

Theories

A **signature** is a (finite or infinite) set of predicate and function symbols. We fix a signature S .

A **theory** is a set of formulas T (over S) closed under consequence, i.e., if $F_1, \dots, F_n \in T$ and $\{F_1, \dots, F_n\} \models G$ then $G \in T$.

Fact: Let \mathcal{A} be a structure suitable for S . The set F of formulas such that $\mathcal{A}(F) = 1$ is a theory.

We call them **model-based** theories.

Fact: Let \mathcal{F} be a set of formulas (a **set of axioms**). The set F of formulas such that $\mathcal{F} \models F$ is a theory.

We call them **axiom-based** theories.

Examples

Model-based theories:

Arithmetic: $Th(\mathbb{N}, 0, 1, +, \cdot, <)$

Presburger Arithmetic: $Th(\mathbb{N}, 0, 1, +, <)$

Linear Arithmetic: $Th(\mathbb{Q}, 0, 1, +, c \cdot (c \in \mathbb{Q}), <)$

Axiom-based theories:

- Theory of groups, rings, fields, boolean algebras, ...
- Abstract datatypes: stacks, queues, ...

Decidability and axiomatizability

A set \mathcal{F} of formulas over a signature S is **decidable** if there is an algorithm that decides for every formula F over S whether $F \in \mathcal{F}$ holds.

A theory T is **decidable** if it is decidable as a set.

A theory T is **axiomatizable** if there is a decidable set $\mathcal{F} \subseteq T$ of closed formulas (the axioms) such that every formula of T is a consequence of \mathcal{F} .

Quantifier elimination

A **quantifier elimination procedure** (QE-procedure) for a model-based theory with structure \mathcal{A} is a **computable** function that maps each formula of the theory of the form $\exists x F$ (where F contains no quantifiers) to a formula G without quantifiers such that:

- $\mathcal{A}(\exists x F) = \mathcal{A}(G)$.
- Every free variable of G is also a free variable of $\exists x F$.

Notation: We abbreviate $\mathcal{A}(F_1) = \mathcal{A}(F_2)$ by $F_1 \equiv_{\mathcal{A}} F_2$.

Theorem: If the set of quantifier-free closed formulas of a theory is decidable and the theory has a quantifier elimination procedure, then the theory is decidable.

Proof:

- Convert the formula into prenex form.
- Eliminate all quantifiers inside-out (i.e., starting with the innermost quantifier), where universal quantifiers are transformed into existential ones with the help of the rule $\forall x F \equiv \neg \exists x \neg F$.
- Decide the resulting quantifier-free closed formula.

Linear Arithmetic

Linear Arithmetic: $Th(\mathcal{Q})$, where $\mathcal{Q} = (\mathbb{Q}, 0, 1, +, c \cdot (c \in \mathbb{Q}), <)$

Syntax:

Terms: $t := 0 \mid 1 \mid x \mid t_1 + t_2 \mid c \cdot t$

Atomic formulas: $A := t_1 < t_2 \mid t_1 = t_2$

Formulas: $F := A \mid \neg F \mid F_1 \vee F_2 \mid F_1 \wedge F_2 \mid \exists x F \mid \forall x F$

Structure \mathcal{Q} :

- Universe: \mathbb{Q} .
- Interpretation of $0, 1, +, <$ is clear.
- $\mathcal{Q}(c \cdot t) = c \cdot \mathcal{Q}(t)$.

Expressiveness

Some assertions that can be formalized in linear arithmetic:

- The system $Ax \leq b$ has no solution.
- Every solution of $A_1x \leq b_1$ is also a solution of $A_2x \leq b_2$.
- For every solution x_1 of $A_1x \leq b_1$ there are solutions x_2 and x_3 of $A_2x \leq b_2$ and $A_3x \leq b_3$ such that $x_1 = x_2 + x_3$.
- The smallest solution of $A_1x \leq b_1$ is larger than the largest solution of $A_2x \leq b_2$.

Fourier-Motzkin elimination

(slides by Prof. Nipkow.)

