

Duplicate Check

Nao Hirokawa

JAIST

February 20, 2024

About This Talk

- ① SMT solving for $\mathcal{R} \approx \mathcal{S}$ (based on Thiemann's approach)

About This Talk

- ① SMT solving for $\mathcal{R} \approx \mathcal{S}$ (based on Thiemann's approach)
- ② fingerprints (variant of Felgenhauer's approach)

About This Talk

- ① SMT solving for $\mathcal{R} \approx \mathcal{S}$ (based on Thiemann's approach)
- ② fingerprints (variant of Felgenhauer's approach)
- ③ experiments

About This Talk

- ① SMT solving for $\mathcal{R} \approx \mathcal{S}$ (based on Thiemann's approach)
- ② fingerprints (variant of Felgenhauer's approach)
- ③ experiments
- ④ future work

Example (partition)

consider collection of TRSs $\mathfrak{R} = \{\mathcal{R}_1, \dots, \mathcal{R}_6\}$:

$$\mathcal{R}_1 = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} +(0, x) \rightarrow x \\ +(s(x), y) \rightarrow s(+x, y)) \\ p(s(x)) \rightarrow x \end{array} \right\}$$

$$\mathcal{R}_3 = \{a \rightarrow b\}$$

$$\mathcal{R}_2 = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} plus(zero, n) \rightarrow n \\ plus(succ(m), n) \rightarrow succ(plus(m, n)) \\ pred(succ(n)) \rightarrow n \end{array} \right\}$$

$$\mathcal{R}_5 = \{c \rightarrow d\}$$

$$\mathcal{R}_6 = \{f(f(x)) \rightarrow x\}$$

Example (partition)

consider collection of TRSs $\mathfrak{R} = \{\mathcal{R}_1, \dots, \mathcal{R}_6\}$:

$$\mathcal{R}_1 = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} +(0, x) \rightarrow x \\ +(s(x), y) \rightarrow s(+x, y)) \\ p(s(x)) \rightarrow x \end{array} \right\} \quad \mathcal{R}_3 = \{a \rightarrow b\}$$

$$\mathcal{R}_4 = \{d \rightarrow c\}$$

$$\mathcal{R}_2 = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} plus(zero, n) \rightarrow n \\ plus(succ(m), n) \rightarrow succ(plus(m, n)) \\ pred(succ(n)) \rightarrow n \end{array} \right\} \quad \mathcal{R}_5 = \{c \rightarrow d\}$$

$$\mathcal{R}_6 = \{f(f(x)) \rightarrow x\}$$

duplicate checker is expected to compute partition by \approx :

$$\mathfrak{R}/\approx = \{\{\mathcal{R}_1, \mathcal{R}_2\}, \{\mathcal{R}_3, \mathcal{R}_4, \mathcal{R}_5\}, \{\mathcal{R}_6\}\}$$

Definition (definition of duplicates)

Definition (definition of duplicates)

- $\mathcal{R} \doteq \mathcal{S}$ if \mathcal{R} and \mathcal{S} are same modulo variable renaming

Definition (definition of duplicates)

- $\mathcal{R} \doteq \mathcal{S}$ if \mathcal{R} and \mathcal{S} are same modulo variable renaming
- $\mathcal{R} \approx \mathcal{S}$ if $\mathcal{R}^\theta \doteq \mathcal{S}$ for some renaming θ for function symbols

Definition (definition of duplicates)

- $\mathcal{R} \doteq \mathcal{S}$ if \mathcal{R} and \mathcal{S} are same modulo variable renaming
- $\mathcal{R} \approx \mathcal{S}$ if $\mathcal{R}^\theta \doteq \mathcal{S}$ for some renaming θ for function symbols

Example

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{plus(zero, } n) \rightarrow n \\ \text{plus(succ}(m), n) \rightarrow \text{succ(plus}(m, n)) \\ \text{pred(succ}(n)) \rightarrow n \end{array} \right\} \approx \left\{ \begin{array}{l} +(0, x) \rightarrow x \\ +(s(x), y) \rightarrow s(+x, y)) \\ p(s(x)) \rightarrow x \end{array} \right\}$$

because of renaming θ :

