions, using the shorthand notation

$(C, A) \in [P] R_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow R_n \rightarrow R$ for $P a_1 \dots a_n \wedge (c_1, a_1) \in R_1 \dots \wedge (c_n, a_n) \in R_n \implies C c_1 \dots c_n \leq \Downarrow R (A a_1 \dots a_n)$: if the abstract arguments satisfy the precondition P , and the concrete arguments implement the abstract ones wrt. the refinement relations $R_1 \dots R_n$, then the result of the concrete algorithm $C c_1 \dots c_n$ refines the result of the abstract algorithm $A a_1 \dots a_n$ wrt. relation R . We extend the notion of refinement to programs with memory, and use the `sepref` [41] tool to automate data refinement and memory management.

Example 3. Listing 1.1 shows an example implementation of sets by array lists.

- 1 **definition** $insert\ x\ S = S \cup \{x\}$ **and** $ls_append\ x\ xs = xs @ [x]$ (*Listing 1.1*)
- 2 **definition** $\alpha_{ls}\ xs = set\ xs$ **and** $I_{ls}\ xs = distinct\ xs$ **and** $R_{ls} = br\ \alpha_{ls}\ I_{ls}$
- 3 **lemma** $(ls_append, insert) \in [\lambda\ x\ S. x \notin S] R_{ls} \rightarrow R_{id} \rightarrow R_{ls}$
- 4 **lemma** $(arl_append, ls_append) :: A_{size} \rightarrow A_{arl}^d \rightarrow A_{arl}$ (*Def. of arl_append elided*)
- 5 **definition** $A_{ls} = A_{arl}\ O\ R_{ls}$
- 6 **lemma** $(arl_append, insert) :: [\lambda\ x\ S. x \notin S] A_{size} \rightarrow A_{ls}^d \rightarrow A_{ls}$

The refinement is done in two steps: first sets are refined to lists with pairwise disjoint elements, and second, these lists are implemented by a dynamic array data structure (array list). Array lists are part of the collection library that comes with the IRF, and we have elided its definitions. Line 1 shows the insert operation on different refinement levels: *insert* inserts an element into a set, *ls_append* appends an element to the end of a list, and *arl_append* (definition elided) appends an element to an array list. Line 2 shows the refinement relation between sets and lists, expressed as abstraction function and invariant. Here, *set* is Isabelle’s function to map a list to the set of its elements, and *distinct* is the predicate for lists with pairwise disjoint elements. Line 3 shows the refinement between insertion on sets and appending on lists: if the element is not yet in the set, and if the first arguments are the same (i.e. related by the identity relation R_{id}), and the second arguments are a disjoint list and the corresponding set (i.e. related by R_{ls}), then the results are, again, related by R_{ls} . Line 4 shows the relation between appending elements to a list and to an array list. If the elements are related by A_{size} , and the list and array list are related by A_{arl} , then the results are, again, related by A_{arl} . Here, A_{size} relates natural numbers to a 64-bit machine words, and A_{arl} relates lists to array lists. The A in those relations’ names stands for (separation logic) assertion, and indicates that those relations can depend on heap memory, e.g. an array list. Furthermore the d in the argument refinement relation indicates that this argument is updated destructively, i.e., the argument refinement is no longer valid after the function call. The `sepref` tool can use this information to automatically translate a functional program into one that uses data structures with memory, like the array list. Finally, Lines 5 and 6 combine the two refinements to obtain an implementation of sets by array lists.

2.4 Floating-Point Arithmetic

Our work uses the formalization of the IEEE 754 floating-point standard [61] in Isabelle/HOL. This formalization provides a generic type (e,f) *float*, where e is the number of bits for the *exponent*, and f is the number of bits for the *fraction* (also known as mantissa). In this formalization, we will use the type *double* = $(11,52)$ *float*. IEEE floating point numbers describe positive and negative numbers, as well as special values for $\pm\infty$, and for *not a number* (NaN). The function $valof :: (e,f) \text{ float} \rightarrow \text{ereal}$ maps (non-NaN) floating point numbers to *extended real numbers*, i.e., $\mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty, +\infty\}$. Moreover, the formalization provides intuitive predicates to identify special cases (e.g. *is_nan*), as well as all standard floating-point instructions (e.g. addition, multiplication, comparison).

3 MDPs in Isabelle/HOL

Our formalization of interval iteration in Isabelle/HOL is based on an existing MDP formalization [37]. In this section we restate the relevant definitions and theorems formalized in prior work. The Isabelle/HOL library *Markov Models* [38] represents finite MDPs with a generic type *'s mdpc* and a locale *Finite_MDP* that contains the states of the MDP and the transition kernel (Locale 3.1, corresponds to Def. 1). Specifically, for $M = (S, K)$, *states M* corresponds to S and *actions M s* to $K(s)$. The type of the states is *'s*, and *'s pmf* is the type of probability mass functions over *'s*. For a distribution $p :: 's \text{ pmf}$, $set_{pmf} p$ denotes its support, i.e. the set of states with non-zero probability.

locale *Finite_MDP* = (Locale 3.1)
fixes $M :: 's \text{ mdpc}$
assumes $states\ M \neq \emptyset$ **and** *finite* ($states\ M$)
assumes $\forall s. actions\ M\ s \neq \emptyset$ **and** $\forall s \in states\ M. finite\ (actions\ M\ s)$
assumes $\forall s \in states\ M. (\bigcup a \in actions\ M\ s. set_{pmf}\ a) \subseteq states\ M$

Instead of policies, the formalization works with *configurations*. A configuration is implemented as a datatype that stores the current state of the MDP and which actions will be chosen in the future based on the history. Configurations are as expressive as history-dependent deterministic policies. When the system transitions to a new state s' , the configuration cfg is updated to $cont\ cfg\ s'$, which is a new configuration in the state s' . A configuration is valid if for all reachable configurations cfg' , the chosen action $action\ cfg'$ is in the set of actions for the current state $state\ cfg'$. The set of all valid configurations is denoted by $valid_{cfg}$. Given a configuration and an MDP, the probability space of infinite traces $T\ cfg$ is constructed from the induced Markov Chain, where each state is a configuration.

Reachability A target set $U \subseteq states\ M$ induces a reachability problem. The value function P_{cfg} assigns to every valid configuration cfg the probability of reaching the target states U (corresponds to Def. 3). Moreover, the minimal reachability probability P_{inf} of the target states U is defined as the infimum of v

over all valid configurations (see $\mathbb{P}_{\text{inf}}(\diamond U)$). The maximal reachability probability P_{sup} is defined analogously and corresponds to the definition of $\mathbb{P}_{\text{sup}}(\diamond U)$. We omit U in the notation if it can be easily deduced from the context.

The *Bellman optimality operators* play an important role in the analysis of MDPs. In Isabelle/HOL, these operators are defined as F_{inf} and F_{sup} as follows (for the sake of brevity, we only show the definition of F_{inf}):

definition $F_{\text{inf}} x = (\lambda s \in \text{states } M. \text{ if } s \in U \text{ then } 1 \text{ else } \prod a \in \text{actions } M s. \int t. x t \partial a)$ (Def. 3.1)

The integral $\int t. x t \partial a$ evaluates to the expected value of the value vector x w.r.t. the distribution of successors of s when choosing the action a . The *least fixed point (lfp)* of F_{inf} (F_{sup}) is the reachability probability P_{inf} (P_{sup}), so by elementary fixed point theory we get that iterating a lower bound of P_{inf} leads us to P_{inf} in the limit (the same holds for F_{sup} and P_{sup}). The idea of II is to iterate F_{inf} on both a lower and an upper bound to compute an approximation of P_{inf} . However, for arbitrary MDPs, the *greatest fixed point (gfp)* of F_{inf} is not necessarily the same as P_{inf} , and therefore II would not always converge to a unique fixed point. To achieve this, the MDP must be preprocessed to only contain MECs that are trivial or bottom MECs.

