

Decidability of the Theory of the Totally Unbounded ω -Layered Structure

Angelo Montanari and Gabriele Puppis

Dipartimento di Matematica e Informatica, Università di Udine

via delle Scienze 206, 33100 Udine, Italy

{montana,puppis}@dimi.uniud.it

Outline

- MSO logics over tree structures
- Layered structures
- The automaton-based approach
- A solution to the decision problem
- Further work

MSO Logics over tree structures - 1

Let $\Lambda = \{1, \dots, k\}$ be a finite set of edge labels.

We consider **tree structures extended with tuples of unary predicates**, namely, structures of the form

$$(\mathcal{T}, \bar{V}) = (S, (E_l)_{l \in \Lambda}, (V_i)_{i \in [1, m]})$$

where

- $S = \Lambda^*$ (set of vertices)
- $E_l = \{(v, vl) : v \in S\}$ (l -labeled edges)
- $V_i \subseteq S$ for all $1 \leq i \leq m$ (unary predicates)

MSO Logics over tree structures - 2

Formulas over a tree structure \mathcal{T} are built up from atoms:

- $x_i = x_j$ “ x_i and x_j denote the same vertex”
- $X_i \subseteq X_j$ “ X_i denotes a subset of X_j ”
- $E_l(x_i, x_j)$ “ (x_i, x_j) denotes a l -labeled edge”
- $X_k(x_i)$ “ x_i denotes a vertex in X_k ”

...through connectives \wedge , \vee , \neg and quantifiers \forall , \exists over first-order and second-order variables.

Remark: we can restrict ourselves to an expressively equivalent framework devoid of *first-order variables*.

MSO Logics over tree structures - 3

Free second-order variables X_1, \dots, X_m will be interpreted by tuples of (unary) predicates V_1, \dots, V_m .


Given a formula $\varphi(\bar{X})$, we write $\mathcal{T} \models \varphi[\bar{V}]$ to say that $\varphi(\bar{X})$ holds in \mathcal{T} by substituting V_i for X_i , for all $1 \leq i \leq m$.

The **decision problem** $MTh(\mathcal{T}, \bar{V})$ is the problem of deciding whether, for a given formula $\varphi(\bar{X})$,

$$\mathcal{T} \models \varphi[\bar{V}]$$

Layered structures: totally unbounded

Goal: we want to decide the MSO theory of the **totally unbounded ω -layered structure (TULS):**




- The structure contains arbitrarily fine/coarse layers
- Arrows map elements of a given layer to elements of the immediately finer layer
- Black vertices denote the elements of a distinguished layer (“layer 0”) with an (optional) successor relation $+_0$

Layered structures: downward unbounded

The TULS embeds the **downward unbounded ω -layered structure (DULS)**

(i.e., the structure with a top layer and an infinite number of finer and finer layers):




\Rightarrow The DULS allows one to express properties like “*P holds true densely in an interval*”.

Layered structures: upward unbounded

...and it embeds the **upward unbounded ω -layered structure (UULS)**


(i.e., the structure with a bottom layer and an infinite number of coarser and coarser layers):



\Rightarrow The UULS allows one to express properties like “ P holds at all time points 2^i ”.

Layered structures: a tree embedding

The totally unbounded ω -layered structure can, in its turn, be embedded into an infinite complete **ternary tree** \mathcal{T}_{TULS} :



The automaton based approach - 1

Any expanded tree structure (\mathcal{T}, \bar{V}) can be encoded by a (*vertex-colored*) tree $\mathcal{T}_{\bar{V}}$ (**canonical representation**).

⇒ **Idea:** to exploit the correspondence between logic over tree structures and Rabin tree automata in order to *reduce a decision problem to an acceptance problem*.

A **Rabin automaton** works on colored trees in a top-down fashion: it “spreads” its states inside a tree (according to the transition relation) and it verifies that suitable acceptance conditions are met.

We say that a colored tree $\mathcal{T}_{\bar{V}}$ is **accepted** by M ($\mathcal{T}_{\bar{V}} \in \mathcal{L}(M)$) if such conditions are satisfied.

The automaton based approach - 2

[Rabin's Theorem] For every formula $\varphi(\bar{X})$, there is a Rabin automaton M (and vice versa) such that

$$\mathcal{T} \models \varphi[\bar{V}] \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \mathcal{T}_{\bar{V}} \in \mathcal{L}(M)$$


\Rightarrow the decision problem $MTh(\mathcal{T}, \bar{V})$ for MSO formulas reduces to an **acceptance problem** $Acc(\mathcal{T}_{\bar{V}})$ for Rabin automata

\Rightarrow we can restrict our attention to the decidability of the acceptance problem for Rabin tree automata.

Notation: Hereafter, we shall drop the subscript \bar{V} from $\mathcal{T}_{\bar{V}}$.

The automaton based approach - 3

Proposition: $Acc(\mathcal{T})$ is decidable for any infinite **regular** tree \mathcal{T} (i.e., a tree with *only finitely many distinct subtrees*).



However, the colored tree \mathcal{T}_{TULS} that embeds the TULS is **not regular**.

\Rightarrow we look for a larger class of colored trees for which the acceptance problem turns out to be decidable.

The automaton based approach - 4

Idea: Given an automaton M , we decide whether $\mathcal{T} \in \mathcal{L}(M)$ by reducing it to a simpler problem $\mathcal{T}' \in \mathcal{L}(M)$, where \mathcal{T}' is a **regular tree equivalent to \mathcal{T}** , namely,

$$\mathcal{T} \in \mathcal{L}(M) \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \mathcal{T}' \in \mathcal{L}(M)$$

(recall that regular trees enjoys a decidable acceptance problem)

Such a reduction works effectively for several non-regular trees.