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{plus}^\theta = + \\ \text{succ}^\theta = s \\ \text{pred}^\theta = p \end{array} \right\}$$

Definition (definition of duplicates)

- $\mathcal{R} \doteq \mathcal{S}$ if \mathcal{R} and \mathcal{S} are same modulo variable renaming
- $\mathcal{R} \approx \mathcal{S}$ if $\mathcal{R}^\theta \doteq \mathcal{S}$ for some renaming θ for function symbols

Example

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{plus(zero, } n) \rightarrow n \\ \text{plus(succ}(m), n) \rightarrow \text{succ(plus}(m, n)) \\ \text{pred(succ}(n)) \rightarrow n \end{array} \right\} \approx \left\{ \begin{array}{l} +(0, x) \rightarrow x \\ +(s(x), y) \rightarrow s(+x, y)) \\ p(s(x)) \rightarrow x \end{array} \right\}$$

because of renaming θ :

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{plus}^\theta = + \\ \text{succ}^\theta = s \\ \text{pred}^\theta = p \end{array} \right\}$$

Q. how to find it?

Definition (definition of duplicates)

- $\mathcal{R} \doteq \mathcal{S}$ if \mathcal{R} and \mathcal{S} are same modulo variable renaming
- $\mathcal{R} \approx \mathcal{S}$ if $\mathcal{R}^\theta \doteq \mathcal{S}$ for some renaming θ for function symbols

Example

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{plus(zero}, n) \rightarrow n \\ \text{plus(succ}(m), n) \rightarrow \text{succ(plus}(m, n)) \\ \text{pred(succ}(n)) \rightarrow n \end{array} \right\} \approx \left\{ \begin{array}{l} +(0, x) \rightarrow x \\ +(s(x), y) \rightarrow s(+x, y)) \\ p(s(x)) \rightarrow x \end{array} \right\}$$

because of renaming θ :

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{plus}^\theta = + \\ \text{succ}^\theta = s \\ \text{pred}^\theta = p \end{array} \right\}$$

Q. how to find it? A. reducing problem to equality constraint

Encoding Equivalence of Rules

Example

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{plus}^\theta(\text{succ}^\theta(x_1), x_2) \rightarrow \text{succ}^\theta(\text{plus}^\theta(x_1, x_2)) \\ = & +(\quad \text{s}(x_1), x_2) \rightarrow \quad \text{s}(\quad +(x_1, x_2)) \end{aligned}$$

Encoding Equivalence of Rules

Example

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{plus}^\theta(\text{succ}^\theta(x_1), x_2) \rightarrow \text{succ}^\theta(\text{plus}^\theta(x_1, x_2)) \\ = & +(\quad \text{s}(x_1), x_2) \rightarrow \quad \text{s}(\quad +(x_1, x_2)) \iff \wedge \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{plus}^\theta = + \\ \text{succ}^\theta = \text{s} \\ \text{succ}^\theta = \text{s} \\ \text{plus}^\theta = + \end{array} \right\} \end{aligned}$$

Encoding Equivalence of Rules

Example

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{plus}^\theta(\text{succ}^\theta(x_1), x_2) \rightarrow \text{succ}^\theta(\text{plus}^\theta(x_1, x_2)) \\ = & +(\quad \text{s}(x_1), x_2) \rightarrow \quad \text{s}(\quad +(x_1, x_2)) \iff \wedge \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{plus}^\theta = + \\ \text{succ}^\theta = \text{s} \\ \text{succ}^\theta = \text{s} \\ \text{plus}^\theta = + \end{array} \right\} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{plus}^\theta(\text{zero}^\theta, x_1) \rightarrow x_1 \\ = & +(\text{s}(x_1), x_2) \rightarrow \text{s}(+(x_1, x_2)) \end{aligned}$$

