## Congruence Closure Algorithm

#### Leonardo Zecchin VR462541

June 19, 2023

### 1 Introduction

This paper presents the research conducted within the scope of the Automatic Reasoning course for the academic year 2022/2023. Specifically, the focus lies on the implementation of the Congruence Closure Algorithm utilizing Directed Acyclic Graphs (DAGs).

The content of the project can be found at the following link: Leonardo Zecchin's project.

## 2 Implementation

### 2.1 Project structure

- 1. The mainProgram program implements the algorithm by reading an input file that contains formulas in normal form, e.g., f(a,b)=a and f(f(a,b),b)!=a.
- 2. The the Parser.py program implements the algorithm by reading an input file that contains the formulas that need to be brought into DNF form and then brought to normal form, e.g., and (eq(f(a,b),a),dis(f(f(a,b),b),a)) becomes f(a,b)=a and f(f(a,b),b)!=a; or imply (eq(x,g(y,z)),eq(f(x),f(g(y,z)))) becomes and (eq(x,g(y,z)),dis(f(x),f(g(y,z)))) and after x=g(y,z) and f(x)!=f(g(y,z)).

Within the code folder are the codes that are used by the main programs, in particular cca is used for the Congruence Closure Algorithm, while the other programs were used during implementation

Inside the classes folder, you will find two important classes: dag and node, which are utilized by the algorithm.

In the input and output folders, there are two types of files:

- 1. input.txt and output.txt: the former contains the formulas in the normal form, and in the latter, you will find the algorithm's resulting outcomes.
- 2. inputToParser.txt and outputToParser.txt: the former contains formulas that must be parsed, and in the latter, you will find the algorithm's resulting outcomes.

#### 2.2 The Algorithm

The structure of the algorithm is the following: Given  $\Sigma_{\rm E}$ -formula

$$F: s_1 = t_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge s_m = t_m \wedge s_{m+1} \neq t_{m+1} \wedge \cdots \wedge s_n \neq t_n$$

with subterm set  $S_F$ , perform the following steps:

- 1. Construct the initial DAG for the subterm set  $S_F$ .
- 2. For  $i \in \{1, ..., m\}$ , MERGE  $s_i t_i$ .
- 3. If FIND  $s_i = \text{FIND } t_i$  for some  $i \in \{m+1, \ldots, n\}$ , return unsatisfiable.
- 4. Otherwise (if FIND  $s_i \neq$  FIND  $t_i$  for all  $i \in \{m+1,\ldots,n\}$ ) return satisfiable.

Inside the dag.py you will find the implementation of the algorithm's functions: *MERGE*, *UNION*, *CONGRUENT*, *CCPAR*, *FIND* and *NODE*, the specific explanation of functions is outside the scope of the paper.

The implementation of the algorithm is within the **cca.py** in particular the function is the **congruenceClosureAlgorith** which takes in input:

- 1. F\_plus: it contains the formulas with equality (=);
- 2. F\_minus: it contains the formulas with disequality  $(\neq)$ ;
- 3. Sf: the subterm set:
- 4. new\_dag: is the DAG that represents the subterm set.

```
\begin{array}{lll} \operatorname{def} \ \operatorname{congruenceClosureAlgorithm} \left( F_{-}\operatorname{plus} \, , \ F_{-}\operatorname{minus} \, , \operatorname{Sf} \, , \operatorname{new\_dag} \right) \colon \\ & \text{for } f \ \operatorname{in} \ F_{-}\operatorname{plus} \, ; \\ & \#\operatorname{Step} \ 1 \\ & \operatorname{idx1} \, , \operatorname{idx2} = \operatorname{getIndex} \left( f \, , \operatorname{Sf} \right) \\ & \operatorname{new\_dag} \, . \operatorname{MERGE} \left( \operatorname{idx1} \, , \operatorname{idx2} \right) \\ & \#\operatorname{Step} \ 2 \\ & \text{for } f \ \operatorname{in} \ F_{-}\operatorname{minus} \, ; \\ & \operatorname{idx1} \, , \operatorname{idx2} = \operatorname{getIndex} \left( f \, , \operatorname{Sf} \right) \\ & \operatorname{if } \operatorname{new\_dag} \, . \operatorname{FIND} \left( \operatorname{idx1} \right) = \operatorname{new\_dag} \, . \operatorname{FIND} \left( \operatorname{idx2} \right) \colon \\ & \operatorname{return} \ False \\ & \operatorname{else} \, : \\ & \operatorname{return} \ True \end{array}
```

In the congruenceClosureAlgorithm there are the implementation the second, the third and fourth steps.

#### 2.3 Differences with pseudocode

The only difference between my code and the pseudocode is in the UNION function:

```
def UNION(self, id1: int, id2: int) -> None:
print(f"UNION {id1} {id2}")
n1 = self.NODE(id1)
n2 = self.NODE(id2)
n1_ccpar = self.CCPAR(id1)
n2_ccpar = self.CCPAR(id2)
if self.FIND(n1.find) != n1.id:
    self.NODE(self.FIND(n1.find)).find = n2.find
else:
    n1.find = n2.find
n2.ccpar = n2_ccpar+ n1_ccpar
n1.ccpar = []
```

I introduced the if/else statement to address scenarios in which the algorithm needs to modify the find field of the n1 node, but it is connected to another node. In such cases, I must also modify the find field of the node linked to n1. Additionally, a notable distinction is that UNION stores the respective CCPAR values in n1\_ccpar and n2\_ccpar prior to altering these fields.

#### 3 Results

In this section we show the results obtain with the algorithm.

# 3.1 Table

Experiments			
Formulas	DNF	Satisfiability	Time execution
$-\mathrm{imply}(\mathrm{eq}(\mathrm{x},\mathrm{g}(\mathrm{y},\mathrm{z})),\mathrm{eq}(\mathrm{f}(\mathrm{x}),\mathrm{f}(\mathrm{g}(\mathrm{y},\mathrm{z}))))$	x=g(y,z) and $f(x)!=f(g(y,z))$	UNSAT	0.0004217
$-\operatorname{and}(\operatorname{eq}(f(a,b),a),\operatorname{dis}(f(f(a,b),b),a))$	f(a,b)=aandf(f(a,b),b)!=a	UNSAT	0.000449
-and(eq(f(f(f(a))),a),and	f(f(f(a)))=aand	UNSAT	0.0006108
(eq(f(f(f(f(f(a))))),a),dis(f(a),a)))	f(f(f(f(f(a)))))=a  and  f(a)!=a		
$-\operatorname{and}(\operatorname{eq}(f(f(f(a))),f(a)),$	f(f(f(a)))=f(a) and $f(f(a))=a$	SAT	0.000388
$\operatorname{and}(\operatorname{eq}(f(f(a)),a),\operatorname{dis}(f(a),a)))$	andf(a)!=a		
$-\mathrm{and}(\mathrm{eq}(\mathrm{x},\!\mathrm{g}(\mathrm{x},\!\mathrm{z})),\!\mathrm{dis}(\mathrm{f}(\mathrm{x}),\!\mathrm{f}(\mathrm{g}(\mathrm{y},\!\mathrm{z}))))$	x=g(x,z) and $f(x)!=f(g(y,z))$	SAT	0.00032