




Proving Non-Termination by Acceleration Driven Clause Learning

Florian Frohn   

Jürgen Giesl   

LuFG Informatik 2, RWTH Aachen University, Aachen, Germany

Abstract

We recently proposed *Acceleration Driven Clause Learning* (ADCL), a novel calculus to analyze satisfiability of *Constrained Horn Clauses* (CHCs). Here, we adapt ADCL to disprove termination of transition systems, and we evaluate its implementation in our tool LoAT against the state of the art.

2012 ACM Subject Classification Theory of computation → Logic and verification

Keywords and phrases Non-Termination, Program Verification, Acceleration, Transition Systems

Related Version See [8]. Full version, including all proofs: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2304.10166>

Funding funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) - 235950644 (Project GI 274/6-2)

1 Introduction

We are concerned with *disproving* termination of *transition systems* (TSs), a popular intermediate representation for verification of programs written in more expressive languages.

► **Example 1.** Consider the TS \mathcal{T} , where x', y', z' represent the updated values of x, y, z , and $\bar{x}, x++, x--$ abbreviate $x' = x$, $x' = x + 1$, and $x' = x - 1$. The first two transitions are a variant of `chc-LIA-Lin_052` from the *CHC Competition '22* (<https://chc-comp.github.io>) and the last two are a variant of `flip2_rec.jar-obl-8` from *TermComp* [9].

$$\text{init} \rightarrow \ell_1 \llbracket x' \leq 0 \wedge z' \geq 5000 \wedge y' \leq z' \rrbracket \quad (\tau_1)$$

$$\ell_1 \rightarrow \ell_1 \llbracket y \leq 2 \cdot z \wedge x++ \wedge ((x < z \wedge \bar{y}) \vee (x \geq z \wedge y++)) \wedge \bar{z} \rrbracket \quad (\tau_{\ell_1})$$

$$\ell_1 \rightarrow \ell_2 \llbracket x = y \wedge x > 2 \cdot z \wedge \bar{x} \wedge \bar{y} \rrbracket \quad (\tau_{\ell_1 \rightarrow \ell_2})$$

$$\ell_2 \rightarrow \ell_2 \llbracket x = y \wedge x > 0 \wedge \bar{x} \wedge y-- \rrbracket \quad (\tau_{\ell_2}^-)$$

$$\ell_2 \rightarrow \ell_2 \llbracket x > 0 \wedge y > 0 \wedge x' = y \wedge ((x > y \wedge y' = x) \vee (x < y \wedge \bar{y})) \rrbracket \quad (\tau_{\ell_2}^{\neq})$$

At ℓ_1 , x is incremented until x reaches z . Then, x and y are incremented until y reaches $2 \cdot z + 1$. If $x = y = c$ holds for some $c > 1$ at that point, then the execution can continue at ℓ_2 as follows: $\ell_2(c, c, c_z) \xrightarrow{\tau_{\ell_2}^-} \ell_2(c, c - 1, c_z) \xrightarrow{\tau_{\ell_2}^{\neq}} \ell_2(c - 1, c, c_z) \xrightarrow{\tau_{\ell_2}^{\neq}} \ell_2(c, c, c_z) \xrightarrow{\tau_{\ell_2}^-} \dots$ Here, $\ell_2(c, c, c_z)$ means that the current location is ℓ_2 and the values of x, y , and z are c, c , and c_z . (Of course, the value of z could also change arbitrarily in the transitions $\tau_{\ell_2}^-$ and $\tau_{\ell_2}^{\neq}$.) Thus, \mathcal{T} does not terminate.

Ex. 1 is challenging for state-of-the-art tools for several reasons. First, more than 5000 steps are required to reach ℓ_2 . Thus, `chc-LIA-Lin_052` is beyond the capabilities of most other state-of-the-art tools for proving reachability. Second, the pattern “ $\tau_{\ell_2}^-$, 1st disjunct of $\tau_{\ell_2}^{\neq}$, 2nd disjunct of $\tau_{\ell_2}^{\neq}$ ” must be found to prove non-termination. Therefore, `flip2_rec.jar-obl-8` cannot be solved by other state-of-the-art termination tools.