In particular, we can reduce the acceptance problem for \mathcal{T}_{TULS} to a decidable acceptance problem over an *equivalent regular tree*.

A digression into Büchi automata - 1

Given a Büchi automaton M , we can define an equivalence \equiv_M over finite words s.t. $u \equiv_M u'$ iff, for every pair of states r, s ,

$$r \xrightarrow{u} s \iff r \xrightarrow{u'} s$$

$$r \xrightarrow{\circlearrowleft u} s \iff r \xrightarrow{\circlearrowleft u'} s$$

Properties:

1. \equiv_M has **finite index**
2. \equiv_M is a **congruence** w.r.t. concatenation
3. \equiv_M -equivalent factorizations are **indistinguishable** by M , namely, if $u_i \equiv_M u'_i$ for all $i \geq 0$, then

$$u_0 u_1 u_2 \dots \in \mathcal{L}(M) \iff u'_0 u'_1 u'_2 \dots \in \mathcal{L}(M)$$

A digression into Büchi automata - 2

[Carton and Thomas] Given an ω -word $w = u_0u_1u_2 \dots$, if for any congruence \equiv_M there are p, q such that $\forall i > p. u_i \equiv_M u_{i+q}$

$$w \in \mathcal{L}(M)$$

$$\Updownarrow$$

$$(u_0 \dots u_p)(u_{p+1} \dots u_{p+q})(u_{p+q+1} \dots u_{p+2q}) \dots \in \mathcal{L}(M)$$

$$\Updownarrow$$

$$(u_0 \dots u_p) \cdot (u_{p+1} \dots u_{p+q})^\omega \in \mathcal{L}(M)$$


\Rightarrow if such p and q are computable for any congruence \equiv_M , then $Acc(w)$ can be effectively reduced to a decidable acceptance problem over an **ultimately periodic word**.

Similar results hold for infinite trees...

A solution to the decision problem - 1

Basic ingredients:

- notion of **tree concatenation** $\mathcal{T}_1 \cdot_c \mathcal{T}_2$
(defined as the substitution in \mathcal{T}_1 of each c -colored leaf by \mathcal{T}_2)



- notion of **factorization** for infinite trees
(i.e. infinite concatenation of the form $\mathcal{T}_0 \cdot_{c_0} \mathcal{T}_1 \cdot_{c_1} \dots$)
- notion of **congruence** \equiv_M w.r.t. tree concatenations

A solution to the decision problem - 2

[Main result] Given an infinite tree \mathcal{T} generated by a factorization $\mathcal{T}_0 \cdot_{c_0} \mathcal{T}_1 \cdot_{c_1} \dots$, if for any congruence \equiv_M there are p, q such that $\forall i > p. \mathcal{T}_i \equiv_M \mathcal{T}_{i+q}$, then:

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{T} \in \mathcal{L}(M) \\ & \Updownarrow \\ & \mathcal{T}_0 \cdot_{c_0} \dots \mathcal{T}_p \cdot_{c_p} \mathcal{T}_{p+1} \cdot_{c_{p+1}} \dots \mathcal{T}_{p+q} \cdot_{c_{p+q}} \mathcal{T}_{p+q+1} \cdot_{c_{p+q+1}} \dots \in \mathcal{L}(M) \\ & \Updownarrow \\ & \mathcal{T}_0 \cdot_{c_0} \dots \mathcal{T}_p \cdot_{c_p} \mathcal{T}_{p+1} \cdot_{c_{p+1}} \dots \mathcal{T}_{p+q} \cdot_{c_{p+q}} \mathcal{T}_{p+1} \cdot_{c_{p+1}} \dots \in \mathcal{L}(M) \end{aligned}$$

Remark. The last factorization is ultimately periodic and it generates a (decidable) **regular** tree \mathcal{T}' .

A solution to the decision problem - 3

A tree \mathcal{T} is said **residually regular** if we can provide a factorization $\mathcal{T}_0 \cdot_{c_0} \mathcal{T}_1 \cdot_{c_1} \dots$ that is *effectively ultimately periodic* w.r.t. any congruence \equiv_M .


\Rightarrow **we solve** $Acc(\mathcal{T})$ **as follows:**

1. we take a factorization \mathcal{S} of \mathcal{T} which is ultimately periodic w.r.t. any congruence \equiv_M
2. given automaton M , we compute an ultimately periodic factorization \mathcal{S}' that is \equiv_M -equivalent to \mathcal{S}
3. we know that \mathcal{S}' generates a regular tree \mathcal{T}' and
$$\mathcal{T}' \in \mathcal{L}(M) \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \mathcal{T} \in \mathcal{L}(M)$$
4. we solve $Acc(\mathcal{T}')$ on automaton M
5. we accordingly return *Yes* or *No* to the original problem $Acc(\mathcal{T})$

A solution to the decision problem - 4

In general, residually regular trees are non-regular trees which however *exhibit a definite pattern* in their structure.

Example. The tree \mathcal{T}_{TULS} , which embeds the TULS, can be proved to be **residually regular**:



The sequence of factors is **ultimately periodic w.r.t. any equivalence \equiv_M**

\Rightarrow the tree \mathcal{T}_{TULS} (and hence the TULS itself) enjoys a **decidable MSO theory**.

Conclusions

Results:

- we developed an original automaton-based method to decide the TULS
- as a by-product, we obtained new uniform decidability proofs for the DULS and UULS

Further work:

- to exploit the proposed technique to decide variants of the theories of the DULS and UULS (MSO fragments extended with *equi-level/equi-column* predicates)
- to determine the generality of the proposed method (e.g., to compare it with the transformational approach developed by Caucal)