

# Approximation of Paths:

Every clause

$$p(t_1, \dots, t_k) \leftarrow \alpha$$

is approximated by the clauses:

$$\begin{aligned} p_j(w) &\leftarrow \bigwedge \Pi(\alpha) \quad \text{where} \\ \Pi(g_1, \dots, g_m) &= \Pi(g_1) \cup \dots \cup \Pi(g_m) \\ \Pi(q(s_1, \dots, s_n)) &= \{q_i(w) \mid w \in \Pi(s_i)\} \end{aligned}$$

( $j = 1, \dots, k, w \in \Pi(t_j)$ ).

**Example:**

$$\begin{aligned} \text{add}(0, Y, Y) &\leftarrow \text{nat}(Y) \\ \text{add}(s(X), Y, s(Z)) &\leftarrow \text{add}(X, Y, Z) \end{aligned}$$

yields:

$$\text{add}_1(0) \leftarrow \text{nat}_1(Y)$$

$$\text{add}_2(Y) \leftarrow \text{nat}_1(Y)$$

$$\text{add}_3(Y) \leftarrow \text{nat}_1(Y)$$

$$\text{add}_1(s_1 X) \leftarrow \text{add}_1(X), \text{add}_2(Y), \\ \text{add}_3(Z)$$

$$\text{add}_2(Y) \leftarrow \text{add}_1(X), \text{add}_2(Y), \\ \text{add}_3(Z)$$

$$\text{add}_3(s_1 Z) \leftarrow \text{add}_1(X), \text{add}_2(Y), \\ \text{add}_3(Z)$$

## Discussion:

- Every literal has at most one occurrence of a variable.
- The literals  $q_j(w_j Y)$  where the variable  $Y$  does not occur in the head, represent **tests**:

If there is a  $w$  with  $w_j w \in \llbracket q_j \rrbracket_{C^\#}$  for all such  $j$ , then we can cancel these literals.

If there is no such  $w$ , then we can cancel the clause ...

## ... in the Example:

The literals:

$\text{add}_1(X), \text{add}_2(Y), \text{add}_3(Z)$

are all satisfiable :-)

We conclude:

$$\text{add}_1(0) \leftarrow$$

$$\text{add}_2(Y) \leftarrow \text{nat}_1(Y)$$

$$\text{add}_3(Y) \leftarrow \text{nat}_1(Y)$$

$$\text{add}_1(s_1 X) \leftarrow \text{add}_1(X)$$

$$\text{add}_2(Y) \leftarrow \text{add}_2(Y)$$

$$\text{add}_3(s_1 Z) \leftarrow \text{add}_3(Z)$$

We conclude:

$$\text{add}_1(0) \leftarrow$$

$$\text{add}_2(Y) \leftarrow \text{nat}_1(Y)$$

$$\text{add}_3(Y) \leftarrow \text{nat}_1(Y)$$

$$\text{add}_1(s_1 X) \leftarrow \text{add}_1(X)$$

$$\text{add}_3(s_1 Z) \leftarrow \text{add}_3(Z)$$

We verify:

## Theorem

Assume that  $\mathcal{C}$  is a set of clauses.

Let  $\mathcal{C}^\#$  denote the corresponding set of clauses for the paths.

Then for all predicates  $p/k$ :

$$\Pi(\llbracket p \rrbracket_{\mathcal{C}}) \subseteq \llbracket p_1 \rrbracket_{\mathcal{C}^\#} \cup \dots \cup \llbracket p_k \rrbracket_{\mathcal{C}^\#}$$

## Proof:

Induction on the approximations of the respective fixpoints :-)

A set of clauses with unary predicates and unary constructors is called **Alternating Pushdown System** (APS).

