

On Solving Word Equations via Program Transformation

Antonina Nepeivoda

Program Systems Institute of Russian Academy of Sciences*
Pereslavl-Zalessky, Russia
a_nevod@mail.ru

The paper focuses on the automatic generating of the witnesses for the word equation satisfiability problem by means of specializing an interpreter $WI(\sigma, \mathcal{E}qs)$, which tests whether a substitution σ of variables of a given word equation system $\mathcal{E}qs$ produces its solution. We specialize such an interpreter *w.r.t.* $\mathcal{E}qs$, while σ is unknown. We show that several variants of such interpreters, when specialized using the basic unfold/fold specialization methods, are able to decide the satisfiability problem for some sets of the word equations whose left- and right-hand sides share variables. We prove that the specialization process *w.r.t.* the constructed interpreters is sound, *i.e.* gives a simple syntactic criterion of the satisfiability, and compare the results of the suggested approach with the results produced by the widely-known SMT-solvers Z3str3 and CVC4.

1 Introduction

In recent decades, program transformation techniques were applied to verification and analysis of properties of several models, including cache-coherence and cryptographic protocols, constrained Horn clauses, Petri nets, deductive databases, and others [2, 10, 12, 21, 30, 41]. On the other hand, the number of works on verification for string manipulating programs and string constraint solvers is rapidly growing last years [1, 4, 6, 8, 17, 18, 19, 22, 33, 37, 42].

One approach to the verification is to apply an unfold/fold algorithm [5] to a deterministic program modelling a nondeterministic system behaviour via introducing an additional path parameter [21, 20]. That is, given an unfold/fold algorithm Spec and a non-deterministic program $f(x)$, the algorithm Spec solves the specialization task $f'(v, x)$ satisfying the condition $\forall c (\exists f(c) \Rightarrow \exists \Phi (f'(\Phi, c) = f(c)))$. Here the parameter v ranges over the paths determining the ways to compute $f(x)$.

This idea has many applications in computer science. In particular, methods to solve word equations, starting from Matyiasovich's [24], Hmelevskij's [13], Makanin's [23] algorithms in 1970s, and including Plandowski's algorithm [32] and Jez's algorithm [14] designed in the recent two decades, all use the non-deterministic search. A word equation is an equation $\Phi = \Psi$, where Φ and Ψ are words in the joint alphabet $\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{V}$ of letters and variables, its solution is a substitution $\sigma : \mathcal{V} \mapsto \mathcal{A}^*$ s.t. $\Phi\sigma$ is textually equal to $\Psi\sigma$. The algorithms provide transformation steps, which, when applied to a given equation iteratively, generate its solution set. Thus, the algorithms produce a (partial) solution tree of the given equation. Some paths of the solution tree may be infinite, and are to be either pruned or represented as loops by the algorithms. For example, given a path in the solution tree, Matyiasovich's algorithm constructs an arc leading to the upper node from its descendant when the two equations marking the

*The reported study was partially supported by Russian Academy of Sciences, research project No. AAAA-A16-116021760039-0.




Figure 1: Unfold/fold method for solving word equations and program transformation.

nodes coincide modulo the variable names. The technique outlined above originally appeared in a pure mathematical context. Figure 1 shows a solution graph for a simple word equation constructed by Matiyasevich's algorithm and a graph of states and the state transitions of a functional program constructed by a basic unfold/fold algorithm. Henceforth, we refer to such graphs as (partial) process trees [31, 35]. One may find that the two graphs coincide modulo the node names. This paper focuses on the mentioned similarity of these two methods and aims at adjusting the unfold/fold program transformation method to solving the word equations.

Our contributions are the following. We study three interpreters, specialization of which using a general-purpose tool constructs residual programs presenting the complete solutions set of a given word equation. We prove that an analogue of Jones-optimality holds for the interpreters considered [3, 15], which guarantees that the satisfiability of an equation systems analysed can be easily restored by checking a simple syntactic property of the residual program. Surprisingly, the naive unfolding plus some basic optimisations generate a solution algorithm, for example, for the set of the one-variable word equations, and the algorithm differs from the well-known one presented by Hmelevskij [13]. We also reveal several other sets of equations sharing variables in right- and left-hand sides, for which the specialization is shown to be sound. To the best of our knowledge, these equation sets were uncovered by the published works on the string constraint solvers applied to the unbounded-length case. Finally, we show the application results of the presented approach to the benchmark equation sets for the solver Woorpje [8], and for the benchmark of new 50 equation systems, and compare the results with the results of the application of the SMT-solvers Z3str3 and CVC4 for these benchmarks. The complete solution sets are generated for the most of the equation systems considered in the tests, although the systems do not belong to any special set for which the specialization is guaranteed to succeed.

The paper is organized as follows. After introducing the presentation syntax (Sec. 2), we describe the interpreters used (Sec. 3), the verification task (Sec. 4), and the general unfold/fold scheme used in it (Sec. 5). Then we discuss the optimality of the specialization and present results of the verification, in particular, for a number of sets of word equations we show that every equation in any of the sets can be solved via the verification method (Sec. 6). Other experiments with the described verification scheme are given in Sec. 7. The proofs of the main statements on properties of the presented algorithms are given in Appendix, as well as the source code of the interpreter models used in the specialization.

2 Preliminaries

We denote the set of the string variables with $\mathcal{V}$, the set of the letters with $\mathcal{A}$. A term is an element of $\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{V}$. A word equation is an equation $\Phi = \Psi$, where $\Phi, \Psi \in \{\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{V}\}^*$. A word equation is said to be *reduced* iff its sides neither start nor end with the same terms [7].

We write an application of substitution $\xi: \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \{\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{V}\}^*$ to a word Φ as $\Phi\xi$. Given an equation $E: \Phi = \Psi$ and substitution ξ , $E\xi$ is $\Phi\xi = \Psi\xi$ (by default, in the reduced form). We denote the number of occurrences of the term t in a word Φ with $|\Phi|_t$. The word equation length is the sum of the lengths of its left- and right-hand sides.

2.1 Presentation Language

In this paper we use the following pseudocode for functional programs manipulating the strings. The programs are written as lists of term rewriting rules. The rules in the definitions are applied using the top-down matching order. The syntax is given in Figure 2. There ε is the empty word, $++$ is the associative concatenation sign (both may be omitted). The set of the constants used as the letters¹ is Σ , elements of which are given in bold.

Rule	::=	FName (Pattern, ..., Pattern) = Exp
Pattern	::=	ε Variable Letter (Pattern)
		Pattern ++ Pattern
Exp	::=	ε Variable Letter (Exp)
		FName (Exp,...,Exp) Exp ++ Exp
Variable	::=	xName sName

Figure 2: The syntax of the program pseudocode.

The variables with the first letter x range over object expressions; the variables with the first letter s range over symbols in Σ .

Given a program, the function Go serves as its entry function. The programming language uses the call-by-value evaluation strategy.

3 Word Equations Interpreters

In this section we introduce a class of simple interpreters transforming word equations. Actually the interpreters generate finite paths in an equation solution tree in a way being similar to Matiyasevich's approach [24]. The nodes in the tree are labeled with configurations. A configuration in a solution graph is a list² of equations. Given a list of word equations $\langle \Phi_1 = \Psi_1, \dots, \Phi_n = \Psi_n \rangle$, its solution tree is a (possibly infinite) directed graph representing a non-deterministic unfolding process using the rules listed in Figure 3 (a). We see the narrowing rules in the first column. Given a narrowing rule, the second column provides the constraint imposed on the first equation in the list required for applying the rule.

We use the notion of a parameter value for data which is already given, but it is unknown to us; while a variable value is undefined and is to be assigned. Thus, the variables are matched against data, while the parameters are to be narrowed. We denote the parameters with letters u, v (maybe subscripted). An

¹This set is wider than the set $\mathcal{A}$, because it contains also the letters used in the inner encoding of the equations.

²In order to emphasize that the the graph depends the order of the equations in the equation system, we use “the list of the equations” instead of “the system ...”.

$x \mapsto \varepsilon$	$x\Phi_1 = \Psi_1$ or $\Phi_1 = x\Psi_1$
$x \mapsto tx$ ($t \in \mathcal{A}$)	$x\Phi_1 = t\Psi_1$ or $t\Phi_1 = x\Psi_1$
$x \mapsto yx$	$x\Phi_1 = y\Psi_1$ or $y\Phi_1 = x\Psi_1$

(a) The rewriting rules and equations producing them.


(b) The solution graph of $Axy = xyA$.

Figure 3: The rewriting rules and an example of a solution graph.

object expression is either a string in Σ^* , catenation of two object expressions, or (Exp) , where Exp is an object expression. We say an expression is *ground* if it does not contain function calls, but may contain parameter occurrences.

Following the classical approach [7, 13, 24], no fresh variables and constants are introduced in the narrowing rules. We use a slightly modified version of Matiyasevich's algorithm. The Nielsen transformation, which is the base of the algorithm, states that given $x\Phi_1 = y\Psi_1$ either the length of the value of the variable x is greater than the length of the value of y , or vice versa, or their lengths are equal (and, consequently, $x = y$). Figure 3 (a) does not show the third case: it is a composition of $x \mapsto yx$ and $x \mapsto \varepsilon$, whereas we allow the rule $x \mapsto \varepsilon$ to be applied to any equation whose left- or right-hand side starts with x . This modification guarantees that any solution of the equation $\Phi_1 = \Psi_1$ can be generated³ as a composition of the substitutions given in Figure 3 (a).

Example 1. Let $x\sigma = A$, $y\sigma = \varepsilon$, and the equation $xy = yx$ be considered. If we use the narrowings $x \mapsto yx \vee y \mapsto xy \vee x \mapsto y$ provided by the classic form of the Nielsen transformation then the solution generated by σ cannot be obtained by any finite number of such substitutions.

We assume that an infinite path in a solution tree is to be folded iff it contains nodes N_1 and N_2 s.t. N_1 is an ancestor of N_2 and their configurations textually coincide. Then the solution subtree with the root N_2 repeats the solution subtree with the root N_1 , and the infinite path can be represented as a cycle. Henceforth we use the notions of the solution tree and of the solution graph almost interchangeably. An example of a graph representing all solutions of the equation $Axy = xyA$ is given in Figure 3 (b). The cyclic arcs in the graph show the folding operation. For the sake of brevity, the folded nodes are not shown.

An interpreter $\text{WI}(P, \langle E_1 \dots, E_n \rangle)$ takes a list of word equations $E_1, \dots, E_n$ and a linear program being a list of substitutions that have to be successively applied to the equations. If the substitutions given in P transform all the equations in the list to the tautologies, then $\text{WI}(P, \langle E_1 \dots, E_n \rangle)$ returns the value **T**. If a substitution is invalid w.r.t. the current equations list or the list of substitutions is empty whereas the equations are not tautologies then $\text{WI}(P, \langle E_1 \dots, E_n \rangle)$ results in the value **F**.

