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## (active) structural completeness

$L$ - a logic, $\vdash_{L}$ - its consequence relation of derivability
$r$ - a rule
$\vdash_{L}^{r}$ - the least consequence relation containing the rule $\{r\} \cup \vdash_{L}$
$r$ is admissible in $L$ if $\operatorname{Theorems}\left(\vdash_{L}^{r}\right)=L$
$r=\Gamma / \varphi$ is active in $L$ if there is a substitution $\sigma$ such that
$\sigma(\Gamma) \subseteq L$
$L$ is (actively) structurally complete if every (active) admissible in $L$ rule is derivable, i.e., is in $\vdash_{L}$

Fact
$\Gamma / \varphi$ is admissible for $\vdash$ iff $\quad(\forall \gamma \in \Gamma, \vdash \sigma(\gamma))$ yields $\quad \vdash \sigma(\varphi)$ for every substitution $\sigma$

## (quasi)varieties

identities look like $(\forall \bar{x}) s(\bar{x}) \approx t(\bar{x})$
quasi-identities look like
$(\forall \bar{x}) s_{1}(\bar{x}) \approx t_{1}(\bar{x}) \wedge \cdots \wedge s_{n}(\bar{x}) \approx t_{n}(\bar{x}) \rightarrow s(\bar{x}) \approx t(\bar{x})$
$\underline{(q u a s i) \text { varieties }}=$ classes of algebras defined by (quasi-)identities

Fact
Every (quasi)variety $\mathcal{V}$ has a free algebra $\mathbf{F}_{\mathcal{V}}(k)$ of rank $k>0$. Let $\mathbf{F}_{\mathcal{V}}=\mathbf{F}_{\mathcal{V}}\left(\aleph_{0}\right)$.

Mal'cev
A class is $\mathrm{SPP}_{\mathrm{U}}$-closed iff it is a quasivariety.
Birkhoff
A class is HSP-closed iff it is a variety.

## admissibility algebraically

| logic L | tha | variety $\mathcal{V}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| logical connectives | tha | basic operations |
| theorems | 4ns | identities valid in $\mathcal{V}$ |
| derived rules | uns | quasi-identities valid in $\mathcal{V}$ |
| admissible rules | tus | quasi-identities valid in $\mathbf{F}_{\mathcal{V}}$ |
| active rules | ms | quasi-identities with |
|  |  | the premise satisfiable in $\mathbf{F}_{\mathcal{V}}$ |

Thus we may study admissibility and (A)SC for varieties

## SC vs ASC

## Examples

- S5 and $Ł_{n}$ are ASC but not SC $(n \geqslant 3)$ [folklore];
- discriminator varieties are ASC [Burris '92, Dzik '11], and are SC iff they are minimal or trivial (if there are two distinct constants) [Campercholi, S., Vaggione '16];
- ASC normal extensions of S4 are SC iff they extend S4.McKinsey [Dzik and S. '16];
- among 3330 3-element groupoids (up to izo.) 2676 generate SC quasivarieties and 2930 generate ASC quasivarieties [Metcalfe and Röthlisberger '13];
- almost all finite algebras generate SC varieties [Murskií '75].


## aim

- To compare ASC and SC for normal modal logics of small frames.
- to understand (A)SC.


## numerical results: normal extensions of K



ASC


| size | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| K | 2 | 8 | 86 | 2838 | 285799 | 96420781 |
| $\mathrm{D}=\mathrm{K} \oplus \diamond \top$ | 1 | 5 | 62 | 2214 | 244134 | 87722854 |
| $\mathrm{~T}=\mathrm{K} \oplus \square p \rightarrow p$ | 1 | 2 | 12 | 189 | 9175 | 1523497 |

## numerical results: normal extensions of K 4




| size | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| K 4 | 2 | 6 | 26 | 145 | 1050 | 9917 | 121496 | 1958413 |
| $\mathrm{KD} 4=\mathrm{K} 4 \oplus \diamond \top$ | 1 | 3 | 11 | 52 | 315 | 2496 | 26314 | 370304 |
| $\mathrm{~S} 4=\mathrm{K} 4 \oplus \square p \rightarrow p$ | 1 | 2 | 5 | 15 | 55 | 242 | 1322 | 9160 |

How it is computed?

## decidability

(A)SC-problem for varieties

INPUT: a finite algebra A,
OUTPUT: YES if $\operatorname{HSP}(\mathbf{A})$ is (A)SC, NO otherwise.
Theorem (Dywan '78, Bergman '88, Metcalfe \& Röthlisberger '13, S.'18)
There are algorithms which solve the (A)SC-problem for varieties when the input is from

- a congruence meet-semidistributive variety,
- a congruence modular variety.
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## Drawback

These algorithms are very very slow.
Hope
The algorithm is just very slow in case of congruence distributivity.

## SI algebras

An algebra $\mathbf{A}$ is subdirectly irreducible if there is a pair $a, b \in A$ of distinct elements such that every nontrivial congruence of $\mathbf{A}$ contains ( $a, b$ ).