Sub-MDPs Prior work in Isabelle/HOL also defines strong connectedness, end components and finally MECs. We extend the formalization with SCCs (strongly connected components) and bottom MECs, which are MECs that contain no outgoing transitions (Def. 3.2, the prior formalization inadvertently had the order of the arguments swapped). The states of an MDP that form trivial or bottom end components are called *trivials* or *bottoms* respectively. We show that every MDP contains a bottom MEC (Thm. 3.1).

definition $\text{bmec } M b \equiv \text{mec } M b \wedge (\forall s \in \text{states } b. \text{actions } b s = \text{actions } M s)$ (Def. 3.2)

theorem $\exists b. \text{bmec } M b$ (Thm. 3.1)

4 Interval Iteration in Isabelle/HOL

The *interval iteration (II)* algorithm for MDPs [26] is an iterative solution method for reachability problems based on value iteration. In contrast to standard value iteration, one can define a simple and sound stopping criterion. We now define II and preprocessing routines in Isabelle/HOL and prove their correctness.

4.1 Reduced MDPs

We follow [26] and call an MDP *reduced* if all of its MECs are either trivial or bottom MECs. The rationale behind this definition is that the reachability

probabilities of a reduced MDP can be computed precisely by II. Reduced MDPs are formalized as an extension of the locale *Finite_MDP*, with the additional assumption that every state is either a trivial or a bottom MEC (Locale 4.1).

locale *Reduced_MDP* = *Finite_MDP* *M* + (Locale 4.1)
assumes $\forall s \in \text{states } M. s \in \text{trivials } M \vee s \in \text{bottoms } M$

Min-Reduction We formalize the min-reduction algorithm for MDPs: it transforms an arbitrary MDP with a single target state s_+ into a reduced MDP while keeping the minimal reachability probabilities the same. For a minimal reachability problem, all non-trivial MECs other than s_+ can be assigned probability 0: there exists a policy that almost surely forever stays in the MEC and therefore never reaches s_+ . Hence, all such MECs may be collapsed into a single absorbing state s_- . To formalize this transformation, we first define a function red_{inf} (Def. 4.1) mapping the states, and then apply it to the MDP M to obtain the reduced MDP M_{inf} (Def. 4.2).

fun red_{inf} **where** (Def. 4.1)
 $\text{red}_{\text{inf}} s_+ = s_+$
 $\text{red}_{\text{inf}} s = \text{if } s \in \text{trivials } M \text{ then } s \text{ else } s_-$

definition $M_{\text{inf}} = \text{fix_loop } s_- (\text{map}_{\text{mdpc}} \text{red}_{\text{inf}} M)$ (Def. 4.2)

The function map_{mdpc} (defined in [38]) applies a function to every state of an MDP. If the function merges states, map_{mdpc} merges the action sets. Finally, $\text{fix_loop } s_-$ replaces the actions at s_- with a single self-loop. See Fig. 2 for the min-reduced version of the MDP in Fig. 1.

It remains to show that the transformation preserves minimal reachability probabilities and M_{inf} is in fact a reduced MDP. To distinguish the reachability probabilities of the original and the reduced MDP, we use the notation P_{inf} for the original MDP and $M_{\text{inf}}.P_{\text{inf}}$ for the reduced MDP. Our proof that the min-reduction algorithm preserves P_{inf} is based on the fact that it preserves the finite-horizon probabilities P_{inf}^{\leq} (Lemma 4.1), i.e. the reachability probability when we restrict ourselves to finite traces. Now, the main claim (Thm. 4.1, [26, Proposition 3]) is a direct consequence. Our proof differs from that of [26]: they claim that for every policy in the reduced MDP there exists a policy in the original MDP with the same reachability probability and vice versa. We argue that our proof is simpler and more precise.

lemma **assumes** $s \in \text{states } M$ (Lemma 4.1)
shows $P_{\text{inf}}^{\leq} n s = M_{\text{inf}}.P_{\text{inf}}^{\leq} n (\text{red}_{\text{inf}} s)$

theorem **assumes** $s \in \text{states } M$ (Thm. 4.1)
shows $P_{\text{inf}} s = M_{\text{inf}}.P_{\text{inf}} (\text{red}_{\text{inf}} s)$

Next we show that every state of M_{inf} is part of a bottom or a trivial MEC. The states s_- and s_+ are bottom MECs by construction. We only need to consider the states of M_{inf} that were constructed from trivial MECs of M and show that they are still trivial MECs in M_{inf} (Thm. 4.2).

theorem **assumes** $s \in \text{trivials } M$ **shows** $\text{red}_{\text{inf}} s \in \text{trivials } M_{\text{inf}}$ (Thm. 4.2)

Max-Reduction Handling maximal reachability probabilities can similarly be handled with a max-reduction, but the procedure is more involved. Not all non-trivial MECs can be collapsed into a single state, as the maximal reachability probabilities would not be preserved. A maximizing policy might choose to leave non-trivial MECs, in contrast to a minimizing policy. We can, however, first collapse each MEC into a single state to obtain an MDP M_{MEC} . In a second step, we map the bottom MECs to s_- . Finally, we remove self-loops at all states except s_+ and s_- and end up with the MDP M_{sup} . See Fig. 3 for the max-reduced version of the MDP in Fig. 1.

Collapsing the MECs into a single state is done by the function *the_mec*, the transformation preserves P_{sup} (Thm. 4.3). Our proof resembles the proof of [2, Theorem 3.8], however we have to work around the fact that the MDP formalization only supports deterministic policies [37]. Every state of M_{MEC} forms its own MEC (we refer the reader to the Isabelle/HOL formalization for details). The second part of the reduction from M_{MEC} to M_{sup} is similar to the min-reduction.

theorem **assumes** $s \in \text{states } M$ (Thm. 4.3)

shows $P_{\text{sup}} s = M_{MEC}.P_{\text{sup}} (\text{the_mec } M s)$

Proof (Proof Outline). (\leq) As collapsing MECs only shortens paths in the MDP, the proof of this direction can proceed similar to the one for the min-reduction via finite-horizon probabilities.

(\geq) This direction is more involved: consider an optimal policy π_{MEC} in M_{MEC} , we need to show that there exists a policy in M with the same reachability probability. Within every MEC m there exists a state s_m^π where the action selected by π_{MEC} is enabled. Moreover, within a MEC, we can obtain a deterministic, memoryless policy π_m that reaches this state with probability 1. Thus we can construct a policy in M that behaves like π_m within each MEC until s_m^π is reached and then follows π_{MEC} . The reachability probability of this policy in M is the same as in M_{MEC} .

4.2 Reachability in Reduced MDPs

For the remainder of this section we assume that we are working with a finite MDP M and within the context of the locale *Reduced_MDP*, i.e. each state of M is a trivial or bottom MECs. We will now show that in a reduced MDP, over time the policy almost surely reaches a bottom MEC. This is the key property that will later allow us to prove the convergence of II.