We present a QE-procedure for linear arithmetic.

Given: Formula $\exists x F$ where F is quantifier-free.

Goal: Quantifier-free formula G such that $G \equiv_{\mathcal{Q}} \exists x F$.

Two phases:

- Phase I: Simplification of the problem through logical manipulations.
- Phase II: QE-procedure for the simplified case.

Phase I

Step 1: Bring negations in and eliminate them using

$$\neg(t_1 = t_2) \equiv_Q (t_2 < t_1) \vee (t_1 < t_2)$$

$$\neg(t_1 < t_2) \equiv_Q (t_2 < t_1) \vee (t_2 = t_1)$$

Step 2: Convert into DNF and move $\exists x$ through \vee using

$$\exists x(F_1 \vee F_2) \equiv \exists xF_1 \vee \exists xF_2$$

The result is of the form $\bigvee_{i=1}^n \exists x (\bigwedge_{j=1}^{m_i} F_{ij})$. So w.l.o.g. we restrict our attention to the case

$$F = F_1 \wedge \dots \wedge F_n$$

Phase I (Con.)

Step 3: Miniscoping: consider only the A_i containing x . The rule

$$\exists x (F_1 \wedge F_2) \equiv (\exists x F_1) \wedge F_2 \quad \text{if } x \text{ does not occur free in } F_2$$

allows us to restrict our attention w.l.o.g. to the case

$$F = F_1 \wedge \dots \wedge F_n \quad \text{and } x \text{ occurs free in every } F_i$$

Phase I (Con.)

Step 4: Isolate x in F_i .

Define x -atoms: $A^x := x = t \mid x < t \mid t < x$ where x does not occur in t .

Fact: For every $i \in [1..n]$ there is a x -Atom A_i^x such that $A_i^x \equiv_Q A_i$.
(requires linearity!!)

Example:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{If } A_i &= 3 \cdot x + 5 \cdot y < 7 \cdot x + 3 \cdot z \\ \text{then take } A_i^x &= \frac{5}{4} \cdot y + \left(-\frac{3}{4}\right) \cdot z < x \end{aligned}$$

W.l.o.g. we can restrict our attention to the case

$$F = A_1^x \wedge \dots \wedge A_n^x$$

Phase II

Case 1. There exists $k \in [1..n]$ such that $A_k^x = (x = t_k)$.

Then: $\exists x F \equiv_Q F[x/t_k]$.

Set $G := F[x/t_k] = A_1^x[x/t_k] \wedge \dots \wedge A_n^x[x/t_k]$.

Case 2. For every $k \in [1..n]$: $A_k^x = (x < t_k)$ or $A_k^x = (t_k < x)$.

Classify the A_i^x into lower and upper bounds:

$$F = \bigwedge_{i=1}^l L_i \wedge \bigwedge_{j=1}^u U_j \quad \text{where } L_i = (l_i < x) \text{ and } U_j = (x < u_j)$$

I.e., l_i is a (lower bound) and u_j an (upper bound) for x .

Phase II (Con.)

Case 2a: $l = 0$ or $u = 0$. (Only lower or upper bounds.)

Then: $\exists x F \equiv_{\mathcal{A}} 1$.

Set $G := 1$

Case 2b: $l > 0$ and $u > 0$. (Both lower and upper bounds.)

Then: $\exists x F \equiv_{\mathcal{Q}} \bigwedge_{i=1}^l \bigwedge_{j=1}^u (l_i < u_j)$.

($\mathcal{Q}(\exists x F) = 1$ iff all lower bounds are smaller than all upper bounds.)

Observe: this holds because \mathbb{Q} is a dense order!

Set $G = \bigwedge_{i=1}^l \bigwedge_{j=1}^u (l_i < u_j)$.

Complexity

Dominated by the case 2b.

If $|F| = n$ then $|G| = O(n^2)$.

The procedure needs $O(n^{2^m})$ for a formula $\exists x_1 \dots \exists x_m F$ of length n .
(Assuming F is in DNF.)