Generally we distinguish the configurations in a *process* tree for $\text{WI}(P, \mathcal{E}qs)$ (where P is a parameter) and configurations in a *solution* tree for $\mathcal{E}qs$ generated by a non-deterministic application of the rules given in Figure 3. However, the structure of the interpreters given below allows us to refer to the solution tree of an equation instead of a more complex process tree of the program specialized by the equation (see Lemma 1).

³The idea of the algorithm originated from Matiyasevich is aimed at deciding the solvability of an equation, rather than at constructing the whole set of the solutions.




Figure 4: Schemes for solving word equations

The general structure of the three interpreters considered in this paper is given in Figure 4. The transformations shown in this figure are also used for constructing the corresponding solution graphs. According to Figure 4 we say that the interpreter WIBase models paths in a solution tree constructed by means of the algorithm AlgWE_{Base}; and so on. See Figure 5 for examples of the corresponding solution graphs.

3.1 Basic Interpreter WIBase

The basic interpreter $WI(P, E)$ manipulates with a single equation and accepts a list of the substitutions presented in Figure 3 (a). After the substitution σ is applied, the interpreter WIBase reduces $E\sigma$. In fact, this basic interpreter models the classic algorithm for solving word equations suggested by Matiyasevich and used in the works [17, 19].

3.2 Splitting Interpreter WISplit

The interpreter $WISplit(P, \langle E_1, \dots, E_n \rangle)$ manipulates with the lists of equations rather than with a single equation. Thus, substitutions and reductions are applied to every equation in the list. Given an equation $t_1 \Phi_i = t_2 \Psi_i$, where $t_1 \in \mathcal{A}$, $t_2 \in \mathcal{A}$, $t_1 \neq t_2$, the equation is replaced with the trivial contradictory equation $t_1 = t_2$, and all the other equations in the list are to be removed. We assume that the operation looking for trivial contradictions is also a part of the reduction algorithm.

Another natural way to simplify an equation by hand is an attempt to split it using the length argument [7]. *E.g.* given equation $\mathbf{x} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{x} \mathbf{B} \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{B} \mathbf{x} \mathbf{x} \mathbf{A}$ we can split it into the list of $E_1 : \mathbf{x} \mathbf{A} = \mathbf{B} \mathbf{x}$ and $E_2 : \mathbf{x} \mathbf{B} \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x} \mathbf{x} \mathbf{A}$, where E_2 is trivially simplified to E_1 .


Given Φ and Ψ in $\{\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{V}\}^+$, s.t. $|\Phi| = |\Psi|$ and for every $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{V}$ the equality $|\Phi|_{\mathbf{x}} = |\Psi|_{\mathbf{x}}$ holds, we say that the words Φ and Ψ are *variable-permuted* (briefly, *var-permuted*).

The next interpreter, WISplit, uses the following trivial proposition.

Proposition 1. *Let an equation be of the form $\text{Pr}_1 S_1 = \text{Pr}_2 S_2$ where the prefixes Pr_1 and Pr_2 are non-empty and var-permuted. Then the equation is equivalent to the system $\text{Pr}_1 = \text{Pr}_2$ & $S_1 = S_2$.*

The same proposition holds for var-permuted suffixes. If it is applied to the prefixes of an equation we say that the equation is left-split; if Proposition 1 is applied to the suffixes we say the equation is right-split.

Given a call $WISplit(\langle \sigma_1, \dots \rangle, \langle E_1, \dots, E_n \rangle)$, the interpreter first reduces all the equations in the list $\langle E_1 \sigma_1, \dots, E_n \sigma_1 \rangle$. For every resulting equation E'_i , WISplit tries then to find the shortest non-empty var-permuted prefixes $\text{Pr}_{1,i,1}$ and $\text{Pr}_{2,i,1}$ of its left- and right-hand sides. In the case of success, WIBase splits the equation E'_i into the two equations $\text{Pr}_{1,i,1} = \text{Pr}_{2,i,1}$ and $S_{1,i,1} = S_{2,i,1}$, reduces the equation

Figure 5: Solution graphs for $xxAyBz = Axxzy$.

$S_{1,i,1} = S_{2,i,1}$, and tries to left-split it, *etc.* until $S_{1,i,j}$ and $S_{2,i,j}$ have no non-empty var-permuted prefixes. The generated equations resulting in k successful left-splits are placed instead of the initial equation E'_i in the list. The order of the new equations is as follows: $S_{1,i,k} = S_{2,i,k}$, $Pr_{1,i,1} = Pr_{2,i,1}, \dots, Pr_{1,i,k} = Pr_{2,i,k}$. The interpreter WISplit does not reduce the resulting equations $Pr_{1,i,k} = Pr_{2,i,k}$, because their construction guarantees that they are already reduced.

3.3 Counting Interpreter WICount

The third variant of our interpreter is based on the following trivial observation.

Proposition 2. *Given an equation $\Phi = \Psi$, let for every $x \in \mathcal{V}$ $|\Phi|_x \geq |\Psi|_x$, and $\sum_{t_i \in \mathcal{A}} |\Phi|_{t_i} > \sum_{t_i \in \mathcal{A}} |\Psi|_{t_i}$.*

Then the equation $\Phi = \Psi$ has no solution.

After reducing the equations, the interpreter WICount tries to construct their left-splits (as WISplit does), and then to construct the right-splits of their suffixes resulted from the left-splits. Finally, WICount checks the resulting equations with non-var-permuted sides according to Proposition 2.

Figure 5 demonstrates the difference between the algorithms used in the presented interpreters. The dotted edges in the graph for the algorithm AlgWBase show the equality of the configurations; but the configurations are not folded there, because they are not along the same path. The edges given in the two parallel lines show splits. The graph for AlgWBase is infinite, whereas the other two graphs show that the equation has no solution.

4 Verification Task

Below we use the underlining sign to show encoded structures of the data and program to be specialized. Given a program transformation tool *Spec*, a list of word equations $\mathcal{E}qs$ and an encoded sources $\underline{WI}$ of an interpreter *WI* the specialization task is as follows.

$$\mathcal{M}(\underline{WI}, \mathcal{E}qs) = \text{Spec}(\underline{WI}, \underline{\text{Go}}(v, \mathcal{E}qs)),$$

where *Go* is the name of the entry function of *WI*; v is a parameter representing a sequence of narrowing rules to be applied to $\mathcal{E}qs$. Here v ranges over the set of the encoded programs that can be interpreted by *WI*, namely all the possible encoded sequences of the narrowing rules shown in Figure 3.

The result of this specialization is a program with the input v . We say that the specialization succeeds if the resulting process tree generated by *Spec* contains a leaf labelled by the configuration **T** iff the equation system $\mathcal{E}qs$ has a solution. In that case the specialization tool *Spec* verifies the property of having at least one solution for all the programs computed by an interpreter *WI* for the given system $\mathcal{E}qs$.

Given a system $\mathcal{E}qs$ every path of its solution tree ending at a leaf labelled by the configuration **T** corresponds to a solution of $\mathcal{E}qs$. Every solution of the equation corresponds to a non-empty (possibly infinite) set of paths rooted in the initial configuration of its solution tree. Thus, the verification task is successfully solved if the solution graph is finite. The finiteness is guaranteed with the following property of the solution tree: there are at least two equal configurations along every infinite path in the tree.

5 Unfold/Fold Program Transformation Method

The specialization tool *Spec* used in the verification scheme is based on the elementary unfold/fold technique widely used, *e.g.* in deforestation, supercompilation, partial evaluation, partial deduction, and so on [5, 15, 31, 34]. The technique exploits the two following steps presented informally in this Section and more formally in the paper [21].

Nodes in the process tree of a program are labelled with configurations, which represent the state of the stack. Every node *N* in the process tree of the program is marked either as open (by default), or as closed with some node N' .

Given a rule $R : F(P_1, \dots, P_n)$ and an expression $F(\text{Expr}_1, \dots, \text{Expr}_n)$, we say that the substitution ξ is a narrowing generated by R iff $\exists \sigma (\forall j (P_j \sigma = \text{Expr}_j \xi))$. There ξ substitutes ground expressions for the parameters; σ substitutes ground expressions for the pattern variables. We say that ξ is a most general narrowing⁴ generated by R iff there is no narrowing ξ' generated by R *s.t.* ξ is an instance of ξ' .

- **Unfolding step.** Given an open node *N* labelled by a parameterized configuration *C* having a call $F(\text{Expr}_1, \dots, \text{Expr}_n)$ at the stack top, where Expr_i are ground expressions, for every rule $R_i : F(P_{i,1}, \dots, P_{i,n}) = \Phi_i$ in the definition of *F* (where $P_{i,j}$ are patterns), construct a set of pairs $\langle \sigma_{i,k}, \xi_{i,k} \rangle$, where $\xi_{i,k}$ are most general narrowings generated by R_i . For every such narrowing $\xi_{i,k}$ generate a child node $N_{i,k}$ labelled by the configuration $C_{i,k}$, where $C_{i,k}$ is $C \xi_{i,k}$ in which the stack top call $F(\text{Expr}_1, \dots, \text{Expr}_n) \sigma_{i,k}$ is replaced by $\Phi_i \sigma_{i,k}$. Mark all the newly generated nodes as open.
- **Folding step.** Given a node *N* labelled by a configuration *C*, if some its ancestor node N' is labelled by *C* (up to a parameter renaming), mark *N* as closed with N' , and stop unfolding paths originating from *N*.

⁴In general, there may be several most general narrowings generated by a single rule.

- **Close.** Mark an open node N as closed with N if either N is labelled with a ground expression, or all the successors of N are closed.

Due to the associativity property of the concatenation, several substitutions can be generated as a result of matching arguments of the call $F(\text{Expr}_1, \dots, \text{Expr}_n)$ against the patterns in the left-hand side $F(P_{i,1}, \dots, P_{i,n})$. Whereas such a matching can generate infinitely many narrowings, *e.g.* the matching $F(vv) : F(x \mathbf{A} \mathbf{A} x)$ [26], we can guarantee that in the case of the verification task considered the matching process is finite. In $\mathfrak{M}(\text{WI}, \mathcal{E}qs)$ the only parameterized data is v , and its value is always matched against the patterns of the form ε or $\Psi_i x$, where word Ψ_i does not contain expression-type variables⁵. In such a case, the matching process is known to be finite [26].

We call a node transient [40], if the unfolding step generates no narrowing on the parameters in its configuration (in particular, if all the Expr_i in $F(\text{Expr}_1, \dots, \text{Expr}_n)$ are object expressions). A transient node has a unique child in the process tree.

6 Results of Specialization

This section presents several sets of word equation systems, which have been solved by the specialization task $\mathfrak{M}(\text{WI}, \mathcal{E}qs)$, where WI is either WIBase , WISplit , or WICount .

