Executable Transitive Closures*

René Thiemann

April 20, 2020

Abstract

We provide a generic work-list algorithm to compute the (reflexive-)transitive closure of relations where only successors of newly detected states are generated. In contrast to our previous work [2], the relations do not have to be finite, but each element must only have finitely many (indirect) successors. Moreover, a subsumption relation can be used instead of pure equality. An executable variant of the algorithm is available where the generic operations are instantiated with list operations.

This formalization was performed as part of the IsaFoR/CeTA project[1] [3], and it has been used to certify size-change termination proofs where large transitive closures have to be computed.

Contents

1 A work-list algorithm for reflexive-transitive closures

theory *RTrancl*
imports *Regular−Sets.Regexp-Method*
begin

In previous work [2] we described a generic work-list algorithm to compute reflexive-transitive closures for *finite* relations: given a finite relation r, it computed r^*.

In the following, we develop a similar, though different work-list algorithm for reflexive-transitive closures, it computes r^* `` *init* for a given relation r and finite set *init*. The main differences are that

*Supported by FWF (Austrian Science Fund) project P22767-N13.
[1] http://cl-informatik.uibk.ac.at/software/ceta

- The relation r does not have to be finite, only $\{b.\ (a,\ b) \in r^*\}$ has to be finite for each a. Moreover, it is no longer required that r is given explicitly as a list of pairs. Instead r must be provided in the form of a function which computes for each element the set of one-step successors.

- One can use a subsumption relation to indicate which elements to no longer have to be explored.

These new features have been essential to certify size-change termination proofs [1] where the transitive closure of all size-change graphs has to be computed. Here, the relation is size-change graph composition.

- Given an initial set of size-change graphs with n arguments, there are roughly $N := 3^{n^2}$ many potential size-change graphs that have to be considered as left-hand sides of the composition relation. Since the composition relation is even larger than N, an explicit representation of the composition relation would have been too expensive. However, using the new algorithm the number of generated graphs is usually far below the theoretical upper bound.

- Subsumption was useful to generate even fewer elements.

1.1 The generic case

Let r be some finite relation.

We present a standard work-list algorithm to compute all elements that are reachable from some initial set. The algorithm is generic in the sense that the underlying data structure can freely be chosen, you just have to provide certain operations like union, selection of an element.

In contrast to [2], the algorithm does not demand that r is finite and that r is explicitly provided (e.g., as a list of pairs). Instead, it suffices that for every element, only finitely many elements can be reached via r, and r can be provided as a function which computes for every element a all one-step successors w.r.t. r. Hence, r can in particular be any well-founded and finitely branching relation.

The algorithm can further be parametrized by a subsumption relation which allows for early pruning.

In the following locales, r is a relation of type $'a \Rightarrow 'a$, the successors of an element are represented by some collection type $'b$ which size can be measured using the *size* function. The selection function *sel* is used to meant to split a non-empty collection into one element and a remaining collection. The union on $'b$ is given by *un*.

locale *subsumption* =

fixes $r :: 'a \Rightarrow 'b$
and *subsumes* $:: 'a \Rightarrow 'a \Rightarrow bool$
and *set-of* $:: 'b \Rightarrow 'a\ set$
assumes
subsumes-refl: $\bigwedge a.\ subsumes\ a\ a$
and *subsumes-trans*: $\bigwedge a\ b\ c.\ subsumes\ a\ b \Longrightarrow subsumes\ b\ c \Longrightarrow subsumes\ a\ c$
and *subsumes-step*: $\bigwedge a\ b\ c.\ subsumes\ a\ b \Longrightarrow c \in set\text{-}of\ (r\ b) \Longrightarrow \exists\ d \in set\text{-}of\ (r\ a).\ subsumes\ d\ c$
begin
abbreviation R **where** $R \equiv \{\ (a,b).\ b \in set\text{-}of\ (r\ a)\ \}$
end

