SMT SOLVING: DECIDABLE THEORIES

Course “Computational Logic”

Wolfgang Schreiner
Research Institute for Symbolic Computation (RISC)
Wolfgang.Schreiner@risc.jku.at
Theories

- A theory $T$ is a set of first-order sentences (closed formulas) that is closed under logical consequence:

  $$ T \models F \text{ if and only if } F \in T, \text{ for every first-order formula } F. $$

- $T$ may be defined as the set $Th(M) := \{ F \mid \forall M \in M. M \models F \}$ of all sentences that hold in (every element of) some class $M$ of structures.
  - Notation $Th(\mathbb{N}, 0, 1, +, \cdot, \leq)$: the theory where $0, 1, +, \cdot, \leq$ are interpreted as the usual natural number constants, functions, predicates.

- $T$ may be also defined as the set $Cn(A) := \{ F \mid A \models F \}$ of consequences of some recursively enumerable set $A$ of first-order formulas called axioms.
  - A set is recursively enumerable if a machine can produce a list of its elements.
  - If $T = Cn(A)$ for some (finite) set $A$, then $T$ is (finitely) axiomatizable.
  - Undefinability theorem (Gödel/Tarski): $Th(\mathbb{N}, 0, 1, +, \cdot, \leq)$ is not axiomatizable.

A theory describes a “domain of interest”.

Decision Problems

Theories give rise to two related decision problems.

- **The problem of Validity Modulo Theories:**
  - Given: a first-order formula $F$ and a first-order theory $T$.
  - Decide: does $T \models F$ hold, i.e., is $F$ a logical consequence of $T$?

- **The problem of Satisfiability Modulo Theories (SMT):**
  - Given: a first-order formula $F$ and a first-order theory $T$.
  - Decide: is $T \cup \{F\}$ satisfiable?

- **Duality:** $T \models F$ if and only if $T \cup \{\neg F\}$ is **not** satisfiable.

An SMT solver is a decision procedure for the SMT problem (with respect to some theory or combination of theories); thus it also decides the dual validity problem.
Decidable Problems

For certain classes of formulas/theories, the satisfiability problem is decidable.

- Prenex normal form $\forall^n \exists^m$ (validity) or $\exists^n \forall^m$ (satisfiability) (“AE/EA fragment”).
- Formulas without functions and with only unary predicates (“monadic fragment”).
- Every with only finite models (e.g., the theory of fixed-size bit vectors).
- Quantifier-free theory of equality with uninterpreted functions (“equational logic”).
- Theory of arrays, theory of recursive data structures.
- Linear arithmetic over integers (“Presburger arithmetic”), natural numbers, reals.
- Theory of reals (“elementary algebra”), complex numbers, algebraically closed fields.
- Logical consequences of equalities over groups, rings, fields (“word problems”).
- …

As we will see later, also any combination of decidable theories is decidable.
SMT-LIB: The Satisfiability Modulo Theories Library

http://smt-lib.org

- A library of theories/logics of practical relevance.
- A common input language for SMT solvers.
- A repository of benchmarks.
- The basis of the yearly SMT-COMP competition.

  - [https://smt-comp.github.io](https://smt-comp.github.io)

Many automated/interactive reasoners and program verifiers are equipped with SMT-LIB interfaces to external SMT solvers.
The SMT-LIB Library

- **QF_UF**: Unquantified formulas built over a signature of uninterpreted (i.e., free) sort and function symbols.
- **QF_LIA**: Unquantified linear integer arithmetic. In essence, Boolean combinations of inequations between linear polynomials over integer variables.

Not every logic is decidable, e.g., NIA (non-linear integer arithmetic).
Z3: An SMT solver with SMT-LIB Support

Software: https://github.com/Z3Prover
Tutorial: https://microsoft.github.io/z3guide

- An **SMT solver** developed since 2007 at Microsoft Research.
  - Nikolaj Bjørner and Leonardo de Moura.
  - Open source since 2015 under the MIT License.

- Highly **efficient and versatile**.
  - Frequent winner of various divisions of the SMT-COMP series.
  - Backend of various software verification systems (e.g., Microsoft Boogie).

- Uses the **SMT-LIB** language and supports various SMT-LIB logics.
  - Uninterpreted functions, linear arithmetic, fixed-size bit-vectors, algebraic datatypes, arrays, polynomial arithmetic, . . .

