Two Techniques for Software Engineering:

Reactive Animation and Smart Play-Out

David Harel The Weizmann Institute of Science



I. Reactive animation

Linking a state-of-the-art reactive system engine with a state-of-theart animation system

Motivation: complex reactive systems with numerous objects, for which standard kinds of GUIs are inadequate as a front end

Benefits: relevant to a wide variety of application areas; flexible and realistic; the best of both worlds





Our main example so far:

Connecting the Rhapsody tool supporting statecharts, with Flash from Macromedia

(with <u>S. Efroni</u> and I. Cohen)





The British humor view on the ability to predict behavior by simulation...





Biological example (with <u>S. Efroni</u> and I. Cohen)

- T-cell (thymocyte) behavior in the thymus.
- Many cells of few types, internal behavior, complex interaction, geometric movement.
- An enormous amount of biological data assimilated, assessed and modeled (around 300 papers).



Flash front-end of entire lobule at runtime



Pre-recorded demos

T cells in the thymus

days 9 to 13

27 days









Sub-chart responsible for movement



Sub-chart responsible for interactions with other cells











Experimentation in silico





Cell migration



Some additional goodies

- We are not committed to a particular theory (e.g., of cell interaction or movement). Several such are modeled, and are selectable at pre-run or at run-time.
- We have associated the source publications with the model and the front-end in a way that facilitates easy retrieval.





We envision numerous applications of reactive animation

Are working on a second example -linking the Play-Engine with Maya , e.g., incorporating 3D -- and on making the idea technically generic





II. Smart Play-Out

Using hard-core verification tools to <u>run</u> real-world programs, rather than to prove properties thereof

Motivation: declarative, logical or constraintbased languages, whose inherent execution mechanism is highly nondeterministic

Benefits: predictive scenario-based programming, smart executable requirements and use cases, powerful testing, etc.

Our main example so far:

Using model-checking to run live sequence charts (LSCs) in the Play-Engine environment

(with <u>H. Kugler</u>, R. Marelly and A. Pnueli)



Live sequence charts (LSC's)

(Damm & H, '98)

A natural extension of classical MSCs, with modalities (universal/existential, hot/cold, etc.) and structure (subcharts, conditionals, loops, etc.)







(similar to [a] in dynamic logic)

- Subcharts
- Loops
- Cold conditions enable control structures
- Hot conditions enable anti-scenarios:





Play-in/Play-out (H & Marelly '99-'03)

- Extensive strengthening of the 1998 version of LSCs (e.g., symbolic instances, time & real-time, weighted choice, forbidden elements,...)
- Play-In (friendly & convenient GUI-based capture)
- Play-Out (execution techniques & algorithms)



The Play-Engine: Play-Out

Play-out works like an over-obedient, but strictly minimalistic citizen, zealously adhering to the Book of Rules.

 Universal charts drive the execution; relevant chart copies started and monitored continuously; instances & variables bound on the fly.

(external event; step*; stable?) = superstep

Hot stuff <u>will</u> be done, cold stuff <u>might</u>.



Play-out demo





At the very least, this enhances many aspects of the standard system design process:

executable requirements, "deep" prototyping, runnable test suites, solid basis for synthesis, etc.



But why not be a lot more ambitious??

Can use LSCs and the Play-Engine to program a system as a final implementation



Recent book attempts to describe it all:

Come, Let's Play: Scenario-Based Programming Using LSCs and the Play-Engine

> D. Harel and R. Marelly Springer, June 2003

(includes the Play-Engine software and formal operational semantics: D)



"Smart" Play-out

- LSCs may give rise to different legal runs, even within supersteps, due to partial order within a chart, and multiple charts interleaving.
- Play-engine takes a practical approach: implements policies and heuristics to execute system runs, not controllable by the user (except by explicit acts programmed into the LSCs themselves).
- Applying powerful methods taken from program verification can help find the "correct" run or identify inconsistencies.