## Fact

An algebra $\mathbf{A}$ is SI if and only if whenever $\mathbf{A} \leqslant \prod \mathbf{A}_{i}$, then one of the projections $\pi_{i}: \mathbf{A} \rightarrow \mathbf{A}_{i}$ is an embedding.
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Theorem (Birkhoff '35)
Every variety $\mathcal{V}$ is generated as a quasivariety by its SI algebras:

$$
\mathcal{V}=\operatorname{SP}\left(\mathcal{V}_{S I}\right)
$$

## algorithm algebraically

Theorem (Bergman '88, Metcalfe \& Röthlisberger '13, Dzik \& S. '16)

Let $\mathbf{A}$ be a finite $k$-generated algebra, $\mathcal{V}=\operatorname{HSP}(\mathbf{A})$ have only finite SI algebras, and $\mathbf{M} \leqslant \mathbf{F}_{\mathcal{V}}$. Then

- $\mathcal{V}$ is $S C$ iff $\mathcal{V}_{S I} \subseteq S\left(\mathbf{F}_{\mathcal{V}}(k)\right)$,
- $\mathcal{V}$ is $\operatorname{ASC}$ iff $\left\{\mathbf{S} \times \mathbf{M}: \mathbf{S} \in \mathcal{V}_{S I}\right\} \subseteq \operatorname{SP}\left(\mathbf{F}_{\mathcal{V}}(k)\right)$.

Jónsson's Lemma
Let $\mathbf{A}$ be a finite algebra and $\mathcal{V}=\operatorname{HSP}(\mathbf{A})$ be congruence distributive. Then $\mathcal{V}_{S I} \subseteq \mathrm{HS}(\mathbf{A})$ is not too big.

## finite duality, a logarithmic reduction

| finite modal algebra $\mathbf{A}$ $\operatorname{HSP}(\mathbf{A})$ | tus | finite modal frame $L(\mathbf{W})$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| subalgebras | tha | p-morphic images |
| homomorphic images | thas | generated subframes |
| products | tus | disjoint union |
| finite SI algebras | thas | finite rooted frames |
| free algebra $\mathbf{F}(k)$ | n | universal model $\mathbf{U}(k)$ |

$$
|W|=\log _{2}|A|, \quad|U(k)|=\log _{2}|F(k)|
$$

## algorithm relationally I

## Corollary

Let $\mathbf{W}$ be a modal frame and $L=L(\mathbf{W})$ be its logic. Let $k$ be a smallest number for which there exists a $k$-valution $v$ such that the model ( $\mathbf{W}, v$ ) has only trivial bisimulations. Then

- $L$ is SC iff every rooted gen. subframe of $\mathbf{W}$ is a p-morphic image of $\mathbf{U}(k)$,
- $L$ is ASC iff $\mathbf{R} \sqcup \mathbf{U}(0)$ is a p-morphic image of a disjoint union of copies of $\mathbf{U}(k)$ for every rooted gen. subframe $\mathbf{R}$ of $\mathbf{W}$.


## Remark

It is still slow: $k \leqslant \log _{2}|W|$ and just $|U(k)| \leqslant|W| \cdot 2^{|W| \cdot \log _{2}|W|}$. so the algorithms works in 2EXPTIME.

## we do not need to check SC

Fact (S. \& U. '18)
Let $\mathbf{W}$ be a finite frame and $L=L(\mathbf{W})$ be its logic. Assume that $L$ is ASC. Then $L$ is SC iff

- $L$ is serial $(\diamond 1 \in L)$ and every top cluster in $\mathbf{W}$ consists of one reflexive point.
or
- $L=\operatorname{Ver}(\mathbf{W}$ has empty accessibility relation).
proof
"The same" as for normal extensions of S4. One just need to consider weak transitivity and weak McKinsey's law.


## we do not need to check non-serial frames

Fact (S. \& U. '18)
Let $\mathbf{W}$ be a finite frame. Then $\mathbf{W}$ is ASC iff $\mathbf{W} \cong \mathbf{W}_{\text {ser }} \sqcup \mathbf{\mathbf { W } _ { \text { ver } }}$, where $\mathbf{W}_{\text {ser }} \models \diamond 1, L\left(\mathbf{W}_{\text {ser }}\right)$ is ASC and $\mathbf{W}_{\text {ver }} \models \square 0$,

Remark: It works without the finiteness assumption but the (algebraic) proof we have for it is harder.
proof
By considering the structure of $\mathbf{U}(k)$ and p -morphisms onto

- $\sqcup \mathbf{U}^{\prime}(0)$, where $\mathbf{U}^{\prime}(0)$ is a gen. subframe of $\mathbf{U}(0)$.