locale *subsumption-impl* = *subsumption r subsumes set-of*
for $r :: 'a \Rightarrow 'b$
and *subsumes* $:: 'a \Rightarrow 'a \Rightarrow bool$
and *set-of* $:: 'b \Rightarrow 'a\ set +$
fixes
sel $:: 'b \Rightarrow 'a \times 'b$
and *un* $:: 'b \Rightarrow 'b \Rightarrow 'b$
and *size* $:: 'b \Rightarrow nat$
assumes *set-of-fin*: $\bigwedge b.\ finite\ (set\text{-}of\ b)$
and *sel*: $\bigwedge b\ a\ c.\ set\text{-}of\ b \neq \{\} \Longrightarrow sel\ b = (a,c) \Longrightarrow set\text{-}of\ b = insert\ a\ (set\text{-}of\ c) \wedge size\ b > size\ c$
and *un*: $set\text{-}of\ (un\ a\ b) = set\text{-}of\ a \cup set\text{-}of\ b$

locale *relation-subsumption-impl* = *subsumption-impl r subsumes set-of sel un size*
for *r subsumes set-of sel un size* +
assumes *rtrancl-fin*: $\bigwedge a.\ finite\ \{b.\ (a,b) \in \{\ (a,b)\ .\ b \in set\text{-}of\ (r\ a)\}\hat{}*\}$
begin

lemma *finite-Rs*: **assumes** *init*: *finite init*
shows *finite* $(R\hat{}* ``\ init)$
proof −
let $?R = \lambda\ a.\ \{b\ .\ (a,b) \in R\hat{}*\}$
let $?S = \{\ ?R\ a \mid a\ .\ a \in init\}$
have *id*: $R\hat{}* ``\ init = \bigcup\ ?S$ **by** *auto*
show *?thesis* **unfolding** *id*
proof (*rule*)
fix M
assume $M \in ?S$
then obtain a **where** M: $M = ?R\ a$ **by** *auto*
show *finite* M **unfolding** M **by** (*rule rtrancl-fin*)
next
show *finite* $\{\{b.\ (a,\ b) \in R\hat{}*\} \mid a.\ a \in init\}$
using *init* **by** *auto*
qed
qed