Given an equation list $\mathcal{E}qs$ and a word equations interpreter WI , the result of the specialization $\mathfrak{M}(\text{WI}, \mathcal{E}qs)$ is a process tree modelling the solution tree of $\mathcal{E}qs$. If the process tree is infinite, then the specialization process does not terminate, unless on every infinite path in the process tree two equal configurations exist. Thus, the specialization succeeds iff the relation of the textual equality is a well-quasi order on a sequence of configurations along every infinite path in the process tree.

6.1 Optimality of Specialization

In general, a process tree may require a folding of the transient configurations. That makes the reasoning in the terms of the solution graphs difficult. All the arcs of a solution graph are marked with narrowings, whereas the process tree after folding the transient configurations will contain some additional arcs, which do not impose any narrowing. The structure of the interpreters WIBase , WISplit , WICount guarantees that all the non-transient nodes are labelled by configurations having a call of the function Main at the call-stack top. Thus, we introduce a notion of the optimal specialization for the verification task given in Sec. 4.

Definition 1. A result of the specialization $\mathfrak{M}(\text{WI}, \mathcal{E}qs)$ is said to be optimal iff all the folded configurations in the process tree are of the form $\text{Main}(v_i, \mathcal{E}qs_i)$, where $\mathcal{E}qs_i$ is an object expression.

If the optimality is guaranteed, then all the intermediate steps of the interpretation, including splitting, reducing, *etc.* become transient in the process tree. We can therefore reason on the process trees using the solution graphs of the equations. Moreover, the optimality guarantees that the residual programs generated by a specialization tool contain no parts of the interpreters' source code. Thus, such an optimality can be considered as an analogue of the Jones-optimality [3, 15] for the given verification task. If we consider the sequence of narrowings given to an interpreter WI as a linear program, we can also

⁵Another feature important for the unfolding step is that for all function rules except the last one and for all i, j Φ_i is never a prefix of Φ_j , hence the narrowings imposed on the parameter v by the corresponding matchings are always disjoint. The exception is the last rule of Main , which accepts an arbitrary input, serving as the `default` or `otherwise` branch. The right-hand side of the last rule is an object expression, hence there is no need to transfer any negative data on parameters to its successor configurations.

use the following reasoning [20]. Unlike the classical Futamura first projection [11], which corresponds to the specialization task $\text{Spec}(\underline{\text{WI}}, \underline{\text{Go}}(\langle \sigma_i \rangle, v))$, where the input data (the equation list) is replaced with a parameter, while program given to the interpreter is fixed, we parameterize the program. We say that the result is Jones-optimal if the residual program contains no part of the interpreter WI.

Lemma 1. *For every word equation $\Phi = \Psi$, the result of the specialization task $\mathfrak{M}(\text{WI}, \Phi = \Psi)$, where WI is either WIBase, WISplit, or WICount, is optimal.*

The proof is given in Appendix (Proof 8.1).

When the optimality holds, we say the verification by specialization of the interpreter WI *w.r.t.* a given equation set succeeds iff for every equation E in this set the solution graph constructed by the corresponding equation solving algorithm is finite.

6.2 Specialization of Interpreter WIBase

Definition 2. *A word equation $\Phi = \Psi$ is said to be quadratic iff for all $x \in \mathcal{V}$, $|\Phi|_x + |\Psi|_x \leq 2$.*

The optimality lemma implies the following proposition: every solution graph for a quadratic equation constructed by the algorithm $\text{AlgWE}_{\text{Base}}$ is finite. This fact is well-known due to the work of Matiyasevich [16, 17, 19, 24]. Thus, specialization of WIBase *w.r.t.* quadratic equations provides a basic test on the optimality of the program model.

Proposition 3. *For every quadratic word equation $\Phi = \Psi$, the specialization task $\mathfrak{M}(\text{WI}, \Phi = \Psi)$ succeeds.*

6.3 Specialization of Interpreter WISplit

The interpreter WISplit was introduced as an optimized version of WIBase, whereas we have shown that the specialization of WISplit succeeds in significantly more cases. One possibly interesting class of word equations solvable with the help of WISplit is the equations with the solutions of a special kind belonging to a regular language.

Definition 3. *Let $\xi(\Phi)$ be a transformation mapping any $\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{A}$ explicitly occurring in Φ to ε . We say an equation $\Phi = \Psi$ is strictly regular-ordered with repetitions iff $\xi(\Phi)$ is textually equal to $\xi(\Psi)$.*

Thus, if the equation $\Phi = \Psi$ is strictly regular-ordered with repetitions, then $\forall x \in \mathcal{V} (|\Phi|_x = |\Psi|_x)$ and the variable occurrences are ordered in Φ and Ψ in the same way. The set of strictly regular-ordered equations with repetitions generalizes the set of regular ordered equations in which every variable occurs twice [9].

Example 2. *The solution sets of the three equations $\mathbf{A}x = x\mathbf{A}$, $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}x = x\mathbf{A}\mathbf{A}$, $\mathbf{A}xx = xx\mathbf{A}$ are all equal, namely the sets are $x \in \mathbf{A}^*$. The first two equations are quadratic; the third is strictly regular-ordered with repetitions, but is not quadratic. Its solution graph constructed with the unfolding procedure $\text{AlgWE}_{\text{Base}}$ is infinite.*

The following proposition is a corollary of the optimality lemma and Lemma 2 given in Appendix.

Proposition 4. *For a strictly regular-ordered equation with repetitions $\Phi = \Psi$, the verification task $\mathfrak{M}(\text{WISplit}, \Phi = \Psi)$ succeeds.*

6.4 Specialization of Interpreter WICount

The interpreter WICount uses more simplifying operations as compared to the interpreter WISplit, as a consequence, the specialization of this interpreter succeeds additionally in solving one-variable equations. The optimality lemma and Lemma 3 given in Appendix imply the following proposition (which fails for WISplit).

Proposition 5. *For every one-variable word equation $\Phi = \Psi$, the verification task $\mathfrak{M}(\text{WICount}, \Phi = \Psi)$ succeeds.*

In order to test the introduced verification technique presented in this paper, we have generated a benchmark consisting of 50 equation systems to test the introduced verification technique: the tests 1–10 are regular-ordered equations with repetitions; the tests 11–20 are similar to the regular-ordered equations with repetitions, but may contain additional variable occurrences or have some variable occurrences permuted; the tests 21–30 contain equations of the form $x\Phi = \Psi x$, where $\Phi = \Psi$ is regular-ordered with repetitions and neither Φ nor Ψ contain x ; the tests 31–40 present systems of regular-ordered equations with repetitions mixed with equations of the form $\Phi\Psi = \Psi\Phi$; the tests 41–50 are equations of no special form sharing several variables in right- and left-hand sides. The archive containing the equations is given on the web-page [28].

The supercompiler SCP4 [25] was mainly used as $\mathfrak{M}$ in the tests of the scheme $\mathfrak{M}(\text{WICount}, \mathcal{E}_{qs})$. The experimental supercompiler MSCP-A [29] was also used and showed the same solvability results on the tests above, but it spends much more time for producing the results as compared with SCP4. The comparative verification results between the approach presented in this paper and the external SMT-solvers CVC4, Z3str3 are presented in Figure 6.4, the last row. The results show that the scheme $\mathfrak{M}(\text{WICount}, \mathcal{E}_{qs})$ is quite stable modulo small changes in the equations which are guaranteed to be solved by it.

Finally, we have tested the scheme $\mathfrak{M}(\text{WICount}, \mathcal{E}_{qs})$ on the equation set provided by the paper [8] as a benchmark for the string constraint solver Woorpje, namely Track 1 consisting of 200 equations guaranteed to have a solution; and Track 5 consisting of 200 equation systems. We have removed the length constraints from the Track 5 benchmark before the specialization starts. The results are quiet successful, provided that we use the general-purpose specialization tool for the verification. First of all, the residual programs constructed by $\mathfrak{M}(\text{WICount}, \mathcal{E}_{qs})$ never contained functions returning **T** if the system $\mathcal{E}_{qs}$ has been found unsatisfiable by the other solvers. That is a practical evidence that the optimality lemma holds. Second, the equations are successfully solved in 179 out of 200 cases, which is comparable with the results of verification by Z3str3 [22]; for 17 equations the specialization process does not terminate. In the remaining cases, the specialization process is theoretically terminating but takes too much time. The equations for which the specialization is the most time-consuming all are linear, *i.e.* every variable occurs in at most once per such an equation. The residual programs encoding paths in the solution graphs for the equations generated in the experiments are given on the web-page [28].

Benchmark	Tests (total)	Unsuccessful tests		
		CVC4	Z3str3	WICount
Track 1 (Woorpje)	200	8	13	21
Track 5 (Woorpje)	200	4	14	19
New benchmark	50	21	28	10

Figure 6: Comparative verification results for CVC4 [18], Z3str3 [22], $\mathfrak{M}(\text{WICount}, \mathcal{E}_{qs})$.

7 Discussion

The discussed specialization tasks above have been solved by using the following two program specializers designed for the string manipulating functional language Refal [39], namely the model supercompiler MSCP-A [27] and the experimental supercompiler SCP4 [25]. Some results of the experiments are given on [29]. Albeit we used the supercompilers, the results do not depend on specific features of the supercompilation method [38] and can be reproduced with other specializers based on partial evaluation, partial deduction, and so on [15, 31].

The domain of the described verification method is not exhausted by the sets of the equations considered above. One more interesting class of the equations with the variables shared by left- and right-hand sides (and non-regular solution sets) consists of equations of the form $\Phi y = y\Psi$, where $\Phi = x\Phi_1x \dots x\Phi_n$, $\Psi = \Psi_1x \dots x\Psi_nx$, where $\Phi_i, \Psi_i \in \mathcal{A}^*$ and $\exists k \in \mathbb{N} \forall i, j |\Phi_i| = k \ \& \ |\Psi_i| = k$. Examining their solution graphs, we can prove that the specialization task $\mathfrak{M}(\text{WICount}, \mathcal{E}_{qs})$ successfully solves such equations. The experiments with the non-specific equations mentioned above promise finding other interesting classes of the word equations that can be solved by automated specialization tools.

7.1 Related Works

A number of quite efficient string constraint solving tools were designed, which are looking for the word equation solutions bounded by a given length, *e.g.* [4, 8]⁶. Whereas reasoning on the unbounded case can provide efficient methods of solution search if the equations considered satisfy some special properties. For example, a number of efficient solving algorithms have been designed for the set of straight-line word equations, *e.g.* [1, 6], whereas our specialization *w.r.t.* such equations is too time-consuming.