Level Graph First, we build a level graph of the MDP, starting at the bottom MECs (Def. 4.3). At level $n + 1$, we add all those states where every action has a successor in level n or below. We define I to be the greatest non-empty level of the level graph G . G is the smallest number of steps that allows us to reach a bottom MEC from every state. We show that G has the desired properties, i.e. it is acyclic and contains every state at exactly one level.

fun G **where** (Def. 4.3)
 $G \ 0 = \text{bottoms } M$
 $G \ (n + 1) = \text{let } G_{\leq n} = \bigcup_{i \leq n}. G \ i$
in $\{s \in \text{states } M \setminus G_{\leq n}. \forall a \in \text{actions } M \ s. G_{\leq n} \cap a \neq \emptyset\}$

lemma $\text{states } M = \bigcup_{i \leq I}. G \ i$ (Lemma 4.2)

Proof (Proof Outline). Consider the set $S' = \text{states } M \setminus (\bigcup_{i \leq I}. G \ i)$. Towards a contradiction, assume that S' is non-empty. Then M restricted to S' is a non-empty MDP, and by Thm. 3.1 it contains a bottom MEC. This is impossible, since the only bottom MECs of M are in $G \ 0$.




Fig. 2. Min-reduced MDP from Fig. 1.




Fig. 3. Max-reduced MDP from Fig. 1.

Reachability of BMECs We now show that in a reduced MDP, the policy almost surely reaches a bottom MEC. The rate at which a bottom MEC is encountered depends on the smallest probability of any transition in the MDP, called η . At every step, the probability of descending a level wrt. G is at least η . Hence we can show that for any valid configuration, the probability to reach the bottom MECs in I steps is bounded below by η^I (Lemma 4.3).

lemma **assumes** $cfg \in \text{valid}_{cfg}$ **shows** $\eta^I \leq P_{cfg}^{\leq} I$ (Lemma 4.3)

The value $P_{cfg}^{\leq} n$ denotes the finite-horizon reachability probability of the bottom MECs in n steps under configuration cfg . Note that the theorem was originally stated for safety instead of reachability. We avoid the need for a formal library of MDP safety problems using the well-known equivalence between safety and reachability probabilities: $\mathbb{P}_{\pi}^{\leq n}(\diamond U) = 1 - \mathbb{P}_{\pi}^{\leq n}(\square \neg U)$. For multiples of I , we obtain a stronger lower bound of $1 - (1 - \eta^I)^n$ (Thm. 4.4, [26, Proposition 1]). As n increases, $(1 - \eta^I)^n$ converges to 0 and therefore $P_{cfg}^{\leq} nI$ tends towards 1. Since we chose cfg arbitrarily, this means that the agent almost surely reaches a bottom MEC in the limit (Thm. 4.5).

theorem **assumes** $cfg \in \text{valid}_{cfg}$ **shows** $1 - (1 - \eta^I)^n \leq P_{cfg}^{\leq} nI$ (Thm. 4.4)

theorem **assumes** $s \in \text{states } M$ **shows** $P_{\text{inf}} s = 1$ **and** $P_{\text{sup}} s = 1$ (Thm. 4.5)

4.3 The Interval Iteration Algorithm

The idea of the II algorithm is to start with a lower and an upper bound on the true reachability probability and iterate the Bellman optimality operator ($F_{\text{inf}}/F_{\text{sup}}$) on both. Since the optimality operators are monotone, both sequences converge to a fixed point. On arbitrary MDPs, these fixed points are not necessarily the same. However, if the MDP is preprocessed to only contain maximal end components (MECs) that are trivial or bottom MECs, both fixed points are equal to the optimal reachability probabilities.

We now assume a special form of reduced MDPs, where the only BMECs are $\{s_+\}$ and $\{s_-\}$ (Locale 4.2). The MDP has a single target state s_+ and a single avoid state s_- , that both are absorbing: $\text{return}_{\text{pmf}} s$ is the probability mass function that assigns probability 1 to state s . The reduced MDPs from Sect. 4.1 are instances of this locale.

locale *MDPC_Reach_Avoid* = *Finite_MDP* M + (Locale 4.2)
assumes

$s_- \in \text{states } M$ **and** $s_+ \in \text{states } M$ **and**
 $\forall s \in \text{states } M \setminus \{s_+, s_-\}. s \in \text{trivials } M$ **and**
 $\text{actions } s_- = \{\text{return}_{\text{pmf}} s_-\}$ **and** $\text{actions } s_+ = \{\text{return}_{\text{pmf}} s_+\}$

As initial lower bound lb_0 , we take the function that assigns a value of 0 to every state (except s_+), the initial upper bound ub_0 assigns 1 to every state except s_- (Def. 4.4). Next, we define the iterated lower and upper bounds $lb_{\text{inf}} n$ and $ub_{\text{inf}} n$ as the n -fold application of the Bellman optimality operator F_{inf} to the initial lower and upper bounds lb_0 and ub_0 .

definition $lb_0 = (\lambda s \in \text{states } M. \text{if } s = s_+ \text{ then } 1 \text{ else } 0)$ (Def. 4.4)

definition $ub_0 = (\lambda s \in \text{states } M. \text{if } s = s_- \text{ then } 0 \text{ else } 1)$

definition $lb_{\text{inf}} n = (F_{\text{inf}})^n lb_0$ **and** $ub_{\text{inf}} n = (F_{\text{inf}})^n ub_0$ (Def. 4.5)

It is an immediate consequence of the monotonicity of the Bellman optimality operators that the lower and upper bounds are monotonically increasing and decreasing respectively. Clearly, lb_0 is a lower bound and ub_0 is an upper bound for both P_{inf} (Lemma 4.4). Additionally, we formally derive that the Bellman optimality operators preserve upper and lower bounds in Lemma 4.5. These two lemmas are the only properties of the abstract II algorithm that we need for the refinement proof in Sect. 5. We formally show that they hold even if the MDP is not reduced. Last, in Thm. 4.6 we show that II indeed computes lower and upper bounds for the reachability probabilities for arbitrarily many iterations. The theorems for P_{sup} are all analogous.

lemma $lb_0 \leq P_{\text{inf}}$ **and** $P_{\text{inf}} \leq ub_0$ (Lemma 4.4)

lemma **assumes** $x \leq P_{\text{inf}}$ **shows** $F_{\text{inf}} x \leq P_{\text{inf}}$ (Lemma 4.5)

lemma **assumes** $x \geq P_{\text{inf}}$ **shows** $F_{\text{inf}} x \geq P_{\text{inf}}$

theorem $lb_{\text{inf}} n \leq P_{\text{inf}}$ **and** $P_{\text{inf}} \leq ub_{\text{inf}} n$ (Thm. 4.6)

4.4 Convergence of Interval Iteration

Towards a convergence proof of II, we first show that the lower and upper bound sequences correspond to finite-horizon reachability probabilities of both s_+ and s_- (Lemma 4.6, [26, Lemma 4]). We introduce the notation P_{sup}^{\leq} and P_{inf}^{\leq} for the finite-horizon reachability probabilities, and in this section, indicate the target sets explicitly. Again, we only present results for minimal probabilities, the results for maximal probabilities are analogous.

lemma (Lemma 4.6)

assumes $s \in \text{states } M$

shows $lb_{\text{inf}} \ n \ s = P_{\text{inf}}^{\leq} \{s_+\} \ n \ s$ **and** $ub_{\text{inf}} \ n \ s = 1 - P_{\text{sup}}^{\leq} \{s_-\} \ n \ s$

Now we use Thm. 4.4 to give a bound on the difference between the lower and the upper bounds in Thm. 4.7. Note that this convergence result in general only holds if all computations are carried out with arbitrary precision arithmetic. In our concrete implementation, i.e. in a floating point setting, the convergence to a unique fixed point is not guaranteed. Still, this theoretical result motivates the usage of the II algorithm to optimally solve reachability problems on MDPs. In practice, on most instances the algorithm converges much faster than the theoretical bound suggests (see Sect. 7 for experimental results).