## Theorem

- Every APS is equivalent to a **simple** APS of the form:

$$p(a X) \leftarrow p_1(X), \dots, p_r(X)$$

$$p(X) \leftarrow$$

$$p(b) \leftarrow$$

- Every APS is equivalent to a **normal** APS of the form:

$$p(a X) \leftarrow p_1(X)$$

$$p(X) \leftarrow$$

$$p(b) \leftarrow$$

## Step 1: Removal of complicated heads:

For  $w = a^{(1)} \dots a^{(m)}$  ( $m > 1$ ) we replace

$$p(w X) \leftarrow rhs \quad \text{with:}$$

$$p(a^{(1)} X) \leftarrow p_2(X)$$

$$p_2(a^{(2)} X) \leftarrow p_3(X)$$

...

$$p_{m-1}(a^{(m-1)} X) \leftarrow p_m(X)$$

$$p_m(a^{(m)} X) \leftarrow rhs$$

//  $p_j$  all new



## Step 1 (Cont.): Removal of complicated heads:

For  $w = a^{(1)} \dots a^{(m)} b$  ( $m > 0$ ) we replace

$$\begin{array}{ll}
 p(w) & \leftarrow \text{rhs} \quad \text{with:} \\
 p(a^{(1)} X) & \leftarrow p_2(X) \\
 p_2(a^{(2)} X) & \leftarrow p_3(X) \\
 & \dots \\
 p_{m-1}(a^{(m-1)} X) & \leftarrow p_m(X) \\
 p_m(a^{(m)} X) & \leftarrow p_{m+1}(X) \\
 p_{m+1}(b) & \leftarrow \text{rhs} \\
 & // \quad p_j \text{ all new}
 \end{array}$$

## Step 2: Splitting

We separate independent parts of pre-conditions into auxiliary predicates:

$$\begin{aligned} \textit{head} &\leftarrow \textit{rest}, p_1(w_1 X), \dots, p_m(w_m X) \\ &\quad (X \text{ does not occur in } \textit{head}, \textit{rest}) \end{aligned}$$

is replaced with:

$$\begin{aligned} \textit{head} &\leftarrow \textit{rest}, q() \\ q() &\leftarrow p_1(w_1 X), \dots, p_m(w_m X) \end{aligned}$$

for a new predicate  $q/0$ .

### Step 3: Normalization

We add simpler derived clauses:

$$head \leftarrow p(a w), rest$$

$$p(a X) \leftarrow p_1(X), \dots, p_r(X)$$

implies:

$$head \leftarrow p_1(w), \dots, p_r(w), rest$$

$$p(X) \leftarrow p_1(X), \dots, p_m(X)$$

$$p_i(a X) \leftarrow p_{i1}(X), \dots, p_{ir_i}(X)$$

implies:

$$p(a X) \leftarrow p_{11}(X), \dots, p_{mr_m}(X)$$

## Step 3 (Cont.): Normalization

$head \leftarrow p(w), rest$

$p(X) \leftarrow$  implies:

$head \leftarrow rest$

$head \leftarrow p(b), rest$

$p(b) \leftarrow$  implies:

$head \leftarrow rest$

$p() \leftarrow p_1(X), \dots, p_m(X)$

$p_i(a X) \leftarrow p_{i1}(X), \dots, p_{ir_i}(X)$

implies:

$p() \leftarrow p_{11}(X), \dots, p_{mr_m}(X)$

Example:

$$\text{add}_1(X) \leftarrow \text{add}_0(X)$$

$$\text{add}_0(0) \leftarrow$$

$$\text{add}_1(X) \leftarrow \text{add}_1(X)$$

$$\text{add}_1(s_1 X) \leftarrow \text{add}_1(X)$$

... results in the new clause:

$$\text{add}_1(0) \leftarrow$$

## Theorem

Assume that  $\mathcal{C}$  is a finite set of clauses for which steps 1 and 2 have been executed and which then has been saturated according to step 3.

Assume that  $\mathcal{C}_0 \subseteq \mathcal{C}$  is the subset of normal clauses of  $\mathcal{C}$ . Then for all occurring predicates  $p$ ,

$$\llbracket p \rrbracket_{\mathcal{C}_0} = \llbracket p \rrbracket_{\mathcal{C}}$$

## Proof:

Induction on the depth of terms in  $\llbracket p \rrbracket_{\mathcal{C}}$  :-)

... in the Example:

For  $\text{add}_1(X)$  we obtain the following clauses:

$$\text{add}_1(0) \leftarrow$$

$$\text{add}_1(s_1 X) \leftarrow \text{add}_1(X)$$

These clauses are already normal :-)

## Transforming into Normal Clauses:

Introduce new predicates for **conjunctions** of predicates.