Several recent works exploit the unfold/fold technique with Nielsen's transformation for solving quadratic word equations, in the way originated from Matiyasevich in 1968 [24]. In the paper [19], non-deterministic counter systems for searching solutions of the unbounded-length word equations with regular constraints via Nielsen's transformation are introduced, and the completeness of the given algorithm has been shown for the set of the regular ordered equations. Maybe the regular ordered equations with repetitions, being split in the way shown in $\text{AlgWE}_{\text{split}}$ algorithm (Sec. 3), can be solved by this method as well. In the paper [17], Nielsen's transformation is used for solving unbounded-length quadratic word equations, but its termination properties require the equations to have at most two occurrences of any variable. Advanced SMT-solvers such as CVC4 [18], Z3str3 [22], or S3P given in [37] demonstrate a very good efficiency in many practical cases, however the paper [17] shows that the algorithms are not complete even *w.r.t.* the set of the quadratic equations, *e.g.* the equation $xvy = ywx$, whose solution set is quite complex; see Hmelevskij work [13] for the first proof of this fact. The tests of our benchmark have shown that the recent version of CVC4 solves equations of the given form, but fails to solve more complex quadratic equations, *e.g.* $x_1x_2x_3\mathbf{ABABAB} = \mathbf{AAABBB}x_2x_3x_1$. Based on the results of the verification we may conclude that the most troublesome cases for the SMT-solvers are the ones when the equation system has no solution and that fact cannot be shown by reasoning on solution lengths. In that cases, the verification scheme $\mathfrak{M}(\text{WICount}, \mathcal{E}_{qs})$ has the best success rate as compared to CVC4 and Z3str3.

⁶In fact, if the upper bound is assigned dynamically, such a tool can decide solvability of every word equation, because a minimal solution length is at most doubly exponential in the equation length [14].

8 Conclusion

We have shown that general-purpose specializers can be useful for solving some classes of the word equations. Instead of modifying the specialization tools, we modify the word equation interpreters specialized according with the verification scheme. This technique follows a modification of the classical first Futamura projection [11] and simplifies the work of interest. Starting from the simplest interpreter WIBase, every new refinement extends significantly the set of the equations solvable via the specialization method. The specialization-time overheads are high as compared with the direct work of the existing string constraint solvers, but the specialization method presented in this paper aims at supporting development of the solver prototypes with a minimal effort. Experiments with the prototypes provide a fruitful research material on the sets of the word equations over which the verification algorithm is terminating. Moreover, we have shown that theoretical methods for solving word equations by hand can be useful in the automatic approach, hence these methods can solve the task of proving unsatisfiability of a word equation system, which, as our experiments show, is hard for the some well-known state-of-art SMT-solvers.

Another interesting aspect of the presented verification experiments is the optimality. The non-deterministic algorithms for solving the word equations are well-designed in order to be used in the intermediate interpretation. This paper considers the optimality property in the case of the basic folding, however our experiments show that the constructed interpreters provide possibility for the optimal verification, if one uses a more complex path termination criterion based on the homeomorphic embedding relation [35]. Thereby advanced specialization tools can also be used for solving the word equations, and the additional strategies developed for program transformation may support more efficient algorithms as compared with the basic unfold/fold transformation.

References

- [1] Parosh Aziz Abdulla, Mohamed Faouzi Atig, Yu-Fang Chen, Bui Phi Diep, Lukáš Holík, Ahmed Rezine & Philipp Rümmer (2017): *Flatten and Conquer: A Framework for Efficient Analysis of String Constraints*. *SIGPLAN Not.* 52(6), pp. 602–617, doi:[10.1145/3140587.3062384](https://doi.org/10.1145/3140587.3062384).
- [2] Steve Barker, Michael Leuschel & Mauricio Varea (2008): *Efficient and flexible access control via Jones-optimal logic program specialisation*. *High. Order Symb. Comput.* 21(1-2), pp. 5–35, doi:[10.1007/s10990-008-9030-8](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10990-008-9030-8).
- [3] A. Ben-Amram & N. Jones (2000): *Computational complexity via programming languages: constant factors do matter*. *Acta Informatica* (37), pp. 83–120, doi:[10.1007/s002360000038](https://doi.org/10.1007/s002360000038).
- [4] Nikolaj Bjørner, Nikolai Tillmann & Andrei Voronkov (2009): *Path Feasibility Analysis for String-Manipulating Programs*. In Stefan Kowalewski & Anna Philippou, editors: *Tools and Algorithms for the Construction and Analysis of Systems*, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, pp. 307–321, doi:[10.1007/978-3-642-00768-2_27](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-00768-2_27).
- [5] R. M. Burstall & John Darlington (1977): *A Transformation System for Developing Recursive Programs*. *J. ACM* 24(1), pp. 44–67, doi:[10.1145/321992.321996](https://doi.org/10.1145/321992.321996).
- [6] Taolue Chen, Matthew Hague, Anthony W. Lin, Philipp Rümmer & Zhilin Wu (2019): *Decision Procedures for Path Feasibility of String-Manipulating Programs with Complex Operations* 3(POPL), p. 30. doi:[10.1145/3290362](https://doi.org/10.1145/3290362).
- [7] Christian Choffrut & Juhani Karhumäki (1997): *Combinatorics of Words*. doi:[10.1007/978-3-642-59136-5_6](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-59136-5_6).
- [8] J. D. Day, Thorsten Ehlers, Mitja Kulczynski, Florin Manea, Dirk Nowotka & Danny Bogsted Poulsen (2019): *On Solving Word Equations Using SAT*. In: *Reachability Problems*. *RP 2019*, 11674, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, doi:[10.1007/978-3-030-30806-3_8](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-30806-3_8).

- [9] Joel D. Day, Florin Manea & Dirk Nowotka (2017): *The Hardness of Solving Simple Word Equations*. In: *42nd International Symposium on Mathematical Foundations of Computer Science (MFCS 2017)*, *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs)* 83, pp. 18:1–18:14, doi:[10.4230/LIPIcs.MFCS.2017.18](https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.MFCS.2017.18).
- [10] Emanuele De Angelis, Fabio Fioravanti, Alberto Pettorossi & Maurizio Proietti (2018): *Solving Horn Clauses on Inductive Data Types Without Induction*. *Theory Pract. Log. Program.* 18(3-4), pp. 452–469, doi:[10.1017/S1471068418000157](https://doi.org/10.1017/S1471068418000157). Available at <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1471068418000157>.
- [11] Yoshihiko Futamura (1999): *Partial Evaluation of Computation Process - An Approach to a Compiler-Compiler*. *Higher-Order and Symbolic Computation* 12, pp. 381–391, doi:[10.1023/A:1010095604496](https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1010095604496).
- [12] Geoff W. Hamilton (2015): *Verifying Temporal Properties of Reactive Systems by Transformation*. In: *Proceedings of the Third International Workshop on Verification and Program Transformation, VPT@ETAPS 2015*, London, United Kingdom, 11th April 2015., pp. 33–49, doi:[10.4204/EPTCS.199.3](https://doi.org/10.4204/EPTCS.199.3). Available at <https://doi.org/10.4204/EPTCS.199.3>.
- [13] Ju. I. Hmelevskij (1971): *Equations in a free semigroup. (in Russian)*. *Trudy Mat. Inst. Steklov* 107, p. 286.
- [14] Artur Jez (2016): *Recompression: A Simple and Powerful Technique for Word Equations*. *J. ACM* 63(1), doi:[10.1145/2743014](https://doi.org/10.1145/2743014).
- [15] Neil Jones, Carsten Gomard & Peter Sestoft (1993): *Partial Evaluation and Automatic Program Generation*. Prentice Hall International.
- [16] Juhani Karhumäki, Hermann Maurer, Gheorghe Paun & Grzegorz Rozenberg (1999): *Jewels are Forever, Contributions on Theoretical Computer Science in Honor of Arto Salomaa*. doi:[10.1007/978-3-642-60207-8_28](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-60207-8_28).
- [17] Quang Loc Le & Mengda He (2018): *A Decision Procedure for String Logic with Quadratic Equations, Regular Expressions and Length Constraints*, pp. 350–372. doi:[10.1007/978-3-030-02768-1_19](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-02768-1_19).
- [18] Tianyi Liang, Andrew Reynolds, Nestan Tsiskaridze, Cesare Tinelli, Clark Barrett & Morgan Deters (2016): *An Efficient SMT Solver for String Constraints*. *Form. Methods Syst. Des.* 48(3), pp. 206–234, doi:[10.1007/s10703-016-0247-6](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10703-016-0247-6).
- [19] Anthony Widjaja Lin & Rupak Majumdar (2018): *Quadratic Word Equations with Length Constraints, Counter Systems, and Presburger Arithmetic with Divisibility*. In: *Automated Technology for Verification and Analysis. ATVA 2018*, 11138, *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, doi:[10.1007/978-3-030-01090-4_21](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-01090-4_21).
- [20] Alexei Lisitsa & Andrei P. Nemytykh (2007): *A Note on Specialization of Interpreters*. In Volker Diekert, Mikhail V. Volkov & Andrei Voronkov, editors: *Computer Science – Theory and Applications*, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, pp. 237–248, doi:[10.1007/978-3-540-74510-5_25](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-74510-5_25).
- [21] Alexei Lisitsa & Andrei P. Nemytykh (2008): *Reachability Analysis in Verification via Supercompilation*. *Int. J. Foundations of Computer Science* 19(4), pp. 953–970, doi:[10.1142/S0129054108006066](https://doi.org/10.1142/S0129054108006066).
- [22] V. Ganesh M. Berzish & Y. Zheng (2017): *Z3str3: A String Solver with Theory-aware Heuristics*. In: *Formal Methods in Computer Aided Design (FMCAD)*, pp. 55–59, doi:[10.23919/FMCAD.2017.8102241](https://doi.org/10.23919/FMCAD.2017.8102241).
- [23] Gennadiy S. Makanin (1977): *The problem of solvability of equations in a free semigroup*. *Math. USSR-Sb.* 32(2), pp. 129–198, doi:[10.1070/SM1977v032n02ABEH002376](https://doi.org/10.1070/SM1977v032n02ABEH002376).
- [24] Yuri Matiyasevich (1968): *A connection between systems of word and length equations and Hilbert's Tenth Problem (in Russian)*. *Sem. Mat. V. A. Steklov Math. Inst. Leningrad* 8, pp. 132–144.
- [25] A. P. Nemytykh (2007): *The Supercompiler SCP4: General Structure (in Russian)*. URSS, Moscow.
- [26] Andrei P. Nemytykh (2014): *On Unfolding for Programs Using Strings as a Data Type*. In: *VPT 2014. Second International Workshop on Verification and Program Transformation, July 17-18, 2014, Vienna, Austria, co-located with the 26th International Conference on Computer Aided Verification CAV 2014*, pp. 66–83, doi:[10.29007/m8rr](https://doi.org/10.29007/m8rr).
- [27] Antonina Nepeivoda: *The page of supercompiler MSCP-A*. Available at http://refal.botik.ru/mscp/mscp-a_eng.html.