theorem (Thm. 4.7)

assumes $s \in \text{states } M$ **and** $\epsilon > 0$ **and** $\eta \neq 1$ **and** $n \geq \lceil \log_{(1-\eta^I)} \epsilon \rceil * I$

shows $ub_{\text{inf}} \ n \ s - lb_{\text{inf}} \ n \ s \leq \epsilon$

Proof (Proof Outline). As a first step, we show for all n :

$$\begin{aligned} ub_{\text{inf}} \ n \ s - lb_{\text{inf}} \ n \ s &= 1 - P_{\text{sup}}^{\leq} \{s_-\} \ n \ s - P_{\text{inf}}^{\leq} \{s_+\} \ n \ s && \text{(Lemma 4.6)} \\ &\leq 1 - (P_{\text{inf}}^{\leq} \{s_-\} \ n \ s + P_{\text{inf}}^{\leq} \{s_+\} \ n \ s) && (P_{\text{inf}}^{\leq} \leq P_{\text{sup}}^{\leq}) \\ &= 1 - P_{\text{inf}}^{\leq} \{s_-, s_+\} \ n \ s && \text{(Disjoint events)} \\ &\leq (1 - \eta^I)^n && \text{(Lemma 4.4)} \end{aligned}$$

Instantiate n with $\lceil \log_{(1-\eta^I)} \epsilon \rceil$ and the theorem follows from monotonicity of the sequences.

Remark 1. The theorem is not applicable if all probabilities in the MDP are equal to one, i.e. there is no branching after an action is selected. In this case, the MDP is deterministic and is better solved with qualitative solution methods. Note that [26] also assume $\eta < 1$.

5 A Verified Floating-Point Implementation of Interval Iteration

Now that we have verified II, we refine it to efficient LLVM code using the IRF. For our work, we focus on IEEE 754 double precision floating-point numbers which we refer to as floats in the following sections. Due to good hardware

support on modern consumer processors, floats are a competitive choice to implement the valuations, especially compared to arbitrary precision arithmetic using rational numbers [52]. However, the refinement from reals to floats necessarily introduces rounding errors and is therefore non-trivial. Our approach uses rounding modes to refine reals to *upper bounding (ub)* floats or *lower bounding (lb)* floats. Most consumer CPUs implement rounding modes through a global flag which is both time-consuming [30] and more cumbersome to reason about in the IRF. As an alternative, we propose using the AVX512 instruction set which includes operation-specific rounding modes. First, we describe our refinement from reals to floats and then apply it to II to obtain correct-by-construction LLVM code.

5.1 Floating-Point Extension of the Isabelle Refinement Framework

We provide two refinements: real to *lb* floats and real to *ub* floats. Since the *ub* case is mostly symmetric to the *lb* case, we focus on the *lb* case unless otherwise stated. We aim to construct a refinement relation that never produces NaN for the operations we support, as NaN is incomparable to other floats and therefore not compatible with a framework reasoning about bounds. Furthermore, bounds must be preserved through these operations: the float representing -2_f (subscript f denotes floats) is a lower bound of the real value 1, yet $-2_f * -2_f = 4_f$ is not a lower bound of $1 * 1 = 1$. Restricting ourselves to non-negative floats (i.e. with sign 0) suffices to guarantee this.

We define $R_{lb} = \{(fl, r). \text{valof } fl \leq r \wedge \neg \text{is_nan } fl \wedge \text{valof } fl \geq 0\}$ as the refinement relation from reals to *lb* floats, e.g. $(2_f, 3) \in R_{lb}$, but $(-2_f, -1) \notin R_{lb}$, as -2_f is negative. This refinement relation also prohibits us from performing operations on NaN, which in turn results in NaN.

We now present the operations supported by our framework. Note that while there are more operations that are compatible with this framework, we focus on those required for our use-case.

Fused multiply-add The ternary operation $fma\ a\ b\ c = a * b + c$ represents fused multiply-add. Compared to separately multiplying and adding, it yields a smaller floating-point rounding error. We name the AVX512 operation for *fma* on floats with rounding mode *to_negative_infinity* fma_avx_lb and integrate it into the semantics of LLVM in the IRF.

lemma $(fma_avx_lb, fma) \in R_{lb} \rightarrow R_{lb} \rightarrow R_{lb} \rightarrow R_{lb}$ (Lemma 5.1)

This lemma states that for all inputs that are *lb*, not NaN and non-negative, the output is also *lb*, not NaN and non-negative. This refinement does not hold for $0_f * \infty_f$ which is NaN. We can resolve this if we can guarantee that one input is neither 0_f nor ∞_f .

Subtraction Refining a subtraction $r1 - r2$ only works for mixed bounds: we can only subtract a *ub* from a *lb* and vice versa. Subtracting *lb* from *lb* does not guarantee any of the desired bounds. Note that, due to restricting ourselves to positive floats, we need the precondition that the first argument is greater than the

second. We only show the variant which subtracts a lb from a ub , yielding a ub . sub_avx_ub is the AVX512 subtraction with rounding set to $to_positive_infinity$.

lemma $(sub_avx_ub, (-)) \in [(\geq)]_f R_{ub} \rightarrow R_{lb} \rightarrow R_{ub}$ (Lemma 5.2)

Comparisons Comparing two lb/ub floats does not provide any information on the result of the comparison of the related real numbers. Hence, we also implement these as mixed operations to get sound and complete comparisons.

definition $leq_sound\ a\ b = spec\ (\lambda r. r \rightarrow a \leq b)$ (Lemma 5.3)

lemma $(leq_double, leq_sound) \in R_{ub} \rightarrow R_{lb} \rightarrow \langle R_{bool} \rangle R_{nres}$

We use **spec** to introduce nondeterminism, in this case leq_sound returns *False* if $a > b$ and can return anything otherwise. The relation R_{nres} signifies that there is nondeterminism at play. To understand why, we consider 2 cases. Case 1: 4_f is a ub of 2, and 3_f is an lb of 5, we have $2 \leq 5$ but $4_f \not\leq 3_f$; Case 2: 3_f is a ub of 2, and 4_f is an lb of 5, we have $2 \leq 5$ and $3_f \leq 4_f$. So for two identical comparisons of reals, we have two implementations with different outcomes.

Min & max It is possible to refine the minimum (min) and maximum (max) of two values using comparisons. We have the following refinement:

definition $min_double\ fl1\ fl2 = (if\ fl1 \leq fl2\ then\ fl1\ else\ fl2)$ (Lemma 5.4)

lemma $(min_double, min) \in R_{ub} \rightarrow R_{lb} \rightarrow R_{lb}$

This refinement holds despite the fact that a comparison does not say anything about the bounding floating point number. Consider the following case: 4_f is a lower bound of 5 and 3_f is a lower bound of 6. $min_double\ 4_f\ 3_f = 3_f$ is a lower bound of $min\ 5\ 6 = 5$, even though the implementation "chose" the refinement of 6. The refinement for max proceeds analogously.

Constants We only require refinements for the real number constants 0_f and 1_f , which are exactly representable as floating-point numbers. Therefore the floating-point refinement is the same for upper and lower bounds.