We present an approach that can prove non-termination of systems like Ex. 1 automatically. To this end, we tightly integrate non-termination techniques into our recent

Acceleration Driven Clause Learning (ADCL) calculus [6], which has originally been designed for Constrained Horn Clauses (CHCs), but it can also be used to analyze TSs.

2 Preliminaries

We assume familiarity with basics from many-sorted first-order logic. \mathcal{V} is a countably infinite set of variables and \mathcal{A} is a first-order theory over a k -sorted signature $\Sigma_{\mathcal{A}}$ with carrier $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{A}} = (\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{A},1}, \dots, \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{A},k})$. $\text{QF}(\Sigma_{\mathcal{A}})$ is the set of all quantifier-free first-order formulas over $\Sigma_{\mathcal{A}}$, which are w.l.o.g. assumed to be in negation normal form, and $\text{QF}_{\wedge}(\Sigma_{\mathcal{A}})$ only contains conjunctions of $\Sigma_{\mathcal{A}}$ -literals. Given a first-order formula η over $\Sigma_{\mathcal{A}}$, σ is a *model* of η (written $\sigma \models_{\mathcal{A}} \eta$) if it is a model of \mathcal{A} with carrier $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{A}}$, extended with interpretations for \mathcal{V} such that η is satisfied. As usual, $\eta \equiv_{\mathcal{A}} \eta'$ means $\models_{\mathcal{A}} \eta \iff \models_{\mathcal{A}} \eta'$. We write \vec{x} for sequences and x_i is the i^{th} element of \vec{x} . We use “ $::$ ” for concatenation of sequences, where we identify sequences of length 1 with their elements, so we may write, e.g., $x :: xs$ instead of $[x] :: xs$.

Transition Systems: Let $d \in \mathbb{N}$ be fixed, and let $\vec{x}, \vec{x}' \in \mathcal{V}^d$ be disjoint vectors of pairwise different variables. Each $\psi \in \text{QF}(\Sigma_{\mathcal{A}})$ induces a relation \longrightarrow_{ψ} on $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{A}}^d$ where $\vec{s} \longrightarrow_{\psi} \vec{t}$ iff $\psi[\vec{x}/\vec{s}, \vec{x}'/\vec{t}]$ is satisfiable. So for the condition $\psi := (x = y \wedge x > 0 \wedge \bar{x} \wedge y -)$ of $\tau_{\ell_2}^-$, we have $(4, 4, 4) \longrightarrow_{\psi} (4, 3, 7)$. $\mathcal{L} \supseteq \{\text{init}, \text{err}\}$ is a finite set of *locations*. A *configuration* is a pair $(\ell, \vec{s}) \in \mathcal{L} \times \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{A}}^d$, written $\ell(\vec{s})$. A *transition* is a triple $\tau = (\ell, \psi, \ell') \in \mathcal{L} \times \text{QF}(\Sigma_{\mathcal{A}}) \times \mathcal{L}$, written $\ell \rightarrow \ell' \llbracket \psi \rrbracket$, and its *condition* is $\text{cond}(\tau) := \psi$. W.l.o.g., we assume $\ell \neq \text{err}$ and $\ell' \neq \text{init}$. Then τ induces a relation \longrightarrow_{τ} on configurations where $\mathfrak{s} \longrightarrow_{\tau} \mathfrak{t}$ iff $\mathfrak{s} = \ell(\vec{s}), \mathfrak{t} = \ell'(\vec{t})$, and $\vec{s} \longrightarrow_{\psi} \vec{t}$. So, e.g., $\ell_2(4, 4, 4) \longrightarrow_{\tau_{\ell_2}^-} \ell_2(4, 3, 7)$. We call τ *recursive* if $\ell = \ell'$, *conjunctive* if $\psi \in \text{QF}_{\wedge}(\Sigma_{\mathcal{A}})$, *initial* if $\ell = \text{init}$, and *safe* if $\ell' \neq \text{err}$. Moreover, we define $(\ell \rightarrow \ell' \llbracket \psi \rrbracket)|_{\psi'} := \ell \rightarrow \ell' \llbracket \psi' \rrbracket$. A *transition system* (TS) \mathcal{T} is a finite set of transitions, and it induces the relation $\longrightarrow_{\mathcal{T}} := \bigcup_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}} \longrightarrow_{\tau}$.