- Also supports **quantification**.
  - However, when using quantifiers, the solver is generally incomplete.

Z3 gradually evolves into a full-fledged automated theorem prover.
The SMT-LIB Language

; file example1.smt2: Integer arithmetic
(set-logic QF_LIA)
(declare-const x Int)
(declare-const y Int)
(assert (= (- x y) (+ x (- y) 1)))
(check-sat)
(exit)

debian10!1> z3 example1.smt
unsat

; file example2.smt2: Getting values or models
(set-logic QF_LIA)
(declare-const x Int)
(declare-const y Int)
(assert (= (+ x (* 2 y)) 20))
(assert (= (- x y) 2))
(check-sat)
(get-value (x y))
(get-model)
(exit)

debian10!1> z3 example2.smt2
sat
((x 8) (y 6))
(model
 (define-fun y () Int 6)
 (define-fun x () Int 8)
)
The SMT-LIB Language

; file example3.smt2:
; Modeling sequential code in SSA form
; Buggy swap: int x, y; int t = x; x = y; y = x;
(set-logic QF_UFLIA)

(declare-fun x (Int) Int)
(declare-fun y (Int) Int)
(declare-fun t (Int) Int)
(assert (= (t 0) (x 0)))
(assert (= (x 1) (y 0)))
(assert (= (y 1) (x 1)))
(assert (not (and (= (x 1) (y 0))
                   (= (y 1) (x 0)))))

(check-sat)
(get-value ((x 0) (y 0) (x 1) (y 1)))
(get-model)
(exit)
Example Application: Program Verification

We can reduce the verification of programs to deciding the satisfiability of formulas.

- Verification of program with respect to pre- and post-condition:
  \[
  \{ a[0] = x \land a[1] = y \land a[2] = z \}
  \]
  
  \[
  i = 0; \quad m = a[i];
  \]
  
  \[
  i = i+1; \quad \text{if } (a[i] < m) \quad m = a[i];
  \]
  
  \[
  i = i+1; \quad \text{if } (a[i] < m) \quad m = a[i];
  \]
  
  \[
  \{ m \leq x \land m \leq y \land m \leq z \land (m = x \lor m = y \lor m = z) \}
  \]

- Satisfiability of formula:
  \[
  a[0] = x \land a[1] = y \land a[2] = z \land
  \]
  
  \[
  i_0 = 0 \land m_0 = a[i_0] \land
  \]
  
  \[
  i_1 = i_0 + 1 \land (\text{if } a[i_1] < m_0 \text{ then } m_1 = a[i_1] \text{ else } m_1 = m_0) \land
  \]
  
  \[
  i_2 = i_1 + 1 \land (\text{if } a[i_2] < m_1 \text{ then } m_2 = a[i_2] \text{ else } m_2 = m_1) \land
  \]
  
  \[
  \neg (m_2 \leq x \land m_2 \leq y \land m_2 \leq z \land (m_2 = x \lor m_2 = y \lor m_2 = z))
  \]

The unsatisfiability of the formula establishes the correctness of the program with respect to its specification; a satisfying valuation determines a violating program run.
Program Verification: SMT-LIB Script

; file minimum.smt2:
(set-logic QF_UFLIA)

(declare-fun a (Int) Int)
(declare-const x Int) (declare-const y Int) (declare-const z Int)
(declare-const i0 Int) (declare-const i1 Int) (declare-const i2 Int)
(declare-const m0 Int) (declare-const m1 Int) (declare-const m2 Int)

(assert (= (a 0) x)) (assert (= (a 1) y)) (assert (= (a 2) z))
(assert (= i0 0)) (assert (= m0 (a i0)))
(assert (= i1 (+ i0 1))) (assert (ite (< (a i1) m0) (= m1 (a i1)) (= m1 m0)))
(assert (= i2 (+ i1 1))) (assert (ite (< (a i2) m1) (= m2 (a i2)) (= m2 m1)))
(assert (not
    (and (and (and (<= m2 x) (<= m2 y)) (<= m2 z))
        (or (or (= m2 x) (= m2 y)) (= m2 z))))))