Assume that  $A = \{p_1, \dots, p_m\}$ . Then:

$[A](b) \leftarrow$  whenever  $p_i(b) \leftarrow$  for all  $i$ .

$[A](a X) \leftarrow [B](X)$  whenever  $B = \{p_{ij} \mid i = 1, \dots, m\}$  for  
 $p_i(a X) \leftarrow p_{i1}(X), \dots, p_{ir_i}(X)$



## Last Step: Transformation into a Type

- First, the automaton is determinized ...

## Last Step: Transformation into a Type

- First, the automaton is determinized ...
- Then transitions for the components of constructors  $a$ :

$$p(a_j X) \leftarrow p^{(j)}(X)$$

are joined into a transition for  $a$ :

$$p(a(X_1, \dots, X_k)) \leftarrow p^{(1)}(X_1), \dots, p^{(k)}(X_k)$$

- Finally, the predicates  $p_j$  for the components of the predicate  $p/k$  are joined to a transition:

$$p(X_1, \dots, X_k) \leftarrow p_1(X_1), \dots, p_k(X_k)$$

In the Example we find:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{add}(X, Y, Z) &\leftarrow \text{add}_1(X), \text{nat}(Y), q'(Z) && \text{where} \\ q'(0) &\leftarrow \\ q'(s X) &\leftarrow q'(X) \\ q' &= \{\text{nat}, \text{add}_2\} \end{aligned}$$

In the Example we find:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{add}(X, Y, Z) &\leftarrow \text{add}_1(X), \text{nat}(Y), q'(Z) && \text{where} \\ q'(0) &\leftarrow \\ q'(s X) &\leftarrow q'(X) \\ q' &= \{\text{nat}, \text{add}_2\} \end{aligned}$$

The types  $\text{add}_1, q', \text{nat}$  are all equivalent :-)

## Discussion:

- For type-checking, it suffices to check for every predicate  $p/k$  that

$$\llbracket p_i \rrbracket_{c^\#} \subseteq \Pi(T_i)$$

- Since the  $T_i$  are topdown deterministic, we have a deterministic automaton for  $\Pi(T_i)$  :-)
- Therefore, we can easily construct a DFA for the complement  $\overline{\Pi(T_i)}$  !!
- Then we check whether

$$\llbracket p_i \rrbracket_{c^\#} \cap \overline{\Pi(T_i)} = \emptyset$$

$\implies$  this saves us determinization :-))

## Warning:

- The emptiness problem for **APS** is **DEXPTIME-complete** !
- In many cases, though, our method terminates quickly ;-)

## Warning:

- The emptiness problem for APS is DEXPTIME-complete !
- In many cases, though, our method terminates quickly ;-)
  
- Inferred types can also be used to understand legacy code.
- Then, however, they are only useful if they are not too complicated !
- Our type inference provides very precise information :-)
- In practical applications, further widenings are applied to accelerate the analysis, e.g., by reducing the number of occurring sets.

## 5.3 Goal-directed Type Inference

Prolog programs explore predicates only insofar as they contribute to answer a query.

Example: `append`

```
app([], Y, Y) ←  
app([H|T], Y, [H|Z]) ← app(T, Y, Z)  
← app([1, 2], [3], Z)
```

... results in:



## The *APS*-Approximation

$$\text{app}_1([\ ]_1(H)) \leftarrow \text{app}_1(T), \text{app}_2(Y), \text{app}_3(Z).$$

$$\text{app}_1([\ ]_2(T)) \leftarrow \text{app}_1(T), \text{app}_2(Y), \text{app}_3(Z).$$

$$\text{app}_2(Y) \leftarrow \text{app}_1(T), \text{app}_2(Y), \text{app}_3(Z).$$

$$\text{app}_3([\ ]_1(H)) \leftarrow \text{app}_1(T), \text{app}_2(Y), \text{app}_3(Z).$$

$$\text{app}_3([\ ]_2(Z)) \leftarrow \text{app}_1(T), \text{app}_2(Y), \text{app}_3(Z).$$

$$\text{app}_1([\ ]) \leftarrow$$

$$\text{app}_2(X) \leftarrow$$

$$\text{app}_3(X) \leftarrow$$

$$\leftarrow \text{app}_1([\ ]_1(1)), \text{app}_1([\ ]_2([\ ]_1(2))), \text{app}_1([\ ]_2([\ ]_2([\ ]))), \\ \text{app}_2([\ ]_1(3)), \text{app}_2([\ ]_2([\ ])), \text{app}_3(X)$$