- [28] Antonina Nepeivoda: *Specialization Results for Benchmark Equations*. Available at <https://github.com/TonitaN/TestEquations>.
- [29] Antonina Nepeivoda: *Word Equations Interpreters and Experiments*. Available at http://refal.botik.ru/mscp/weq_int_readme.html.
- [30] Antonina Nepeivoda (2016): *Ping-pong protocols as prefix grammars: Modelling and verification via program transformation*. *Journal of Logical and Algebraic Methods in Programming* 85(5), pp. 782–804, doi:[10.1016/j.jlamp.2016.06.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jlamp.2016.06.001). Special Issue on Automated Verification of Programs and Web Systems.
- [31] Alberto Pettorossi & Maurizio Proietti (1996): *A comparative revisitation of some program transformation techniques*. In: *Partial Evaluation*, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, pp. 355–385, doi:[10.1007/3-540-61580-6_18](https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-61580-6_18).
- [32] Wojciech Plandowski (2006): *An Efficient Algorithm for Solving Word Equations*. In: *Proceedings of 38th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, pp. 467–476, doi:[10.1145/1132516.1132584](https://doi.org/10.1145/1132516.1132584).
- [33] P. Saxena, D. Akhawe, S. Hanna, F. Mao, S. McCamant & D. Song (2010): *A symbolic execution framework for Javascript*. In: *SP*, pp. 513–528, doi:[10.1109/SP.2010.38](https://doi.org/10.1109/SP.2010.38).
- [34] Jens P. Secher & Morten Heine Sørensen (1999): *On Perfect Supercompilation*. In: *Perspectives of System Informatics, Third International Andrei Ershov Memorial Conference, PSI'99*, Akademgorodok, Novosibirsk, Russia, July 6-9, 1999, *Proceedings*, pp. 113–127, doi:[10.1007/3-540-46562-6_10](https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-46562-6_10).
- [35] Morten H. Sørensen & Robert Glück (1995): *An Algorithm of Generalization in Positive Supercompilation*. In: *Proceedings of ILPS'95, the International Logic Programming Symposium*, MIT Press, pp. 465–479, doi:[10.7551/mitpress/4301.003.0048](https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/4301.003.0048).
- [36] Morten H. Sørensen, Robert Glück & Neil D. Jones (1993): *A Positive Supercompiler*. *Journal of Functional Programming* 6, pp. 465–479, doi:[10.1017/s0956796800002008](https://doi.org/10.1017/s0956796800002008).
- [37] M.-T. Trinh, D.-H. Chu & D.-H. Jaffar (2016): *Progressive Reasoning over Recursively-Defined Strings*. In: *Proc. CAV 2016 (LNCS)*, 9779, pp. 218–240, doi:[10.1007/978-3-319-41528-4_12](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-41528-4_12).
- [38] Valentin F. Turchin (1986): *The Concept of a Supercompiler*. *ACM Transactions on Programming Languages and Systems* 8(3), pp. 292–325, doi:[10.1145/5956.5957](https://doi.org/10.1145/5956.5957).
- [39] Valentin F. Turchin (1989): *Refal-5, Programming Guide and Reference Manual*. New England Publishing Co., Holyoke, Massachusetts. Electronic version: <http://www.botik.ru/pub/local/scp/refal5/>.
- [40] Valentin F. Turchin (1996): *On Generalization of Lists and Strings in Supercompilation*. In: *Technical Report CSc. TR 96-002*, City College of the City University of New York.
- [41] Germán Vidal (2012): *Annotation of logic programs for independent AND-parallelism by partial evaluation*. *Theory Pract. Log. Program.* 12(4-5), pp. 583–600, doi:[10.1017/S1471068412000191](https://doi.org/10.1017/S1471068412000191).
- [42] Fang Yu, Tevfik Bultan & Oscar H. Ibarra (2011): *Relational String Verification Using Multi-track Automata*. In Michael Domaratzki & Kai Salomaa, editors: *Implementation and Application of Automata*, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, pp. 290–299, doi:[10.1007/978-3-642-18098-9_31](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-18098-9_31).

Appendix

8.1 Proofs and Auxiliary Propositions

Proposition 6. *Let E be a reduced word equation $\Phi = \Psi$ with the var-permuted sides (and with no non-empty var-permuted suffixes and prefixes); σ be an arbitrary substitution given in Figure 3. Let $E' : \Phi\sigma = \Psi\sigma$ be of the reduced form. Then the two following properties hold.*

1. *If E' is split into $\text{Pr}_1 S_1 = \text{Pr}_2 S_2$ where Pr_1 and Pr_2 are non-empty and var-permuted, then either σ is $x \mapsto \varepsilon$ or the equations $\text{Pr}_1 = \text{Pr}_2$ and $S_1 = S_2$ cannot be reduced.*
2. *If the length of E' is lesser than the length of E , then σ is $x \mapsto \varepsilon$.*

- Proof.* 1. Let a substitution σ be $\sigma: x \mapsto tx$, where $t \in \mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{V}$, and let $\Phi = \Phi_1 x \dots \Phi_{n-1} x \Phi_n$ and $\Psi = \Psi_1 x \dots \Psi_{n-1} x \Psi_n$, where $\forall i, j (|\Phi_i|_x = 0 \ \& \ |\Psi_j|_x = 0)$. The substitution σ results in equation $\Phi_1 tx \dots \Phi_{n-1} tx \Phi_n = \Psi_1 tx \dots \Psi_{n-1} tx \Psi_n$. We consider the left-split operation finding non-empty var-permuted prefixes with the minimal length. The case of the right-split operation uses the analogous reasoning. If the var-permuted prefixes found by the operation are of the form $\Phi_1 tx \dots tx \Phi'_i$ and $\Psi_1 tx \dots tx \Psi'_i$, where Φ'_i and Ψ'_i are prefixes of Φ_i and Ψ_i respectively, then the words $\Phi_1 x \dots x \Phi'_i$ and $\Psi_1 x \dots x \Psi'_i$ are also var-permuted and the equation should be split until the substitution σ is applied. Thereby the var-permuted prefixes Pr_1 and Pr_2 can be only of the forms $\Phi_1 tx \dots tx \Phi'_i$ (where Φ'_i is a prefix of Φ_i) and $\Psi_1 tx \dots tx \Psi'_i$. Thus, S_1 starts with a term other than x , while S_2 starts with x . Moreover, if the last term of Φ'_i can be reduced with t , then the word $\Phi_1 x \dots x \Phi'_i$ and $\Psi_1 x \dots x \Psi'_i$ are var-permuted⁷.
2. Let σ be $x \mapsto tx$, where x occurs in Φ . The first case proven above allows us not to consider reduction operations after splitting the equation. Consider the possible reductions of the equation $E': \Phi\sigma = \Psi\sigma$ before it is split. A reduction may occur only if Φ starts with x , and Ψ starts with t (or vice versa). Let $k = |\Phi| + |\Psi|$, then $|\Phi\sigma| + |\Psi\sigma| \geq k + 2$, and the considered reduction decreases the length of E' by 2. Thus, after an application of such a substitution σ the overall length of the equation cannot decrease. $\square$

The following proposition does not hold when the algorithm of interest is $\text{AlgWE}_{\text{Split}}$ or $\text{AlgWE}_{\text{Count}}$.

Proposition 7. *Given a substitution $\sigma: x \mapsto tx$, where $t \in \mathcal{V} \cup \mathcal{A}$ ($t \neq x$), σ is an injection on the set of reduced equations when they are simplified by the algorithm $\text{AlgWE}_{\text{Base}}$ unless the equations are trivial contradictions.*

Proof. Given a reduced equation $\Phi = \Psi$ s.t. Φ and Ψ start with different terms, let us assume that there exists E' s.t. $E = E'\sigma$. Let E' be $\Phi' = \Psi'$. If E' is of the reduced form then at most one elementary reduction can be done in $E'\sigma$, namely the we can reduce the first terms in the left- and right-hand sides of the equation. Moreover, the reduction occurs iff Φ' starts with x and Ψ' with t (or vice versa). If none of Φ and Ψ starts with x , then no reduction is possible in $E'\sigma$ and E' can be computed as a result of the formal inverse substitution $\sigma^{-1}: tx \mapsto x$, namely $\Phi' = \Phi\sigma^{-1}$, $\Psi' = \Psi\sigma^{-1}$. Let $\Phi = x\Phi_1$. Then Φ' is $x(\Phi_1\sigma^{-1})$, Ψ' is $t(\Psi\sigma^{-1})$. $\square$

Informally, Proposition 7 states that given an equation E and a substitution σ of a special kind s.t. the node N in a tree generated by algorithm $\text{AlgWE}_{\text{Base}}$ is labelled by E and has the ingoing arc labelled with σ , then the configuration of the parent of N can be restored. But this proposition does not require σ be generated according to the rules given in Figure 3: both Φ and Ψ may start with terms differing from x .

In the following proof the notion of a configuration is used w.r.t. the program process trees, i.e. a configuration is a state of the call-stack which labels a node in the process tree.

Lemma 1 — Optimality Lemma. Let $[N_1; N_2]$ denote a path segment starting at N_1 and ending at N_2 .

First, consider the interpreter WIBase . (see subsection 8.2 for its source code). The node configurations in the process tree of WIBase are as follows:

1. $\text{Main}(v, \underline{E})$;
2. $\text{Main}(v, \text{Sim}(\sigma, \text{Other arguments}))$, where $\underline{\sigma}$ is a constant data representing the substitution which was applied last⁸ to the equation list, and the other arguments may contain a call of the function Subst .

The function Main consequently applies substitutions given in its first argument to the equation list given in the second argument; the function Sim simplifies, i.e. reduces the equations. We call the configurations of the first form above *basic*. If only the basic configurations are folded, the specialization is already optimal. Let the fold operation occur on the nodes N_1 and N_2 labelled with the (equal up to the parameter renaming) configurations of the form $\text{Main}(v_i, \text{Sim}(\underline{\sigma}, \text{Args}))$. Let us consider their closest ancestors N'_1 and N'_2 , such that their configurations are $\text{Main}(v, \underline{E})$ and $\text{Main}(v', \underline{E}')$ ⁹, and their closest successors such that they are labelled by the configurations $\text{Main}(v'_i, \underline{E}_0)$. No narrowings generating a substitution $x \mapsto \varepsilon$ can occur along the segment $[N_1; N_2]$, otherwise their configurations cannot be folded. Thus σ is $x \mapsto tx$. The substitution σ is the same in the configurations labelling N_1 and N_2 , and they generate the same equation E_0 after this substitution, hence by Proposition 7 E and E' coincide.

⁷This reasoning still holds if $i = 1$. In the case of $\Psi_1 = \varepsilon$ or $\Phi_1 = \varepsilon$, one reduction is to be done until the splitting, but the overall reasoning is the same.