(check-sat) (exit)

debian10!1> z3 minimum.smt2
unsat
Program Verification: SMT-LIB Script

; file minimum2.smt2:
...
; BUG: ">" rather than "<"
(assert (ite (> (a i2) m1) (= m2 (a i2)) (= m2 m1)))
...
(check-sat) (get-value (x y z i0 m0 i1 m1 i2 m2)) (get-model) (exit)

alan!89> z3 minimum2.smt2
sat
((x 1) (y 0) (z 2) (i0 0) (m0 1) (i1 1) (m1 0) (i2 2) (m2 2))
(model
  (define-fun m0 () Int 1) (define-fun i1 () Int 1) (define-fun m2 () Int 2)
  (define-fun y () Int 0) (define-fun m1 () Int 0) (define-fun i2 () Int 2)
  (define-fun i0 () Int 0) (define-fun z () Int 2) (define-fun x () Int 1)
  (define-fun a ((x!1 Int)) Int (ite (= x!1 0) 1 (ite (= x!1 1) 0 (ite (= x!1 2) 2 1))))

The assignments of a buggy program with an inverted test operation.
The Theory \textbf{LRA}: Linear Real Arithmetic

Essentially the SMT-LIB logic QF_LRA.

- \textbf{LRA} is a quantifier-free first-order theory.
  - Interpretation over the domain $\mathbb{R}$ of real numbers.
  - Only atomic formulas are inequalities $a \leq b$ with polynomials $a, b$.
    - Integer and rational constants, functions $+$ and $\cdot$, predicate $\leq$.
    - Also $-, <, >, \geq, =$ are allowed: $a - b$ can be reduced to $a + (-1) \cdot b$; $\{<, >\}$ can be reduced to $\{=, \leq, \geq\}$; $=$ can be reduced to $\{\leq, \geq\}$; $\geq$ can be reduced to $\leq$.
  - Linear: in every multiplication $a \cdot b$, $a$ must be a constant.

- \textbf{LRA-Satisfiability} of formula $F$:
  - Convert $F$ into its disjunctive normal form $C_1 \lor \ldots \lor C_n$.
  - $F$ is \textbf{LRA}-satisfiable if and only if some $C_i$ is \textbf{LRA}-satisfiable.

To decide the \textbf{LRA-Satisfiability} of $F$, it suffices to decide the satisfiability of a conjunction of (possibly negated) inequalities $a \leq b$ with linear polynomials $a, b$ (in the following, we only consider conjunctions of unnegated inequalities).
Deciding $LRA$-Satisfiability by Fourier-Motzkin Elimination

Joseph Fourier (1826), Theodore Motzkin (1936).

function $\text{FOURIERMOTZKIN}(F)$ \hspace{1cm} $F$ is a conjunction of inequalities $a \leq b$ with linear polynomials $a, b$

while $F$ contains a variable do
  Choose some variable $x$ in $F$
  Arithmetically transform every inequality in which $x$ occurs into the form $a \leq x$ or $x \leq b$
  Let $A$ be the set of all $a$ where $a \leq x$ is an inequality in $F$.
  Let $B$ be the set of all $b$ where $x \leq b$ is an inequality in $F$.
  Remove from $F$ all inequalities of form $a \leq x$ and $x \leq b$.
  Add to $F$ a (possibly simplified version of the) inequality $a \leq b$ for every pair $(a, b) \in A \times B$
end while

if $F$ contains a constraint $c_1 \leq c_2$ with constant $c_1$ greater than constant $c_2$ then
  return false \hspace{1cm} $\triangleright$ unsatisfiable
else
  return true \hspace{1cm} $\triangleright$ satisfiable
end if

end function
Example

$LRA$-Satisfiability of formula $F :\Leftrightarrow (z \leq x - y) \land (x + 2 \cdot y \leq 5) \land (y \leq 4 \cdot z - 2 \cdot x)$

- **Eliminate $x$**:
  - Transform: $(z + y \leq x) \land (x \leq 5 - 2 \cdot y) \land (x \leq 2 \cdot z - \frac{1}{2} \cdot y)$
  - Eliminate: $(z + y \leq 5 - 2 \cdot y) \land (z + y \leq 2 \cdot z - \frac{1}{2} \cdot y)$
  - Simplify: $(z \leq 5 - 3 \cdot y) \land (\frac{3}{2} \cdot y \leq z)$

- **Eliminate $z$**:
  - Transform: $(\frac{3}{2} \cdot y \leq z) \land (z \leq 5 - 3 \cdot y)$
  - Eliminate: $(\frac{3}{2} \cdot y \leq 5 - 3 \cdot y)$
  - Simplify: $(\frac{9}{2} \cdot y \leq 5)$

