(Active) structural completeness for small frames

Michał Stronkowski & Mateusz Uliński

Warsaw University of Technology

WARU PRAGUE, May 2019

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲ 三▶ ▲ 三▶ 三 のへぐ

(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 <u>admissible in</u> L if Theorems $(\vdash_L^r) = L$

 $r=\Gamma/\varphi$ is active in L if there is a substitution σ 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

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

(quasi)varieties

 $\begin{array}{ll} \underline{\text{identities}} \text{ look like} & (\forall \bar{x}) \; s(\bar{x}) \approx t(\bar{x}) \\ \text{quasi-identities look like} \end{array}$

 $(\forall \bar{x}) \ s_1(\bar{x}) \approx t_1(\bar{x}) \land \cdots \land s_n(\bar{x}) \approx t_n(\bar{x}) \rightarrow \ s(\bar{x}) \approx t(\bar{x})$

(quasi)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 $\mathbf{F}_{\mathcal{V}} = \mathbf{F}_{\mathcal{V}}(\aleph_0)$.

Mal'cev

A class is SPP_U -closed iff it is a quasivariety.

Birkhoff

A class is HSP-closed iff it is a variety.

admissibility algebraically

logic <i>L</i>	\longleftrightarrow
logical connectives	\longleftrightarrow
theorems	\longleftrightarrow
derived rules	\longleftrightarrow
admissible rules	\longleftrightarrow
active rules	\longleftrightarrow

variety \mathcal{V} basic operations identities valid in \mathcal{V} quasi-identities valid in \mathcal{V} quasi-identities valid in $\mathbf{F}_{\mathcal{V}}$ quasi-identities with the premise satisfiable in $\mathbf{F}_{\mathcal{V}}$

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ■ ●の00

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

SC vs ASC

Examples

- S5 and L_n are ASC but not SC $(n \ge 3)$ [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 [Murskii '75].

 To compare ASC and SC for normal modal logics of small frames.

(ロ)、(型)、(E)、(E)、(E)、(O)へ(C)

► to understand (A)SC.

numerical results: normal extensions of K



size	1	2	3	4	5	6
K	2	8	86	2838	285799	96420781
D=K⊕⊘⊤	1	5	62	2214	244134	87722854
$T=K\oplus\Box p o p$	1	2	12	189	9175	1523497

numerical results: normal extensions of K4



size	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
K4	2	6	26	145	1050	9917	121496	1958413
KD4=K4⊕⊘⊤	1	3	11	52	315	2496	26314	370304
$S4=K4\oplus\Box p \rightarrow p$	1	2	5	15	55	242	1322	9160

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲三▶ ▲三▶ 三三 のへで

How it is computed?

decidability

(A)SC-problem for varieties

INPUT: a finite algebra \mathbf{A} , OUTPUT: YES if 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

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ■ ●の00

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

decidability

(A)SC-problem for varieties

INPUT: a finite algebra \mathbf{A} , OUTPUT: YES if 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

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ■ ●の00

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

Drawback

These algorithms are very very slow.

decidability

(A)SC-problem for varieties

INPUT: a finite algebra \mathbf{A} , OUTPUT: YES if 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.

Drawback

These algorithms are very very slow.

Hope

The algorithm is just very slow in case of congruence distributivity.

SI algebras

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

Fact

An algebra **A** is SI if and only if whenever $\mathbf{A} \leq \prod \mathbf{A}_i$, then one of the projections $\pi_i : \mathbf{A} \to \mathbf{A}_i$ is an embedding.

SI algebras

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

Fact

An algebra **A** is SI if and only if whenever $\mathbf{A} \leq \prod \mathbf{A}_i$, then one of the projections $\pi_i : \mathbf{A} \to \mathbf{A}_i$ is an embedding.

