

Exercises for “Decision Procedures for Verification”
Exercise sheet 10

Exercise 10.1: (2 P)

Let F_1 be the following conjunction (in linear rational arithmetic $LI(\mathbb{Q})$):

$$\begin{aligned} F_1 : \quad x_1 + x_2 + 2x_3 &= 2 && \wedge \\ x_1 + x_3 + \frac{1}{5} &< 0 && \wedge \\ x_2 - x_3 &\leq \frac{1}{2} && \wedge \\ x_1 + 5x_3 &\leq 5 \end{aligned}$$

Check the satisfiability of F_1 using the Loos-Weispfenning method for quantifier elimination.

Exercise 10.2: (4 P)

Let \mathcal{T} be the combination of $LI(\mathbb{Z})$ (linear arithmetic over \mathbb{Z}) and UIF_Σ , the theory of uninterpreted function symbols in the signature $\Sigma = \{f/1, g/2, \emptyset\}$.

Check the satisfiability of the following ground formula w.r.t. \mathcal{T} using the “guessing” version of the Nelson-Oppen procedure:

- (1) $\phi = (c + d \approx e \wedge f(e) \approx c + d \wedge f(f(c + d)) \not\approx e)$.
- (2) $\psi = (f(c) > 0 \wedge f(d) > 0 \wedge f(c) + f(d) \approx e \wedge g(c, e) \not\approx g(d, e))$

Exercise 10.3: (2 P)

Let \mathcal{T} be the combination of $LI(\mathbb{Q})$ (linear arithmetic over \mathbb{Q}) and UIF_Σ , the theory of uninterpreted function symbols in the signature $\Sigma = \{f/1, g/2, \emptyset\}$.

Check the satisfiability of the following ground formula w.r.t. \mathcal{T} using the deterministic version of the Nelson-Oppen procedure (after purifying the formulae check for entailment of equalities between shared constants and propagate the entailed equalities):

- $\phi = (c + d \approx e \wedge f(e) \approx c + d \wedge f(f(c + d)) \not\approx e)$.

Remark: You will be able to solve this exercise only after the lecture which will take place on Tuesday, 27.1.2015.

Supplementary exercises.

Exercise 10.4: (4 P)

Let $\Sigma = (\Omega, \Pi)$ be a signature, and let $\Pi_0 \subseteq \Pi \cup \{\approx\}$.

We say that a theory \mathcal{T} is *convex* if for all atomic formulae $A_1(\bar{x}), \dots, A_n(\bar{x})$, and all atomic formulae $B_1(\bar{x}), \dots, B_k(\bar{x})$ where $B_i(\bar{x})$ is the equality $s_i \approx t_i$, with s_i, t_i terms:

If $\mathcal{T} \models (\bigwedge_{i=1}^n A_i(\bar{x}) \rightarrow (\bigvee_{j=1}^k B_j(\bar{x})))$ then there exists $1 \leq j \leq k$ s.t. $\mathcal{T} \models (\bigwedge_{i=1}^n A_i(\bar{x}) \rightarrow B_j(\bar{x}))$.

Let $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{Z}}$ be the theory of integers having as signature $\Sigma_{\mathbb{Z}} = (\Omega, \Pi)$, where $\Omega = \{\dots, -2, -1, 0, 1, 2, \dots\} \cup \{\dots, -3\cdot, -2\cdot, 2\cdot, 3\cdot, \dots\} \cup \{+, -\}$ and $\Pi = \{\leq\}$, where:

- $\dots, -2, -1, 0, 1, 2, \dots$ are constants (intended to represent the integers)
- $\dots, -3\cdot, -2\cdot, 2\cdot, 3\cdot, \dots$ are unary functions (representing multiplication with constants)
- $+, -$ are binary functions (usual addition/subtraction)
- \leq is a binary predicate.

The intended interpretation of $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{Z}}$ has domain \mathbb{Z} , and the function and predicate symbols are interpreted in the obvious way.

Show that:

- $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{Z}} \models [(1 \leq z \wedge z \leq 2 \wedge u \approx 1 \wedge v \approx 2) \rightarrow (z \approx u \vee z \approx v)]$
- $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{Z}} \not\models [(1 \leq z \wedge z \leq 2 \wedge u \approx 1 \wedge v \approx 2) \rightarrow z \approx u]$
- $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{Z}} \not\models [(1 \leq z \wedge z \leq 2 \wedge u \approx 1 \wedge v \approx 2) \rightarrow z \approx v]$

Is $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{Z}}$ convex?

Exercise 10.5: (6 P)

Let \mathcal{T}_1 and \mathcal{T}_2 be two theories with signatures Σ_1, Σ_2 . Assume that Σ_1 and Σ_2 share only constants and the equality predicate. Let ϕ be a ground formula over the signature $(\Sigma_1 \cup \Sigma_2)^c = (\Omega_1 \cup \Omega_2 \cup C, \Pi_1 \cup \Pi_2)$ (the extension of the union $\Sigma_1 \cup \Sigma_2$ with a countably infinite set C of constants). The *purification* step in the Nelson-Oppen decision procedure for satisfiability of ground formulae in the combination of \mathcal{T}_1 and \mathcal{T}_2 can be described as follows:

(Step 1) Purify all terms by replacing, in a bottom-up manner, the “alien” subterms in ϕ (i.e. terms starting with a function symbol in Σ_i occurring as arguments of a function symbol in Σ_j , $j \neq i$) with new constants (from a countably infinite set C of constants). The transformations are schematically represented as follows:

$$(\neg)P(\dots, g(\dots, f(t_1, \dots, t_n), \dots), \dots) \mapsto (\neg)P(\dots, g(\dots, u, \dots), \dots) \wedge u \approx t$$

where $t = f(t_1, \dots, t_n)$, $f \in \Sigma_1, g \in \Sigma_2$ (or vice versa).

(Step 2) Purify mixed equalities and inequalities by adding additional constants and performing the following transformations (where $f \in \Sigma_1$ and $g \in \Sigma_2$ or vice versa):

$$\begin{aligned} f(s_1, \dots, s_n) \approx g(t_1, \dots, t_m) &\mapsto u \approx f(s_1, \dots, s_n) \wedge u \approx g(t_1, \dots, t_m) \\ f(s_1, \dots, s_n) \not\approx g(t_1, \dots, t_m) &\mapsto u \approx f(s_1, \dots, s_n) \wedge v \approx g(t_1, \dots, t_m) \wedge u \not\approx v \end{aligned}$$

(Step 3) Purify mixed literals by renaming alien terms:

$$(\neg)P(\dots, s_i, \dots) \mapsto (\neg)P(\dots, u, \dots) \wedge u \approx s_i$$

if P is a predicate symbol in Σ_1 and s_i is a Σ_2^c -term (or vice versa).

After purification we obtain a conjunction $\phi_1 \wedge \phi_2$, with ϕ_i ground Σ_i^c -formula. Prove that:

- ϕ is satisfiable w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}_1 \cup \mathcal{T}_2$ if and only if $\phi_1 \wedge \phi_2$ is satisfiable w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}_1 \cup \mathcal{T}_2$.
- If ϕ is satisfiable w.r.t. $\mathcal{T}_1 \cup \mathcal{T}_2$ then ϕ_i is satisfiable w.r.t. \mathcal{T}_i for $i = 1, 2$.

Please submit your solution until Wednesday, January 28, 2015 at 13:00. Joint solutions prepared by up to three persons are allowed. Please do not forget to write your name on your solution.

Submission possibilities:

- By e-mail to sofronie@uni-koblenz.de with the keyword “Homework DP” in the subject.
- Put it in the box in front of Room B 222.