

# Decision Procedures

Jochen Hoenicke



Software Engineering  
Albert-Ludwigs-University Freiburg

Winter Term 2019/2020

## Quantifier Elimination

Quantifier Elimination (QE) removes quantifiers from formulae:

- Given a formula with quantifiers, e.g.,  $\exists x.F[x, y, z]$ .
- Goal: find an **equivalent** quantifier-free formula  $G[y, z]$ .
- The **free** variables of  $F$  and  $G$  are the same.

$$\exists x.F[x, y, z] \Leftrightarrow G[y, z]$$

Decide satisfiability for a formula  $F$ , e.g. in  $T_{\mathbb{Q}}$ , using quantifier elimination:

- Given a formula  $F$ , with free variable  $x_1, \dots, x_n$ .
- Build  $\exists x_1 \dots \exists x_n. F$ .
- Build equivalent quantifier free formula  $G$ .  
 $G$  contains only constants, functions and predicates  
i.e.  $0, 1, +, -, \geq, =$ .
- Compute truth value of  $G$ .

In developing a QE algorithm for theory  $T$ , we need only consider formulae of the form

$$\exists x. F$$

for quantifier-free  $F$

**Example:** For  $\Sigma$ -formula

$$G_1: \exists x. \forall y. \underbrace{\exists z. F_1[x, y, z]}_{F_2[x, y]}$$

$$G_2: \exists x. \forall y. F_2[x, y]$$

$$G_3: \exists x. \underbrace{\neg \exists y. \neg F_2[x, y]}_{F_3[x]}$$

$$G_4: \underbrace{\exists x. \neg F_3[x]}_{F_4}$$

$$G_5: F_4$$

$G_5$  is quantifier-free and  $T$ -equivalent to  $G_1$

Consider the Signature of Rationals:  $\Sigma_{\mathbb{Q}} : \{0, 1, +, -, =, \geq\}$

We extend the signature with the predicate  $>$ , which is defined as

$$x > y :\Leftrightarrow x \geq y \wedge \neg(x = y).$$

Additionally we allow predicates  $<$  and  $\leq$ :

$$x < y :\Leftrightarrow y > x \quad x \leq y :\Leftrightarrow y \geq x.$$

We extend the signature by fractions:

$$\frac{\cdot}{a} \in \Sigma_{\mathbb{Q}} \text{ for } a \in \mathbb{Z}^+$$

which are unary function symbols, with their usual meaning.

Given a  $\Sigma_{\mathbb{Q}}$ -formula  $\exists x. F[x]$ , where  $F[x]$  is quantifier-free  
Generate quantifier-free formula  $F_4$  (four steps) s.t.

$F_4$  is  $\Sigma_{\mathbb{Q}}$ -equivalent to  $\exists x. F[x]$ .

- 1 Put  $F[x]$  in NNF.
- 2 Eliminate negated literals.
- 3 Solve the literals s.t.  $x$  appears isolated on one side.
- 4 Finite disjunction  $\bigvee_{t \in S_F} F[t]$ .

$$\exists x. F[x] \Leftrightarrow \bigvee_{t \in S_F} F[t].$$

where  $S_F$  depends on the formula  $F$ .

**Step 1:** Put  $F[x]$  in NNF. The result is  $\exists x. F_1[x]$ .

**Step 2:** Eliminate negated literals and  $\geq$  (left to right)

$$\begin{aligned} s \geq t &\Leftrightarrow s > t \vee s = t \\ \neg(s > t) &\Leftrightarrow t > s \vee t = s \\ \neg(s \geq t) &\Leftrightarrow t > s \\ \neg(s = t) &\Leftrightarrow t < s \vee t > s \end{aligned}$$

The result  $\exists x. F_2[x]$  does not contain negations.



Solve for  $x$  in each atom of  $F_2[x]$ , e.g.,

$$ax + t_2 < bx + t_1 \quad \Rightarrow \quad x < \frac{t_1 - t_2}{a - b}$$

where  $a - b \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ .

All atoms containing  $x$  in the result  $\exists x. F_3[x]$  have form

(A)  $x < t$

(B)  $t < x$

(C)  $x = t$

where  $t$  is a term that does not contain  $x$ .