- <u>Goal 1</u>: compute a <u>superstep</u>; that is, figure out a "good" series of responses of the system to an action from the user or the environment, and drive the play-engine's execution.
- <u>Goal 2</u>: compute a way to satisfy a full existential chart; that is, figure out a "good" sequence of events that will drive the engine to satisfy a test scenario.
- <u>Approach</u> :
- Formulate the goal as a generic verification problem.
- Perform model-checking (TLV, CMU-SMV...).
- Model-checker produces a desired super-step (if there is one), or the sought-after run of the entire existential chart (if there is one).



The translation

Variables:

$$\begin{array}{ll} act_{m_{i}} & - \mbox{ chart } m_{i} \mbox{ is active (in main chart)} \\ msg^{s}_{O_{j} \rightarrow O_{k}} - O_{j} \mbox{ sends } msg \mbox{ to } O_{k} \\ msg^{r}_{O_{j} \rightarrow O_{k}} - O_{k} \mbox{ receives } msg \mbox{ from } O_{j} \\ l_{m_{i},O_{j}} & - O_{j} \mbox{ 's location (0 . . . } l_{max} \mbox{)} \end{array}$$



Translation relation



$$l'_{m_i,O_j} = \begin{cases} l & \text{if } l_{m_i,O_j} = l - 1 \land msg^s_{O_j \to O_k} \\ l - 1 & \text{if } l_{m_i,O_j} = l - 1 \land msg^s_{O_j \to O_k} \\ \end{pmatrix} = 0$$



Translation relation (cont.)

There is an active chart causing msg, and all active charts must agree on msg

$$\begin{split} msg_{O_{j} \to O_{k}}^{s} & = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \phi_{1} \land \phi_{2} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\ \phi_{1} &= \bigvee_{m_{i} \in M^{U} \land msg_{O_{j} \to O_{k}}^{s} \in Messages(m_{i})} act_{m_{i}} = 1 \\ \phi_{2} &= \bigwedge_{m_{i} \in M^{U} \land msg_{O_{j} \to O_{k}}^{s} \in Messages(m_{i})} (act_{m_{i}} = 0 \lor \psi(m_{i})) \\ \psi(m_{i}) &= \bigvee_{l_{t} \text{ s.t. } f(l_{t}) = msg_{O_{j} \to O_{k}}^{s}} (l_{m_{i},O_{j}} = l_{t} - 1 \land l'_{m_{i},O_{j}} = l_{t}) \end{split}$$



Chart activation

Chart is active when the prechart reaches maximal locations, and is deactivated when the main chart reaches maximal locations.

$$act'_{m_i} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \phi(pch(m_i)) \\ 0 & \text{if } \phi(m_i) \\ act_{m_i} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$
$$\phi(m_i) = \bigwedge_{O_j \in Obj(m_i)} (l'_{m_i,O_j} = l^{max}_{m_i,O_j})$$



Model checking for super-step execution

There is an eventual point where none of the universal charts is active:

$$\neg \Box (\bigvee_{m_i \in M^U} act_{m_i} = 1)$$

If this is true, the model-checker finds a satisfying run, which is a desired superstep

This is then fed automatically into the Play-Engine for execution



Pre-recorded demo

Being smart helps





Biological example (with <u>N. Kam</u>, M. Stern, J. Hubbard, A. Pnueli)

Modeling vulval precursor cell fate in C. elegans



11 Destructor 199 Science Pages 1945-2140 \$7 • C. elegans • Sequence to Biology

Small (1mm long) and transparent.

- The most completely described creature ever.
 - Studied in about 450 labs worldwide.
- Extremely resilient (survived Feb. '03 Columbia crash)
 - Its pioneers (e.g., Sydney Brenner) rec'd 2002 Nobel Prize

Fixed development (→ wildtype has fixed number of cells with fixed roles).

Development of the Egg-Laying System





Pre-recorded demos

Smart Let-23 (make anti-scenario)

D

Smart P7pAlone (use anti-scenario)

D



We envision an increasingly broader potential for smart play-out

Are working hard on strengthening the technique, extending the language features it covers, and linking it to notions of consistency and synthesis



Thank you for listening



