

**COMPLEXITY OF THE DECIDABILITY OF ONE CLASS  
OF FORMULAS IN QUANTIFIER-FREE SET THEORY  
WITH A SET-UNION OPERATOR**

M. TETRUASHVILI

ABSTRACT. We consider the quantifier-free set theory  $MLSUn$  containing the symbols  $U, \setminus, =, \in, Un$ .  $Un(p)$  is interpreted as the union of all members of the set  $p$ . It is proved that there exists an algorithm which for any formula  $Q$  of the  $MLSUn$  theory containing at most one occurrence of the symbol  $Un$  decides whether  $Q$  is true or not using the space  $cn^3 \log_2 n$  ( $n$  is the length of  $Q$ ).

Let  $MLSUn$  ( $MLS$ ) be a quantifier-free set theory whose language contains the symbols  $U, \setminus, =, \in, Un$  ( $U, \setminus, =, \in$ ), where  $Un$  is a unary functional symbol ( $Un(p)$  is understood as a union of all members of the set  $p$ ). Let  $MLSUn^{(1)}$  be the class of formulas of the language  $MLSUn$  containing at most one occurrence of the symbol  $Un$ . The decidability problem for a class of formulas consists in finding an algorithm which decides whether an arbitrary formula of this class is true or not. For the class  $MLSUn^{(1)}$  the problem of decidability can be easily reduced to testing the satisfiability of conjunctions of literals of the following types:

$$(=) x = y \cup z, \quad x = y \setminus z, \quad (\in) x \in y, \quad (Un) u = Un(p),$$

where the conjunctions contain the  $(Un)$ -type literal not more than once.

Let  $Q$  be the formula of the  $MLSUn^{(1)}$ . If  $Q$  contains literals  $u = Un(p)$  and  $u = \emptyset$ , then  $Q$  has a model if and only if  $Q_0$  has a model, where  $Q_0$  denotes the result of removing the clause  $u = Un(p)$  from  $Q$  and adding either the literal  $p = \emptyset$  or the clauses  $\emptyset \in p, \emptyset = x \cap p \vee \emptyset = x \cap p \vee \emptyset = p \setminus x$  for every variable  $x$  of  $Q$ . The obtained  $Q_0$  is a formula of the decidable theory  $MLS$  [1]. Therefore we can assume  $Q$  to contain the literal  $u \neq \emptyset$ .

Let  $x, z_1, \dots, z_m, y$  be variables. By  $P^+(x, z_1, \dots, z_m, y)$  we denote the disjunction  $\bigvee_{\langle i_1, \dots, i_k \rangle \in \mathcal{I}_m^+} (x \in z_{i_1} \& z_{i_1} \in z_{i_2} \& \dots \& z_{i_{k-1}} \in z_{i_k} \& z_{i_k} \in y)$  where  $\mathcal{I}_m^+$  is the set of all non-empty ordered subsets of the set  $\{1, \dots, m\}$ .

---

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 03D15.

*Key words and phrases.* Complexity of decidability, set theory, set-union operator.

Let  $x_1, \dots, x_m$  be all variables occurring in  $Q$ . It is proved in [2] that given a finite family  $z_1, \dots, z_m$  of sets and the set  $p$  such that  $Un(p) \neq \emptyset$ , there exists a non-empty set  $t \in p$  such that  $P^+(t, z_1, \dots, z_m, Un(p))$  is false. Therefore we can add the statements  $t \in p$ ,  $t \neq \emptyset$  and  $\neg P^+(t, x_1, \dots, x_m, u)$  to the formula  $Q$  not modifying its satisfiability ( $t$  is a new variable).

Finally,  $Q$  can be assumed to contain one full conjunct  $C$  of the disjunctive normal form (d.n.f.) of the statement  $\big\&_{i=1}^m (x_i \notin p \vee x_i \setminus u = \emptyset)$  which is true in any model of  $Q$ .

Let  $Q_-$  denote the result of removing the literal  $u = Un(p)$  from  $Q$ . The obtained  $Q_-$  is a formula of  $MLS$ . It has been proved in [2] that  $Q$  has a model if and only if  $Q_-$  has a model. Therefore this theorem solves the problem of decidability for the class  $MLSUn^{(1)}$ . However, the formula  $P^+(x, z_1, \dots, z_m, y)$  playing an important part in the investigation of satisfiability of  $Q$  is awkward:  $2^m \leq \text{Card}(\mathcal{I}_m^+) \leq m^m$ , and the d.n.f. of this formula contains a large number of summands (exponential with respect to  $m$ ).

Therefore the corresponding decidability procedure has an exponential computational complexity (by space).

Below we shall find an algorithm which solves the decidability problem for the class  $MLSUn^{(1)}$  with a polynomial computational complexity (by space).