Chaining $\tau = \ell_s \rightarrow \ell_t \llbracket \psi \rrbracket$ and $\tau' = \ell'_s \rightarrow \ell'_t \llbracket \psi' \rrbracket$ yields $\text{chain}(\tau, \tau') := (\ell_s \rightarrow \ell'_t \llbracket \psi_c \rrbracket)$ where $\psi_c := \psi[\vec{x}'/\vec{x}''] \wedge \psi'[\vec{x}/\vec{x}'']$ for fresh $\vec{x}'' \in \mathcal{V}^d$ if $\ell_t = \ell'_s$, and $\psi_c := \perp$ (meaning *false*) if $\ell_t \neq \ell'_s$. So $\longrightarrow_{\text{chain}(\tau, \tau')} = \longrightarrow_{\tau} \circ \longrightarrow_{\tau'}$, and $\text{chain}(\tau_{\ell_1 \rightarrow \ell_2}, \tau_{\ell_2}^-) = \ell_1 \rightarrow \ell_2 \llbracket \psi \rrbracket$ where $\psi \equiv_{\mathcal{A}} (x = y \wedge x > 0 \cdot z \wedge x > 0 \wedge \bar{x} \wedge y -)$. For non-empty, finite sequences of transitions we define $\text{chain}([\tau]) := \tau$ and $\text{chain}([\tau_1, \tau_2] :: \vec{\tau}) := \text{chain}(\text{chain}(\tau_1, \tau_2) :: \vec{\tau})$. We lift notations for transitions to finite sequences via chaining. So $\text{cond}(\vec{\tau}) := \text{cond}(\text{chain}(\vec{\tau}))$, $\vec{\tau}$ is *recursive* if $\text{chain}(\vec{\tau})$ is recursive, $\longrightarrow_{\vec{\tau}} = \longrightarrow_{\text{chain}(\vec{\tau})}$, etc. If τ is initial and $\text{cond}(\tau :: \vec{\tau}) \not\equiv_{\mathcal{A}} \perp$, then $(\tau :: \vec{\tau}) \in \mathcal{T}^+$ is a *finite run*. \mathcal{T} is *safe* if every finite run is safe. If there is a σ such that $\sigma \models_{\mathcal{A}} \text{cond}(\vec{\tau})$ for every finite prefix $\vec{\tau}'$ of $\vec{\tau} \in \mathcal{T}^{\omega}$, then $\vec{\tau}$ is an *infinite run*. If no infinite run exists, then \mathcal{T} is *terminating*.

Acceleration Techniques: *Acceleration techniques* compute transitive closures of relations.

► **Definition 2** (Acceleration). *An acceleration technique is a function $\text{accel} : \text{QF}_{\wedge}(\Sigma_{\mathcal{A}}) \mapsto \text{QF}_{\wedge}(\Sigma_{\mathcal{A}'})$ such that $\longrightarrow_{\psi}^+ = \longrightarrow_{\text{accel}(\psi)}$, where \mathcal{A}' is a first-order theory. For recursive conjunctive transitions τ , we define $\text{accel}(\tau) := \tau|_{\text{accel}(\text{cond}(\tau))}$.*

Def. 2 allows $\mathcal{A}' \neq \mathcal{A}$ as most theories are not “closed under acceleration”. E.g., accelerating the linear formula $x'_1 = x_1 + x_2 \wedge \bar{x}_2$ yields $n > 0 \wedge x'_1 = x_1 + n \cdot x_2 \wedge \bar{x}_2$, which is non-linear.

3 Proving Non-Termination with ADCL

To bridge the gap between transitions τ where $\text{cond}(\tau) \in \text{QF}(\Sigma_{\mathcal{A}})$ and acceleration techniques for formulas from $\text{QF}_{\wedge}(\Sigma_{\mathcal{A}})$, ADCL uses *syntactic implicants*.