5.2 Refinement of Interval Iteration

Our extension to the IRF presented in Sect. 5.1 allows us to reuse the results of Sect. 4, where probabilities are represented as real numbers. Through this separation of concerns we avoid directly proving the floating-point implementation correct. We implement real numbers using floats, rounding conservatively as shown in Fig. 4. This plot shows a fictive run of II. The dashed red line denotes




Fig. 4. The valuation for a (non-target or avoid) state over successive iterations. One using reals (grey) and the other using floats with safe rounding (blue). The red dashed line marks the reachability probability.

the probability that II converges to. The grey lines denote the valuations of some MDP state using reals, x starting from lb_0 and y from ub_0 . Implementing x with floats using the refinement relation R_{lb} yields the blue line xi (similarly for y using R_{ub}). Note that we have exaggerated the deviations for this example. In practice, the errors are so small that no visual differences would appear in a to-scale plo. Formally, the following specification states soundness of II, i.e. the outputs are lower and upper bounds of the reachability probability:

definition $ii_inf_spec M =$ (Def. 5.1)
 $\text{spec } (\lambda(x, y). \forall s \in \text{states } M. x \leq M.P_{\text{inf}} s \wedge M.P_{\text{inf}} s \leq y)$

Note that we can also include convergence in our specification. We were able to prove convergence of II using reals (Thm. 4.7). However, the refinement to floats using our framework from Sect. 5.1 would make such specification meaningless, e.g. it would yield statements like “eventually we get a floating point value that is a lower bound of a real value that is at most ε away from the solution.” As a first step towards the refinement to LLVM, we define II in the nres-monad (the *sup* case is analogous):

```

1 definition  $interval\_iteration\_inf\_gs M L =$  (Def. 5.2)
2    $x \leftarrow lb_0 M; y \leftarrow ub_0 M; i \leftarrow 0; flag \leftarrow True;$ 
3   while  $(i++ < L \wedge flag)$  (
4      $(x, y) \leftarrow F_{inf}^{gs} M x y$ 
5      $flag \leftarrow \text{spec}(\lambda x. True)$ )
6   return  $(x, y)$ 

```

We define $interval_iteration_inf_gs$ in Line 1. It takes as inputs the MDP M , and the maximal iteration count L that ensures termination. Line 2 initializes the lower bounds x and upper bounds y , sets the iteration counter to 0 and a flag to $True$.

The while-loop in Line 3 states we iterate at most L times. We include a flag in the termination criterion to allow earlier termination. In each iteration, we first update the valuations in Line 4. The main difference to F_{inf} is the fact that we use Gauss-Seidel iteration: by updating the values in-place, we already use the updated values in the current iteration and converge faster. We nondeterministically set a flag in Line 5 which allows us to implement early termination criteria on floats without stating them explicitly at this point. This is possible because the specification ii_inf_spec is satisfied after any number of iterations. Using the setup from Sect. 4, proving the following soundness statement becomes straightforward:

theorem $interval_iteration_inf_gs M L \leq ii_inf_spec M$ (Thm. 5.1)

This theorem corresponds directly to Thm. 4.6. Additionally, the algorithm is now in a format ready for refinement proofs to LLVM.

5.3 Refinement of the mcsta Data Structure

We aim for refinement of II to LLVM code to embed it into `mcsta` of the MODEST TOOLSET [31]. `mcsta` is an explicit-state probabilistic model checker that also

supports quantitative model checking of MDPs. To ensure compatibility with `mcsta` without costly conversions of data structures, we model the MDP data structure of `mcsta` as a 6-tuple in `Isabelle/HOL`:

$(St :: \text{nat list}, Tr :: \text{nat list}, Br :: \text{nat list}, Pr :: \text{real list}, u_a :: \text{nat}, u_t :: \text{nat}).$

St contains for each state a pointer to Tr , pointing to the first transition of the state. Similarly, Tr contains for each transition a pointer to Br , pointing to the first branch of the transition. Concretely, the transitions of state i are all values $j \in \{St ! i.. < St ! (i + 1)\}$, where $!$ is the list index operator, e.g. $xs ! 2$ obtains the third entry of list xs . The branches of transition j are $k \in \{Tr ! j.. < Tr ! (j + 1)\}$. Furthermore, $Br ! k$ is the index of the state the branch k points to and $Pr ! k$ its probability. Ultimately, u_a, u_t are the (unique) avoid and target states respectively.

St, Tr and Br provide a way to efficiently iterate over select branches, this layout of the data structure enables an efficient implementation of F_{inf}^{gs} . Using `sepref`, these lists can be directly refined to arrays of 64-bit integers, which are signed for compatibility with `mcsta`.

The lower bounds x are refined using R_{lb} , while the upper bounds y use R_{ub} . However, our framework only supports multiplication for refinements with the same bounds. We therefore refine each real value in the list Pr to two floats: a lower bound and an upper bound of the real probability. We discuss how we obtain these bounds in Sect. 6.

Refinement Relation We have discussed the refinement of our data structure to LLVM using `sepref`. Next, we present the refinement of the `mdpc` type introduced in Sect. 3 to the `mcsta` data structure. The abstraction function is defined in Listing 1.3.

```

1 definition  $Tr\_pmf\ t =$  (Listing 1.3)
2    $pmf\_of\_list\ (map\ (!)\ (zip\ Br\ Pr))\ ([Tr\ !\ t.. < Tr\ !\ (t+1)])$ 
3 definition  $St\_pmfs\ s =$  (if  $s \in \{u_a, u_t\}$  then  $\{return_{pmf}\ s\}$ 
4   else  $\{Tr\_pmf\ t \mid t. St\ !\ s \leq t \wedge t \leq St\ !\ (s+1)\}$ )
5 definition  $\alpha_M = (\lambda s < length\ St - 1. St\_pmfs\ s)$ 

```

The function Tr_pmf creates a *pmf* from the branches of a single transition t in the `mcsta` data structure by combining the branch target (from Br) with its transition probability (from Pr). Then, St_pmfs collects all actions of a state s . If s is a target or avoid state, it merely gets a self loop. Finally, we create α_M : a partial function that only returns a result for states that have an index less than $length\ St - 1$. We subtract one because St contains one more entry than the number of states. The invariant I_M (definition elided) states the well-formedness rules: St, Tr and Br do not point out of bounds; St and Tr are sorted, Pr contains positive probabilities that add up to one per transition. Moreover, Pr and Br are of equal length and u_a and u_t are distinct states. Using conversions from lists to arrays and nats to 64-bit words and our float framework, and composing that with $br\ \alpha_M\ I_M$, we convert this into assertion A_M which refines an MDP of type `mdpc` to the `mcsta` data structure.

Example 4. A possible representation of the MDP from Fig. 1 is $St = [0, 2, 3, 4, 5]$, $Tr = [0, 1, 3, 4, 6, 7]$, $Br = [2, 0, 1, 0, 1, 3, 3]$, $Pr = [1.0, 0.9, 0.1, 1, 0.5, 0.5, 1.0]$. If the target state is 3, we set $u_t = 3$.

Refinement of Operations We now refine the four operations necessary for II: lb_0 , ub_0 , F_{inf}^{gs} and $flag$. For lb_0 and ub_0 , we only need to initialize an array and set entries to 0_f or 1_f which we introduced as constants in our framework. For F_{inf}^{gs} , we need fma and min (max for F_{sup}^{gs}). We use $flag$ to determine whether to abort the computation. The standard mcsta II algorithm aborts when the distance between the lower and upper bound is less than a user specified ε . We realize this by subtracting the lower bound from the upper bound two values and comparing the result to ε .

5.4 Correctness Statement

Using the refinements for all of the operations in *interval_iteration_gs_inf*, we use sepre to obtain an LLVM implementation *interval_iteration_gs_inf_ll* (definition elided). Using the transitivity of the refinement relation, we can directly prove correctness of *interval_iteration_gs_inf_ll* against the specification *ii_inf_spec* (unfolded here) in one proof. We provide the correctness guarantee in the form of a Hoare triple. We only show the *inf* case because the *sup* analogous.

