

# An Improved Non-Termination Criterion for Binary Constraint Logic Programs

Etienne Payet   Fred Mesnard

IREMIA,  
université de la Réunion, Océan Indien, France

Workshop on Logic-based methods in Programming  
Environments, 2005

# Where Is It?



# Outline

- 1 Motivation
  - Termination/Non-termination in (C)LP
  - Previous Work
- 2 Our Contribution
  - Preliminary Definitions
  - Main Result

# Outline

- 1 Motivation
  - Termination/Non-termination in (C)LP
  - Previous Work
- 2 Our Contribution
  - Preliminary Definitions
  - Main Result

# Termination

There exists various web-interfaced termination analyzers for Prolog, e.g.

- *cTI (ISO-Prolog)*
- TALP
- TermiLog
- TerminWeb

They check or infer termination conditions for *universal termination* of Prolog programs.

# Non-Termination

There is also at least one web-interfaced **non-termination** tool for *pure* Prolog programs:

- *nTI*

It generates classes of queries for which *existential non-termination* is insured: there exists an infinite branch in the search tree.

# Optimal Termination Condition

## The Idea:

When cTI and nTI produce complementary results, we hold **optimal** termination conditions for the given program wrt our language defining classes of queries.

# An Example (1)

$\text{ways}(A, Cs, N)$  iff

- $N$  is the number of ways to change
- a given amount of money  $A$
- using a fixed set  $Cs$  of coins values

NB: suggested by Mike Codish.



## An Example (2)

```
add(0,X,X).  
add(s(X),Y,s(Z)) :-  
    add(X,Y,Z).
```

```
ways(A,[],0).  
ways(0,Cs,s(0)).  
ways(s(Amount),[C|Coins],N) :-  
    add(C,NewAmount,s(Amount)),  
    ways(s(Amount),Coins,N1),  
    ways(NewAmount,[C|Coins],N2),  
    add(N1,N2,N).
```

```
ways(s(Amount),[C|Coins],N) :-  
    add(s(Amount),s(D),C),  
    ways(s(Amount),Coins,N).
```

## An Example (3)

cTI:

- `term_cond(add(A,B,C),C+A)`
- `term_cond(ways(A,B,C),0)`

What's wrong???

## An Example (3)

cTI:

- `term_cond(add(A,B,C),C+A)`
- `term_cond(ways(A,B,C),0)`

What's wrong???

## An Example (4)

Let's do an optimal termination check with *precision* = 2:

- ok for add/3:
  - termConds=[[1],[3]],
  - nonTermQueries=[[2]-add(s(A),B,s(C))],
  - undecidedModes=[]
- problem with ways/3:
  - termConds=[],
  - nonTermQueries=[
    - [1,2,3]-ways(s(A),[0],B),
    - ...
  - undecidedModes=[]

Oops ... ways(s( $t_1$ ),[0], $t_2$ ) loops for any term  $t_1$  and term  $t_2$ .

## An Example (4)

Let's do an optimal termination check with *precision* = 2:

- ok for add/3:  
termConds=[[1],[3]],  
nonTermQueries=[[2]-add(s(A),B,s(C))],  
undecidedModes=[]
- problem with ways/3:  
termConds=[],  
nonTermQueries=[  
    [1,2,3]-ways(s(A),[0],B),  
    ...  
undecidedModes=[]

Oops ... ways(s( $t_1$ ),[0], $t_2$ ) loops for any term  $t_1$  and term  $t_2$ .

## An Example (5)

```
ways(A, [], 0).  
ways(0, Cs, s(0)).  
ways(s(Amount), [C|Coins], N) :-  
    C=s(_),  
    add(C, NewAmount, s(Amount)),  
    ways(s(Amount), Coins, N1),  
    ways(NewAmount, [C|Coins], N2),  
    add(N1, N2, N).  
ways(s(Amount), [C|Coins], N) :-  
    add(s(Amount), s(D), C),  
    ways(s(Amount), Coins, N).
```

## An Example (6)

Let's redo an optimal termination check with *precision* = 3:

- ok for add/3
- ok for ways/3:  
termConds=[[1,2]],  
nonTermQueries=[  
    [1,3]-ways(s(A),[s(0)|B],C),  
    [2,3]-ways(s(A),[s(0)],B)  
undecidedModes=[]

## An Example (7)

Hence, cTI + nTI *may* provide some means to:

- **debug** programs
- get a **complete** knowledge about the termination behaviour of programs.