► **Definition 3** (Syntactic Implicants [6, Def. 6]). *If $\psi \in \text{QF}(\Sigma_{\mathcal{A}})$, then:*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{sip}(\psi, \sigma) &:= \bigwedge \{ \pi \text{ is a literal of } \psi \mid \sigma \models_{\mathcal{A}} \pi \} && \text{if } \sigma \models_{\mathcal{A}} \psi \\ \text{sip}(\psi) &:= \{ \text{sip}(\psi, \sigma) \mid \sigma \models_{\mathcal{A}} \psi \} \\ \text{sip}(\tau) &:= \{ \tau|_{\psi} \mid \psi \in \text{sip}(\text{cond}(\tau)) \} && \text{for transitions } \tau \\ \text{sip}(\mathcal{T}) &:= \bigcup_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}} \text{sip}(\tau) && \text{for TSs } \mathcal{T} \end{aligned}$$

Here, sip abbreviates syntactic implicant projection.

While $\text{sip}(\psi)$ contains $\text{sip}(\psi, \sigma)$ for all models σ of ψ , the set $\text{sip}(\psi)$ is finite, because $\text{sip}(\psi, \sigma)$ is restricted to literals from ψ . Syntactic implicants ignore the semantics of literals. So we have, e.g., $(X > 1) \notin \text{sip}(X > 0 \wedge X > 1) = \{X > 0 \wedge X > 1\}$. It is easy to show $\psi \equiv_{\mathcal{A}} \bigvee \text{sip}(\psi)$, and thus $\rightarrow_{\tau} = \rightarrow_{\text{sip}(\mathcal{T})}$.

The core idea of ADCL is to learn new, *non-redundant* transitions via acceleration.

► **Definition 4** (Redundancy, [6, Def. 8]). *A transition τ is (strictly) redundant w.r.t. τ' , denoted $\tau \sqsubseteq \tau'$ ($\tau \sqsubset \tau'$) if $\rightarrow_{\tau} \subseteq \rightarrow_{\tau'}$ ($\rightarrow_{\tau} \subset \rightarrow_{\tau'}$). For a TS \mathcal{T} , we have $\tau \sqsubseteq \mathcal{T}$ ($\tau \sqsubset \mathcal{T}$) if $\tau \sqsubseteq \tau'$ ($\tau \sqsubset \tau'$) for some $\tau' \in \mathcal{T}$.*

To prove non-termination, we look for a corresponding *certificate*.

► **Definition 5** (Certificate of Non-Termination). *Let $\tau = \ell \rightarrow \ell[\dots]$. A satisfiable formula ψ certifies non-termination of τ , written $\psi \models_{\mathcal{A}}^{\infty} \tau$, if for any model σ of ψ , there is an infinite sequence $\ell(\sigma(\vec{x})) = s_1 \rightarrow_{\tau} s_2 \rightarrow_{\tau} \dots$*

From now on, let \mathcal{T} be the TS that is being analyzed with ADCL, and assume that \mathcal{T} does not contain unsafe transitions. A *state* of ADCL consists of a TS \mathcal{S} that augments \mathcal{T} with *learned transitions*, a run $\vec{\tau}$ of \mathcal{S} called the *trace*, and a sequence of sets of *blocking transitions* $[B_i]_{i=0}^k$, where transitions that are redundant w.r.t. B_k must not be appended to the trace.

► **Definition 6** (ADCL). *A state is a triple $(\mathcal{S}, [\tau_i]_{i=1}^k, [B_i]_{i=0}^k)$ where $\mathcal{S} \supseteq \mathcal{T}$ is a TS, $\bigcup_{i=0}^k B_i \subseteq \text{sip}(\mathcal{S})$, and $[\tau_i]_{i=1}^k \in \text{sip}(\mathcal{S})^*$. The transitions in $\text{sip}(\mathcal{T})$ are called *original* and the transitions in $\text{sip}(\mathcal{S}) \setminus \text{sip}(\mathcal{T})$ are *learned*. A transition $\tau_{k+1} \sqsubseteq B_k$ is *blocked*, and $\tau_{k+1} \not\sqsubseteq B_k$ is *active* if $\text{chain}([\tau_i]_{i=1}^{k+1})$ is an initial transition with satisfiable condition (i.e., $[\tau_i]_{i=1}^{k+1}$ is a run). Let $\text{bt}(\mathcal{S}, [\tau_i]_{i=1}^k, [B_0, \dots, B_k]) := (\mathcal{S}, [\tau_i]_{i=1}^{k-1}, [B_0, \dots, B_{k-1} \cup \{\tau_k\}])$, where bt abbreviates “backtrack”. Our calculus is defined by the following rules.*