- 1 **theorem** *Modest_interval_iteration_inf_ll_htriple: llvm_htriple* (Listing 1.4)
- 2 ($A_{size} N ni \star A_{size} L Li \star A_{ub} \varepsilon \varepsilon i \star A_M M Mi$
- 3 $\star \uparrow(MDPC_Reach_Avoid M \wedge N + 1 < max_size_t \wedge N = card (states M))$)
- 4 (*interval_iteration_gs_inf_ll* $Li ni \varepsilon i Mi resi$)
- 5 ($\lambda(xi, yi). \exists x y. (* Input data/preconditions preserved -- elided *)$
- 6 $A_{lb}^{out} x xi \star A_{ub}^{out} y yi \star \uparrow(\forall s \in states M. x s \leq M.P_{inf} s \wedge M.P_{inf} s \leq y s)$)

Line 2 formalizes the input data: N and L are natural numbers implemented as 64-bit words ni and li ; ε is a real number implemented as float εi and M is the MDP implemented as Mi . The separation conjunction \star specifies that these implementations are allocated to disjoint memory locations. Line 3 states that M has to satisfy the assumptions of Locale 4.2 and asserts an upper bound on the number of states. Since St has one more entry than the number of states N , an index can be at most N as well, yet the array length $N + 1$ cannot exceed the largest representable 64-bit number.

Given these preconditions, if we run the algorithm (Line 4), we get a post-condition that states that there exists an x that is implemented by the output of the algorithm xi through assertion A_{lb}^{out} . This is an array of lb floats where each index corresponds to a state and the value at that index to its valuation (ub analogous). Furthermore, x and y are lower and upper bounds of P_{inf} respectively. Due to xi and yi in turn being lower and upper bounds of x and y , it shows how a convergence proof would yield a void statement. Because of this reason, we have to experimentally show that convergence generally happens.

6 Implementation

We now convert *interval_iteration_gs_inf_ll* from Sect. 5, which is an algorithm expressed in our model of LLVM within Isabelle/HOL, to actual LLVM instructions for usage in the LLVM compiler pipeline. We use the `export_llvm` command of the IRF for this translation. This command produces a C header file for usage in other software. In our case we want to invoke it from `mcsta`. We make this invocation optional by an additional argument that triggers the usage of our verified algorithm.

Compatibility with mcsta When integrating the library with `mcsta`, we aim to have as little error-prone glue code as possible. The postcondition of (Listing 1.4) only holds if the precondition is satisfied. The input parameters L , N and ε do not require any special checks. For the MDP data structure Mi , we need to obtain two floats that are lower and upper bounds of the actual precise probability. These bounds may not be 0_f or ∞_f as we use the refinement R_{pfb} . `mcsta` provides probabilities as 128-bit rationals (a pair of 64-bit longs representing the numerator and denominator). We convert the probabilities to 64-bit doubles by directly converting the numerator and denominator to doubles and performing a division twice, once rounding up and once rounding down. This approach never yields 0_f or ∞_f if both the numerator and denominator are non-zero.

We assume that the input MDP as produced by the `mcsta` pipeline is well-formed. While a check for well-formedness would be possible, if there is a bug in parser of `mcsta` the results would still be invalidated without notice. This cannot be ruled out until an entire probabilistic model checker is verified, including the parsing phase.

Interpretation of the output Listing 1.4 states that performing finitely many iterations using precise arithmetic provides us with lower and upper bounds (x and y) on the actual reachability probability. Since we are using floats for our implementation, the values of the floats xi and yi are again conservative bounds of those real numbers. As the directions of the bounds coincide (i.e. x is a lower bound of the reachability probability, xi is a lower bound of x , analogous for y), the floating-point bounds are actual bounds of the reachability probabilities for the MDP with real-valued probabilities. However, whereas we can prove convergence of the abstract algorithm using reals, we cannot do so in the implementation, as the floating-point bounds do not necessarily converge to the same fixed point. For our implementation, we confirm experimentally that for a broad set of benchmark MDPs, the bounds always converge to the same fixed point up to ε . We use an unverified MDP reduction algorithm provided by `mcsta` as required for convergence to a single fixpoint.

7 Experiments

We experimentally evaluate the performance of our implementation on standard benchmark MDPs. The goals of this evaluation are twofold: 1) compare the




Fig. 5. Comparison of runtime to complete the Interval Iteration routine

running times of the verified with an unverified implementation and 2) evaluate whether convergence still generally occurs in the floating-point setting. We think that 1) is important to demonstrate since verified implementations tend to be orders of magnitude slower than manually implemented ones [52]. Moreover, 2) is important because our verified implementation does not guarantee convergence as we traded this for having guaranteed bounds. For runtime speed, we compare our verified implementation (*Verified* implementation) to the manual implementation in *Modest*. There are two variants of this algorithm in *mcsta*: The C# with standard rounding (*Modest* implementation) and a manually implemented variant with safe rounding [30] (*Safe* implementation). The latter uses the AVX512 implementation with safe rounding, similar to our verified LLVM implementation. For the convergence threshold, we set $\varepsilon = 10^{-6}$ which is the standard in *mcsta*. We use all DTMC, MDP and PTA models of the QVBS of QCOMP [16] with between 1.000.000 and 100.000.000 states, that additionally need at least two iterations to converge to ε . We consider both minimal and maximal reachability probabilities for our benchmarks. In total, this yields a benchmark set of 49 benchmark instances. We ran all benchmarks on an Intel i9-11900K at 3.5GHz with 128GB of RAM.

Fig. 5 on the left compares the *Verified* implementation to the *Modest* implementation, while the plot on the right compares to the *Safe* implementation. We observe that the performance is consistent among the different implementations. Based on the raw data of the benchmarks (elided) we conclude that the safe and verified implementations behave identical. We conclude that the difference between implementations are minimal. This shows that 1) we have replaced an unverified implementation with a verified one at no or negligible cost and 2) that our algorithm still converges for practical use-cases. Remember that, for the latter, this is not a formal guarantee. Our refinement to floats sacrifices the convergence guarantee to preserve the bounds.

8 Conclusion

We have formally proven the correctness of interval iteration in Isabelle/HOL. The algorithm provably computes lower and upper bounds for the reachability probabilities (soundness) and converges to a single fixpoint (completeness). Furthermore, we have proven that soundness is preserved if we implement the algorithm using floating-point arithmetic with safe rounding. For this purpose, we used a principled refinement approach. We exploited the parametricity principle of the IRF by consistently rounding our floating-point values in one direction. To make this practical, we equip the `sepref` tool with reasoning infrastructure for floating-point numbers to generate an LLVM program. All our proofs culminate in a single statement, presented as a Hoare triple, leaving no gaps in the link between the specification and the implementation in LLVM.

Finally, we extract verified LLVM code from our formalization and embed it into the `mcsta` model checker of the Modest toolset. We experimentally verify that our implementation converges in practice and is competitive with manually implemented, unverified counterparts. This is an important step towards a fully verified probabilistic model checking pipeline.

We also present our approach as an alternative a bottom-up approach of building a verified model checker from scratch. With our top-down approach, the full functionality of the model checker is available to the user, possibly in cross-usage with verified components. Verified components are integrated into the model checker as drop-in replacements for unverified components, designed with competitive performance in mind.

Future Work In a next step, we plan to build a complete, verified II backend of `mcsta`. The missing part is an efficient verified implementation of the transformations to reduced MDPs. On the implementation side, the prerequisites are already there in the form of a verified and efficiently executable MEC decomposition algorithm in Isabelle/HOL [35,36].

Another challenge is to obtain formal guarantees for the convergence of the floating point variant of II. It also remains open how the technique of directed rounding can be applied to other algorithms with monotone operators. An example is optimistic value iteration [33], which initially performs value iteration and then heuristically transitions to II by determining an upper bound on the value function. Another possible extension is II for Interval MDPs [26].