Construct from  $F_3[x]$

- **left infinite projection**  $F_3[-\infty]$  by replacing
  - (A) atoms  $x < t$  by  $\top$
  - (B) atoms  $t < x$  by  $\perp$
  - (C) atoms  $x = t$  by  $\perp$
  
- **right infinite projection**  $F_3[+\infty]$  by replacing
  - (A) atoms  $x < t$  by  $\perp$
  - (B) atoms  $t < x$  by  $\top$
  - (C) atoms  $x = t$  by  $\perp$

Let  $S$  be the set of terms  $t$  from (A), (B), (C) atoms.

Construct the formula

$$F_4 : \bigvee_{t \in S_F} F_3[t], \quad \text{where } S_F := \{-\infty, \infty\} \cup \left\{ \frac{s+t}{2} \mid s, t \in S \right\}$$

which is  $T_{\mathbb{Q}}$ -equivalent to  $\exists x. F[x]$ .

- $F_3[-\infty]$  captures the case when small  $x \in \mathbb{Q}$  satisfy  $F_3[x]$
- $F_3[\infty]$  captures the case when large  $x \in \mathbb{Q}$  satisfy  $F_3[x]$
- if  $s \equiv t$ ,  $\frac{s+t}{2} = s$  captures the case when  $s \in S$  satisfies  $F_3[s]$   
if  $s < t$  are adjacent numbers,  $\frac{s+t}{2}$  represents the whole interval  $(s, t)$ .

Four cases are possible:

- 1 All numbers  $x$  smaller than the smallest term satisfy  $F[x]$ .

$$\leftarrow) t_1 t_2 \cdots t_n$$

- 2 All numbers  $x$  larger than the largest term satisfy  $F[x]$ .

$$t_1 t_2 \cdots t_n \rightarrow$$

- 3 Some  $t_i$ , satisfies  $F[x]$ .

$$t_1 \cdots t_i \cdots t_n$$

$$\uparrow$$

- 4 On an open interval between two terms every element satisfies  $F[x]$ .

$$t_1 \cdots t_i \left( \longleftrightarrow \right) t_{i+1} \cdots t_n$$

$$\frac{t_i + t_{i+1}}{2}$$

$$\exists x. \underbrace{3x + 1 < 10 \wedge 7x - 6 > 7}_{F[x]}$$

Solving for  $x$

$$\exists x. \underbrace{x < 3 \wedge x > \frac{13}{7}}_{F_3[x]}$$

Step 4:

$$F_4 : \bigvee_{t \in S_F} \underbrace{\left( t < 3 \wedge t > \frac{13}{7} \right)}_{F_3[t]}$$

$$S_F = \{-\infty, +\infty, 3, \frac{13}{7}, \frac{3 + \frac{13}{7}}{2}\}.$$

$$F_3[x] = x < 3 \wedge x > 13/7$$

$$F_{-\infty} \Leftrightarrow \top \wedge \perp \Leftrightarrow \perp \quad F_{+\infty} \Leftrightarrow \perp \wedge \top \Leftrightarrow \perp$$

$$F_3[3] \perp \wedge \top \Leftrightarrow \perp \quad F_3\left[\frac{13}{7}\right] \Leftrightarrow \top \wedge \perp \Leftrightarrow \perp$$

$$F_3\left[\frac{\frac{13}{7} + 3}{2}\right] : \frac{\frac{13}{7} + 3}{2} < 3 \wedge \frac{\frac{13}{7} + 3}{2} > \frac{13}{7} \Leftrightarrow \top$$

Thus,  $F_4 : \bigvee_{t \in S_F} F_3[t] \Leftrightarrow \top$  is  $T_{\mathbb{Q}}$ -equivalent to  $\exists x. F[x]$ ,  
 so  $\exists x. F[x]$  is  $T_{\mathbb{Q}}$ -valid.

$$\exists x. \underbrace{2x > y \wedge 3x < z}_{F[x]}$$

Solving for  $x$

$$\exists x. \underbrace{x > \frac{y}{2} \wedge x < \frac{z}{3}}_{F_3[x]}$$

Step 4:  $F_{-\infty} \Leftrightarrow \perp$ ,  $F_{+\infty} \Leftrightarrow \perp$ ,  $F_3[\frac{y}{2}] \Leftrightarrow \perp$  and  $F_3[\frac{z}{3}] \Leftrightarrow \perp$ .

$$F_4 : \frac{\frac{y}{2} + \frac{z}{3}}{2} > \frac{y}{2} \wedge \frac{\frac{y}{2} + \frac{z}{3}}{2} < \frac{z}{3}$$

which simplifies to:

$$F_4 : 2z > 3y$$

$\Sigma_{\mathbb{Z}} : \{\dots, -2, -1, 0, 1, 2, \dots, -3\cdot, -2\cdot, 2\cdot, 3\cdot, \dots, +, -, =, <\}$

Consider the formula

$$F : \exists x. 2x = y$$

Which quantifier free formula  $G[y]$  is equivalent to  $F$ ?