The formula  $\neg P^+(x, z_1, \dots, z_m, y)$  is equivalent to the formula

$$\big\&_{\langle i_1, \dots, i_k \rangle \in \mathcal{I}_m^+} (x \notin z_{i_1} \vee z_{i_1} \notin z_{i_2} \vee \dots \vee z_{i_{k-1}} \notin z_{i_k} \vee z_{i_k} \notin y).$$

Its d.n.f.  $\Delta^+(x, z_1, \dots, z_m, y) \equiv \Delta^+$  contains at most  $m^{m^2}$  summands.

Let  $\mathcal{K}$  be an arbitrary summand of the above d.n.f.  $\Delta^+$ . This  $\mathcal{K}$  is a conjunction of literals of the following forms:  $x \notin z_i$ ,  $z_i \notin z_j$ ,  $z_j \notin y$ . The number of various ordered pairs composed of all variables of the formula  $\Delta^+$  is less than  $(m+2)^2$ . Therefore, although the number of factors in  $\mathcal{K}$  is greater than  $2^m$ , the number of different factors in it is less than  $(m+2)^2$ . Consequently,  $\mathcal{K}$  contains the majority of recurring factors.

In the sequel, the disjunction will be assumed to be a well-ordered set of its summands. The set  $\mathcal{I}_m^+$  is naturally well ordered with respect to the number  $k$  of elements in the system  $\langle i_1, \dots, i_k \rangle$  and lexicographically for a given number  $k$  of elements in the system. Let  $M_\nu$  denote the disjunction  $x \notin z_1 \vee \dots \vee z_{i_k} \notin y$ , where  $\nu$  is a number of the system  $\langle i_1, \dots, i_k \rangle$  in the set  $\mathcal{I}_m^+$  and let  $m_\nu$  be the last element of the set  $M_\nu$ . The conjunction  $\mathcal{K}$  is composed as follows: the number of all factors is equal to  $\text{Card}(\mathcal{I}_m^+)$  and the  $\nu$ th member of the conjunction is an element of the set  $M_\nu$ .

It can be easily seen that the formula  $Q_-$  is equivalent to the disjunction

$D$  of the formulas of the form

$$\mathcal{H} \& \Delta^+(x, z_1, \dots, z_m, y), \quad (1)$$

where  $\mathcal{H}$  is  $Q_0 \& (t \in p) \& (t \neq \emptyset) \& C$ , and  $Q_0$  denotes the result of removing the literal  $u = Un(p)$  from  $Q$ ,  $\text{length}(\mathcal{H}) \leq c_0 \cdot \text{length}(Q)$  with a constant  $c_0$  and the number of summands in the disjunction is equal to  $2^m$ . The formula  $Q$  is satisfiable if and only if one of the summands of  $D$  is satisfiable. In this case the passage from one summand to the next one is realized easily and mechanically. Therefore, having investigated one summand for satisfiability we can write out the next one  $\mathcal{H}'$  and cancel the previous  $\mathcal{H}$ .

The satisfiability test for the given summand of  $D$  of the type (1) requires that for all summands of the d.n.f. of the formula (1). We test the satisfiability of each such conjunction with the linear space [3].

Obviously, an arbitrary summand of the d.n.f. of the formula of the type (1) has the form  $\mathcal{H} \& \mathcal{K}$ , where  $\mathcal{K}$  is a conjunction of literals. Hence, to construct an algorithm testing the satisfiability of the formula  $Q_+$ , it suffices to construct an algorithm  $\mathfrak{A}$  which for an arbitrary conjunction  $\mathcal{K}'$  of the d.n.f.  $\Delta^+$  gives immediately the next conjunction  $\mathcal{K}$ . The formula  $\Delta^+$  can be regarded as a direct product of the well-known number of well-ordered finite sets  $M_\nu$  and hence as a well-ordered set of conjunctions. Therefore, writing down the given conjunction  $\mathcal{K}$  of the d.n.f.  $\Delta^+$  along with all its recurring factors (their number is greater than  $2^m$ ), we can easily write out the next conjunction immediately following it.

When constructing an algorithm  $\mathfrak{A}$  it is natural to operate with reduced conjunctions  $\mathcal{K}$  of the d.n.f.  $\Delta^+$ . However, in order to reset all conjunctions of the d.n.f.  $\Delta^+$ , it is necessary to keep some information about implicit recurring factors of the reduced conjunctions in the case where the conjunction  $\mathcal{K}$  is reduced.