References

1. Abdulaziz, M., Madlener, C.: A Formal Analysis of RANKING. In: The 14th Conference on Interactive Theorem Proving (ITP) (2023). <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2302.13747>
2. de Alfaro, L.: Formal verification of probabilistic systems. Ph.D. thesis, Stanford University, USA (1997), <https://searchworks.stanford.edu/view/3910936>
3. Audebaud, P., Paulin-Mohring, C.: Proofs of randomized algorithms in Coq. Science of Computer Programming (Jun 2009). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scico.2007.09.002>

4. Baier, C.: Probabilistic model checking. In: Esparza, J., Grumberg, O., Sickert, S. (eds.) *Dependable Software Systems Engineering, NATO Science for Peace and Security Series – D: Information and Communication Security*, vol. 45, pp. 1–23. IOS Press (2016). <https://doi.org/10.3233/978-1-61499-627-9-1>
5. Baier, C., de Alfaro, L., Forejt, V., Kwiatkowska, M.: Model checking probabilistic systems. In: Clarke, E.M., Henzinger, T.A., Veith, H., Bloem, R. (eds.) *Handbook of Model Checking*, pp. 963–999. Springer (2018). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-10575-8_28
6. Baier, C., Haverkort, B.R., Hermanns, H., Katoen, J.P.: Performance evaluation and model checking join forces. *Commun. ACM* **53**(9), 76–85 (2010). <https://doi.org/10.1145/1810891.1810912>
7. Baier, C., Katoen, J.P.: *Principles of model checking*. MIT Press (2008)
8. Baier, C., Klein, J., Leuschner, L., Parker, D., Wunderlich, S.: Ensuring the reliability of your model checker: Interval iteration for Markov decision processes. In: Majumdar, R., Kuncak, V. (eds.) *29th International Conference on Computer Aided Verification (CAV)*. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol. 10426, pp. 160–180. Springer (2017). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-63387-9_8
9. Ballarin, C.: Locales and locale expressions in Isabelle/Isar. In: *TYPES*. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol. 3085, pp. 34–50. Springer (2003)
10. Barrett, G.: Formal methods applied to a floating-point number system. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering* (May 1989). <https://doi.org/10.1109/32.24710>
11. Bellman, R.: A Markovian decision process. *Journal of Mathematics and Mechanics* **6**(5), 679–684 (1957)
12. Bohnenkamp, H.C., D’Argenio, P.R., Hermanns, H., Katoen, J.P.: MoDeST: A compositional modeling formalism for hard and softly timed systems. *IEEE Trans. Software Eng.* **32**(10), 812–830 (2006). <https://doi.org/10.1109/TSE.2006.104>
13. Boldo, S., Melquiond, G.: Flocq: A Unified Library for Proving Floating-Point Algorithms in Coq. In: *2011 IEEE 20th Symposium on Computer Arithmetic (Jul 2011)*. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ARITH.2011.40>
14. Boldo, S., Muñoz, C.: A high-level formalization of floating-point number in PVS. *Tech. rep.* (2006)
15. Budde, C.E., Dehnert, C., Hahn, E.M., Hartmanns, A., Junges, S., Turrini, A.: JANI: Quantitative model and tool interaction. In: Legay, A., Margaria, T. (eds.) *23rd International Conference on Tools and Algorithms for the Construction and Analysis of Systems (TACAS)*. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol. 10206, pp. 151–168 (2017). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-54580-5_9
16. Budde, C.E., Hartmanns, A., Klauck, M., Kretínský, J., Parker, D., Quatmann, T., Turrini, A., Zhang, Z.: On correctness, precision, and performance in quantitative verification (QComp 2020 competition report). In: Margaria, T., Steffen, B. (eds.) *9th International Symposium on Leveraging Applications of Formal Methods (ISoLA)*. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol. 12479, pp. 216–241. Springer (2020). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-83723-5_15
17. D’Argenio, P.R., Jeannet, B., Jensen, H.E., Larsen, K.G.: Reachability analysis of probabilistic systems by successive refinements. In: de Alfaro, L., Gilmore, S. (eds.) *Joint International Workshop on Process Algebra and Probabilistic Methods, Performance Modeling and Verification (PAPM-PROBMIV)*. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol. 2165, pp. 39–56. Springer (2001). https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-44804-7_3

18. De Dinechin, F., Lauter, C., Melquiond, G.: Certifying the floating-point implementation of an elementary function using Gappa. *IEEE Transactions on Computers* (2010). <https://doi.org/10.1109/TC.2010.128>
19. Eberl, M., Haslbeck, M.W., Nipkow, T.: Verified Analysis of Random Binary Tree Structures. *J. Autom. Reason.* (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1007/S10817-020-09545-0>
20. Eberl, M., Hölzl, J., Nipkow, T.: A Verified Compiler for Probability Density Functions. In: Programming Languages and Systems - 24th European Symposium on Programming, ESOP 2015, Held as Part of the European Joint Conferences on Theory and Practice of Software, ETAPS 2015, London, UK, April 11-18, 2015. *Proceedings* (2015). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-46669-8_4
21. Faissole, F., Geneau de Lamarlière, P., Melquiond, G.: End-To-End Formal Verification of a Fast and Accurate Floating-Point Approximation. *LIPICs*, Volume 309, ITP 2024 (2024). <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPICs.ITP.2024.14>
22. Ferreira, N.B.F., Moscato, M.M., Titolo, L., Ayala-Rincón, M.: A Provably Correct Floating-Point Implementation of Well Clear Avionics Concepts. In: Formal Methods in Computer-Aided Design, FMCAD 2023, Ames, IA, USA, October 24-27, 2023 (2023). https://doi.org/10.34727/2023/ISBN.978-3-85448-060-0_32
23. Giry, M.: A categorical approach to probability theory. In: *Categorical Aspects of Topology and Analysis* (1982). <https://doi.org/10.1007/BFb0092872>
24. Gordon, M.J.C., Milner, R., Wadsworth, C.P.: *Edinburgh LCF*, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 78. Springer (1979)
25. Haddad, S., Monmege, B.: Reachability in MDPs: Refining convergence of value iteration. In: Ouaknine, J., Potapov, I., Worrell, J. (eds.) 8th International Workshop on Reachability Problems (RP). *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol. 8762, pp. 125–137. Springer (2014). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-11439-2_10
26. Haddad, S., Monmege, B.: Interval iteration algorithm for mdps and imdps. *Theor. Comput. Sci.* **735**, 111–131 (2018). <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.TCS.2016.12.003>
27. Hahn, E.M., Hartmanns, A., Hermanns, H., Katoen, J.P.: A compositional modelling and analysis framework for stochastic hybrid systems. *Formal Methods Syst. Des.* **43**(2), 191–232 (2013). <https://doi.org/10.1007/S10703-012-0167-Z>
28. Harrison, J.: Formal verification at Intel. In: 18th Annual IEEE Symposium of Logic in Computer Science, 2003. *Proceedings.* (Jun 2003). <https://doi.org/10.1109/LICS.2003.1210044>
29. Harrison, J.: A Machine-Checked Theory of Floating Point Arithmetic. In: *Theorem Proving in Higher Order Logics* (1999). https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-48256-3_9
30. Hartmanns, A.: Correct probabilistic model checking with floating-point arithmetic. In: TACAS (2). *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol. 13244, pp. 41–59. Springer (2022)
31. Hartmanns, A., Hermanns, H.: The Modest Toolset: An integrated environment for quantitative modelling and verification. In: Ábrahám, E., Havelund, K. (eds.) 20th International Conference on Tools and Algorithms for the Construction and Analysis of Systems (TACAS). *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol. 8413, pp. 593–598. Springer (2014). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-54862-8_51
32. Hartmanns, A., Junges, S., Quatmann, T., Weininger, M.: A practitioner’s guide to MDP model checking algorithms. In: Sankaranarayanan, S., Sharygina, N. (eds.) 29th International Conference on Tools and Algorithms for the Construction and Analysis of Systems (TACAS). *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol. 13993, pp. 469–488. Springer (2023). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-30823-9_24