There is **no** such formula!



## Lemma

Given quantifier-free  $\Sigma_{\mathbb{Z}}$ -formula  $F$  s.t.  $\text{free}(F) = \{y\}$ . Let

$$S_F : \{n \in \mathbb{Z} : F\{y \mapsto n\} \text{ is } T_{\mathbb{Z}}\text{-valid}\} .$$

Either  $\mathbb{Z}^+ \cap S_F$  or  $\mathbb{Z}^+ \setminus S_F$  is finite.

where  $\mathbb{Z}^+$  is the set of positive integers

Proof (Structural Induction over  $F$ )

Base case:  $F$  is an atomic formula:

$$\top, \perp, t_1 = t_2, a \cdot y = t, t_1 < t_2, a \cdot y < t.$$

- $\mathbb{Z}^+ \setminus S_{\top} = \mathbb{Z}^+ \cap S_{\perp} = \emptyset$  is finite
- $S_{t_1=t_2}$  and  $S_{t_1 < t_2}$  are either  $S_{\top}$  or  $S_{\perp}$ .
- $\mathbb{Z}^+ \cap S_{a \cdot y = t}$ , ( $a \neq 0$ ) has at most one element.
- $\mathbb{Z}^+ \cap S_{a \cdot y < t}$ ,  $a > 0$  is finite.
- $\mathbb{Z}^+ \setminus S_{a \cdot y < t}$ ,  $a < 0$  is finite.

## Lemma

Given quantifier-free  $\Sigma_{\mathbb{Z}}$ -formula  $F$  s.t.  $\text{free}(F) = \{y\}$ . Let

$$S_F : \{n \in \mathbb{Z} : F\{y \mapsto n\} \text{ is } T_{\mathbb{Z}}\text{-valid}\}.$$

Either  $\mathbb{Z}^+ \cap S_F$  or  $\mathbb{Z}^+ \setminus S_F$  is finite.

where  $\mathbb{Z}^+$  is the set of positive integers

Proof (Structural Induction over  $F$ )

**Induction step:** Assume property holds for  $F, G$ . Show it for  $\neg F, F \wedge G, F \vee G, F \rightarrow G, F \leftrightarrow G$ .

- $\neg F$ : We have  $\mathbb{Z}^+ \cap S_{\neg F} = \mathbb{Z}^+ \setminus S$  and  $\mathbb{Z}^+ \setminus S_{\neg F} = \mathbb{Z}^+ \cap S$  and by ind.-hyp one of these sets is finite.
- $F \wedge G$ : We have  $\mathbb{Z}^+ \cap S_{F \wedge G} = (\mathbb{Z}^+ \cap S_F) \cap (\mathbb{Z}^+ \cap S_G)$  and  $\mathbb{Z}^+ \setminus S_{F \wedge G} = (\mathbb{Z}^+ \setminus S_F) \cup (\mathbb{Z}^+ \setminus S_G)$ .  
If the latter set is not finite then one of  $\mathbb{Z}^+ \cap S_F$  or  $\mathbb{Z}^+ \cap S_G$  is finite.  
In both cases  $\mathbb{Z}^+ \cap S_{F \wedge G}$  is finite.

## Lemma

Given quantifier-free  $\Sigma_{\mathbb{Z}}$ -formula  $F$  s.t.  $\text{free}(F) = \{y\}$ . Let

$$S_F : \{n \in \mathbb{Z} : F\{y \mapsto n\} \text{ is } T_{\mathbb{Z}}\text{-valid}\}.$$

Either  $\mathbb{Z}^+ \cap S_F$  or  $\mathbb{Z}^+ \setminus S_F$  is finite.

where  $\mathbb{Z}^+$  is the set of positive integers

Proof (Structural Induction over  $F$ )

**Induction step:** Assume property holds for  $F, G$ . Show it for  $\neg F, F \wedge G, F \vee G, F \rightarrow G, F \leftrightarrow G$ .