$$\begin{array}{c} \frac{}{\mathcal{T} \rightsquigarrow (\mathcal{T}, [], [\emptyset])} \quad (\text{INIT}) \qquad \frac{\tau \in \text{sip}(\mathcal{S}) \text{ is active}}{(\mathcal{S}, \vec{\tau}, \vec{B}) \rightsquigarrow (\mathcal{S}, \vec{\tau} :: \tau, \vec{B} :: \emptyset)} \quad (\text{STEP}) \\ \\ \frac{\vec{\tau}^{\circ} \text{ is recursive} \quad |\vec{\tau}^{\circ}| = |\vec{B}^{\circ}| \quad \text{accel}(\vec{\tau}^{\circ}) = \tau \not\sqsubseteq \text{sip}(\mathcal{S})}{(\mathcal{S}, \vec{\tau} :: \vec{\tau}^{\circ}, \vec{B} :: \vec{B}^{\circ}) \rightsquigarrow (\mathcal{S} \cup \{\tau\}, \vec{\tau} :: \tau, \vec{B} :: \{\tau\})} \quad (\text{ACCELERATE}) \\ \\ \frac{\vec{\tau}^{\circ} \text{ is recursive} \quad \vec{\tau}^{\circ} \sqsubseteq \text{sip}(\mathcal{S}) \text{ or } \vec{\tau}^{\circ} \sqsubseteq \text{sip}(\mathcal{S}) \wedge |\vec{\tau}^{\circ}| > 1}{s = (\mathcal{S}, \vec{\tau} :: \vec{\tau}^{\circ}, \vec{B}) \rightsquigarrow \text{bt}(s)} \quad (\text{COVERED}) \\ \\ \frac{\vec{\tau} \text{ is unsafe}}{(\mathcal{S}, \vec{\tau}, \vec{B}) \rightsquigarrow \text{unsafe}} \quad (\text{REFUTE}) \qquad \frac{\text{all transitions from } \text{sip}(\mathcal{S}) \text{ are inactive} \quad \tau \text{ is safe}}{s = (\mathcal{S}, \vec{\tau} :: \tau, \vec{B}) \rightsquigarrow \text{bt}(s)} \quad (\text{BACKTRACK}) \\ \\ \frac{\text{chain}(\vec{\tau}^{\circ}) = \ell \rightarrow \ell[\dots] \quad \psi \models_{\mathcal{A}}^{\infty} \vec{\tau}^{\circ} \quad \tau = \ell \rightarrow \text{err}[\psi] \not\sqsubseteq \text{sip}(\mathcal{S})}{(\mathcal{S}, \vec{\tau} :: \vec{\tau}^{\circ}, \vec{B}) \rightsquigarrow (\mathcal{S} \cup \{\tau\}, \vec{\tau} :: \vec{\tau}^{\circ}, \vec{B})} \quad (\text{NONTERM}) \end{array}$$

We write $\overset{\text{I}}{\rightsquigarrow}$, $\overset{\text{S}}{\rightsquigarrow}$, \dots to indicate that the rule INIT, STEP, \dots was used. STEP adds a transition to the trace. When the trace has a recursive suffix, ACCELERATE allows for learning a new

transition which replaces the recursive suffix on the trace, or we may backtrack via COVERED if the recursive suffix is redundant. Note that COVERED does not apply if $\bar{\tau}' \sqsubseteq \text{sip}(\mathcal{S})$ and $|\bar{\tau}'| = 1$, as it could immediately undo every STEP, otherwise. If no further STEP is possible, BACKTRACK applies. Note that BACKTRACK and COVERED block the last transition from the trace so that we do not perform the same STEP again. If $\bar{\tau}$ is unsafe, REFUTE yields unsafe. As \mathcal{T} is safe, this only happens if NONTERM, which applies a non-termination technique to a recursive suffix of the trace, added an unsafe transition before.