- **Eliminate $y$**:
  - Transform: $(y \leq \frac{10}{9})$
  - Eliminate: $\top$

$F$ is $LRA$-satisfiable (by, e.g., $y := 0 \in [-\infty, \frac{10}{9}], z := 0 \in [0, 5], x := 0 \in [0, 0]$).
Example

$LRA$-Satisfiability of formula $F : \iff (x \leq y) \land (x \leq z) \land (y + 2 \cdot z \leq x) \land (1 \leq x)$

- **Eliminate $x$:**
  - Transform: $(y + 2 \cdot z \leq x) \land (1 \leq x) \land (x \leq y) \land (x \leq z)$
  - Eliminate: $(y + 2 \cdot z \leq y) \land (y + 2 \cdot z \leq z) \land (1 \leq y) \land (1 \leq z)$
  - Simplify: $(z \leq 0) \land (y + z \leq 0) \land (1 \leq y) \land (1 \leq z)$

- **Eliminate $z$:**
  - Transform: $(1 \leq z) \land (z \leq 0) \land (z \leq -y) \land (1 \leq y)$
  - Eliminate: $(1 \leq 0) \land (1 \leq -y) \land (1 \leq y)$
  - Simplify: $(1 \leq 0) \land (y \leq -1) \land (1 \leq y)$

- **Eliminate $y$:**
  - Transform: $(1 \leq y) \land (y \leq -1) \land (1 \leq 0)$
  - Eliminate: $(1 \leq -1) \land (1 \leq 0)$

$F$ is $LRA$-unsatisfiable.
The Theory \( EUF \): Equality with Uninterpreted Functions

Essentially the SMT-LIB logic QF_UF.

- \( EUF \) is a quantifier-free first-order theory with only predicate “=”.
  - Syntax: an arbitrary propositional combination of equalities.
  - Semantics: the fixed interpretation of “=” as “equality”.

- \( EUF \) is sufficient to also deal with \textbf{arbitrary other predicates} in a formula \( F \):
  - Introduce a fresh constant \( T \) and a fresh function \( f_p \) for every other predicate \( p \).
  - Transform every atomic formula \( p(\ldots) \) into an equality \( f_p(\ldots) = T \).
  - Formula \( F \) is satisfiable if and only if its transformed version is \( EUF \)-satisfiable.

- \( EUF \)-satisfiability of formula \( F \):
  - Convert \( F \) into its disjunctive normal form \( C_1 \lor \ldots \lor C_n \).
  - \( F \) is \( EUF \)-satisfiable if and only if some \( C_i \) is \( EUF \)-satisfiable.

It suffices to decide the satisfiability of a conjunction of (negated) equalities.
Deciding $EUF$-Satisfiability by Congruence Closure


- $R \subseteq S \times S$ is a congruence relation if it is an equivalence relation
  - $R$ is reflexive, symmetric, and transitive
    that satisfies for every $n$-ary function $f$ the congruence condition of $f$:
  - $\forall t, u \in S^n. (\forall 1 \leq i \leq n. R(t_i, u_i)) \Rightarrow R(f(t), f(u))$
- The congruence closure $R^c$ is the smallest congruence relation covering $R$:
  - $R^c$ is a congruence relation with $R \subseteq R^c$
  - $\forall R'. (R' \text{ is a congruence relation with } R \subseteq R') \Rightarrow (R^c \subseteq R')$
- $EUF$-satisfiability of formula $F : \Leftrightarrow (\bigwedge_{i=1}^{n} t_i = u_i) \land (\bigwedge_{j=n+1}^{n+m} t_j \neq u_j)$:
  - Let $R$ be the relation $\{(t_i, u_i) \mid 1 \leq i \leq n\}$ on the set $S$ of subterms of $F$.
  - $F$ is $EUF$-satisfiable if and only if $\forall n + 1 \leq j \leq n + m. \neg R^c(t_j, u_j)$.

To decide the $EUF$-satisfiability of $F$, it suffices to compute the congruence closure of the term equalities in $F$ and check that it is compatible with the term inequalities.
Congruence Closure: Basic Idea

We compute the congruence closure by partitioning \( S \) into classes of congruent terms.