- $F \vee G$  follows from previous, since  $S_{F \vee G} = S_{\neg(\neg F \wedge \neg G)}$ .
- $F \rightarrow G$  follows from  $S_{F \rightarrow G} = S_{(\neg F \vee G)}$ .
- $F \leftrightarrow G$  follows from  $S_{F \leftrightarrow G} = S_{(F \rightarrow G) \wedge (G \rightarrow F)}$ .

## Lemma

Given quantifier-free  $\Sigma_{\mathbb{Z}}$ -formula  $F$  s.t.  $\text{free}(F) = \{y\}$ . Let

$$S_F : \{n \in \mathbb{Z} : F\{y \mapsto n\} \text{ is } T_{\mathbb{Z}}\text{-valid}\} .$$

Either  $\mathbb{Z}^+ \cap S_F$  or  $\mathbb{Z}^+ \setminus S_F$  is finite.

where  $\mathbb{Z}^+$  is the set of positive integers

$\Sigma_{\mathbb{Z}}$ -formula  $F : \exists x. 2x = y$  (with quantifier)

$S_F$ : even integers

$\mathbb{Z}^+ \cap S_F$ : positive even integers — infinite

$\mathbb{Z}^+ \setminus S_F$ : positive odd integers — infinite

Therefore, by the lemma, there is no quantifier-free  $T_{\mathbb{Z}}$ -formula that is  $T_{\mathbb{Z}}$ -equivalent to  $F$ .

Thus,  $T_{\mathbb{Z}}$  does not admit QE.

$\widehat{\Sigma}_{\mathbb{Z}}$ :  $\Sigma_{\mathbb{Z}}$  with countable number of unary **divisibility predicates**  
 $\Sigma_{\mathbb{Z}} \cup \{1|\cdot, 2|\cdot, 3|\cdot, \dots\}$

Intended interpretations:

$k \mid x$  holds iff  $k$  divides  $x$  without any remainder

**Axioms of  $\widehat{T}_{\mathbb{Z}}$** : axioms of  $T_{\mathbb{Z}}$  with additional countable set of axioms

$$\forall x. k \mid x \leftrightarrow \exists y. x = ky \quad \text{for } k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$$

**Example:**

$$x > 1 \wedge y > 1 \wedge 2 \mid x + y$$

is satisfiable (choose  $x = 2, y = 2$ ).

$$\neg(2 \mid x) \wedge 4 \mid x$$

is not satisfiable.

**Algorithm:** Given  $\widehat{\Sigma}_{\mathbb{Z}}$ -formula  $\exists x. F[x]$ , where  $F$  is quantifier-free  
Construct quantifier-free  $\widehat{\Sigma}_{\mathbb{Z}}$ -formula that is equivalent to  $\exists x. F[x]$ .

- 1 Put  $F[x]$  into Negation Normal Form (NNF).
- 2 Normalize literals:  $s < t$ ,  $k|t$ , or  $\neg(k|t)$ .
- 3 Put  $x$  in  $s < t$  on one side:  $hx < t$  or  $s < hx$ .
- 4 Replace  $hx$  with  $x'$  without a factor.
- 5 Replace  $F[x']$  by  $\bigvee F[j]$  for finitely many  $j$ .

Put  $F[x]$  in NNF  $F_1[x]$ , that is,

$\exists x. F_1[x]$  has negations only in literals (only  $\wedge, \vee$ )  
and  $\widehat{T}_{\mathbb{Z}}$ -equivalent to  $\exists x. F[x]$

**Example:**

$$\exists x. \neg(x - 6 < z - x \wedge 4 \mid 5x + 1 \rightarrow 3x < y)$$

is equivalent to

$$\exists x. \neg(3x < y) \wedge x - 6 < z - x \wedge 4 \mid 5x + 1$$

Replace (left to right)

$$\begin{aligned}s = t &\Leftrightarrow s < t + 1 \wedge t < s + 1 \\ \neg(s = t) &\Leftrightarrow s < t \vee t < s \\ \neg(s < t) &\Leftrightarrow t < s + 1\end{aligned}$$

The output  $\exists x. F_2[x]$  contains only literals of form

$$s < t, \quad k \mid t, \quad \text{or} \quad \neg(k \mid t),$$

where  $s, t$  are  $\widehat{T}_{\mathbb{Z}}$ -terms and  $k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ .

**Example:**

$$\exists x. \neg(3x < y) \wedge x - 6 < z - x \wedge 4 \mid 5x + 1$$

is equivalent to

$$\exists x. y < 3x + 1 \wedge x - 6 < z - x \wedge 4 \mid 5x + 1$$



Collect terms containing  $x$  so that literals have the form

$$hx < t, \quad t < hx, \quad k \mid hx + t, \quad \text{or} \quad \neg(k \mid hx + t),$$

where  $t$  is a term and  $h, k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ . The output is the formula  $\exists x. F_3[x]$ , which is  $\widehat{T}_{\mathbb{Z}}$ -equivalent to  $\exists x. F[x]$ .

**Example:**

$$\exists x. y < 3x + 1 \wedge x - 6 < z - x \wedge 4 \mid 5x + 1$$

is equivalent to

$$\exists x. y - 1 < 3x \wedge 2x < z + 6 \wedge 4 \mid 5x + 1$$

Let

$$\delta = \text{lcm}\{h : h \text{ is a coefficient of } x \text{ in } F_3[x]\},$$

where lcm is the least common multiple. Multiply atoms in  $F_3[x]$  by constants so that  $\delta$  is the coefficient of  $x$  everywhere:

$$\begin{array}{lll} hx < t & \Leftrightarrow & \delta x < h't & \text{where } h'h = \delta \\ t < hx & \Leftrightarrow & h't < \delta x & \text{where } h'h = \delta \\ k \mid hx + t & \Leftrightarrow & h'k \mid \delta x + h't & \text{where } h'h = \delta \\ \neg(k \mid hx + t) & \Leftrightarrow & \neg(h'k \mid \delta x + h't) & \text{where } h'h = \delta \end{array}$$

The result  $\exists x. F'_3[x]$ , in which all occurrences of  $x$  in  $F'_3[x]$  are in terms  $\delta x$ .

Replace  $\delta x$  terms in  $F'_3$  with a fresh variable  $x'$  to form

$$F''_3 : F_3\{\delta x \mapsto x'\}$$

Finally, construct

$$\exists x'. \underbrace{F_3''[x'] \wedge \delta \mid x'}_{F_4[x']}$$

$\exists x'. F_4[x']$  is equivalent to  $\exists x. F[x]$  and each literal of  $F_4[x']$  has one of the forms:

- (A)  $x' < t$
- (B)  $t < x'$
- (C)  $k \mid x' + t$
- (D)  $\neg(k \mid x' + t)$

where  $t$  is a term that does not contain  $x$ , and  $k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ .

Example:  $\widehat{T}_{\mathbb{Z}}$ -formula

$$\exists x. \underbrace{2x < z + 6 \wedge y - 1 < 3x \wedge 4 \mid 5x + 1}_{F_3[x]}$$

Collecting coefficients of  $x$ :

$$\delta = \text{lcm}(2, 3, 5) = 30$$

Multiply when necessary

$$\exists x. 30x < 15z + 90 \wedge 10y - 10 < 30x \wedge 24 \mid 30x + 6$$

Replacing  $30x$  with fresh  $x'$

$$\exists x'. \underbrace{x' < 15z + 90 \wedge 10y - 10 < x' \wedge 24 \mid x' + 6 \wedge 30 \mid x'}_{F_4[x']}$$

$\exists x'. F_4[x']$  is equivalent to  $\exists x. F_3[x]$

$\exists x'. F_4[x']$  is equivalent to  $\exists x. F[x]$  and each literal of  $F_4[x']$  has one of the forms:

(A)  $x' < t$

(B)  $t < x'$

(C)  $k \mid x' + t$

(D)  $\neg(k \mid x' + t)$

where  $t$  is a term that does not contain  $x$ , and  $k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ .

Construct

left infinite projection  $F_{-\infty}[x']$

of  $F_4[x']$  by

(A) replacing literals  $x' < t$  by  $\top$

(B) replacing literals  $t < x'$  by  $\perp$

idea: very small numbers satisfy (A) literals but not (B) literals

Let

$$\delta = \text{lcm} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} k \text{ of (C) literals } k \mid x' + t \\ k \text{ of (D) literals } \neg(k \mid x' + t) \end{array} \right\}$$

and  $B$  be the set of terms  $t$  appearing in (B) literals. Construct

$$F_5 : \bigvee_{j=1}^{\delta} F_{-\infty}[j] \vee \bigvee_{j=1}^{\delta} \bigvee_{t \in B} F_4[t + j].$$

$F_5$  is quantifier-free and  $\widehat{T}_{\mathbb{Z}}$ -equivalent to  $F$ .

$$\exists x'. \underbrace{x' < 15z + 90 \wedge 10y - 10 < x' \wedge 24 \mid x' + 6 \wedge 30 \mid x'}_{F_4[x']}$$

Compute lcm:  $\delta = \text{lcm}(24, 30) = 120$

Then

$$F_5 = \bigvee_{j=1}^{120} \top \wedge \perp \wedge 24 \mid j + 6 \wedge 30 \mid j$$

$$\vee \bigvee_{j=1}^{120} 10y - 10 + j < 15z + 90 \wedge 10y - 10 < 10y - 10 + j \\ \wedge 24 \mid 10y - 10 + j + 6 \wedge 30 \mid 10y - 10 + j$$

The formula can be simplified to:

$$F_5 = \bigvee_{j=1}^{120} 10y - 10 + j < 15z + 90 \wedge 24 \mid 10y - 10 + j + 6 \wedge 30 \mid 10y - 10 + j$$

## Theorem

Let  $F_5$  be the formula constructed from  $\exists x'. F_4[x']$  as in Step 5. Then  $\exists x'. F_4[x'] \Leftrightarrow F_5$ .

**Lemma[Periodicity]:** For all atoms  $k \mid x' + t$  in  $F_4$ , we have  $k \mid \delta$ .

Therefore,  $k \mid x' + t$  iff  $k \mid x' + \lambda\delta + t$  for all  $\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

## Proof of Theorem

$\Leftarrow$  If  $F_5$  is true, there are two cases:  $F_{-\infty}[j]$  is true or  $F_4[t + j]$  is true. If  $F_4[t + j]$  is true, then obviously  $\exists x'. F_4[x']$  is true. If  $F_{-\infty}[j]$  is true, then (due to periodicity)  $F_{-\infty}[j + \lambda \cdot \delta]$  is true.

If  $\lambda < t - 1$  for all  $t \in A \cup B$ , then

$j + \lambda \cdot \delta < \delta + (t - 1)\delta = \delta t \leq t$ . Thus,

$$F_{-\infty}[j + \lambda \cdot \delta] \Leftrightarrow F_4[j + \lambda \cdot \delta] \Rightarrow \exists x'. F_4[x'].$$



## Correctness of Step 5

⇒ Assume for some  $x'$ ,  $F_4[x']$  is true. If  $\neg(t < x')$  for all  $t \in B$ , then choose  $j_{x'} \in \{1, \dots, \delta\}$  such that  $\delta \mid (j_{x'} - x')$ .  $j_{x'}$  will satisfy all (C) and (D) literals that  $x'$  satisfies.  $x'$  does not satisfy any (B) literal. Therefore if  $F_4[x']$  is true,  $F_{-\infty}[j]$  must be true. Therefore  $F_5$  is true. If  $t < x'$  for some  $t \in B$ , then let

$$t_{x'} = \max\{t \in B \mid t < x'\}$$

and choose  $j_{x'} \in \{1, \dots, \delta\}$  such that  $\delta \mid (t_{x'} + j_{x'} - x')$ . We claim that  $F_4[t_{x'} + j_{x'}]$  is true.

Since  $x' = t_{x'} + j_{x'} + \lambda\delta$ ,  $x'$  and  $t_{x'} + j_{x'}$  satisfy the same (C) and (D) literals (due to periodicity).

Since  $t_{x'} + j_{x'} > t_{x'} = \max\{t \in B \mid t < x'\}$ ,  $t_{x'} + j_{x'}$  satisfies all (B) literals that are satisfied by  $x'$ .

Since  $t_{x'} < x' = t_{x'} + j_{x'} + \lambda\delta \leq t_{x'} + (\lambda + 1)\delta$ , we conclude that  $\lambda \geq 0$ . Hence,  $x' \geq t_{x'} + j_{x'}$  and  $t_{x'} + j_{x'}$  satisfies all (A) literals satisfied by  $x'$ .

Thus  $F_4[t_{x'} + j_{x'}]$  is true. Therefore,  $F_5$  is true.

