

Why Multi-Result Supercompilation Matters: Case Study of Reachability Problems for Transition Systems



Andrei Klimov

Keldysh Institute of Applied Mathematics, Russian Academy of Sciences

July 8, 2012

Third International Valentin Turchin Workshop on Metacomputation, META 2010
Pereslavl-Zalessky, Russia

History and Main Conclusion

- **2005-2007 Andrei Nemytykh and Alexei Lisitsa**
 - have **experimentally** found a method to solve the **coverability problem** for (a class of) **practical counter systems** (models of cache-coherence protocols and other systems) with the Refal Supercompiler SCP4
 - *User + single-result supercompiler = MRSC*
- **2010-2011 Andrei Klimov**
 - have **theoretically** explained and proved that the **coverability problem** is solvable for **monotonic counter systems** by an **iterative procedure** of applying a **domain-specific supercompiler** for counter systems **varying a parameter** of generalization
 - *An optimized MRSC enumerating a small subset of residual graphs*
- **2005-2007 Gilles Geeraerts *et al* (Belgium)**
 - theory of 'Expand, Enlarge and Check' algorithmic schema (ECC) for solving the **coverability problem** of **well-structured transition systems** (WSTS)
 - *An MRSC for WSTS with reduced search space*

One thing to remember from this talk

- These are instances of **domain-specific multi-result supercompilation (MRSC)** with **search space reduction** based of **domain properties and purpose**

`User-controlled' MRSC

- **2005-2007 Andrei Nemytykh and Alexei Lisitsa**
 - have **experimentally** found a method to solve the **coverability problem** for (a class of) **practical counter systems** (models of cache-coherence protocols and other systems) with the Refal Supercompiler SCP4
 - *User + single-result supercompiler = MRSC*
- **Andrei Nemytykh devised two versions of SCP4**
 - SCP4₀ – standard version
 - SCP4₁ – generalization of empty expressions (representing zeros) prohibited
- **The user behavior**
 - When SCP4₀ did not prove the coverability, SCP4₁ was applied
 - No more supercompilers were needed for the considered samples borrowed from the collection by Giorgio Delzanno
- **Questions remained**
 - Were these SCP4 versions sufficient?
 - Might other restrictions of generalization be needed?
 - Had the SCP4 author to invent new modifications of SCP4?

Domain-Specific Special-Purpose MRSC

- **2010-2011 Andrei Klimov**

- have **theoretically** explained and proved that the **coverability problem** is solvable for **monotonic counter systems** by an **iterative procedure** of applying a **domain-specific supercompiler** for counter systems **varying a parameter** of generalization
- *An optimized MRSC enumerating a small subset of residual graphs*

- **Algorithm**

- Scp_l – a domain-specific supercompiler for counter systems with parameter l **prohibiting generalization of integers** $n < l$
 - the **simplest** version: integers $n \geq l$ are **immediately generalized**
- **for** $l=1,2,3\dots$ **do**
 - use Scp_l to build a **residual set of configurations**
 - if** all residual configurations are **disjoint** with the target set $Unsafe$
 - then return** “Unreachable”
- This algorithm with the **simplest** supercompiler Scp_l **fits the ECC schema**
- My proof of its correctness **differs** from that of the ECC algorithmic schema
- ...and asserts a **stronger termination** statement:
 - it terminates for all **monotonic** counter systems and upper-closed $Unsafe$ sets

ECC as a domain-specific multi-result supercompiler

- **2005-2007 Gilles Geeraerts *et al***
 - theory of ‘Expand, Enlarge and Check’ algorithmic schema (ECC) for solving the coverability problem of well-structured transition systems (WSTS)
 - *An MRSC for WSTS and its optimized versions*
- **Main ideas**
 - The set of all possible configurations \mathcal{C} is infinite (as usual)
 - *Def.* A finite $R \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ is called a residual set iff it is closed under “driving”:
 - $\text{Post}(\llbracket R \rrbracket) \subseteq \llbracket R \rrbracket$
 - Consider an ascending sequence of finite sets of configurations C_l :
 - $C_0 \subset C_1 \subset C_2 \subset C_3 \dots$
 - $\mathcal{C} = \bigcup C_l$
 - Consider residual sets $R \subseteq C_l$
 - The set $\{R \mid R \subseteq C_l\}$ of all such residual sets is finite as C_l is finite
 - Hence, it is solvable whether there exists a safe $R \subseteq C_l$ (that is, all configurations in R are disjoint with the target set *Unsafe*)
 - Iterate for $l=0,1,2,3\dots$
 - If a safe residual set $R \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ exists, then C_l s.t. $R \subseteq C_l$ exists and hence the iterative procedure terminates
- The notion of MRSC is wider

ECC as a domain-specific multi-result supercompiler

- **2005-2007 Gilles Geeraerts *et al***
 - theory of 'Expand, Enlarge and Check' algorithmic schema (ECC) for solving the coverability problem of well-structured transition systems (WSTS)
 - *An MRSC for WSTS and its optimized versions*

- **Main ideas**

- The set of all possible configurations \mathcal{C}
- *Def.* A finite $R \subseteq \mathcal{C}$
 - $\text{Post}(\llbracket R \rrbracket) \subseteq R$
- Consider an ascending chain of residual sets $C_0 \subset C_1 \subset C_2 \subset \dots$
 - $\mathcal{C} = \bigcup C_l$
- Consider residual sets $R \subseteq \mathcal{C}$
- The set $\{R \mid R \subseteq \mathcal{C}\}$ is solvable (that is, all configurations in R are covered)
- Iterate for $l=0,1,2,3,\dots$
- If a safe residual set R is found, then MRSC finds it and hence the iteration terminates

Where is the well-structuredness of a TS used?

(WS = monotonicity + well-quasi-order)

- Existence of safe R when the TS is safe
- Optimizations: reducing the search space

Without the well-structuredness:

If there exists an inductive proof that a TS is safe with the inductive hypotheses in form of a residual set of configurations, then MRSC finds it

- The notion of MRSC is wider

Related work: Supercompilation-like algorithms

1969 Richard M. Karp and Raymond E. Miller.

Parallel Program Schemata, *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.* 3(2), 147-195.

- a covering tree for ordinary Petri nets
- like supercompilation with lower-node generalization

1993 Alain Finkel.

The minimal coverability graph for Petri nets.

In Grzegorz Rozenberg, ed., *Advances in Petri Nets 1993*, LNCS 674, 210-243.

- an attempt to improve the KM algorithm
- generalization of upper configuration
- a flaw: under-approximation of the minimal coverability set

...and a lot of other works...

2006 Gilles Geeraerts, Jean-François Raskin, and Laurent Van Begin.

Expand, Enlarge and Check: New algorithms for the coverability problem of WSTS. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 72(1), 180-203.