

Homework 3

Instructor: Fei He

Guanlin Shen (2017013569)

TA: Jianhui Chen, Fengmin Zhu

Read the instructions below carefully before you start working on the assignment:

- Please typeset your answers in the attached L^AT_EX source file, compile it to a PDF, and finally hand the PDF to Tsinghua Web Learning *before the due date*.
- Make sure you fill in your *name* and *Tsinghua ID*, and replace all “TODO”s with your solutions.
- Any kind of dishonesty is *strictly prohibited* in the full semester. If you refer to any material that is not provided by us, you *must cite* it.

Problem 1: Short-Answered Questions

1-1 First-order logic is “semidecidable” – which half is decidable?

Solution When F is valid/ not satisfiable, its validity/satisfiability is decidable. ■

1-2 Are the following statements about $T_{\mathbb{Z}}$ true? Briefly explain the reason (you may use conclusions from lectures).

- $T_{\mathbb{Z}}$ is decidable.
- $T_{\mathbb{Z}}$ is complete.
- If a formula ϕ is both a $\Sigma_{\mathbb{Z}}$ -formula and a $\Sigma_{\mathbb{N}}$ -formula, then: ϕ is $T_{\mathbb{N}}$ -valid if and only if ϕ is $T_{\mathbb{Z}}$ -valid.

Solution (a):True

(b):True

Since $T_{\mathbb{N}}$ is decidable and complete, and $T_{\mathbb{Z}}$ can be reduced to $T_{\mathbb{N}}$, $T_{\mathbb{Z}}$ is decidable and complete.

(c):False

$(x + y = 0) \rightarrow (x = 0 \wedge y = 0)$ is valid in $T_{\mathbb{N}}$ but not valid in $T_{\mathbb{Z}}$. ■

1-3 Is the following formula T_A -valid? Briefly explain the reason:

$$(a[i] = x \wedge x = y) \rightarrow a\langle i \triangleleft y \rangle = a$$

Solution valid

1. $I \not\models F$, assumption

2. $I \models (a[i] = x \wedge x = y)$, 1

3. $I \not\models a\langle i \triangleleft y \rangle = a$, 1

4. $I \models a[i] = x$, 2

5. $I \models x = y$, 2

6. $a[i] = y$, 4,5, equality

7. $I \not\models \forall j (a\langle i \triangleleft y \rangle[j] = a[j])$, 2

- 8. $I[j \mapsto c_j] \not\models a\langle i \triangleleft y \rangle[j] = a[j], 1, \forall$
- 9. $I[j \mapsto c_j] \models a\langle i \triangleleft y \rangle[j] \neq a[j], 8$
- 10. $I[j \mapsto c_j] \models i = j, 9, \text{r.o.w}, 2$
- 11. $I[j \mapsto c_j] \models a[i] = a[j], 10, \text{congruence}$
- 12. $I[j \mapsto c_j] \models a\langle i \triangleleft y \rangle[j] = y, 11, \text{r.o.w}, 1$
- 13. $I[j \mapsto c_j] \models a\langle i \triangleleft y \rangle[j] = a[j], 5, 12, \text{equality}$
- 14. $\perp, 8, 13$ ■

1-4 T_A is not convex – show that by providing a counterexample.

Solution $F : a\langle i \triangleleft v \rangle[j] = u$

$F \Rightarrow u = v \vee u = a[j]$

neither $F \Rightarrow u = v$ nor $F \Rightarrow u = a[j]$

■

Problem 2: Semantic Argument

Use the semantic method to check the validity of the following formulas. If not valid, please find a counterexample (a falsifying interpretation in its theory).

2-1 In T_E : $f(f(f(a))) = f(f(a)) \wedge f(f(f(f(a)))) = a \rightarrow (f(a) = a)$

Solution valid

1. $I \not\models F$, assumption
2. $I \models f(f(f(a))) = f(f(a)) \wedge f(f(f(f(a)))) = a, 1$
3. $I \models f(a) = a, 1$
4. $I \models f(f(f(a))) = f(f(a)), 2$
5. $I \models f(f(f(f(a)))) = a, 2$
6. $I \models f(f(f(f(a)))) = f(f(f(a))), 4, \text{function congruence}$
7. $I \models f(f(f(f(a)))) = f(f(a)), 4, 6, \text{transitivity}$
8. $I \models a = f(f(a)), 5, 7, \text{transitivity}$
9. $I \models f(a) = f(f(f(a))), 8, \text{function congruence}$
10. $I \models f(f(f(a))) = a, 4, 8, \text{transitivity}$
11. $I \models a = f(a), 9, 10, \text{transitivity}$
12. $\perp, 3, 11$

■

2-2 In $T_{\mathbb{Z}}$: $(1 \leq x \wedge x \leq 2) \rightarrow (x = 1 \vee x = 2)$

Solution valid

1. $I \not\models F$, assumption
2. $I \models 1 \leq x \wedge x \leq 2, 1$
3. $I \models (x = 1 \vee x = 2), 1$
4. $I \models 1 \leq x, 2$
5. $I \models x \leq 2, 2$
6. $I \models x = 1, 3$
7. $I \models x = 2, 3$
8. $\perp, 2, 6, 7, T_{\mathbb{Z}}$