⁸This substitution is stored as an argument of the function Sim as an additional annotation of the calls.

⁹Such ancestors always exist, because the first call of Sim initialized by Go (and not preceded with a basic configuration) is of the form $\text{Sim}(\varepsilon, \dots)$, while all other calls of Sim have a non-empty first argument taken from a basic configuration.

Let us consider now specialization of interpreters WISplit and WICount. In these cases the possible configurations are exhausted with the following ones:

1. $\text{Main}(v, (n)++\{E_i\}^+)$, where n coincides with the number of equations in the list unless the list consists of a single unsatisfiable equation;
2. $\text{Main}(v, \text{Sim}(n, \sigma, \text{Other arguments}))$, where n is the number of equations in the list at the last basic configuration, and σ is the last substitution that was applied to the equations; the other arguments may contain function calls;
3. $\text{Main}(v, \text{Sort}(n, \sigma, \text{Other arguments}))$.

The argumentation for the case 3 does not differ from the one for the case 2, thus we assume the folding works only with the nodes N_1 and N_2 with the configurations $\text{Main}(v_i, \text{Sim}(n, \sigma, \text{Args}))$. Once again we consider their closest ancestors N'_1 and N'_2 , such that they are labelled with the basic configurations $\text{Main}(v, (n)++\{E_i\}^+)$ and $\text{Main}(v', (n)++\{E'_i\}^+)$, as that was done for WIBase case. Function Sim takes its natural argument from the last Main call, hence it is the same in all the four configurations. The substitution $x \mapsto \varepsilon$ cannot be applied along the path segment $[N_1; N_2]$. Let σ be $x \mapsto tx$. By Proposition 6, the number of equations in $[N'_1; N'_2]$ cannot decrease. Thus, the number of equations is a constant (namely, n) along the path, and no equation in a configuration in $[N'_1; N'_2]$ can be split. That means every equation in a configuration along the path starting at N'_1 is transformed as it would be transformed by the algorithm $\text{AlgWE}_{\text{Base}}$. Given first successors N_{loop} and N'_{loop} of N_1 and N_2 such that they are labelled with the basic configurations (in a looped graph, these successors coincide), they are labelled by the equal lists of equations, thus by Proposition 7 the lists of equations $E_i^{'+}$ and E_i^+ also coincide (see Figure 7). $\square$

Proposition 8. *Let $Q_i, Q'_i \in \mathcal{A}^+$. Given a list of equations $\mathcal{E}qs = \langle Q_1 x_1 = x_1 Q'_1, \dots, Q_n x_n = x_n Q'_n \rangle$, where for some i, j , $x_i = x_j$ may hold, every configuration in the solution tree generated by $\text{AlgWE}_{\text{Split}}(\mathcal{E}qs)$ contains at most n equations. If a configuration contains exactly n equations $\langle \Phi'_1 = \Psi'_1, \dots, \Phi'_n = \Psi'_n \rangle$, then $|\Phi'_i| \leq |Q_i| + 1$, $|\Psi'_i| \leq |Q'_i| + 1$.*

Proof. Figure 3 shows that the possible substitutions applicable to the initial equation list $\langle Q_1 x_1 = x_1 Q'_1, \dots, Q_n x_n = x_n Q'_n \rangle$ are either $x_i \mapsto \varepsilon$ or $x_i \mapsto A_i x_i$. The first one transforms equations including x_i to either tautologies or contradictions. The second one transforms an equation $Q_i x_i = x_i Q'_i$ either to a contradiction or to an equation of the form $R_i x_i = x_i Q'_i$, where R_i is a cyclic permutation of the word Q_i , $|R_i| = |Q_i|$. $\square$

Corollary 1. *If $Q_i, Q'_i \in \mathcal{A}^+$ then every infinite path of a solution graph generated by the algorithm $\text{AlgWE}_{\text{Split}}$ applied to the list $\langle Q_1 x_1 = x_1 Q'_1, \dots, Q_n x_n = x_n Q'_n \rangle$ contains two nodes with equal configurations.*

Proposition 9. *Let $\Phi = \Psi$ be a strictly regular-ordered equation with repetitions. Then the following statements hold.*

1. *Given the shortest non-empty var-permuted prefixes Φ_1 and Ψ_1 s.t. $\Phi = \Phi_1 \Phi_2$, $\Psi = \Psi_1 \Psi_2$, the equations $\Phi_1 = \Psi_1$ and $\Phi_2 = \Psi_2$ are strictly regular-ordered with repetitions.*
2. *The solution tree generated by the algorithm $\text{AlgWE}_{\text{Split}}(\Phi = \Psi)$ never includes an application of the rule $x \mapsto yx$ given in Figure 5.*
3. *Every infinite path in the solution tree generated by $\text{AlgWE}_{\text{Split}}(\Phi = \Psi)$ contains a finite number of the split operations.*

Proof. 1. For every $x_i \in \mathcal{V}$, the property of being var-permuted gives $|\Phi_1|_{x_i} = |\Psi_1|_{x_i}$, and hence $|\Phi_2|_{x_i} = |\Psi_2|_{x_i}$. The order of the variable occurrences in $\Phi = \Psi$ is preserved also in the prefixes and suffixes.

2. Consider the variable x leading in Φ (and Ψ). Then $\Phi = x\Phi'$, $\Psi = \Psi_0 x\Psi'$ (or vice versa), where $\Psi_0 \in \mathcal{A}^+$. Let Ψ_0 be $A\Psi'_0$ then a rule unfolding the equation $x\Phi' = \Psi_0 x\Psi'$ is either $x \mapsto \varepsilon$ or $x \mapsto Ax$. Both of the substitutions preserve the property of being strictly regular-ordered, as well as the splitting operation does.

3. The property (2) follows that given a list $\langle \Phi_1 = \Psi_1, \dots, \Phi_n = \Psi_n \rangle$ of equations labelling a configuration of the solution tree to $\Phi = \Psi$, for every $x_i \in \mathcal{V}$, $\sum_{j=1}^n |\Phi_j|_{x_i} + |\Psi_j|_{x_i} \leq |\Phi|_{x_i} + |\Psi|_{x_i}$. And every split operation generates two equations containing at least two variables. $\square$

Lemma 2. *Given a strictly regular-ordered equation with repetitions $\Phi = \Psi$, every infinite path in its solution tree generated by the algorithm $\text{AlgWE}_{\text{Split}}(\Phi = \Psi)$ contains nodes with equal configurations.*

Proof. Every infinite path in the tree generated by $\text{AlgWE}_{\text{Split}}(\Phi = \Psi)$ has an infinite subpath satisfying the following two conditions:

1. equations are never split along the subpath;




Figure 7: Scheme of the Optimality Lemma proof.

2. variables are never mapped to ε along the subpath.

Let the first node in such a subpath be N , and the configuration of N be a list $\langle \Theta x \Phi_1 = x \Psi_1, \dots, \Phi_n = \Psi_n \rangle$, $\Theta \in \mathcal{A}^+$. There may be the following three options.

1. For every j , if $|\Phi_j|_x > 0$ then $\Phi_j = x \Phi'_j$, $\Psi_j = \Theta_j x \Psi'_j$ (or vice versa), $\Theta_j \in \mathcal{A}^+$, $|\Phi'_j|_x = |\Psi'_j|_x = 0$. Given such an equation, a substitution $\sigma: x \mapsto t x$ ($t \in \mathcal{A}$) preserves its length. The number of the equations in the configurations along the path, as well as their lengths, cannot grow, hence the set of the configurations along the path is finite.
2. Some equation $E_j: \Phi_j = \Psi_j$ is of the form $\Phi_{0,j} x \Phi_{1,j} x \Phi_{2,j} = x \Psi_{1,j} x \Psi_{2,j}$, where $\Phi_{0,j} \in \mathcal{A}^+$, $|\Phi_{1,j}|_x = 0$, $|\Psi_{1,j}|_x = 0$. Equation E_j is strictly regular-ordered, hence $\forall k (|\Phi_{1,j}|_{x_k} = |\Psi_{1,j}|_{x_k})$. Let $m = \left| |\Phi_{0,j}| + |\Phi_{1,j}| - |\Psi_{1,j}| \right|$; $m \neq 0$, otherwise E_j would be split. Consider the path segment starting at N and having the length m . The arcs in this segment are labelled by the substitutions $x \mapsto c_1 x, \dots, x \mapsto c_m x$. Let $\Theta' = c_1 \dots c_m$. The ending node of the m -length path is labelled by the following configuration: $\langle \dots, \Phi'_{0,j} x \Phi_{1,j} \Theta' x \Phi_{2,j} = x \Psi_{1,j} \Theta' x \Psi_{2,j}, \dots \rangle$, $|\Phi'_{0,j}| = |\Phi_{0,j}|$. If $|\Phi_{0,j}| + |\Phi_{1,j}| - |\Psi_{1,j}| > 0$, then the prefixes $\Phi'_{0,j} x \Phi_{1,j}$ and $x \Psi_{1,j} \Theta$ are var-permuted, otherwise the prefixes $\Phi'_{0,j} x \Phi_{1,j} \Theta$ and $x \Psi_{1,j}$ are var-permuted. In any case, at most in the m -th configuration (and maybe earlier, if $\Phi_{1,j}$ or $\Psi_{1,j}$ do not end with a variable) a split takes place.
3. Some equation $E_j: \Phi_j = \Psi_j$ is of the form $\Phi_{1,j} x \Phi_{2,j} = \Psi_{1,j} x \Psi_{2,j}$, $|\Phi_{1,j}|_x = 0$, $|\Psi_{1,j}|_x = 0$, $\Phi_{1,j}, \Psi_{1,j} \notin \mathcal{A}^+$. Let $m = \left| |\Phi_{1,j}| - |\Psi_{1,j}| \right|$. The same arguments show that given such an E_j a split would occur along the path at most after m substitutions. If $\Psi_{1,j}$ or $\Phi_{1,j}$ do not end with a variable, then the split can be applied earlier. That case is given in Figure 8, where $\Phi_{1,j} = \Phi'_0 y \Phi'_1$, $\Psi_{1,j} = \Psi'_0 y \Psi'_1$, $\Phi'_1, \Psi'_1 \in \mathcal{A}^+$.

Thus, either equal configurations exist along the given subpath or a split is constructed. That contradicts the choice of the subpath. $\square$




Figure 8: Splitting a strictly regular-ordered equation with repetitions resulted by substitution $x\sigma = \Theta x$, where $|\Theta| = |\Psi'_0| - |\Phi'_0| - |\Phi'_1|$.

The next two propositions use the following notations. The letters T and T' stand for words in $\mathcal{A} \cup \{x\}$; t_i, u_i are letters in $\mathcal{A}$.