- **Partition** \( S/R^c := \{[t]_{R^c} \mid t \in S\} \).
  - Congruence class \([t]_{R^c} : R^c(t,u)\) if and only if \([t]_{R^c} = [u]_{R^c}\).
  - Given \( F \) with equations \( t_1 = u_1, \ldots, t_n = u_n \), compute partitions \( P_0, P_1, \ldots, P_n = S/R^c \).
    - \( P_0 \): every element of \( S \) represents a separate congruence class.
    - \( P_{i+1} \): determined from \( P_i \) by merging \([t_{i+1}]\) and \([u_{i+1}]\), i.e., by forming their union and propagating new congruences that arise within this union.

- **Example**: satisfiability of \( F \) \( \iff f(a, b) = a \land f(f(a, b), b) \neq a \)
  - Set \( S := \{a, b, f(a, b), f(f(a, b), b)\} \), single equation \( f(a, b) = a \).
  - \( P_0 := \{\{a\}, \{b\}, \{f(a, b)\}, \{f(f(a, b), b)\}\} \)
  - \( P_1 := \{\{b\}, \{a, f(a, b), f(f(a, b), b)\}\} \)
    - Union of \([f(a, b)]\) and \([a]\): \(\{\{b\}, \{a, f(a, b)\}, \{f(f(a, b), b)\}\}\)
    - Propagation: \([f(a, b)] = [a] \) implies \([f(f(a, b), b)] = [f(a, b)]\)
  - \( F \) is **EUF-unsatisfiable**: \([f(f(a, b), b)] = [a] \).
Congruence Closure: Algorithm

function CONGRUENCE\_CLOSURE(\(S, R\))
    \(P := \{\{t\} \mid t \in S\}\) \(\triangleright\) compute partition \(P := S/(R^c)\)
    for \((t, u) \in R\) do
        \(P := \text{MERGE}(S, P, t, u)\)
    end for
    \(\triangleright\) return relation determined by \(P\)
    return \(\{(t, u) \in S \times S \mid \text{FIND}(P, t) = \text{FIND}(P, u)\}\)
end function

function CONGRUENT(\(P, t, u\))
    if \(t\) and \(u\) are \(f(t_1, \ldots, t_n)\) and \(f(u_1, \ldots, u_n)\) then
        return \(\forall 1 \leq i \leq n. \text{FIND}(P, t_i) = \text{FIND}(P, u_i)\)
    else
        return false
    end if
end function

\(P\) can be represented by a “disjoint-set” data structure with efficient merge/find algorithms.

function MERGE(\(S, P, t, u\)) \(\triangleright\) merge \([t]\) and \([u]\)
    \(p_t, p_u := \text{FIND}(P, t), \text{FIND}(P, u)\)
    if \(p_t = p_u\) return \(P\)
    \(P := (P\backslash\{p_t, p_u\}) \cup \{p_t \cup p_u\}\)
    for \((t_1, t_2) \in S \times S\) do
        \(p_1, p_2 := \text{FIND}(P, t_1), \text{FIND}(P, t_2)\)
        if \(p_1 \neq p_2\) \&\& \text{CONGRUENT}(P, t_1, t_2) then
            \(P := \text{MERGE}(P, t_1, t_2)\)
        end if
    end for
    return \(P\)
end function

function FIND(\(P, t\)) \(\triangleright\) find congruence class \([t]\) \(\in P\)
    choose \(p \in P\) with \(t \in p\)
    return \(p\)
end function
**Congruence Closure: More Examples**

- **Example:** satisfiability of $F :\iff f(f(f(a))) = a \land f(f(f(f(f(a))))) = a \land f(a) \neq a$.
  - $P_0 := \{\{a\}, \{f(a)\}, \{f^2(a)\}, \{f^3(a)\}, \{f^4(a)\}, \{f^5(a)\}\}$
  - $P_1 := \{\{a, f^3(a)\}, \{f(a), f^4(a)\}, \{f^2(a), f^5(a)\}\}$
    - Union of $[f^3(a)]$ and $[a]$: $\{\{a, f^3(a)\}, \{f(a)\}, \{f^2(a)\}, \{f^4(a)\}, \{f^5(a)\}\}$
    - Propagation: $[f^3(a)] = [a]$ implies $[f^4(a)] = [f(a)]$ and $[f^5(a)] = [f^2(a)]$.
  - $P_2 := \{\{a, f(a), f^2(a), f^3(a), f^4(a), f^5(a)\}\}$
    - Union of $[f^5(a)]$ and $[a]$: $\{\{a, f^2(a), f^3(a), f^5(a)\}, \{f(a), f^4(a)\}\}$
    - Propagation: $[f^2(a)] = [a]$ implies $[f^3(a)] = [f(a)]$.