Theorem (Birkhoff '35)

Every variety \mathcal{V} is generated as a quasivariety by its SI algebras:

 $\mathcal{V} = \mathsf{SP}(\mathcal{V}_{SI}).$

algorithm algebraically

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

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

•
$$\mathcal{V}$$
 is SC iff $\mathcal{V}_{SI} \subseteq S(\mathbf{F}_{\mathcal{V}}(k))$,

▶ \mathcal{V} is ASC iff {**S** × **M** : **S** ∈ \mathcal{V}_{SI} } ⊆ SP(**F**_{\mathcal{V}}(*k*)).

Jónsson's Lemma

Let **A** be a finite algebra and $\mathcal{V} = \mathsf{HSP}(\mathbf{A})$ be congruence distributive. Then $\mathcal{V}_{SI} \subseteq \mathsf{HS}(\mathbf{A})$ is not too big.

finite duality, a logarithmic reduction

finite modal algebra A $HSP(\mathbf{A})$ subalgebras \longleftrightarrow homomorphic images \longleftrightarrow products \longleftrightarrow finite SI algebras \longleftrightarrow free algebra $\mathbf{F}(k)$ \longleftrightarrow

finite modal frame W	
$L(\mathbf{W})$	
p-morphic images	
generated subframes	
disjoint union	
finite rooted frames	
universal model $\mathbf{U}(k)$	

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ■ ●の00

 $|W| = \log_2 |A|, \quad |U(k)| = \log_2 |F(k)|$

 $\leftrightarrow \rightarrow$

 $\leftrightarrow \rightarrow$

algorithm relationally I

Corollary

Let **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 W is a p-morphic image of 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: $k \leq \log_2 |W|$ and just $|U(k)| \leq |W| \cdot 2^{|W| \cdot \log_2 |W|}$. so the algorithms works in 2EXPTIME. we do not need to check SC

Fact (S. & U. '18)

Let **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 (◊1 ∈ L) and every top cluster in W consists of one reflexive point.

or

L = Ver (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 **W** be a finite frame. Then **W** is ASC iff $\mathbf{W} \cong \mathbf{W}_{ser} \sqcup \mathbf{W}_{ver}$, where $\mathbf{W}_{ser} \models \Diamond 1$, $L(\mathbf{W}_{ser})$ is ASC and $\mathbf{W}_{ver} \models \Box 0$,

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 $\circ \sqcup \mathbf{U}'(0)$, where $\mathbf{U}'(0)$ is a gen. subframe of $\mathbf{U}(0)$.

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

Let **W** be an input frame. Let $Val(k) = (2^W)^{\{p_1,...,p_k\}}$ be the set of all *k*-valuations of **W**. Then **U**(*k*) is the underlying frame of the model

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

where β is a largest bisimulation

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

・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・

algorithm relationally II

Corollary

Let **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 R or R ⊔ • is a p-morphic image of U(k) for every rooted gen. subframe R of 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 $\mathbf{U}^{\rho}(k)$ 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

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

where β 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 γ is a frame bisimilar equivalence extending β 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 (\mathbf{W}_i, w_i) , $i \leq N$ be the list of all k-models based on (copies of) \mathbf{W}

Put $(V_0, v_0) = (W_0, w_0)$, Once defined (V_i, v_i) : Let, say

$$w_{i+1}'(x) = \begin{cases} w_{i+1}(x) & \text{if } x \text{ is bisimilar to } y \text{ in } (\mathbf{W}_0, w_0) \\ \emptyset & \text{in the oposite case} \end{cases}$$

and take

and

$$\mathbf{V}_{i+1} = (\mathbf{V}_i, v_i) \sqcup (\mathbf{W}_{i+1}, w'_{i+1})/(a \text{ largest bisimulation})$$

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 ¬ASC!

Find an easy to check condition sufficient for ASC!

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲ 三▶ ▲ 三▶ 三三 - のへぐ

condition for $\neg ASC$

Let $\mathbf{R} \sqsubseteq \mathbf{S}$ iff there is a surjective p-morphism $\mathbf{S} \to \mathbf{R}$. 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 $L(\mathbf{W})$ is not ASC.

proof

Similar as we deal with non-serial frames.

Remarks:

- It is easy to be check.
- ▶ It covers around 99% of ¬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 W is symmetric, then L(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!