Proposition 10. *Given an equation $t_1 \dots t_n x T = x u_1 \dots u_m x T'$ s.t. $n > 0, m \geq 0$, every infinite path of its solution graph contains a split.*

Proof. If $m \geq n$, the initial equation generates a split. Let $n = m + k, k > 0, x\sigma_n = t_1 \dots t_n x$. The k -th step of the unfolding observes that the equation is either already split or is of the following form:

$$t_{k+1} \dots t_n t_1 \dots t_k x T \sigma_k = x u_1 \dots u_m t_1 \dots t_k x T' \sigma_k.$$

The equation has var-permuted prefixes. □

Lemma 3. *Given an equation $\Phi = \Psi, \Phi, \Psi \in \{\mathcal{A} \cup \{x\}\}^*, |\Phi\Psi|_x > 2$, every infinite path of its solution graph contains a split.*

Proof. Only the following three cases may appear.

1. $t_1 \dots t_n x T = x u_1 \dots u_m x T'$, where $t_i \in \mathcal{A}, u_j \in \mathcal{A}, n > 0$. This case is considered in Proposition 10.
2. $x u_1 \dots u_m = t_1 \dots t_n x \Phi x$, where $t_i \in \mathcal{A}, u_i \in \mathcal{A}$. Thus, the left-hand side of the equation contains the only occurrence of x .
3. $x = t_1 \dots t_n x \Phi x u_1 \dots u_k, k \geq 1$. The equation is contradictory according to Proposition 2.

Only the case (2) is of our interest. We assume $m > n$, otherwise the equation is split. Let $m = n * i + j, x\sigma = t_1 \dots t_n x, x\sigma_j = t_1 \dots t_j x, \xi = \sigma^i \sigma_j$. On the m -th unfolding step either the equation is split already or is of the following form: $x u_1 \dots u_m = t_{j+1} \dots t_n t_1 \dots t_j x \Phi \xi (t_1 \dots t_n)^i t_1 \dots t_j x$. This equation has the var-permuted suffixes and is split. □

8.2 Source Code of Interpreters

The encoding of the input equation is as follows. Any constant letter from $\mathcal{A}$ is encoded with itself, as a single symbol. A variable from $\mathcal{V}$ is encoded with the term (Vt) (i.e. the pair enclosed in the parentheses constructor), where $t \in \Sigma$ is a symbol encoding the unique identifier of the equation variable.

For the sake of readability, we use the following syntactic sugar in the source code of the interpreters. Variables x_{num} and x_{freshnum} of the natural number type with the operations $+1$ and -1 are used instead of the unary Peano number representation, namely (I^n) . An equation $\Phi_{\text{lhs}} = \Phi_{\text{rhs}}$ is encoded as $(\Phi_{\text{lhs}}, \Phi_{\text{rhs}})$ instead of $((\Phi_{\text{lhs}})(\Phi_{\text{rhs}}))$.

For example, the encoding of the equation $Axy = xyA$ in the source code of the interpreters is $(A(VX)(VY), (VX)(VY)A)$.

8.2.1 Interpreter WIBase

```

Go(x, E) = Main(x, Sim(ε, E));

Main(ε, ε, ε) = T;
Main(((Vsx) ↦ ε) ++ xrul, xLHS, (Vsx) xRHS)
  = Main(xrul, Sim(((Vsx) ↦ ε), Subst((Vsx) ↦ ε, ε, xLHS), Subst(Vsx ↦ ε, ε, xRHS)));
Main(((Vsx) ↦ ε) ++ xrul, (Vsx) xLHS, xRHS)
  = Main(xrul, Sim(((Vsx) ↦ ε), Subst((Vsx) ↦ ε, ε, xLHS), Subst((Vsx) ↦ ε, ε, xRHS)));
Main(((Vsx) ↦ ssym (Vsx)) ++ xrul, (Vsx) xLHS, ssym xRHS)
  = Main(xrul, Sim(((Vsx) ↦ ssym (Vsx)),
    Subst((Vsx) ↦ ssym (Vsx), (Vsx), xLHS),
    Subst((Vsx) ↦ ssym (Vsx), ε, xRHS)));
Main(((Vsx) ↦ ssym (Vsx)) ++ xrul, ssym xLHS, (Vsx) xRHS)
  = Main(xrul, Sim(((Vsx) ↦ ssym (Vsx)),
    Subst((Vsx) ↦ ssym (Vsx), ε, xLHS),
    Subst((Vsx) ↦ ssym (Vsx), (Vsx), xRHS)));
Main(((Vsx) ↦ (Vsy) (Vsx)) ++ xrul, (Vsy) xLHS, (Vsx) xRHS)
  = Main(xrul, Sim(((Vsx) ↦ (Vsy) (Vsx)),
    Subst((Vsx) ↦ (Vsy) (Vsx), ε, xLHS),
    Subst((Vsx) ↦ (Vsy) (Vsx), (Vsx), xRHS)));
Main(((Vsx) ↦ (Vsy) (Vsx)) ++ xrul, (Vsx) xLHS, (Vsy) xRHS)
  = Main(xrul, Sim(((Vsx) ↦ (Vsy) (Vsx)),
    Subst((Vsx) ↦ (Vsy) (Vsx), (Vsx), xLHS),
    Subst((Vsx) ↦ (Vsy) (Vsx), ε, xRHS)));
Main(xrul, xLHS, xRHS) = F;

Subst((Vsx) ↦ xeqlist, xres, ε) = xres;
Subst((Vsx) ↦ xeqlist, xres, (Vsx) xexpr) = Subst((Vsx) ↦ xeqlist, xres xeqlist, xexpr);
Subst((Vsx) ↦ xeqlist, xres, ssym xexpr) = Subst((Vsx) ↦ xeqlist, xres ssym, xexpr);
Subst((Vsx) ↦ xeqlist, xres, (Vsy) xexpr) = Subst((Vsx) ↦ xeqlist, xres (Vsy), xexpr);

```

```

Sim(xsubst, (Vsx) xLHS, (Vsx) xLHS) = Sim(xsubst, xLHS, xLHS);
Sim(xsubst, ssym xLHS, ssym xLHS) = Sim(xsubst, xLHS, xLHS);
Sim(xsubst, ssym1 xLHS, ssym2 xLHS) = (ssym1, ssym2);
Sim(xsubst, xLHS (Vsx), xLHS (Vsx)) = Sim(xsubst, xLHS, xLHS);
Sim(xsubst, xLHS ssym, xLHS ssym) = Sim(xsubst, xLHS, xLHS);
Sim(xsubst, xLHS ssym1, xLHS ssym2) = (ssym1, ssym2);
Sim(xsubst, xLHS, xLHS) = (xLHS, xRHS);

```

8.2.2 Interpreter WISplit.

This interpreter has the following refinements as compared to WIBase.

- The functions `Main` and `Sim` take a list of equations rather than a single equation, as an input value of their last arguments.
- The function `Split` and the auxiliary multiset-handling function are added. In order to guarantee that all the equations resulted by a split are reduced, we introduce the `Reduce` function reducing a given single equation. The new function `Sort` transforms a list of equations to a single unsatisfiable equation if at least one contradiction is found in the list and otherwise it counts how many equations are included in the list.
- The functions `Main`, `Sim`, and `Sort` use an additional argument `xnum` — a natural number which is 0 if the equations in the list are unchecked or contradictory and is the length of the list otherwise. This argument is used as the annotation that prevents unwanted fold operations in a process tree.

```

Go(x, x_val) = Main(x, Sim(0, ε, ε, x_val));

Main(ε, (x_num)++((ε, ε))) = T;
Main(x_rul, (x_num)++((ε, ε)++xeqs)) = Main(x_rul, (x_num - 1)++xeqs);
Main(((V s_x) ↦ ε)++x_rul, (x_num)++((x_LHS, (V s_x) x_RHS)++xeqs))
  = Main(x_rul, Sim(x_num, ((V s_x) ↦ ε), ε, (Subst((V s_x) ↦ ε, ε, x_LHS), Subst((V s_x) ↦ ε, ε, x_RHS)))
    ++SubstAll((V s_x) ↦ ε, xeqs));
Main(((V s_x) ↦ ε)++x_rul, (x_num)++(((V s_x) x_LHS, x_RHS)++xeqs))
  = Main(x_rul, Sim(x_num, ((V s_x) ↦ ε), ε, (Subst((V s_x) ↦ ε, ε, x_LHS), Subst((V s_x) ↦ ε, ε, x_RHS)))
    ++SubstAll((V s_x) ↦ ε, xeqs));
Main(((V s_x) ↦ s_sym(V s_x))++x_rul, (x_num)++(((V s_x) x_LHS, s_sym x_RHS)++xeqs))
  = Main(x_rul, Sim(x_num, ((V s_x) ↦ s_sym(V s_x)), ε,
    (Subst((V s_x) ↦ s_sym(V s_x), (V s_x), x_LHS), Subst((V s_x) ↦ s_sym(V s_x), ε, x_RHS))
    ++SubstAll((V s_x) ↦ s_sym(V s_x), xeqs)));
Main(((V s_x) ↦ s_sym(V s_x))++x_rul, (x_num)++((s_sym x_LHS, (V s_x) x_RHS)++xeqs))
  = Main(x_rul, Sim(x_num, ((V s_x) ↦ s_sym(V s_x)), ε,
    (Subst((V s_x) ↦ s_sym(V s_x), (V s_x), x_LHS), Subst((V s_x) ↦ s_sym(V s_x), (V s_x), x_RHS))
    ++SubstAll((V s_x) ↦ s_sym(V s_x), xeqs)));
Main(((V s_x) ↦ (V s_y)(V s_x))++x_rul, (x_num)++(((V s_y) x_LHS, (V s_x) x_RHS)++xeqs))
  = Main(x_rul, Sim(x_num, ((V s_x) ↦ (V s_y)(V s_x)), ε,
    (Subst((V s_x) ↦ (V s_y)(V s_x), (V s_x), ε, x_LHS),
    Subst((V s_x) ↦ (V s_y)(V s_x), (V s_x), x_RHS))
    ++SubstAll((V s_x) ↦ (V s_y)(V s_x), xeqs)));
Main(((V s_x) ↦ (V s_y)(V s_x))++x_rul, (x_num)++(((V s_x) x_LHS, (V s_y) x_RHS)++xeqs))
  = Main(x_rul, Sim(x_num, ((V s_x) ↦ (V s_y)(V s_x)), ε,
    (Subst((V s_x) ↦ (V s_y)(V s_x), (V s_x), x_LHS),
    Subst((V s_x) ↦ (V s_y)(V s_x), ε, x_RHS))
    ++SubstAll((V s_x) ↦ (V s_y)(V s_x), xeqs)));
Main(x_rul, (x_num)++xeqs) = F;