Encoding Equivalence of Rules

Example

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{plus}^\theta(\text{succ}^\theta(x_1), x_2) \rightarrow \text{succ}^\theta(\text{plus}^\theta(x_1, x_2)) \\ = & +(\quad \text{s}(x_1), x_2) \rightarrow \quad \text{s}(\quad +(x_1, x_2)) \iff \wedge \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{plus}^\theta = + \\ \text{succ}^\theta = \text{s} \\ \text{succ}^\theta = \text{s} \\ \text{plus}^\theta = + \end{array} \right\} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{plus}^\theta(\text{zero}^\theta, x_1) \rightarrow x_1 \\ = & +(\text{s}(x_1), x_2) \rightarrow \text{s}(+(x_1, x_2)) \iff \wedge \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{plus}^\theta = + \\ \perp \end{array} \right\} \end{aligned}$$

Encoding Equivalence of Rules

Example

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{plus}^\theta(\text{succ}^\theta(x_1), x_2) \rightarrow \text{succ}^\theta(\text{plus}^\theta(x_1, x_2)) \\ = & +(\quad \text{s}(x_1), x_2) \rightarrow \quad \text{s}(\quad +(x_1, x_2)) \iff \wedge \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{plus}^\theta = + \\ \text{succ}^\theta = \text{s} \\ \text{succ}^\theta = \text{s} \\ \text{plus}^\theta = + \end{array} \right\} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{plus}^\theta(\text{zero}^\theta, x_1) \rightarrow x_1 \\ = & +(\text{s}(x_1), x_2) \rightarrow \text{s}(+(x_1, x_2)) \iff \wedge \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{plus}^\theta = + \\ \perp \end{array} \right\} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{f}^\theta(x_1) \rightarrow x_2 \quad \text{if } \text{g}^\theta(x_1) \rightarrow x_2 \\ = & \text{g}(x_1) \rightarrow x_2 \quad \text{if } \text{f}(x_1) \rightarrow x_2 \end{aligned}$$

Encoding Equivalence of Rules

Example

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{plus}^\theta(\text{succ}^\theta(x_1), x_2) \rightarrow \text{succ}^\theta(\text{plus}^\theta(x_1, x_2)) \\ = & +(\quad \text{s}(x_1), x_2) \rightarrow \quad \text{s}(\quad +(x_1, x_2)) \iff \wedge \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{plus}^\theta = + \\ \text{succ}^\theta = \text{s} \\ \text{succ}^\theta = \text{s} \\ \text{plus}^\theta = + \end{array} \right\} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{plus}^\theta(\text{zero}^\theta, x_1) \rightarrow x_1 \\ = & +(\text{s}(x_1), x_2) \rightarrow \text{s}(+(x_1, x_2)) \iff \wedge \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{plus}^\theta = + \\ \perp \end{array} \right\} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{f}^\theta(x_1) \rightarrow x_2 \quad \text{if} \quad \text{g}^\theta(x_1) \rightarrow x_2 \\ = & \text{g}(x_1) \rightarrow x_2 \quad \text{if} \quad \text{f}(x_1) \rightarrow x_2 \iff \wedge \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{f}^\theta = \text{g} \\ \text{g}^\theta = \text{f} \end{array} \right\} \end{aligned}$$

Fact

$$\mathcal{R} \subseteq \mathcal{S} \iff \bigwedge_{\alpha \in \mathcal{R}} \bigvee_{\beta \in \mathcal{S}} \alpha = \beta$$

Fact

$$\mathcal{R} \subseteq \mathcal{S} \iff \bigwedge_{\alpha \in \mathcal{R}} \bigvee_{\beta \in \mathcal{S}} \alpha = \beta \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{R}^\theta = \mathcal{S} \iff \mathcal{R}^\theta \subseteq \mathcal{S} \wedge \mathcal{R}^\theta \supseteq \mathcal{S}$$