Ignoring the query, we find via normalization:

$$\begin{array}{ll}
 \text{app}_2(X) & \leftarrow \\
 \text{app}_3(X) & \leftarrow \\
 \text{app}_1([]) & \leftarrow \\
 \text{app}_1([[ ]_2 X) & \leftarrow q_0(X) \\
 \text{app}_1([[ ]_2 X) & \leftarrow q_1(X) \\
 \text{app}_1([[ ]_2 X) & \leftarrow q_2(X) \\
 \text{app}_1([[ ]_1 X) & \leftarrow \\
 q_0([]) & \leftarrow \\
 q_1([[ ]_2 X) & \leftarrow q_0(X) \\
 q_1([[ ]_2 X) & \leftarrow q_1(X) \\
 q_1([[ ]_2 X) & \leftarrow q_2(X) \\
 q_2([[ ]_1 X) & \leftarrow
 \end{array}$$

## Discussion

- The second and third argument can be arbitrary.
- The first argument is a list where nothing is known about the elements :-)
- Ignoring the query, this result is the best we can hope for :-)
- Better results can be obtained if additionally **call patterns** are tracked !

⇒ Magic Set Transformation

## Magic Sets

- For every predicate  $p/k$ , we introduce a new predicate  $\text{called}_p/k$  with the clauses

$$\text{called}_p(\underline{t}) \leftarrow \text{for the query } \leftarrow p(\underline{t})$$

- 

$$\text{called}_{p_i}(\underline{t_i}) \leftarrow \text{called}_p(\underline{t}), p_1(\underline{t_1}), \dots, p_{i-1}(\underline{t_{i-1}})$$

$$p_i(\underline{t}) \leftarrow \text{called}_p(\underline{t}), p_1(\underline{t_1}), \dots, p_m(\underline{t_m})$$

for every clause:

$$p(\underline{t}) \leftarrow p_1(\underline{t_1}), \dots, p_m(\underline{t_m})$$

## Example: `append` (Cont.)

`app([], Y, Y)` ← `called([], Y, Y)`

`app([H|T], Y, [H|Z])` ← `called([H|T], Y, [H|Z]),`  
`app(T, Y, Z)`

`called(T, Y, Z)` ← `called([H|T], Y, [H|Z])`

`called([1, 2], [3], Z)` ←

## The *APS*-Approximation:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{app}_1([\ ] &\leftarrow \text{called}_1([\ ], \text{called}_2(X), \text{called}_3(X)) \\ \text{app}_2(X) &\leftarrow \text{called}_1([\ ], \text{called}_2(X), \text{called}_3(X)) \\ \text{app}_3(X) &\leftarrow \text{called}_1([\ ], \text{called}_2(X), \text{called}_3(X)) \\ \text{app}_1([\ ]_1 H) &\leftarrow \text{called}_1([\ ]_1 H), \text{called}_1([\ ]_2 T), \text{called}_2(Y), \text{called}_3([\ ]_1 H), \text{called}_3([\ ]_2 Z), \\ &\quad \text{app}_1(T), \text{app}_2(Y), \text{app}_3(Z) \\ \text{app}_1([\ ]_2 T) &\leftarrow \text{called}_1([\ ]_1 H), \text{called}_1([\ ]_2 T), \text{called}_2(Y), \text{called}_3([\ ]_1 H), \text{called}_3([\ ]_2 Z), \\ &\quad \text{app}_1(T), \text{app}_2(Y), \text{app}_3(Z) \\ \text{app}_2(Y) &\leftarrow \text{called}_1([\ ]_1 H), \text{called}_1([\ ]_2 T), \text{called}_2(Y), \text{called}_3([\ ]_1 H), \text{called}_3([\ ]_2 Z), \\ &\quad \text{app}_1(T), \text{app}_2(Y), \text{app}_3(Z) \\ \text{app}_3([\ ]_1 H) &\leftarrow \text{called}_1([\ ]_1 H), \text{called}_1([\ ]_2 T), \text{called}_2(Y), \text{called}_3([\ ]_1 H), \text{called}_3([\ ]_2 Z), \\ &\quad \text{app}_1(T), \text{app}_2(Y), \text{app}_3(Z) \\ \text{app}_3([\ ]_2 Z) &\leftarrow \text{called}_1([\ ]_1 H), \text{called}_1([\ ]_2 T), \text{called}_2(Y), \text{called}_3([\ ]_1 H), \text{called}_3([\ ]_2 Z), \\ &\quad \text{app}_1(T), \text{app}_2(Y), \text{app}_3(Z) \end{aligned}$$