```

```

Subst((V s_x) ↦ xeqlist, x_res, ε) = x_res;
Subst((V s_x) ↦ xeqlist, x_res, (V s_x) x_expr) = Subst((V s_x) ↦ xeqlist, x_res xeqlist, x_expr);
Subst((V s_x) ↦ xeqlist, x_res, s_sym x_expr) = Subst((V s_x) ↦ xeqlist, x_res s_sym, x_expr);
Subst((V s_x) ↦ xeqlist, x_res, (V s_y) x_expr) = Subst((V s_x) ↦ xeqlist, x_res (V s_y), x_expr);

```

```

SubstAll((V s_x) ↦ xeqlist, (x_LHS, x_RHS)++xeqs)
  = (Subst((V s_x) ↦ xeqlist, ε, x_LHS), Subst((V s_x) ↦ xeqlist, ε, x_RHS))
  ++SubstAll((V s_x) ↦ xeqlist, xeqs);
SubstAll((V s_x) ↦ xeqlist, ε) = ε;

```

```

Sim(x_num, x_subst, x_res, ((V s_x) x_LHS, (V s_x) x_RHS)++xeqs)
  = Sim(x_num, x_subst, x_res, (x_LHS, x_RHS)++xeqs);
Sim(x_num, x_subst, x_res, (s_sym x_LHS, s_sym x_RHS)++xeqs)
  = Sim(x_num, x_subst, x_res, (x_LHS, x_RHS)++xeqs);
Sim(x_num, x_subst, x_res, (x_LHS (V s), x_RHS (V s))++xeqs)
  = Sim(x_num, x_subst, x_res, (x_LHS, x_RHS)++xeqs);
Sim(x_num, x_subst, x_res, (x_LHS s_sym, x_RHS s_sym)++xeqs)
  = Sim(x_num, x_subst, x_res, (x_LHS, x_RHS)++xeqs);
Sim(x_num, x_subst, x_res, (s_sym_1 x_LHS, s_sym_2 x_RHS)++xeqs) = (0)++(s_sym_1, s_sym_2);
Sim(x_num, x_subst, x_res, (x_LHS s_sym_1, x_RHS s_sym_2)++xeqs) = (0)++(s_sym_1, s_sym_2);
Sim(x_num, x_subst, x_res, (ε, ε)++xeqs) = Sim(x_num, x_subst, x_res (ε, ε)++xeqs);
Sim(x_num, x_subst, x_res, (x_LHS, x_RHS)++xeqs)
  = Sim(x_num, x_subst, x_res ++Split(ε, N, ((CONST 0)), ((CONST 0)), ε, ε, x_LHS, x_RHS, xeqs);
Sim(x_num, x_subst, x_res) = Sort(x_num, 0, x_subst, ε, x_res);

```

```

Sort(x_num, x_freshnum, x_subst, x_res, (s_sym_1, s_sym_2)++xeqs) = (0)++(s_sym_1, s_sym_2);
Sort(x_num, x_freshnum, x_subst, x_res, (x_eq)++xeqs)
  = Sort(x_num, x_freshnum + 1, x_subst, x_res ++(x_eq), xeqs);
Sort(x_num, x_freshnum, x_subst, x_res, ε) = (x_freshnum)++x_res;

```

```

Reduce((V sx)++xLHS, (V sx)++xRHS) = Reduce(xLHS, xRHS);
Reduce(s++xLHS, s++xRHS) = Reduce(xLHS, xRHS);
Reduce(xLHS++(V sx), xRHS++(V sx)) = Reduce(xLHS, xRHS);
Reduce(xLHS++s, xRHS++s) = Reduce(xLHS, xRHS);
Reduce(s1++xLHS, s2++xRHS) = (s1, s2);
Reduce(xLHS++s1, xRHS++s2) = (s1, s2);
Reduce(xLHS, xRHS) = (xLHS, xRHS);

Split(xres, N, (xms1), (xms2), xprefLHS, xprefRHS, t1 xLHS, t2 xRHS)
  = Split(xres,
    CountMS(Include(t1, ε, xms1), Include(t2, ε, xms2)), xprefLHS t1, xprefRHS t2, xLHS, xRHS);
Split(xres, F, (xms1), (xms2), xprefLHS, xprefRHS, t1 xLHS, t2 xRHS)
  = Split(xres,
    CountMS(Include(t1, ε, xms1), Include(t2, ε, xms2)), xprefLHS t1, xprefRHS t2, xLHS, xRHS);
Split(xres, T, (xms1), (xms2), xprefLHS, xprefRHS, xLHS, xRHS)
  = Split(xres++(xprefLHS, xprefRHS), N, ((CONST 0)), ((CONST 0)), ε, ε, xLHS, xRHS);
Split(xres, ssym, (xms1), (xms2), ε, ε, ε, ε) = xres;
Split(xres, ssym, (xms1), (xms2), xprefLHS, xprefRHS, xLHS, xRHS)
  = Reduce(xprefLHS xLHS, xprefRHS xRHS)++xres;

Include(ssym, xprev, (xms, (CONST xnum))) = (xprev, (CONST xnum + 1));
Include((V sx), xprev, (((V sx) xnum), xms)) = (xprev, ((V sx) xnum + 1), xms);
Include((V sx), xprev, (((V sy) xnum) xms)) = Include((V sx), xprev, ((V sy) xnum), xms);
Include((V sx), xprev, ((CONST xnum))) = (((V sx) 1) xprev (CONST xnum));

CountMS(t xms1, xms2)
  = AreEqual(xms1, ElMinus(t, ε, xms2))(t xms1)(xms2);

AreEqual(xms1, xms2 F) = F;
AreEqual(ε, ε) = T;
AreEqual(xms1, ε) = F;
AreEqual(ε, xms2) = F;
AreEqual(((V ssym) xnum) xms1, xms2) = AreEqual(xms1, ElMinus(((V ssym) xnum), ε, xms2));
AreEqual((CONST xnum) xms1, xms2) = AreEqual(xms1, ElMinus((CONST xnum), ε, xms2));

ElMinus((CONST xnum), ε, (xms (CONST xnum))) = (xms);
ElMinus(((V sx) xnum), xprev, (((V sx) xnum) xms)) = (xprev xms);
ElMinus(((V sx) xnum1), xprev, (((V sx) xnum2) xms)) = F;
ElMinus(((V sx) xnum1), xprev, (((V sy) xnum2) xms)) = ElMinus(((V sx) xnum1), xprev, ((V sy) xnum2), xms);
ElMinus(((V sx) xnum1), xprev, ((CONST xnum2))) = F;

```

8.2.3 Interpreter WICount.

This interpreter uses the function definitions given for the interpreter WISplit plus some additional functions, provided that the function ElMinus is modified and the last rule of the function Split is replaced with the following rewriting rule.

```

/* This rule replaces the last rule of Split definition given in WISplit. */
Split(xres, ssym, (xms1), (xms2), xprefLHS, xprefRHS, xLHS, xRHS)
  = SplitR(xres, N, ((CONST 0)), ((CONST 0)), ε, ε, Reduce(xprefLHS xLHS, xprefRHS xRHS));

```

The additional functions definitions are given below. The function ElMinus replaces the version given in the WISplit source code.

```

ElMinus((CONST xnum1), ε, xms (CONST xnum2)) = xms CountMinus(xnum1, xnum2);
ElMinus(((Vssym) xnum1), xprev, ((Vssym) xnum2) xms) = xprev xms CountMinus(xnum1, xnum2);
ElMinus(((Vssym) xnum1), xprev, (CONST xnum2)) = xprev G;
ElMinus(((Vssym1) xnum1), xprev, ((Vssym2) xnum2) xms) = ElMinus(((Vssym1) xnum1), xprev, ((Vssym2) xnum2), xms);

CountMinus(xnum, xnum) = ε;
CountMinus(xnum1 + 1, xnum2 + 1) = CountMinus(xnum1, xnum2);
CountMinus(ε, xnum) = L;
CountMinus(xnum, ε) = G;

SplitR(xres, ssym, xms1, xms2, ε, ε, ε, ε) = xres;
SplitR(xres, N, xms1, xms2, xsuffLHS, xsuffRHS, xLHS t1, xRHS t2)
  = SplitR(xres,
    CountMS(Include(t1, ε, xms1), Include(t2, ε, xms2), t1 xsuffLHS, t2 xsuffRHS, xLHS, xRHS));
SplitR(xres, F, xms1, xms2, xsuffLHS, xsuffRHS, xLHS t1, xRHS t2)
  = SplitR(xres,
    CountMS(Include(t1, ε, xms1), Include(t2, ε, xms2), t1 xsuffLHS, t2 xsuffRHS, xLHS, xRHS));
SplitR(xres, T, xms1, xms2, xsuffLHS, xsuffRHS, xLHS, xRHS)
  = SplitR(xres, (xsuffLHS)(xsuffRHS), N, (CONST 0), (CONST 0), ε, ε, xLHS, xRHS);
SplitR(xres, ssym, xms1, xms2, xsuffLHS, xsuffRHS, xLHS, xRHS)
  = CheckLengths(YieldCheck(AddExprMS(xLHS, xms1), AddExprMS(xRHS, xms2)),
    xLHS xsuffLHS, xRHS xsuffRHS) ++ xres;

CheckLengths(F, xLHS, xRHS) = (xLHS, xRHS);
CheckLengths(T, xLHS, xRHS) = (A, B);

SubtractMS(G, xms1, ε) = T;
SubtractMS(L, ε, xms2) = T;
SubtractMS(G, ((Vssym) xnum) xms1, xms2) = CheckInfo(G, ElMinus(((Vssym) xnum), ε, xms2), xms1);
SubtractMS(G, (CONST xnum) xms1, xms2) = CheckInfo(G, ElMinus((CONST xnum), ε, xms2), xms1);
SubtractMS(L, ((Vssym) xnum) xms1, xms2) = CheckInfo(L, ElMinus(((Vssym) xnum), ε, xms2), xms1);
SubtractMS(L, (CONST xnum) xms1, xms2) = CheckInfo(L, ElMinus((CONST xnum), ε, xms2), xms1);
SubtractMS(ssym, xms1, xms2) = F;

CheckInfo(ssym, xms2 ssym, xms1) = SubtractMS(ssym, xms1, xms2);
CheckInfo(G, xms2 L, xms1) = F;
CheckInfo(L, xms2 G, xms1) = F;
CheckInfo(ssym, xms1, xms2) = SubtractMS(ssym, xms1, xms2);

YieldCheckAux(ε, xms1, xms2) = F;
YieldCheckAux(ssym, xms1, xms2) = SubtractMS(ssym, xms1, xms2);

YieldCheck(xms1 (CONST xnum1), xms2 (CONST xnum2))
  = YieldCheckAux(ElMinus((CONST xnum1), ε, (CONST xnum2)), xms1, xms2);

AddExprMS((Vssym) x, xms) = AddExprMS(x, Include((Vssym), ε, xms));
AddExprMS(s x, xms) = AddExprMS(x, Include(s, ε, xms));
AddExprMS(ε, xms) = xms;

```