Using ACL2's Verified Clause Processor Mechanism to Sort Commutative and Associative Operations

Erik Reeber CS Department 1 University Station, M/S C0500 The University of Texas Austin, TX 78712-0233

E-mail: reeber@cs.utexas.edu

Verified Clause Processors

- New form of meta-reasoning available in ACL2 v3.2 and later.
- Clause processors reduce an ACL2 proof goal into a list of new goals that together imply the original.
- Matt Kaufmann, J Strother Moore, Sandip Ray, and Erik Reeber. Integrating External Deduction Tools with ACL2. To Appear in the Journal of Applied Logic, Special Issue on Empirically Successful Computerized Reasoning (ESCoR).
- Similar to meta-rules, with the following advantages:
 - Can generalize
 - Can implement techniques that are not inside-out

Example problem: Sorting

- Proofs sometimes require sorting arguments to operations that are commutative and associative.
 - Some typical sorting theorems for bit-vector addition:

```
(DEFTHM BV+COMMUTE
(IMPLIES
(AND (SYNTAXP (NOT (BV+ORD X Y)))
(BVP X) (BVP Y))
(EQUAL (BV+BIN X Y) (BV+BIN Y X)))
:RULE-CLASSES ((:REWRITE :LOOP-STOPPER NIL)))
(DEFTHM BV+REORDER
(IMPLIES
(AND (SYNTAXP (NOT (BV+ORD X Y)))
(BVP X) (BVP Y) (BVP Z))
(EQUAL (BV+BIN X (BV+BIN Y Z))
(BV+BIN Y (BV+BIN X Z))))
:RULE-CLASSES ((:REWRITE :LOOP-STOPPER NIL)))
```

- may be too inefficient for large expressions.

Sorting Clause Processor

- BV+ may also be sorted using a verified clause processor.
- Clause processor implemented as BV+SORT function satisfying:

- where:
 - EVL-BV+ is an ACL2 evaluator for IF, BV+BIN, and BVP.
 - PSEUDO-TERM-LISTP recognizes well-formed ACL2 clauses.
 - DISJOIN creates the disjunction represented by an ACL2 clause.
 - CONJOIN-CLAUSES creates the conjunction of disjunctions represented by a list of ACL2 clauses.

Example Usage

• The sorting clause processor is accessed through the hint mechanism:

```
(DEFTHM FIRST-TEST
(IMPLIES
(AND (BVP X0) (BVP X1) (BVP X2) (BVP X3))
(EQUAL (F (BV+BIN X3 (BV+BIN X2 (BV+BIN X1 X0))))
(F (BV+BIN X0 (BV+BIN X1 (BV+BIN X2 X3)))))
:HINTS (("GOAL"
:CLAUSE-PROCESSOR (:FUNCTION BV+SORT))))
```

• In this case, 5 subgoals are produced:

```
Subgoal 5

(IMPLIES (AND (BVP X0) (BVP X1) (BVP X2) (BVP X3))

(EQUAL (F (BV+BIN X0 (BV+BIN X1 (BV+BIN X2 X3))))

(F (BV+BIN X0 (BV+BIN X1 (BV+BIN X2 X3))))).

Subgoal 4

(IMPLIES (NOT (BVP X0))

(IMPLIES (AND (BVP X0) (BVP X1) (BVP X2) (BVP X3))

(EQUAL (F (BV+BIN X3 (BV+BIN X2 (BV+BIN X1 X0))))

(F (BV+BIN X0 (BV+BIN X1 (BV+BIN X2 X3)))))).
```

Performance Comparison

- Extended example problem to different numbers of bit-vector arguments.
- Without the sorting clause processor:
 - 7.12, 127.60, and 1862.55 seconds to verify property with 100, 200, and 400 arguments respectively.
- With sorting clause processor:
 - 0.05, 0.30, and 1.51 seconds to verify property with 100, 200, and 400 arguments respectively.
 - 19.08 and 139.47 seconds to verify property with 1000 and 2000 arguments (only 0.04 and 0.08 seconds during SCP).
- Journal paper has results without BVP hypotheses:
 - 10.55 and 58.15 seconds to prove the 500 and 1000 argument theorem without the clause processor.
 - 0.02 and 0.05 seconds to prove the 500 and 1000 argument theorem with the clause processor.

Conclusion

- Verified clause processors present a new method of extending the theorem prover.
 - Useful for creating efficient domain-specific proof techniques.
- BV+ sorting clause processor.
 - Much more efficient than traditional rewrite-based approach.
 - Must be accessed through a clause hint.
- Generalized into a macro for any commutative and associative operation.
 - Will make publicly available,
 "books/clause-processors/sorting-cp/".