$\dots$   
 $\text{called}_1(T) \leftarrow \text{called}_1([\ ]_1 H), \text{called}_1([\ ]_2 T), \text{called}_2(Y), \text{called}_3([\ ]_1 H), \text{called}_3([\ ]_2 Z)$   
 $\text{called}_2(Y) \leftarrow \text{called}_1([\ ]_1 H), \text{called}_1([\ ]_2 T), \text{called}_2(Y), \text{called}_3([\ ]_1 H), \text{called}_3([\ ]_2 Z)$   
 $\text{called}_3(Z) \leftarrow \text{called}_1([\ ]_1 H), \text{called}_1([\ ]_2 T), \text{called}_2(Y), \text{called}_3([\ ]_1 H), \text{called}_3([\ ]_2 Z)$   
 $\text{called}_1([\ ]_1 1) \leftarrow$   
 $\text{called}_1([\ ]_2([\ ]_1 2) \leftarrow$   
 $\text{called}_1([\ ]_2[\ ]_2[]) \leftarrow$   
 $\text{called}_2([\ ]_1 3) \leftarrow$   
 $\text{called}_2([\ ]_2[]) \leftarrow$   
 $\text{called}_3(X) \leftarrow$

## The Normalized *APS*-Approximation (Cont.)

$\text{app}_1([\ ]_1 X) \leftarrow q_1(X)$	$\text{app}_3([\ ]_1 X) \leftarrow q_3(X)$	$q_4([\ ]_2 X) \leftarrow q_0(X)$
$\text{app}_1([\ ]_1 X) \leftarrow q_2(X)$	$\text{app}_3([\ ]_2 X) \leftarrow q_0(X)$	$q_5([\ ]_1 X) \leftarrow q_2(X)$
$\text{app}_1([\ ]) \leftarrow$	$\text{app}_3([\ ]_2 X) \leftarrow q_4(X)$	$q_6([\ ]_1 X) \leftarrow q_3(X)$
$\text{app}_1([\ ]_2 X) \leftarrow q_4(X)$	$\text{app}_3([\ ]_2 X) \leftarrow q_6(X)$	$q_7([\ ]_1 X) \leftarrow q_1(X)$
$\text{app}_1([\ ]_2 X) \leftarrow q_0(X)$	$\text{app}_3([\ ]_2 X) \leftarrow q_7(X)$	$q_7([\ ]_1 X) \leftarrow q_2(X)$
$\text{app}_1([\ ]_2 X) \leftarrow q_5(X)$	$\text{app}_3([\ ]_2 X) \leftarrow q_8(X)$	$q_8([\ ]_2 X) \leftarrow q_4(X)$
$\text{app}_2([\ ]_1 X) \leftarrow q_3(X)$	$q_0([\ ]) \leftarrow$	$q_8([\ ]_2 X) \leftarrow q_7(X)$
$\text{app}_2([\ ]_2 X) \leftarrow q_0(X)$	$q_1(1) \leftarrow$	$q_8([\ ]_2 X) \leftarrow q_8(X)$
$\text{app}_3([\ ]_1 X) \leftarrow q_1(X)$	$q_2(2) \leftarrow$	$q_8([\ ]_2 X) \leftarrow q_6(X)$
$\text{app}_3([\ ]_1 X) \leftarrow q_2(X)$	$q_3(3) \leftarrow$	



## Discussion

- The result now is amazingly precise !!
- The correct values for the second parameter is inferred.
- For the result parameter, a list containing 1,2 and 3 is inferred.
- It only fails to infer that this list is finite and of length 3 :-)