

## Appendix to Lecture 25

J. Meseguer

**Theorem.** Let  $f : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  be a *simulation* map, then for any  $U, V \subseteq A$ ,  $\mathcal{A} \models \exists U \rightarrow^* V$  implies  $\mathcal{B} \models \exists f(U) \rightarrow^* f(V)$ . Equivalently,  $\mathcal{B} \models \forall f(U) \rightarrow^* f(V)$  implies  $\mathcal{A} \models \forall U \rightarrow^* V$ .

**Proof:**  $\mathcal{A} \models \exists U \rightarrow^* V$  just means that  $\exists a \in U$ ,  $\exists a' \in V$ ,  $a \rightarrow_{\mathcal{A}}^* a'$ . But, since  $f$  is a simulation, this forces  $f(a) \rightarrow_{\mathcal{B}}^* f(a')$ , i.e.,  $\mathcal{B} \models \exists f(U) \rightarrow^* f(V)$ .  $\square$

**Theorem.** Let  $f : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  be a *bisimulation* map, then for any  $U, V \subseteq A$ ,  $\mathcal{A} \models \exists U \rightarrow^* V$  iff  $\mathcal{B} \models \exists f(U) \rightarrow^* f(V)$ . Equivalently,  $\mathcal{A} \models \forall U \rightarrow^* V$  iff  $\mathcal{B} \models \forall f(U) \rightarrow^* f(V)$ .

**Proof:** Taking into account the previous theorem, we just need to prove that  $\mathcal{B} \models \exists f(U) \rightarrow^* f(V)$  implies  $\mathcal{A} \models \exists U \rightarrow^* V$ . But  $\mathcal{B} \models \exists f(U) \rightarrow^* f(V)$  means that  $\exists a \in U$ ,  $\exists a' \in V$ ,  $f(a) \rightarrow_{\mathcal{B}}^* f(a')$ , and  $f$  being a bisimulation then forces  $a \rightarrow_{\mathcal{A}}^* a'$ , giving us  $\mathcal{A} \models \exists U \rightarrow^* V$ , as desired.  $\square$

**Theorem.** Let  $\mathcal{R} = (\Sigma, E \cup B, R)$  be a topmost rewrite theory such that  $G = E \cup B$  is FVP, and  $G' = E' \cup B'$  is such that  $E \cup E' \cup B \cup B'$  is FVP modulo  $B \cup B'$ .  $\mathcal{R}/G'$  defines a bisimilar equational abstraction of  $\mathcal{R}$  if for each  $(u_0^i = u_1^i) \in G'$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq p$ , and  $(t_0^j \rightarrow t_1^j) \in R$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq q$ , and each  $\sigma \in \text{Unif}_G(t_{b'}^j = u_b^i)$ ,  $0 \leq b \leq 1$ ,  $0 \leq b' \leq 1$ , there exists a  $\theta$  such that  $u_{b' \oplus 1}^i \sigma =_G t_b^j \theta \wedge t_{b \oplus 1}^j \theta =_G t_{b \oplus 1}^j \sigma$ , where  $\oplus$  denotes exclusive or.

**Proof:** It will be enough to show that for all  $j$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq q$ , and for any  $R/G \cup G'$  rewrite of the form  $w =_{G \cup G'} t_0^j \rho \rightarrow t_1^j \rho =_{G \cup G'} w'$  there is a  $R/G$  rewrite of the form  $w =_G t_0^j \rho' \rightarrow t_1^j \rho' =_G w'$ . The proof is by contradiction. Suppose not. Then, we can choose a specific  $k$ ,  $1 \leq k \leq q$ , and an  $R/G \cup G'$  rewrite  $w =_{G \cup G'} t_0^k \rho \rightarrow t_1^k \rho =_{G \cup G'} w'$  for which no  $R/G$  rewrite of the form  $w =_G t_0^k \rho' \rightarrow t_1^k \rho' =_G w'$  exists and, furthermore, if  $n_l$  are the  $G'$  equality steps in  $w =_{G \cup G'} t_0^k \rho$  and  $n_r$  are the  $G'$  equality steps in  $t_1^k \rho =_{G \cup G'} w'$ , then  $n_l + n_r$  is *smallest possible* so that no  $R/G$  rewrite of the form  $w =_G t_0^k \rho' \rightarrow t_1^k \rho' =_G w'$  exists. Without loss of generality we may assume that  $\text{vars}(G') \cap \text{vars}(R) = \emptyset$  and that  $n_l > 0$  (the case  $n_r > 0$  is entirely analogous). Therefore, the proof  $w =_{G \cup G'} t_0^k \rho$  can be decomposed as a proof of the form  $w =_{G \cup G'} u_{b \oplus 1}^{k'} \tau = u_b^{k'} \tau =_G t_0^k \rho$  for some  $k'$ ,  $1 \leq k' \leq p$ , and  $\tau$ , with  $w =_{G \cup G'} u_{b \oplus 1}^{k'} \tau$  involving  $n_l - 1$   $G'$  equality steps. But then  $\tau \oplus \rho$  is a  $G$ -unifier of the equation  $u_b^{k'} = t_0^k$ . Therefore, there exists a  $\sigma \in \text{Unif}_G(t_0^k = u_b^{k'})$  and a  $\gamma$  such that  $\sigma \gamma =_G (\tau \oplus \rho)$ , and by the theorem's assumptions there exist a  $\theta$  such that  $u_{b' \oplus 1}^{k'} \sigma =_G t_0^k \theta \wedge t_1^k \theta =_G t_1^k \sigma$ . But this gives as a  $R/G \cup G'$  rewrite of the form:

$$w =_{G \cup G'} u_{b \oplus 1}^{k'} \tau =_G u_{b \oplus 1}^{k'} \sigma \gamma =_G t_0^k \theta \gamma \rightarrow t_1^k \theta \gamma =_G t_1^k \sigma \gamma =_G t_1^k \rho =_{G \cup G'} w'$$

with  $(n_l + n_r) - 1$   $G'$  equality steps, contradicting the minimality of  $n_l + n_r$  for which no  $R/G$  rewrite of the form  $w =_G t_0^k \rho' \rightarrow t_1^k \rho' =_G w'$  exists.  $\square$