Let us remove from the conjunction  $\mathcal{K}$  the recurring literals from the left to the right and keep the number of the removed literals. The obtained conjunction  $\lambda_1 \& \dots \& \lambda_k$  of literals we write as follows:

$$\lambda_1 \mathfrak{b}_1 \lambda_2 \mathfrak{b}_2 \dots \lambda_k \mathfrak{b}_k, \quad (2)$$

where  $\mathfrak{b}_i$  is a binary notation of the number of those literals of  $\mathcal{K}$  which iterate the literals  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_i$ . Since  $k \leq 2m^2$  and  $\text{Card}(\mathcal{I}_m^+) \leq m^m$ , the length of the whole writing (2) does not exceed  $2m^3 \log_2 m$ . Our aim can be achieved by proving the following

**Lemma.** *There exists an algorithm  $\mathfrak{A}$  which for the variables  $x, z_1, \dots, z_m, y$  and an arbitrary number  $\mu$  (in binary notation) of the conjunction of the d.n.f.  $\Delta^+$  with the space  $cm^3 \log_2 m$  gives this conjunction  $\mathcal{K}_\mu$  in the form (2) and also determines in a non-last conjunction  $\mathcal{K}_\mu$  the first from the right number  $\nu_0$  (in binary notation) of its literal which is different from  $m_{\nu_0}$ .*

*Proof.* The binary notation length of the number  $\mu$  of the conjunction of  $\Delta^+$  does not exceed  $m^2 \log_2 m$ . For  $\mu = 1$  the validity of assertions of the lemma is obvious. Let for  $\mu$  the conjunction  $\mathcal{K}_\mu$  be already written out in the form (2) and let the first from the right number  $\nu_0$  of the literal  $\lambda$  from  $\mathcal{K}_\mu$ , which is different from  $m_{\nu_0}$ , be also determined. We replace in  $\mathcal{K}_\mu$  the literal  $\lambda$  with the number  $\nu_0$  by the next literal  $\lambda'$  of  $M_{\nu_0}$ . Furthermore we replace all literals of  $\mathcal{K}_\mu$  with the numbers  $\nu > \nu_0$  by the first elements of  $M_\nu$  and leave unchanged all literals with the numbers  $\nu < \nu_0$ . If  $\lambda' \neq m_{\nu_0}$ , then the required conjunction  $\mathcal{K}_{\mu+1}$  and the number  $\nu_0$  are found for  $\mu + 1$ . Let  $\lambda' = m_{\nu_0}$ . Then we can determine the first, to the left of  $\nu_0$ , number  $\nu_1$  of the literal of the complete conjunction  $\mathcal{K}_{\mu+1}$  which is different from  $m_{\nu_1}$ . To this end, starting with  $\mu = 1$  we successively write out the conjunctions  $\mathcal{K}_1, \dots, \mathcal{K}_\mu, \mathcal{K}_{\mu+1}$  and survey constantly the literal with the number  $\nu_0 - 1$ . This literal is included (temporarily) in the reduced writing of the conjunction, while when passing from  $\mathcal{K}_i$  to  $\mathcal{K}_{i+1}$  the previous writing relating to  $\mathcal{K}_i$  is canceled. Thus, having reached  $\mathcal{K}_{\mu+1}$ , we can determine the literal  $\tilde{\lambda}$  of the conjunction  $\mathcal{K}_{\mu+1}$  with the number  $\nu_0 - 1$ . If  $\tilde{\lambda} \neq m_{\nu_0-1}$ , then our task is fulfilled for  $\mu + 1$ . If  $\tilde{\lambda} = m_{\nu_0-1}$ , then the same can be repeated for the number  $\nu_0 - 2$  of the literal, and in this case the previous writing for  $\nu_0 - 1$  is canceled. If  $\mu + 1$  is the number of the non-last conjunction, then there exists the unknown number  $\nu_1$  which can be found.  $\square$

It is easy to see that in computations with the use of the algorithm  $\mathfrak{A}$  the length of the writing does not exceed the length of the writing of the conjunction from  $\Delta^+$  multiplied by a constant  $c$ , i.e.,  $cm^3 \log_2 m$ . The main lemma and the reasonings preceding this lemma result in the validity of the following

**Theorem.** *There exists an algorithm which for any formula  $Q$  from the class  $MLSUn^{(1)}$  determines the validity of  $Q$  and needs the space  $cn^3 \log_2 n$ , where  $n$  is the length of  $Q$ .*

#### REFERENCES

1. A. Ferro et al., Decision procedures for elementary sublanguages of set theory. I. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **33**(1980), 599–608.
2. M. Breban and A. Ferro, Decision procedures for elementary sublanguages of set theory. III. *Advances Appl. Math.* **5**(1984), 147–215.
3. M. R. Tetrushvili, The complexity of decision of the validity problem for an elementary sublanguage of quantifier-free set theory. (Russian) *Bull. Acad. Sci. Georgian SSR* **126**(1987), 245–247.

(Received 23.12.1993)

Author's address:

1. Vekua Institute of Applied Mathematics, Tbilisi State University
- 2, University St., Tbilisi 380043, Republic of Georgia