a standard work-list algorithm with subsumption

```
function mk-rtrancl-main where
  mk-rtrancl-main todo fin = (if set-of todo = {} then fin
      else (let (a,tod) = sel todo
            in (if (∃ b ∈ fin. subsumes b a) then mk-rtrancl-main tod fin
                else mk-rtrancl-main (un (r a) tod) (insert a fin))))
  by pat-completeness auto


termination mk-rtrancl-main
proof −
  let ?r1 = λ (todo, fin). card (R^* `` (set-of todo) − fin)
  let ?r2 = λ (todo, fin). size todo
  show ?thesis
  proof
    show wf (measures [?r1,?r2]) by simp
  next
    fix todo fin pair tod a
   assume nempty: set-of todo ≠ {} and pair1: pair = sel todo and pair2: (a,tod)
= pair
    from pair1 pair2 have pair: sel todo = (a,tod) by simp
    from set-of-fin have fin: finite (set-of todo) by auto
    note sel = sel[OF nempty pair]
    show ((tod,fin),(todo,fin)) ∈ measures [?r1,?r2]
    proof (rule measures-lesseq[OF - measures-less], unfold split)
      from sel
      show size tod < size todo by simp
    next
      from sel have subset: R^* `` set-of tod − fin ⊆ R^* `` set-of todo − fin (is
?l ⊆ ?r) by auto
      show card ?l ≤ card ?r
        by (rule card-mono[OF - subset], rule finite-Diff, rule finite-Rs[OF fin])
    qed
  next
    fix todo fin a tod pair
   assume nempty: set-of todo ≠ {} and pair1: pair = sel todo and pair2: (a,tod)
= pair and nmem: ¬ (∃ b ∈ fin. subsumes b a)
    from pair1 pair2 have pair: sel todo = (a,tod) by auto
    from nmem subsumes-refl[of a] have nmem: a ∉ fin by auto
    from set-of-fin have fin: finite (set-of todo) by auto
    note sel = sel[OF nempty pair]
    show ((un (r a) tod,insert a fin),(todo,fin)) ∈ measures [?r1,?r2]
    proof (rule measures-less, unfold split,
        rule psubset-card-mono[OF finite-Diff[OF finite-Rs[OF fin]]])
      let ?l = R^* `` set-of (un (r a) tod) − insert a fin
      let ?r = R^* `` set-of todo − fin
      from sel have at: a ∈ set-of todo by auto
      have ar: a ∈ ?r using nmem at by auto
      show ?l ⊂ ?r
      proof
```

```
      show ?l ≠ ?r using ar by auto
    next
      have R^* `` set-of (r a) ⊆ R^* `` set-of todo
      proof
        fix b
        assume b ∈ R^* `` set-of (r a)
        then obtain c where cb: (c,b) ∈ R^* and ca: c ∈ set-of (r a) by blast
        hence ab: (a,b) ∈ R O R^* by auto
        have (a,b) ∈ R^*
          by (rule subsetD[OF - ab], regexp)
        with at show b ∈ R^* `` set-of todo by auto
      qed
      thus ?l ⊆ ?r using sel unfolding un by auto
    qed
  qed
qed

declare mk-rtrancl-main.simps[simp del]

lemma mk-rtrancl-main-sound: set-of todo ∪ fin ⊆ R^* `` init ⟹ mk-rtrancl-main
todo fin ⊆ R^* `` init
proof (induct todo fin rule: mk-rtrancl-main.induct)
  case (1 todo fin)
  note simp = mk-rtrancl-main.simps[of todo fin]
  show ?case
  proof (cases set-of todo = {})
    case True
    show ?thesis unfolding simp using True 1(3) by auto
  next
    case False
    hence nempty: (set-of todo = {}) = False by auto
    obtain a tod where selt: sel todo = (a,tod) by force
    note sel = sel[OF False selt]
    note IH1 = 1(1)[OF False refl selt[symmetric]]
    note IH2 = 1(2)[OF False refl selt[symmetric]]
    note simp = simp nempty if-False Let-def selt
    show ?thesis
    proof (cases ∃ b ∈ fin. subsumes b a)
      case True
      hence mk-rtrancl-main todo fin = mk-rtrancl-main tod fin
        unfolding simp by simp
      with IH1[OF True] 1(3) show ?thesis using sel by auto
    next
      case False
      hence id: mk-rtrancl-main todo fin = mk-rtrancl-main (un (r a) tod) (insert
a fin) unfolding simp by simp
      show ?thesis unfolding id
      proof (rule IH2[OF False])
```

```
      from sel 1(3) have subset: set-of todo ∪ insert a fin ⊆ R^* `` init by auto
      {
        fix b
        assume b: b ∈ set-of (r a)
        hence ab: (a,b) ∈ R by auto
        from sel 1(3) have a ∈ R^* `` init by auto
        then obtain c where c: c ∈ init and ca: (c,a) ∈ R^* by blast
        from ca ab have cb: (c,b) ∈ R^* O R by auto
        have (c,b) ∈ R^*
          by (rule subsetD[OF - cb], regexp)
        with c have b ∈ R^* `` init by auto
      }
      with subset
      show set-of (un (r a) tod) ∪ (insert a fin) ⊆ R^* `` init
        unfolding un using sel by auto