# Outline

- 1 Motivation
  - Termination/Non-termination in (C)LP
  - Previous Work
- 2 Our Contribution
  - Preliminary Definitions
  - Main Result

# The Binary Unfoldings of a Logic Programs (1)

[Gabbrielli & Giacobazzi, 89] [Codish & Taboch, 99]

- A  $T_P$ -like operator :  $T_P^{bin}$
- Input: a pure logic program  $P$
- Output:  $lfp(T_P^{bin}) = P^{bin}$  a possibly infinite set of facts and *binary* clauses

## Property

$Q$ , an atomic query, left-terminates wrt  $P$   
 iff

$Q$  terminates wrt  $P^{bin}$

## The Binary Unfoldings of a Logic Programs (2)

- compute  $P_{precision}^{bin} = T_P^{bin} \uparrow precision$
- generalize the lifting lemma to infer classes non-terminating atomic queries from  $P_{precision}^{bin}$
- hence we hold classes of non-terminating atomic queries for  $P$

# Outline

- 1 Motivation
  - Termination/Non-termination in (C)LP
  - Previous Work
- 2 Our Contribution
  - Preliminary Definitions
  - Main Result

# Preliminary Definitions (1)

We consider *ideal* CLP.

## Definition (Set Described by a Query)

The set of atoms that is described by a query  $S := \langle p(\tilde{t}) \mid d \rangle$  is  $\text{Set}(S) = \{p(v(\tilde{t})) \mid \mathcal{D}_C \models_v d\}$ .

## Definition (More General)

We say that a query  $S'$  is *more general than* a query  $S$  if  $\text{Set}(S) \subseteq \text{Set}(S')$ .

# Lifting Theorem

## Theorem (Lifting)

*Consider a derivation step  $S \xRightarrow{r} T$  and a query  $S'$  that is more general than  $S$ .*

*Then, there exists a derivation step  $S' \xRightarrow{r} T'$  where  $T'$  is more general than  $T$ .*

# Preliminary Definitions (2)

## Definition (Set of Positions)

- A *set of positions*, denoted by  $\tau$ , is a function that maps each predicate symbol  $p$  to a subset of  $[1, \text{arity}(p)]$ .
- Let  $\tau$  be a set of positions. Then,  $\bar{\tau}$  is the set of positions defined as: for each predicate symbol  $p$ ,  
$$\bar{\tau}(p) = [1, \text{arity}(p)] \setminus \tau(p).$$

# Preliminary Definitions (3)

## Definition (Projection)

Let  $\tau$  be a set of positions and  $p$  a predicate symbol of arity  $n$ .

- The *projection of  $p$  on  $\tau$*  is the predicate symbol denoted by  $p_\tau$ . Its arity equals the number of elements of  $\tau(p)$ .
- Let  $\tilde{t} := (t_1, \dots, t_n)$  be a sequence of  $n$  terms. The *projection of  $\tilde{t}$  on  $\tau$* , denoted by  $\tilde{t}_\tau$  is the sequence  $(t_{i_1}, \dots, t_{i_m})$  where  $\{i_1, \dots, i_m\} = \tau(p)$  and  $i_1 \leq \dots \leq i_m$ .
- Let  $A := p(\tilde{t})$  be an atom. The *projection of  $A$  on  $\tau$* , denoted by  $A_\tau$ , is the atom  $p_\tau(\tilde{t}_\tau)$ .
- The *projection of a query  $\langle A \mid d \rangle$  on  $\tau$* , denoted by  $\langle A \mid d \rangle_\tau$ , is the query  $\langle A_\tau \mid d \rangle$ .