Construct

left infinite projection  $F_{-\infty}[x']$

of  $F_4[x']$  by

- (A) replacing literals  $x' < t$  by  $\top$
- (B) replacing literals  $t < x'$  by  $\perp$

Let

$$\delta = \text{lcm} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} k \text{ of (C) literals } k \mid x' + t \\ k \text{ of (D) literals } \neg(k \mid x' + t) \end{array} \right\}$$

and  $B$  be the set of terms  $t$  appearing in (B) literals. Construct

$$F_5 : \bigvee_{j=1}^{\delta} F_{-\infty}[j] \vee \bigvee_{j=1}^{\delta} \bigvee_{t \in B} F_4[t + j].$$

$F_5$  is quantifier-free and  $\widehat{T}_{\mathbb{Z}}$ -equivalent to  $F$ .

In step 5, if there are fewer

(A) literals  $x' < t$

than

(B) literals  $t < x'$ .

Construct the right infinite projection  $F_{+\infty}[x']$  from  $F_4[x']$  by replacing

each (A) literal  $x' < t$  by  $\perp$

and

each (B) literal  $t < x'$  by  $\top$ .

Then right elimination.

$$F_5 : \bigvee_{j=1}^{\delta} F_{+\infty}[-j] \vee \bigvee_{j=1}^{\delta} \bigvee_{t \in A} F_4[t - j].$$

$$\exists x'. \underbrace{x' < 15z + 90 \wedge 10y - 10 < x' \wedge 24 \mid x' + 6 \wedge 30 \mid x'}_{F_4[x']}$$

Compute lcm:  $\delta = \text{lcm}(24, 30) = 120$

Then

$$F_5 = \bigvee_{j=1}^{120} \perp \wedge \top \wedge 24 \mid -j + 6 \wedge 30 \mid -j$$

$$\vee \bigvee_{j=1}^{120} 15z + 90 - j < 15z + 90 \wedge 10y - 10 < 15z + 90 - j$$

$$\wedge 24 \mid 15z + 90 - j + 6 \wedge 30 \mid 15z + 90 - j$$

The formula can be simplified to:

$$F_5 = \bigvee_{j=1}^{120} 10y - 10 < 15z + 90 - j \wedge 24 \mid 15z + 90 - j + 6 \wedge 30 \mid 15z + 90 - j$$

$$\underbrace{\exists x. (3x + 1 < 10 \vee 7x - 6 > 7) \wedge 2 \mid x}_{F[x]}$$

Isolate  $x$  terms

$$\exists x. (3x < 9 \vee 13 < 7x) \wedge 2 \mid x ,$$

so

$$\delta = \text{lcm}\{3, 7\} = 21 .$$

After multiplying coefficients by proper constants,

$$\exists x. (21x < 63 \vee 39 < 21x) \wedge 42 \mid 21x ,$$

we replace  $21x$  by  $x'$ :

$$\exists x'. \underbrace{(x' < 63 \vee 39 < x') \wedge 42 \mid x' \wedge 21 \mid x'}_{F_4[x']} .$$

Then

$$F_{-\infty}[x'] : (\top \vee \perp) \wedge 42 \mid x' \wedge 21 \mid x' ,$$

or, simplifying,

$$F_{-\infty}[x'] : 42 \mid x' \wedge 21 \mid x' .$$

Finally,

$$\delta = \text{lcm}\{21, 42\} = 42 \quad \text{and} \quad B = \{39\} ,$$

so

$$F_5 : \bigvee_{j=1}^{42} (42 \mid j \wedge 21 \mid j) \vee \bigvee_{j=1}^{42} ((39 + j < 63 \vee 39 < 39 + j) \wedge 42 \mid 39 + j \wedge 21 \mid 39 + j) .$$

Since  $42 \mid 42$  and  $21 \mid 42$ , the left main disjunct simplifies to  $\top$ , so that  $F$  is  $\widehat{T}_{\mathbb{Z}}$ -equivalent to  $\top$ . Thus,  $F$  is  $\widehat{T}_{\mathbb{Z}}$ -valid.

Quantifier elimination decides validity/satisfiable **quantified** formulae.

Can also be used for quantifier free formulae:

To decide **satisfiability** of  $F[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ ,  
apply QE on  $\exists x_1, \dots, x_n. F[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ .

But high complexity (doubly exponential for  $T_{\mathbb{Q}}$ ).

Therefore, we are looking for a fast procedure.