► **Example 7.** We apply ADCL to Ex. 1

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{T} &\xrightarrow{\text{I}} (\mathcal{T}, [], [\emptyset]) \xrightarrow{\text{S}^2} (\mathcal{T}, [\bar{\tau}_1, \tau_{\ell_1} | \psi_{x < z}], [\emptyset, \emptyset, \emptyset]) && (x \leq 1 \wedge z \geq 5k \wedge y \leq z) \\
&\xrightarrow{\text{A}} (\mathcal{S}_1, [\bar{\tau}_1, \tau_{x < z}^+, [\emptyset, \emptyset, \{\tau_{x < z}^+\}]] && (x \leq z \wedge z \geq 5k \wedge y \leq z) \\
&\xrightarrow{\text{S}} (\mathcal{S}_1, [\bar{\tau}_1, \tau_{x < z}^+, \tau_{\ell_1} | \psi_{x \geq z}], [\emptyset, \emptyset, \{\tau_{x < z}^+\}, \emptyset]) && (x = z + 1 \wedge z \geq 5k \wedge y \leq z + 1) \\
&\xrightarrow{\text{A}} (\mathcal{S}_2, [\bar{\tau}_1, \tau_{x < z}^+, \tau_{x \geq z}^+, [\emptyset, \emptyset, \{\tau_{x < z}^+\}, \{\tau_{x \geq z}^+\}]] && (x \geq y \wedge x > z \geq 5k \wedge y \leq 2 \cdot z + 1) \\
&\xrightarrow{\text{S}_{\text{nt}}^4} (\mathcal{S}_2, [\bar{\tau}_1, \tau_{x < z}^+, \tau_{x \geq z}^+, \tau_{\ell_1 \rightarrow \ell_2}, \tau_{\ell_2}^-, \tau_{\ell_2}^\# | \psi_{x > y}, \tau_{\ell_2}^\# | \psi_{x < y}], [\dots]) && (1 \equiv_2 y = x > 10k \wedge \dots) \\
&\xrightarrow{\text{N}_{\text{nt}}} (\mathcal{S}_3, [\bar{\tau}_1, \tau_{x < z}^+, \tau_{x \geq z}^+, \tau_{\ell_1 \rightarrow \ell_2}, \tau_{\ell_2}^-, \tau_{\ell_2}^\# | \psi_{x > y}, \tau_{\ell_2}^\# | \psi_{x < y}], [\dots]) && (1 \equiv_2 y = x > 10k \wedge \dots) \\
&\xrightarrow{\text{S}_{\text{nt}}} (\mathcal{S}_3, [\bar{\tau}_1, \tau_{x < z}^+, \tau_{x \geq z}^+, \tau_{\ell_1 \rightarrow \ell_2}, \tau_{\ell_2}^-, \tau_{\ell_2}^\# | \psi_{x > y}, \tau_{\ell_2}^\# | \psi_{x < y}, \tau_{\text{err}}], [\dots]) \xrightarrow{\text{R}_{\text{nt}}} \text{unsafe}
\end{aligned}$$

Here, $5k$ abbreviates 5000 and:

$$\begin{aligned}
\psi_{x < z} &:= y \leq 2 \cdot z \wedge x++ \wedge x < z \wedge \bar{y} \wedge \bar{z} && \psi_{x \geq z} := y \leq 2 \cdot z \wedge x++ \wedge x \geq z \wedge y++ \wedge \bar{z} \\
\tau_{x < z}^+ &:= \ell_1 \rightarrow \ell_1 \llbracket y \leq 2 \cdot z \wedge n > 0 \wedge x' = x + n \wedge x + n \leq z \wedge \bar{y} \wedge \bar{z} \rrbracket \\
\tau_{x \geq z}^+ &:= \ell_1 \rightarrow \ell_1 \llbracket y + n - 1 \leq 2 \cdot z \wedge n > 0 \wedge x' = x + n \wedge x \geq z \wedge y' = y + n \wedge \bar{z} \rrbracket \\
\psi_{x > y} &:= x > 0 \wedge y > 0 \wedge x' = y \wedge x > y \wedge y' = x && \psi_{x < y} := x > 0 \wedge y > 0 \wedge x' = y \wedge x < y \wedge \bar{y} \\
\mathcal{S}_1 &:= \mathcal{T} \cup \{\tau_{x < z}^+\} && \mathcal{S}_2 := \mathcal{S}_1 \cup \{\tau_{x \geq z}^+\} && \mathcal{S}_3 := \mathcal{S}_2 \cup \{\tau_{\text{err}}\} && \tau_{\text{err}} := \ell_2 \rightarrow \text{err} \llbracket x = y > 1 \rrbracket
\end{aligned}$$