    qed
  qed
 qed
qed

lemma mk-rtrancl-main-complete:
  ⟦⋀ a. a ∈ init ⟹ ∃ b. b ∈ set-of todo ∪ fin ∧ subsumes b a⟧
  ⟹ ⟦ ⋀ a b . a ∈ fin ⟹ b ∈ set-of (r a) ⟹ ∃ c. c ∈ set-of todo ∪ fin ∧
subsumes c b⟧
  ⟹ c ∈ R^* `` init
  ⟹ ∃ b. b ∈ mk-rtrancl-main todo fin ∧ subsumes b c
proof (induct todo fin rule: mk-rtrancl-main.induct)
  case (1 todo fin)
  from 1(5) have c: c ∈ R^* `` init .
  note finr = 1(4)
  note init = 1(3)
  note simp = mk-rtrancl-main.simps[of todo fin]
  show ?case
  proof (cases set-of todo = {})
    case True
    hence id: mk-rtrancl-main todo fin = fin unfolding simp by simp
    from c obtain a where a: a ∈ init and ac: (a,c) ∈ R^* by blast
    show ?thesis unfolding id using ac
    proof (induct rule: rtrancl-induct)
      case base
      from init[OF a] show ?case unfolding True by auto
    next
      case (step b c)
      from step(3) obtain d where d: d ∈ fin and db: subsumes d b by auto
      from step(2) have cb: c ∈ set-of (r b) by auto
      from subsumes-step[OF db cb] obtain a where a: a ∈ set-of (r d) and ac:
subsumes a c by auto
    from finr[OF d a] obtain e where e: e ∈ fin and ea: subsumes e a unfolding
True by auto
```

```
    from subsumes-trans[OF ea ac] e
    show ?case by auto
   qed
  next
   case False
   hence nempty: (set-of todo = {}) = False by simp
   obtain A tod where selt: sel todo = (A,tod) by force
   note simp = nempty simp if-False Let-def selt
   note sel = sel[OF False selt]
   note IH1 = 1(1)[OF False refl selt[symmetric] - - - c]
   note IH2 = 1(2)[OF False refl selt[symmetric] - - - c]
   show ?thesis
   proof (cases ∃ b ∈ fin. subsumes b A)
    case True note oTrue = this
    hence id: mk-rtrancl-main todo fin = mk-rtrancl-main tod fin
     unfolding simp by simp
    from True obtain b where b: b ∈ fin and ba: subsumes b A by auto
    show ?thesis unfolding id
    proof (rule IH1[OF True])
     fix a
     assume a: a ∈ init
     from init[OF a] obtain c where c: c ∈ set-of todo ∪ fin and ca: subsumes
c a by blast
     show ∃ b. b ∈ set-of tod ∪ fin ∧ subsumes b a
     proof (cases c = A)
      case False
      thus ?thesis using c ca sel by auto
     next
      case True
          show ?thesis using b subsumes-trans[OF ba, of a] ca unfolding
True[symmetric] by auto
     qed
    next
     fix a c
     assume a: a ∈ fin and c: c ∈ set-of (r a)
     from finr[OF a c] obtain e where e: e ∈ set-of todo ∪ fin and ec: subsumes
e c by auto
     show ∃ d. d ∈ set-of tod ∪ fin ∧ subsumes d c
     proof (cases A = e)
      case False
      with e ec show ?thesis using sel by auto
     next
      case True
      from subsumes-trans[OF ba[unfolded True] ec]
      show ?thesis using b by auto
     qed
    qed
   next
    case False
```

```
    hence id: mk-rtrancl-main todo fin = mk-rtrancl-main (un (r A) tod) (insert
A fin) unfolding simp by simp
    show ?thesis unfolding id
    proof (rule IH2[OF False])
      fix a
      assume a: a ∈ init
      from init[OF a]
      show ∃ b. b ∈ set-of (un (r A) (tod)) ∪ insert A fin ∧ subsumes b a
        using sel unfolding un by auto
    next
      fix a b
      assume a: a ∈ insert A fin and b: b ∈ set-of (r a)
      show ∃ c. c ∈ set-of (un (r A) tod) ∪ insert A fin ∧ subsumes c b
      proof (cases a ∈ fin)
        case True
        from finr[OF True b] show ?thesis using sel unfolding un by auto
      next
        case False
        with a have a: A = a by simp
        show ?thesis unfolding a un using b subsumes-refl[of b] by blast
      qed
    qed
  qed
qed

definition mk-rtrancl where mk-rtrancl init ≡ mk-rtrancl-main init {}

lemma mk-rtrancl-sound: mk-rtrancl init ⊆ R^* `` set-of init
  unfolding mk-rtrancl-def
  by (rule mk-rtrancl-main-sound, auto)

lemma mk-rtrancl-complete: assumes a: a ∈ R^* `` set-of init
  shows ∃ b. b ∈ mk-rtrancl init ∧ subsumes b a
  unfolding mk-rtrancl-def
proof (rule mk-rtrancl-main-complete[OF - - a])
  fix a
  assume a: a ∈ set-of init
  thus ∃ b. b ∈ set-of init ∪ {} ∧ subsumes b a using subsumes-refl[of a] by blast
qed auto

lemma mk-rtrancl-no-subsumption: assumes subsumes = (=)
  shows mk-rtrancl init = R^* `` set-of init
  using mk-rtrancl-sound[of init] mk-rtrancl-complete[of - init] assms
  by auto
end
```