- $P$ is **EUF-unsatisfiable**: $[f(a)] = [a]$.

- **Example:** satisfiability of $F :\iff f(x) = y \land x \neq f(y)$.
  - $P_0 := \{\{x\}, \{y\}, \{f(x)\}, \{f(y)\}\}$
  - $P_1 := \{\{x\}, \{y, f(x)\}, \{f(y)\}\}$
    - Union of $[f(x)]$ and $[y]$: $\{\{x\}, \{y, f(x)\}, \{f(y)\}\}$
    - No more propagation.
  - $F$ is **EUF-satisfiable**: $[x] \neq [f(y)]$. 
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let congruent eqv (s,t) = (* Test whether subterms are congruent under an equivalence. *)
  match (s,t) with
    Fn(f,a1),Fn(g,a2) -> f = g & forall2 (equivalent eqv) a1 a2
  | _ -> false;;

let rec emerge (s,t) (eqv,pfn) = (* Merging of terms, with congruence closure. *)
  let s' = canonize eqv s and t' = canonize eqv t in
  if s' = t' then (eqv,pfn) else
  let sp = tryapplyl pfn s' and tp = tryapplyl pfn t' in
  let eqv' = equate (s,t) eqv in
  let st' = canonize eqv' s' in
  let pfn' = (st' |-> union sp tp) pfn in
  itlist (fun (u,v) (eqv,pfn) ->
    if congruent eqv (u,v) then emerge (u,v) (eqv,pfn)
    else eqv,pfn)
  (allpairs (fun u v -> (u,v)) sp tp) (eqv',pfn');;
let predecessors $t$ $pfn =$
  match $t$ with
  $\text{Fn}(f,a) \rightarrow \text{itlist} \left( \text{fun} \ s \ f \rightarrow (s \ |\rightarrow \text{insert} \ t \ (\text{tryapply} \ f \ s) \ f) \ \text{(setify} \ a) \ pfn \right)
  | _ \rightarrow pfn;$

let ccsatisfiable $fms =$ (* Satisfiability of conjunction of ground equations and inequations. *)
  let $\text{pos}, \text{neg} =$ partition positive $fms$ in
  let $\text{eqps} =$ map dest_eq $\text{pos}$ and $\text{eqns} =$ map (dest_eq ** negate) $\text{neg}$ in
  let $\text{lrs} =$ map fst $\text{eqps}$ @ map snd $\text{eqps}$ @ map fst $\text{eqns}$ @ map snd $\text{eqns}$ in
  let $pfn =$ itlist predecessors (unions(map subterms $\text{lrs}$)) undefined in
  let $\text{eqv}, _ =$ itlist emerge $\text{eqps}$ (unequal,$pfn$) in
  forall (fun (l,r) -> not(equivalent $\text{eqv}$ l r)) $\text{eqns}$;

let ccvalid $fm =$ (* Validity checking a universal formula. *)
  let $fms =$ simpdnf(askolemize(Not(generalize $fm$))) in
  not (exists ccsatisfiable $fms$);

# ccvalid \(\langle f(f(f(f(c)))) = c \land f(f(c)) = c \Rightarrow f(c) = c \lor f(g(c)) = g(f(c))\rangle\);
- : bool = true

# ccvalid \(\langle f(f(f(c))) = c \land f(f(c)) = c \Rightarrow f(c) = c\rangle\);
- : bool = true
The Theory $E$: Equality Logic

$EUF$ without uninterpreted functions (i.e., only with constants).

- **Decision of $E$-satisfiability:**
  - Computation of congruence closure without the need to propagate congruences:
    ```
    function $\text{MERGE}(S, P, t, u)$
    $p_t, p_u := \text{FIND}(P, t), \text{FIND}(P, u)$
    return $(P\{p_t, p_u\}) \cup \{p_t \cup p_u\}$
    end function
    ```
    - equals $P$, if $p_t = p_u$
- **Ackermann’s Reduction:** transformation of an $EUF$-formula into an $E$-formula.
  - Replace every function application $f(t_1, \ldots, t_n)$ by a fresh constant $f_{t_1, \ldots, t_n}$.
  - For every pair of applications $f(t_1, \ldots, t_n)$ and $f(u_1, \ldots, u_n)$, add the constraint
    $$(t_1 = u_1 \land \ldots \land t_n = u_n) \Rightarrow f_{t_1, \ldots, t_n} = f_{u_1, \ldots, u_n}$$
  - The result is $E$-satisfiable if and only if the original formula is $EUF$-satisfiable.