On the right, we show formulas describing the configurations that are reachable with the current trace, where $1 \equiv_2 y$ means that y is odd. Every \rightsquigarrow -derivation starts with INIT. The first two STEPS add the initial transition $\bar{\tau}_1$ and an element of $\text{sip}(\tau_{\ell_1})$ to the trace. Since $x < z$ holds after applying $\bar{\tau}_1$, the only possible choice for the latter is $\tau_{\ell_1} | \psi_{x < z}$.

As $\tau_{\ell_1} | \psi_{x < z}$ is recursive, it is accelerated and replaced with $\text{accel}(\tau_{\ell_1} | \psi_{x < z}) = \tau_{x < z}^+$, which simulates n steps with $\tau_{\ell_1} | \psi_{x < z}$. Moreover, $\tau_{x < z}^+$ is also added to the current set of blocking transitions, as we always have $\rightarrow_{\tau}^2 \subseteq \rightarrow_{\tau}$ for learned transitions τ and thus adding them to the trace twice in a row is pointless.

Next, τ_{ℓ_1} is applicable again. As neither $x < z$ nor $x \geq z$ holds for all reachable configurations, we could continue with any element of $\text{sip}(\tau_{\ell_1}) = \{\tau_{\ell_1} | \psi_{x < z}, \tau_{\ell_1} | \psi_{x \geq z}\}$. We choose $\tau_{\ell_1} | \psi_{x \geq z}$, so that the recursive transition $\tau_{\ell_1} | \psi_{x \geq z}$ can be accelerated to $\tau_{x \geq z}^+$.

After the next STEP with $\tau_{\ell_1 \rightarrow \ell_2}$, just $\tau_{\ell_2}^-$ can be used, as $\text{cond}(\tau_{\ell_1 \rightarrow \ell_2})$ implies $x' = y'$. While $\tau_{\ell_2}^-$ is recursive, ACCELERATE cannot be applied next, as $\rightarrow_{\tau_{\ell_2}^-} = \rightarrow_{\tau_{\ell_2}^-}^+$, so the learned transition would be redundant. Thus, we continue with $\tau_{\ell_2}^\#$, projected to $x > y$ (as $\text{cond}(\tau_{\ell_2}^-)$ implies $x' = y' + 1$). Again, all transitions that could be learned are redundant, so ACCELERATE does not apply. We next use $\tau_{\ell_2}^\#$ projected to $x < y$, as the previous STEP swapped x and y . As the suffix $[\tau_{\ell_2}^-, \tau_{\ell_2}^\# | \psi_{x > y}, \tau_{\ell_2}^\# | \psi_{x < y}]$ of the trace does not terminate (see Ex. 1), NONTERM applies. So we learn the transition τ_{err} , which is added to the trace to finish the proof, afterwards.

	No		Yes	Runtime overall			Runtime No	
	solved	unique	solved	average	median	timeouts	average	median
LoAT ADCL	521	9	0	48.6 s	0.1 s	183	2.9 s	0.1 s
LoAT '22	494	2	0	7.4 s	0.1 s	0	6.2 s	0.1 s
T2	442	3	615	17.2 s	0.6 s	45	7.4 s	0.6 s
VeryMax	421	6	631	28.3 s	0.5 s	30	30.5 s	14.5 s
iRankFinder	409	0	642	32.0 s	2.0 s	93	12.3 s	1.7 s

► **Theorem 8.** *If $\mathcal{T} \rightsquigarrow_{\text{nt}}^*$ unsafe, then \mathcal{T} does not terminate.*

See [8] for a discussion of obstacles regarding an adaption of ADCL for *proving* termination.