Fact

$$\mathcal{R} \subseteq \mathcal{S} \iff \bigwedge_{\alpha \in \mathcal{R}} \bigvee_{\beta \in \mathcal{S}} \alpha = \beta \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{R}^\theta = \mathcal{S} \iff \mathcal{R}^\theta \subseteq \mathcal{S} \wedge \mathcal{R}^\theta \supseteq \mathcal{S}$$

Example

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{plus(zero, } x_1) \rightarrow x_1 \\ \text{plus(succ(} x_1), x_2) \rightarrow \text{succ(plus(} x_1, x_2)) \\ \text{pred(succ(} x_1)) \rightarrow x_1 \end{array} \right\}^\theta \subseteq \left\{ \begin{array}{l} +(0, x_1) \rightarrow x_1 \\ +(s(x_1), x_2) \rightarrow s(+x_1, x_2)) \\ p(s(x_1)) \rightarrow x_1 \end{array} \right\}$$

Fact

$$\mathcal{R} \subseteq \mathcal{S} \iff \bigwedge_{\alpha \in \mathcal{R}} \bigvee_{\beta \in \mathcal{S}} \alpha = \beta \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{R}^\theta = \mathcal{S} \iff \mathcal{R}^\theta \subseteq \mathcal{S} \wedge \mathcal{R}^\theta \supseteq \mathcal{S}$$

Example

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{plus(zero}, x_1) \rightarrow x_1 \\ \text{plus(succ}(x_1), x_2) \rightarrow \text{succ}(\text{plus}(x_1, x_2)) \\ \text{pred}(\text{succ}(x_1)) \rightarrow x_1 \end{array} \right\}^\theta \subseteq \left\{ \begin{array}{l} +(0, x_1) \rightarrow x_1 \\ +(s(x_1), x_2) \rightarrow s(+x_1, x_2)) \\ p(s(x_1)) \rightarrow x_1 \end{array} \right\}$$

$$\iff \bigwedge \left\{ \begin{array}{l} (\text{plus}^\theta = + \wedge \text{zero}^\theta = 0) \vee \perp \vee \perp \\ \perp \vee (\text{plus}^\theta = + \wedge \text{succ}^\theta = s) \vee \perp \\ \perp \vee \perp \vee (\text{pred}^\theta = p \wedge \text{succ}^\theta = s) \end{array} \right\}$$

Encoding Equivalence of Signatures

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} (\text{plus}, 2) \\ (\text{succ}, 1) \\ (\text{pred}, 1) \end{array} \right\}^\theta \subseteq \left\{ \begin{array}{l} (+, 2) \\ (\text{s}, 1) \\ (\text{p}, 1) \end{array} \right\}$$

Encoding Equivalence of Signatures

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} (\text{plus}, 2) \\ (\text{succ}, 1) \\ (\text{pred}, 1) \end{array} \right\}^\theta \subseteq \left\{ \begin{array}{l} (+, 2) \\ (\text{s}, 1) \\ (\text{p}, 1) \end{array} \right\}$$

$$\iff \wedge \left\{ \begin{array}{llll} \text{plus}^\theta = + & \vee & \perp & \vee & \perp \\ \perp & \vee & \text{succ}^\theta = \text{s} & \vee & \text{succ}^\theta = \text{p} \\ \perp & \vee & \text{pred}^\theta = \text{s} & \vee & \text{pred}^\theta = \text{p} \end{array} \right\}$$

Encoding Equivalence of Signatures

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} (\text{plus}, 2) \\ (\text{succ}, 1) \\ (\text{pred}, 1) \end{array} \right\}^\theta \subseteq \left\{ \begin{array}{l} (+, 2) \\ (\text{s}, 1) \\ (\text{p}, 1) \end{array} \right\}$$

$$\iff \bigwedge \left\{ \begin{array}{llll} \text{plus}^\theta = + & \vee & \perp & \vee & \perp \\ \perp & \vee & \text{succ}^\theta = \text{s} & \vee & \text{succ}^\theta = \text{p} \\ \perp & \vee & \text{pred}^\theta = \text{s} & \vee & \text{pred}^\theta = \text{p} \end{array} \right\}$$