The theory $E$ needs larger formulas but has a simpler decision algorithm than $EUF$. 
\( E\)-Satisfiability: Example

\( \text{EUF-satisfiability of formula } F : \Leftrightarrow x_2 = x_3 \land f(x_1) = f(x_3) \land f(x_1) \neq f(x_2) \)

- Ackermann’s reduction to \( E\)-formula \( F' \):

\[
\begin{align*}
&x_2 = x_3 \land f_1 = f_3 \land f_1 \neq f_2 \land \\
&(x_1 = x_2 \Rightarrow f_1 = f_2) \land (x_1 = x_3 \Rightarrow f_1 = f_3) \land (x_2 = x_3 \Rightarrow f_2 = f_3)
\end{align*}
\]

- Disjunctive normal form of \( F' \):

\[
\begin{align*}
&(x_2 = x_3 \land f_1 = f_3 \land f_1 \neq f_2 \land x_1 \neq x_2 \land x_1 \neq x_3 \land x_2 \neq x_3) \lor \\
&(x_2 = x_3 \land f_1 = f_3 \land f_1 \neq f_2 \land x_1 \neq x_2 \land f_1 = f_3 \land x_2 \neq x_3) \lor \\
&(x_2 = x_3 \land f_1 = f_3 \land f_1 \neq f_2 \land x_1 \neq x_2 \land f_1 = f_3 \land f_2 = f_3) \lor \\
&(x_2 = x_3 \land f_1 = f_3 \land f_1 \neq f_2 \land f_1 = f_2 \land x_1 \neq x_3 \land x_2 \neq x_3) \lor \\
&(x_2 = x_3 \land f_1 = f_3 \land f_1 \neq f_2 \land f_1 = f_2 \land f_1 = f_3 \land f_2 = f_3) \lor \\
&(x_2 = x_3 \land f_1 = f_3 \land f_1 \neq f_2 \land f_1 = f_2 \land f_1 = f_3 \land x_2 \neq x_3) \lor \\
&(x_2 = x_3 \land f_1 = f_3 \land f_1 \neq f_2 \land f_1 = f_2 \land f_1 = f_3 \land f_2 = f_3)
\end{align*}
\]
\textbf{E-Satisfiability: Example}

\emph{E-satisfiability} of DNF of $F'$: only two clauses do not have conflicting literals.

- **Satisfiability of** $(x_2 = x_3 \land f_1 = f_3 \land f_1 \neq f_2 \land x_1 \neq x_2 \land x_1 \neq x_3 \land f_2 = f_3)$:
  - $P_0 := \{\{x_1\}, \{x_2\}, \{x_3\}, \{f_1\}, \{f_2\}, \{f_3\}\}$
  - $P_1 := \{\{x_1\}, \{x_2, x_3\}, \{f_1\}, \{f_2\}, \{f_3\}\}$
  - $P_2 := \{\{x_1\}, \{x_2, x_3\}, \{f_1, f_3\}, \{f_2\}\}$
  - $P_3 := \{\{x_1\}, \{x_2, x_3\}, \{f_1, f_2, f_3\}\}$
  - $[f_1] = [f_2]$: clause is \textit{E}-unsatisfiable.

- **Satisfiability of** $(x_2 = x_3 \land f_1 = f_3 \land f_1 \neq f_2 \land x_1 \neq x_2 \land f_1 = f_3 \land f_2 = f_3)$:
  - $P_0 := \{\{x_1\}, \{x_2\}, \{x_3\}, \{f_1\}, \{f_2\}, \{f_3\}\}$
  - $P_1 := \{\{x_1\}, \{x_2, x_3\}, \{f_1\}, \{f_2\}, \{f_3\}\}$
  - $P_2 := \{\{x_1\}, \{x_2, x_3\}, \{f_1, f_3\}, \{f_2\}\}$
  - $P_3 := \{\{x_1\}, \{x_2, x_3\}, \{f_1, f_2, f_3\}\}$
  - $[f_1] = [f_2]$: clause is \textit{E}-unsatisfiable.

DNF of $F'$ is \textit{E}-unsatisfiable, thus $F$ is \textit{EUF}-unsatisfiable.