1.2 Instantiation using list operations

It follows an implementation based on lists. Here, the working list algorithm is implemented outside the locale so that it can be used for code generation. In general, it is not terminating, therefore we use partial_function instead of function.

partial-function(*tailrec*) *mk-rtrancl-list-main* **where**
[*code*]: *mk-rtrancl-list-main subsumes r todo fin* = (*case todo of* [] ⇒ *fin*
| *Cons a tod* ⇒
(*if* (∃ *b* ∈ *set fin*. *subsumes b a*) *then mk-rtrancl-list-main subsumes r tod fin*
else mk-rtrancl-list-main subsumes r (*r a* @ *tod*) (*a* # *fin*)))

definition *mk-rtrancl-list* **where**
mk-rtrancl-list subsumes r init ≡ *mk-rtrancl-list-main subsumes r init* []

locale *subsumption-list* = *subsumption r subsumes set*
for *r* :: *'a* ⇒ *'a list* **and** *subsumes* :: *'a* ⇒ *'a* ⇒ *bool*

locale *relation-subsumption-list* = *subsumption-list r subsumes* **for** *r subsumes* +
assumes *rtrancl-fin*: ⋀ *a*. *finite* {*b*. (*a*,*b*) ∈ { (*a*,*b*) . *b* ∈ *set* (*r a*)}^*}

abbreviation(*input*) *sel-list* **where** *sel-list x* ≡ *case x of Cons h t* ⇒ (*h*,*t*)

sublocale *subsumption-list* ⊆ *subsumption-impl r subsumes set sel-list append length*
proof(*unfold-locales*, *rule finite-set*)
fix *b a c*
assume *set b* ≠ {} **and** *sel-list b* = (*a*,*c*)
thus *set b* = *insert a* (*set c*) ∧ *length c* < *length b*
by (*cases b*, *auto*)
qed *auto*

sublocale *relation-subsumption-list* ⊆ *relation-subsumption-impl r subsumes set sel-list append length*
by (*unfold-locales*, *rule rtrancl-fin*)

context *relation-subsumption-list*
begin

The main equivalence proof between the generic work list algorithm and the one operating on lists

lemma *mk-rtrancl-list-main*: *fin* = *set finl* ⟹ *set* (*mk-rtrancl-list-main subsumes r todo finl*) = *mk-rtrancl-main todo fin*
proof (*induct todo fin arbitrary*: *finl rule*: *mk-rtrancl-main.induct*)
case (*1 todo fin finl*)
note *simp* = *mk-rtrancl-list-main.simps*[*of - - todo finl*] *mk-rtrancl-main.simps*[*of todo fin*]
show *?case* (**is** *?l* = *?r*)

```
  proof (cases todo)
    case Nil
    show ?thesis unfolding simp unfolding Nil 1(3) by simp
  next
    case (Cons a tod)
    show ?thesis
    proof (cases ∃ b ∈ fin. subsumes b a)
      case True
      from True have l: ?l = set (mk-rtrancl-list-main subsumes r tod finl)
        unfolding simp unfolding Cons 1(3) by simp
      from True have r: ?r = mk-rtrancl-main tod fin
        unfolding simp unfolding Cons by auto
      show ?thesis unfolding l r
        by (rule 1(1)[OF - refl - True], insert 1(3) Cons, auto)
    next
      case False
      from False have l: ?l = set (mk-rtrancl-list-main subsumes r (r a @ tod) (a
# finl))
        unfolding simp unfolding Cons 1(3) by simp
      from False have r: ?r = mk-rtrancl-main (r a @ tod) (insert a fin)
        unfolding simp unfolding Cons by auto
      show ?thesis unfolding l r
        by (rule 1(2)[OF - refl - False], insert 1(3) Cons, auto)
    qed
  qed
qed

lemma mk-rtrancl-list: set (mk-rtrancl-list subsumes r init) = mk-rtrancl init
  unfolding mk-rtrancl-list-def mk-rtrancl-def
  by (rule mk-rtrancl-list-main, simp)

end



end
```

References

[1] C. S. Lee, N. D. Jones, and A. M. Ben-Amram. The size-change principle for program termination. In *Proc. POPL '01*, pages 81–92. ACM Press, 2001.

[2] C. Sternagel and R. Thiemann. Executable Transitive Closures of Finite Relations. In *Archive of Formal Proofs*. http://isa-afp.org/entries/Transitive-Closure.shtml, Mar. 2011. Formalization.

[3] R. Thiemann and C. Sternagel. Certification of termination proofs using CeTA. In *Proc. TPHOLs'09*, volume 5674 of *LNCS*, pages 452–468, 2009.