Note

- equivalence of $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{R})$ and $(\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{S})$ is decided by solving $\mathcal{F}^\theta = \mathcal{G} \wedge \mathcal{R}^\theta = \mathcal{S}$
- in same way, CS(C)TRSs and MSTRSs can be handled

Duplicate Check I

given $(\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{R}_1), \dots, (\mathcal{F}_n, \mathcal{R}_n)$

Duplicate Check I

given $(\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{R}_1), \dots, (\mathcal{F}_n, \mathcal{R}_n)$

union-find maintains equivalence on $\{1, \dots, n\}$

Duplicate Check I

given $(\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{R}_1), \dots, (\mathcal{F}_n, \mathcal{R}_n)$

union-find maintains equivalence on $\{1, \dots, n\}$

for each (i, j) with $i < j$

Duplicate Check I

given $(\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{R}_1), \dots, (\mathcal{F}_n, \mathcal{R}_n)$

union-find maintains equivalence on $\{1, \dots, n\}$

for each (i, j) with $i < j$

if $\text{find}(i) \neq \text{find}(j)$

Duplicate Check I

given $(\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{R}_1), \dots, (\mathcal{F}_n, \mathcal{R}_n)$

union-find maintains equivalence on $\{1, \dots, n\}$

for each (i, j) with $i < j$

if $\text{find}(i) \neq \text{find}(j)$

if $\mathcal{F}_i^\theta = \mathcal{F}_j$ and $\mathcal{R}_i^\theta \doteq \mathcal{R}_j$ for some θ

takes 1ms

Duplicate Check I

given $(\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{R}_1), \dots, (\mathcal{F}_n, \mathcal{R}_n)$

union-find maintains equivalence on $\{1, \dots, n\}$

for each (i, j) with $i < j$

if $\text{find}(i) \neq \text{find}(j)$

if $\mathcal{F}_i^\theta = \mathcal{F}_j$ and $\mathcal{R}_i^\theta \doteq \mathcal{R}_j$ for some θ

$\text{union}(i, j)$

takes 1ms

Duplicate Check I

given $(\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{R}_1), \dots, (\mathcal{F}_n, \mathcal{R}_n)$

union-find maintains equivalence on $\{1, \dots, n\}$

for each (i, j) with $i < j$

if $\text{find}(i) \neq \text{find}(j)$

if $\mathcal{F}_i^\theta = \mathcal{F}_j$ and $\mathcal{R}_i^\theta \doteq \mathcal{R}_j$ for some θ

takes 1ms

$\text{union}(i, j)$

Estimation of Runtime

if $|\mathfrak{R}| = 1500$ then $\frac{1500 \times 1499}{2} \times 1 \text{ ms} \approx 20 \text{ min}$

Duplicate Check I

given $(\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{R}_1), \dots, (\mathcal{F}_n, \mathcal{R}_n)$

union-find maintains equivalence on $\{1, \dots, n\}$

for each (i, j) with $i < j$

if $\text{find}(i) \neq \text{find}(j)$

if $\mathcal{F}_i^\theta = \mathcal{F}_j$ and $\mathcal{R}_i^\theta \doteq \mathcal{R}_j$ for some θ

takes 1ms

$\text{union}(i, j)$

Estimation of Runtime

if $|\mathfrak{R}| = 1500$ then $\frac{1500 \times 1499}{2} \times 1 \text{ ms} \approx 20 \text{ min}$

Idea

use fingerprint function φ : $\varphi(\mathcal{R}) \neq \varphi(\mathcal{S}) \implies \mathcal{R} \not\approx \mathcal{S}$