# Preliminary Definitions (4)

## Definition (Filter)

- A *filter*, denoted by  $\Delta$ , is a pair  $(\tau, \delta)$  where  $\tau$  is a set of positions and  $\delta$  is a function that maps each predicate symbol  $p$  to  $\langle p_\tau(\tilde{u}) \mid d \rangle$  where  $\mathcal{D}_C \models \exists d$  and  $\tilde{u}$  is a sequence of *arity*( $p_\tau$ ) terms.
- Let  $\Delta := (\tau, \delta)$  be a filter and  $S$  be a query. Let  $p := \text{rel}(S)$ .  $S$  *satisfies*  $\Delta$  if  $\text{Set}(S_\tau) \subseteq \text{Set}(\delta(p))$ .
- Let  $\Delta := (\tau, \delta)$  be a filter and  $S$  and  $S'$  be two queries.  $S'$  is  $\Delta$ -*more general than*  $S$  if  $S'_\tau$  is more general than  $S_\tau$  and  $S'$  satisfies  $\Delta$ .

# First Result

## Definition (Derivation Neutral)

$\Delta$  is *DN* for  $r$  if for each derivation step  $S \xRightarrow[r]{} T$  and each query  $S'$  that is  $\Delta$ -more general than  $S$ , there exists a derivation step  $S' \xRightarrow[r]{} T'$  where  $T'$  is  $\Delta$ -more general than  $T$ .

## Theorem

*Let  $\Delta$  be a filter that is DN for  $r$ .  
If  $\langle B \mid c \rangle$  is  $\Delta$ -more general than  $\langle H \mid c \rangle$  then  $\langle H \mid c \rangle$  loops with respect to  $\{r\}$ .*

# Preliminary Definitions (5)

## Definition (Local Variables)

Let  $r := p(\tilde{X}) \leftarrow c \diamond q(\tilde{Y})$  be a rule. The set of *local variables* of  $r$  is denoted by  $local\_var(r)$  and is defined as:

$$local\_var(r) := Var(c) \setminus (Var(\tilde{X}) \cup Var(\tilde{Y})).$$

## Definition (sat)

Let  $S := \langle p(\tilde{u}) \mid d \rangle$  be a query and  $\tilde{s}$  be a sequence of *arity*( $p$ ) terms. Then,  $sat(\tilde{s}, S)$  denotes a formula of the form

$\exists_{Var(S')} (\tilde{s} = \tilde{u}' \wedge d')$  where  $S' := \langle p(\tilde{u}') \mid d' \rangle$  is any variant of  $S$  variable disjoint with  $\tilde{s}$ .

# Outline

- 1 Motivation
  - Termination/Non-termination in (C)LP
  - Previous Work
- 2 Our Contribution
  - Preliminary Definitions
  - Main Result

# DNlog = DN

## Definition (Logical Derivation Neutral)

A filter  $\Delta := (\tau, \delta)$  is *DNlog* for  $r := p(\tilde{X}) \leftarrow c \diamond q(\tilde{Y})$  if

$$\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{C}} \models c \rightarrow \forall_{\tilde{x}_\tau} [\text{sat}(\tilde{X}_\tau, \delta(p)) \rightarrow \exists y [\text{sat}(\tilde{Y}_\tau, \delta(q)) \wedge c]]$$

where  $\mathcal{Y} := \text{Var}(\tilde{Y}_\tau) \cup \text{local\_var}(r)$ .

## Theorem

Assume  $\mathcal{C}$  enjoys the following property: for each  $\alpha \in D_{\mathcal{C}}$ , there exists a ground  $\Sigma_{\mathcal{C}}$ -term  $a$  such that  $[a] = \alpha$ .

$\Delta$  is *DN* for  $r$  iff  $\Delta$  is *DNlog* for  $r$ .

# Summary

- For constraint filtered derivations:  $DN = DNlog$
- it **strictly generalizes** our previous criteria defined in SAS'02, SAS'04, and TOPLAS'06.
- Implementation:
  - SAS'02: CLP(H), filter: positions+*true*
  - SAS'04: CLP(Q), filter: positions+*true*
  - TOPLAS'06: CLP(H), filter: positions+*constraint*
  - WLPE'05: ?