33. Hartmanns, A., Kaminski, B.L.: Optimistic value iteration. In: Lahiri, S.K., Wang, C. (eds.) 32nd International Conference on Computer Aided Verification (CAV). Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 12225, pp. 488–511. Springer (2020). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-53291-8_26
34. Hartmanns, A., Klauck, M., Parker, D., Quatmann, T., Ruijters, E.: The quantitative verification benchmark set. In: Vojnar, T., Zhang, L. (eds.) 25th International Conference on Tools and Algorithms for the Construction and Analysis of Systems (TACAS). Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 11427, pp. 344–350. Springer (2019). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-17462-0_20
35. Hartmanns, A., Kohlen, B., Lammich, P.: Fast verified sccs for probabilistic model checking. In: ATVA (1). Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 14215, pp. 181–202. Springer (2023)
36. Hartmanns, A., Kohlen, B., Lammich, P.: Efficient formally verified maximal end component decomposition for mdps. In: FM (1). Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 14933, pp. 206–225. Springer (2024)
37. Hölzl, J.: Markov chains and markov decision processes in isabelle/hol. *J. Autom. Reason.* **59**(3), 345–387 (2017). <https://doi.org/10.1007/S10817-016-9401-5>
38. Hölzl, J., Nipkow, T.: Markov models. *Arch. Formal Proofs* **2012** (2012), https://www.isa-afp.org/entries/Markov_Models.shtml
39. Kamali, M., Katoen, J.P.: Probabilistic model checking of AODV. In: Gribaudo, M., Jansen, D.N., Remke, A. (eds.) 17th International Conference on the Quantitative Evaluation of Systems (QEST). Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 12289, pp. 54–73. Springer (2020). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-59854-9_6
40. Kaminski, B.L.: Advanced Weakest Precondition Calculi for Probabilistic Programs. Ph.D. thesis, RWTH Aachen University, Germany (2019), <http://publications.rwth-aachen.de/record/755408>
41. Lammich, P.: Generating verified LLVM from isabelle/hol. In: Harrison, J., O’Leary, J., Tolmach, A. (eds.) 10th International Conference on Interactive Theorem Proving (ITP). LIPIcs, vol. 141, pp. 22:1–22:19. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik (2019). <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPICS.ITP.2019.22>
42. Lammich, P., Tuerk, T.: Applying data refinement for monadic programs to hopcroft’s algorithm. In: Beringer, L., Felty, A.P. (eds.) 3rd International Conference on Interactive Theorem Proving (ITP). Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 7406, pp. 166–182. Springer (2012). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-32347-8_12
43. Lattner, C., Adve, V.: LLVM: A compilation framework for lifelong program analysis and transformation. p. 75–88. San Jose, CA, USA (Mar 2004)
44. Miner, P.S.: Defining the IEEE-854 floating-point standard in PVS. Tech. rep. (1995)
45. Moscato, M., Titolo, L., Dutle, A., Muñoz, C.A.: Automatic Estimation of Verified Floating-Point Round-Off Errors via Static Analysis. In: Computer Safety, Reliability, and Security (2017). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-66266-4_14
46. Nipkow, T., Paulson, L.C., Wenzel, M.: Isabelle/HOL – A Proof Assistant for Higher-Order Logic, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 2283. Springer (2002)
47. Puterman, M.L.: Markov Decision Processes: Discrete Stochastic Dynamic Programming. Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics, Wiley (1994). <https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470316887>
48. Quatmann, T., Katoen, J.P.: Sound value iteration. In: Chockler, H., Weissenbacher, G. (eds.) 30th International Conference on Computer Aided Verifica-

- tion (CAV). Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 10981, pp. 643–661. Springer (2018). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-96145-3_37
49. Roberts, R., Lewis, B., Hartmanns, A., Basu, P., Roy, S., Chakraborty, K., Zhang, Z.: Probabilistic verification for reliability of a two-by-two network-on-chip system. In: Lluch-Lafuente, A., Mavridou, A. (eds.) 26th International Conference on Formal Methods for Industrial Critical Systems (FMICS). Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 12863, pp. 232–248. Springer (2021). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-85248-1_16
 50. Ruijters, E., Guck, D., Drolenga, P., Peters, M., Stoelinga, M.: Maintenance analysis and optimization via statistical model checking – evaluating a train pneumatic compressor. In: Agha, G., Houdt, B.V. (eds.) 13th International Conference on the Quantitative Evaluation of Systems (QEST). Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 9826, pp. 331–347. Springer (2016). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-43425-4_22
 51. Ruijters, E., Guck, D., van Noort, M., Stoelinga, M.: Reliability-centered maintenance of the electrically insulated railway joint via fault tree analysis: A practical experience report. In: 46th Annual IEEE/IFIP International Conference on Dependable Systems and Networks (DSN). pp. 662–669. IEEE Computer Society (2016). <https://doi.org/10.1109/DSN.2016.67>
 52. Schäffeler, M., Abdulaziz, M.: Formally verified solution methods for markov decision processes. In: AAAI. pp. 15073–15081. AAAI Press (2023)
 53. Sutton, R.S., Barto, A.G.: Reinforcement learning – an introduction. Adaptive computation and machine learning, MIT Press (1998)
 54. Tassarotti, J., Harper, R.: A separation logic for concurrent randomized programs. Proc. ACM Program. Lang. (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3290377>
 55. Titolo, L., Moscato, M., Feliu, M.A., Masci, P., Muñoz, C.A.: Rigorous Floating-Point Round-Off Error Analysis in PRECiSA 4.0. In: Formal Methods (2025). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-71177-0_2
 56. Titolo, L., Moscato, M., Feliu, M.A., Muñoz, C.A.: Automatic Generation of Guard-Stable Floating-Point Code. In: Integrated Formal Methods (2020). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-63461-2_8
 57. Titolo, L., Moscato, M.M., Feliú, M.A., Masci, P., Muñoz, C.A.: Rigorous floating-point round-off error analysis in precisa 4.0. In: Platzer, A., Rozier, K.Y., Pradella, M., Rossi, M. (eds.) Formal Methods - 26th International Symposium, FM 2024, Milan, Italy, September 9-13, 2024, Proceedings, Part II. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 14934, pp. 20–38. Springer (2024). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-71177-0_2, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-71177-0_2
 58. Titolo, L., Moscato, M.M., Muñoz, C.A., Dutle, A., Bobot, F.: A Formally Verified Floating-Point Implementation of the Compact Position Reporting Algorithm. In: Formal Methods (2018). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-95582-7_22
 59. Vajjha, K., Shinnar, A., Trager, B.M., Pestun, V., Fulton, N.: CertRL: Formalizing convergence proofs for value and policy iteration in Coq. In: The 10th International Conference on Certified Programs and Proofs (CPP) (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3437992.3439927>
 60. Wimmer, R., Kortus, A., Herbstritt, M., Becker, B.: Probabilistic model checking and reliability of results. In: Straube, B., Drutarovský, M., Renovell, M., Gramata, P., Fischerová, M. (eds.) 11th IEEE Workshop on Design & Diagnostics of Electronic Circuits & Systems (DDECS). pp. 207–212. IEEE Computer Society (2008). <https://doi.org/10.1109/DDECS.2008.4538787>

61. Yu, L.: A formal model of IEEE floating point arithmetic. Arch. Formal Proofs **2013** (2013), https://www.isa-afp.org/entries/IEEE_Floating_Point.shtml