$\varphi(\mathcal{R})$ in Current Implementation

$$\mathcal{R} = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{a(b(c(x, y)))} \rightarrow \text{b(a(c(y, y)))} \\ \text{a(x)} \rightarrow \text{b(x)} \\ \text{b(x)} \rightarrow \text{a(x)} \end{array} \right\}$$

$\varphi(\mathcal{R})$ in Current Implementation

$$\mathcal{R} = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{a(b(c}(x,y))) \rightarrow \text{b(a(c(y,y)))} \\ \text{a}(x) \rightarrow \text{b}(x) \\ \text{b}(x) \rightarrow \text{a}(x) \end{array} \right\}$$

$$\varphi(\mathcal{R}) = \text{concat}(\text{sort}(\left[\begin{array}{l} [0, 1, 2, 0, 1, 1, 0, 3, 1, 1], \\ [0, 0, 1, 0], \\ [0, 0, 1, 0] \end{array} \right]))$$

$\varphi(\mathcal{R})$ in Current Implementation

$$\mathcal{R} = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{a(b(c}(x,y))) \rightarrow \text{b(a(c}(y,y))) \\ \text{a}(x) \rightarrow \text{b}(x) \\ \text{b}(x) \rightarrow \text{a}(x) \end{array} \right\}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi(\mathcal{R}) &= \text{concat}(\text{sort}(\left[\begin{array}{c} [0, 1, 2, 0, 1, 1, 0, 3, 1, 1], \\ [0, 0, 1, 0], \\ [0, 0, 1, 0] \end{array} \right])) \\ &= [0, 0, 1, 0, 0, 0, 1, 0, 0, 1, 2, 0, 1, 1, 0, 3, 1, 1]\end{aligned}$$

$\varphi(\mathcal{R})$ in Current Implementation

$$\mathcal{R} = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{a(b(c}(x,y))) \rightarrow \text{b(a(c}(y,y))) \\ \text{a}(x) \rightarrow \text{b}(x) \\ \text{b}(x) \rightarrow \text{a}(x) \end{array} \right\}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi(\mathcal{R}) &= \text{concat}(\text{sort}(\left[\begin{array}{c} [0, 1, 2, 0, 1, 1, 0, 3, 1, 1], \\ [0, 0, 1, 0], \\ [0, 0, 1, 0] \end{array} \right])) \\ &= [0, 0, 1, 0, 0, 0, 1, 0, 0, 1, 2, 0, 1, 1, 0, 3, 1, 1]\end{aligned}$$

Theorem

$$\varphi(\mathcal{R}) \neq \varphi(\mathcal{S}) \implies \mathcal{R} \not\approx \mathcal{S}$$

$\varphi(\mathcal{R})$ in Current Implementation

$$\mathcal{R} = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{a(b(c}(x,y))) \rightarrow \text{b(a(c(y,y)))} \\ \text{a}(x) \rightarrow \text{b}(x) \\ \text{b}(x) \rightarrow \text{a}(x) \end{array} \right\}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi(\mathcal{R}) &= \text{concat}(\text{sort}(\left[\begin{array}{c} [0, 1, 2, 0, 1, 1, 0, 3, 1, 1], \\ [0, 0, 1, 0], \\ [0, 0, 1, 0] \end{array} \right])) \\ &= [0, 0, 1, 0, 0, 0, 1, 0, 0, 1, 2, 0, 1, 1, 0, 3, 1, 1]\end{aligned}$$

Theorem

$\varphi(\mathcal{R}) \neq \varphi(\mathcal{S}) \implies \mathcal{R} \not\approx \mathcal{S}$ if \mathcal{R} and \mathcal{S} are variant-free (why?)