4 Implementation and Experiments

So far, our implementation in our tool LoAT is restricted to integer arithmetic. It uses the technique from [5] for acceleration and finding certificates of non-termination, the SMT solvers Z3 [11] and Yices [4], the recurrence solver PURRS [1], and libFAUDES (<https://fgdes.tf.fau.de/faudes>) to implement the automata-based redundancy check from [6].

To evaluate our implementation in LoAT, we used the 1222 *Integer Transition Systems* (ITSs) from the *Termination Problems Database* (<https://termination-portal.org/wiki/TPDB>) used in *TermComp* [9]. We compared our implementation (LoAT ADCL) with other leading termination analyzers: iRankFinder [3], T2 [2], VeryMax [10], and the previous version of LoAT [5] (LoAT '22). For T2 and VeryMax, we took the versions of their last *TermComp* participations (2015 and 2019). For iRankFinder, we used the configuration from the evaluation of [5], which is tailored towards proving non-termination. All tests were run on StarExec with 300s wallclock timeout, 1200s CPU timeout, and 128GB memory limit per example.

The table above shows the results of our experiments, where the column “unique” contains the number of examples that could be solved by the respective tool, but no others. It shows that LoAT ADCL is the most powerful tool for proving non-termination of ITSs.

If we only consider the examples where non-termination is proven, LoAT ADCL is also the fastest tool. If we consider all examples, then the *average* runtime of LoAT ADCL is significantly slower. This is not surprising, as ADCL does not terminate in general [6, Thm. 18]. So while it is very fast in most cases (as witnessed by the very fast *median* runtime), it times out more often than the other tools. Note that LoAT ADCL does not subsume LoAT '22. The reason is that LoAT '22 under-approximates more aggressively and hence solves some instances where LoAT ADCL times out.

See [7] for detailed results and a pre-compiled binary. LoAT is open-source and available on GitHub: <https://github.com/LoAT-developers/LoAT>

References

- 1 Roberto Bagnara, Andrea Pescetti, Alessandro Zaccagnini, and Enea Zaffanella. PURRS: Towards computer algebra support for fully automatic worst-case complexity analysis. *CoRR*, abs/cs/0512056, 2005.
- 2 Marc Brockschmidt, Byron Cook, Samin Ishtiaq, Heidy Khlaaf, and Nir Piterman. T2: Temporal property verification. In *TACAS '16*, LNCS 9636, 2016.
- 3 Jesús J. Doménech and Samir Genaim. iRankFinder. In *WST '18*, 2018.
- 4 Bruno Dutertre. Yices 2.2. In *CAV '14*, LNCS 8559, 2014.
- 5 Florian Frohn and Jürgen Giesl. Proving non-termination and lower runtime bounds with LoAT. In *IJCAR '22*, LNCS 13385, 2022.

- 6 Florian Frohn and Jürgen Giesl. ADCL: Acceleration Driven Clause Learning for constrained Horn clauses. In *SAS '23*, LNCS, 2023. To appear. Full version appeared in *CoRR*, abs/2303.01827.
- 7 Florian Frohn and Jürgen Giesl. Empirical evaluation of “Proving non-termination by Acceleration Driven Clause Learning”, 2023. URL: <https://loat-developers.github.io/adcl-nonterm-eval>.
- 8 Florian Frohn and Jürgen Giesl. Proving non-termination by Acceleration Driven Clause Learning. In *CADE '23*, LNCS, 2023. To appear. Full version appeared in *CoRR*, abs/2304.10166.
- 9 Jürgen Giesl, Albert Rubio, Christian Sternagel, Johannes Waldmann, and Akihisa Yamada. The termination and complexity competition. In *TACAS '19*, LNCS 11429, 2019.
- 10 Daniel Larraz, Kaustubh Nimkar, Albert Oliveras, Enric Rodríguez-Carbonell, and Albert Rubio. Proving non-termination using Max-SMT. In *CAV '14*, LNCS 8559, 2014.
- 11 Leonardo de Moura and Nikolay Bjørner. Z3: An efficient SMT solver. In *TACAS '08*, LNCS 4963, 2008.