■

2-3 In T_A : $a \langle i \triangleleft e \rangle [j] = e \rightarrow a[j] = e$

Solution not valid:

e.g.: $i = 1, j = 1, a[1] = 2, e = 3$

$a \langle i \triangleleft e \rangle [j] = 3 = e$, but $a[j] = a[1] = 2 \neq e$, invalid ■

Problem 3: Decision Procedure for Theories

3-1 Apply the decision procedure for quantifier-free T_E to the following Σ_E -formula:

$$p(x) \wedge f(f(x)) = x \wedge f(f(f(x))) = x \wedge \neg p(f(x))$$

Solution First, eliminate the quantifier $p(x)$.

$$F : g(x) = \cdot \wedge f(f(x)) = x \wedge f(f(f(x))) = x \wedge g(f(x)) \neq \cdot$$

Then, build the subterm set

$$S_F = \{x, f(x), f^2(x), f^3(x), g(x), g(f(x)), \cdot\}$$

Then, initialize the congruence relation of S_F :

$$\{\{x\}, \{f(x)\}, \{f^2(x)\}, \{f^3(x)\}, \{g(x)\}, \{g(f(x))\}, \{\cdot\}\}$$

Then, merge $g(x)$ and \cdot , merge $f^3(x)$ and x , merge $f^2(x)$ and x , you can get

$$\{\{f(x)\}, \{x, f^2(x), f^3(x)\}, \{g(f(x))\}, \{g(x), \cdot\}\}$$

Then, from $x = f^2(x)$, propagate $f(x) = f^3(x)$, merge $f(x)$ to get

$$\{\{x, f(x), f^2(x), f^3(x)\}, \{g(f(x))\}, \{g(x), \cdot\}\}$$

Then, from $x = f(x)$, propagate $g(x) = g(f(x))$, merge $f(f(x))$ to get

$$\{\{x, f(x), f^2(x), f^3(x)\}, \{g(x), g(f(x)), \cdot\}\}$$

Since $g(f(x)) \neq \cdot$, unsat. ■

3-2 Apply the decision procedure for quantifier-free T_A to the following Σ_A -formula:

$$a\langle i \triangleleft e \rangle \langle j \triangleleft f \rangle [k] = g \wedge j \neq k \wedge i = j \wedge a[k] \neq g$$

Solution First, eliminate the quantifier. Since $j \neq k$, we can get

$$a\langle i \triangleleft e \rangle [k] = g \wedge j \neq k \wedge i = j \wedge a[k] \neq g$$

Then, it can be split into 2 cases

$$i = k : e = g \wedge i = k \wedge j \neq k \wedge i = j \wedge a[k] \neq g$$

$$i \neq k : a[k] = g \wedge i \neq k \wedge j \neq k \wedge i = j \wedge a[k] \neq g$$

Use $f(k)$ to substitute $a[k]$, we get

$$i = k : e = g \wedge i = k \wedge j \neq k \wedge i = j \wedge f(k) \neq g$$

$$i \neq k : f(k) = g \wedge i \neq k \wedge j \neq k \wedge i = j \wedge f(k) \neq g$$

For case 1, build the subterm set

$$S_F = \{i, j, k, e, g, f(k)\}$$

Merge the equalities, we get

$$\{\{i, j, k\}, \{e, g\}, \{f(k)\}\}$$

Since $j \neq k$, it reaches a contradiction.

For case 2, $f(k) \neq g$ and $f(k) = g$ suddenly reaches a contradiction, unsat. ■

3-3 Apply the Nelson-Oppen method to the following formula in $T_{\mathbb{Z}} \cup T_A$:

$$a[i] \geq 1 \wedge a[i] + x \leq 2 \wedge x > 0 \wedge x = i \wedge a\langle x \triangleleft 2 \rangle[i] \neq 1$$

Do it first using the nondeterministic version (i.e. guess and check), and then the deterministic version (i.e. equality propagation).

Solution First, purify the formula, use w_1, w_2 to replace 1,2, use v to replace $a[i]$

$$F_Z : x > 0 \wedge w_1 = 1 \wedge w_2 = 2 \wedge v \geq 1 \wedge v + x \leq 2$$

$$F_A : a\langle x \triangleleft w_2 \rangle[i] \neq w_1 \wedge x = i \wedge a[i] = v$$

Shared variables: $\{w_1, w_2, x, v\}$

guess and check For convenience, since $w_1 = 1, w_2 = 2$, it is impossible that $w_1 = w_2$.

Since $v \geq 1, w_1 = 1$, it is impossible that $v = w_1$

Since $v \geq 1, x > 0, v + x \leq 2$, The only possibility is that $v = x = 1$. We can get that the only case satisfying F_Z is

$$\{w_1, v, x, w_2\}$$

First, eliminate the predicates of F_A : Consider $x = i$, and use $f(i)$ to substitute $a[i]$,

$$F_A : w_2 \neq w_1 \wedge x = i \wedge f(i) = v$$

Then the subterm set

$$S_E = \{w_2, w_1, x, i, f(i), v\}$$

According to the result of guess and check, we get

$$\{\{w_2\}, \{w_1, x, v\}, \{i\}, \{f(i)\}\}$$

Merging the equalities, we get

$$\{\{w_2\}, \{w_1, x, v, i, f(i)\}\}$$

It satisfies $w_2 \neq w_1$, the formula is satisfiable.

equality propagation From F_Z , you can get $x = w_1$. Then you can get $x = w_1 = v$, then you can get no conflicts in F_A, F_Z , and no more equalities will be get. Satisfiable. ■