Duplicate Check II

given $(\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{R}_1), \dots, (\mathcal{F}_n, \mathcal{R}_n)$

union-find maintains equivalence on $\{1, \dots, n\}$

for each i

compute variant-free version \mathcal{R}'_i of \mathcal{R}_i

$$\vec{v}_i = \varphi(\mathcal{R}'_i)$$

for each (i, j) with $i < j$

if $\text{find}(i) \neq \text{find}(j)$

if $\vec{v}_i = \vec{v}_j$

takes < 0.01ms

if $\mathcal{F}_i^\theta = \mathcal{F}_j$ and $\mathcal{R}_i^\theta \doteq \mathcal{R}_j$ for some θ

takes 1ms

$\text{union}(i, j)$

Experimental Results

- Core i5-1340P @ 1.30GHz

Experimental Results

- Core i5-1340P @ 1.30GHz
- Z3 for finding renaming

Experimental Results

- Core i5-1340P @ 1.30GHz
- Z3 for finding renaming
- ARI contains 1218 (CS)(C)TRSs

Experimental Results

- Core i5-1340P @ 1.30GHz
- Z3 for finding renaming
- ARI contains 1218 (CS)(C)TRSs

DB	problems	duplicates	SMT calls	time (sec)
TRSs in COPS	577	13	16	0.12
ARI	1503	0	8	0.37

Experimental Results

- Core i5-1340P @ 1.30GHz
- Z3 for finding renaming
- ARI contains 1218 (CS)(C)TRSs

DB	problems	duplicates	SMT calls	time (sec)
TRSs in COPS	577	13	16	0.12
ARI	1503	0	8	0.37

Remark

some TRS in COPS is not variant-free; what about ARI?

Future Work I: MSTRSs

$$\{a : A, b : B\}^\theta \approx \{0 : C, 1 : D\}$$

Future Work I: MSTRSs

$$\begin{aligned} \{a : A, b : B\}^\theta &\approx \{0 : C, 1 : D\} \\ \iff \quad & \bigwedge \left\{ \begin{array}{l} (a^\theta = 0 \wedge A^\theta = C) \vee (a^\theta = 1 \wedge A^\theta = D) \\ (b^\theta = 0 \wedge B^\theta = C) \vee (b^\theta = 1 \wedge B^\theta = D) \end{array} \right\} \end{aligned}$$

Future Work II: COM

indexes can be swapped

```
(format TRS :number 2)
(fun f 1)
(rule (f x) x      :index 1)
(rule (f (f x)) x :index 2)
```

is equivalent to

```
(format TRS :number 2)
(fun g 1)
(rule (g x) x      :index 2)
(rule (g (g x)) x :index 1)
```

Future Work III: INF

arguments can be swapped

```
(format TRS :problem infeasibility)
(fun a 0)
(fun b 0)
(infeasibility? (= a a) (= a b))
```

is equivalent to

```
(format TRS :problem infeasibility)
(fun a 0)
(fun b 0)
(infeasibility? (= a b) (= a a))
```

Future Work III: INF

arguments can be swapped

```
(format TRS :problem infeasibility)
(fun a 0)
(fun b 0)
(infeasibility? (= a a) (= a b))
```

is equivalent to

```
(format TRS :problem infeasibility)
(fun a 0)
(fun b 0)
(infeasibility? (= a b) (= a a))
```

probably infeasibility problems are generated by tools

Future Work IV

- duplicate check for LCTRSs (no idea about notion of equivalence)

Future Work IV

- duplicate check for LCTRSs (no idea about notion of equivalence)
- how does termCOMP gourp manage problems in TPDB?

Future Work IV

- duplicate check for LCTRSs (no idea about notion of equivalence)
- how does termCOMP group manage problems in TPDB?
- is duplicate check in P? or NP-complete?

Future Work IV

- duplicate check for LCTRSs (no idea about notion of equivalence)
- how does termCOMP group manage problems in TPDB?
- is duplicate check in P? or NP-complete?
- how to verify correctness of duplicate checkers?
in COPS, some CTRS was wrongly tagged

Future Work IV

- duplicate check for LCTRSs (no idea about notion of equivalence)
- how does termCOMP group manage problems in TPDB?
- is duplicate check in P? or NP-complete?
- how to verify correctness of duplicate checkers?

in COPS, some CTRS was wrongly tagged

Thanks for Your Attention!