## structure of $\mathbf{U}(k)$

Let $\mathbf{W}$ be an input frame.
Let $\operatorname{Val}(k)=\left(2^{W}\right)^{\left\{p_{1}, \ldots, p_{k}\right\}}$ be the set of all $k$-valuations of $\mathbf{W}$. Then $\mathbf{U}(k)$ is the underlying frame of the model

$$
\left(\bigsqcup_{w \in \operatorname{Val}(k)}(\mathbf{W}, w)\right) / \beta
$$

where $\beta$ is a largest bisimulation

$$
(x, y) \in \beta \quad \text { iff } \quad \text { the same } k \text {-formulas are satisfied in } x \text { and } y .
$$

## algorithm relationally II

## Corollary

Let $\mathbf{W}$ be a serial frame and $L=L(\mathbf{W})$ be its logic. Let $k$ be a smallest number for which there exists a $k$-valution $v$ such that the model ( $\mathbf{W}, v$ ) has only trivial bisimulations. Then

- $L$ is ASC iff $\mathbf{R}$ or $\mathbf{R} \sqcup \bullet$ is a p-morphic image of $\mathbf{U}(k)$ for every rooted gen. subframe $\mathbf{R}$ of $\mathbf{W}$.

Remark: Still quite slow, though enough for 5-element frames.

## basic idea for improvement

Observation (Metcalfe \& Röthlisberger '13)
Let $\mathbf{U}^{p}(k)$ be frame such that

- W embeds as a gen. subframe into $\mathbf{U}^{p}(k)$,
- $\mathbf{U}^{p}(k)$ is a p-morphic image of $\mathbf{U}(k)$.

Then in the algorithm we may replace $\mathbf{U}(k)$ for $\mathbf{U}^{p}(k)$.
proof
The duals of $\mathbf{U}(k)$ and $\mathbf{U}^{p}(k)$ generate the same quasivariety.

How to find a small $\mathbf{U}^{p}(k)$ ?

## structure of $\mathbf{U}^{p}(k)$

Recall that $\mathbf{U}(k)$ is the underlying frame of the model

$$
\left(\bigsqcup_{v \in \operatorname{Val}(k)}(\mathbf{W}, w)\right) / \beta
$$

where $\beta$ is a largest bisimulation
The frame $\mathbf{U}^{p}(k)$ is of the form

$$
\left(\bigsqcup_{w \in \operatorname{Val}(k)} \mathbf{w}\right) / \gamma,
$$

where $\gamma$ is a frame bisimilar equivalence extending $\beta$ and not gluing elements from a chosen copy of $W$.

## optimalization ingredients

1. Do not compute $\mathbf{U}(k)$ at all!
2. Search p-morphisms reasonably?
3. Use randomness (Las Vegas method)!

## sample reduction

let $\left(\mathbf{W}_{i}, w_{i}\right), i \leqslant N$ be the list of all $k$-models based on (copies of) W

Put $\left(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{0}}, v_{0}\right)=\left(\mathbf{W}_{\mathbf{0}}, w_{0}\right)$,
Once defined $\left(\mathbf{V}_{i}, v_{i}\right)$ : Let, say

$$
w_{i+1}^{\prime}(x)= \begin{cases}w_{i+1}(x) & \text { if } x \text { is bisimilar to } y \text { in }\left(\mathbf{W}_{0}, w_{0}\right) \\ \emptyset & \text { in the oposite case }\end{cases}
$$

and take

$$
\mathbf{V}_{i+1}=\left(\mathbf{V}_{i}, v_{i}\right) \sqcup\left(\mathbf{W}_{i+1}, w_{i+1}^{\prime}\right) /(\text { a largest bisimulation })
$$

and dafine $\mathbf{U}^{p}(k)=\mathbf{V}_{N}$.

## Remarks:

- More optimalizations are used, but this one is the most efficient.
- We incorporate ramdomness here.
- It is sufficient for 6-elements frames


## do we really need this algorithm?

- Find an easy to check condition suffitient for $\neg$ ASC!
- Find an easy to check condition suffitient for ASC!


## condition for $\neg \mathrm{ASC}$

Let $\mathbf{R} \sqsubseteq \mathbf{S}$ iff there is a surjective p-morphism $\mathbf{S} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$. Let $\mathcal{M}(\mathbf{W})$ be the set of generated rooted subframes of $\mathbf{W}$ which are maximal w.r.t. $\sqsubseteq$.

Fact (S. \& U. '19)
If some $\mathbf{R} \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbf{W})$ is a proper gen. subframe of a rooted gen. subframe of $\mathbf{W}$, then $L(\overline{\mathbf{W}})$ is not ASC.
proof
Similar as we deal with non-serial frames.

## Remarks:

- It is easy to be check.
- It covers around $99 \%$ of $\neg$ ASC frames we checked.


## condition for ASC

Observation (Dzik '11)
If $L$ admits a projective unification, then $L$ is ASC.
Corollary
If the transitive closure of the accessibility relation of $\mathbf{W}$ is symmetric, then $L(\mathbf{W})$ is ASC.
proof
The corresponding variery is discriminator. By Burris' result, it admits projective unification.

Theorem (Dzik \& Wojtylak '12, Kost '18)
There is a simple characterization of transitive frames which logics admits projective unification.

## The end

This is all
Thank you!

