

# A Verified Efficient Implementation of the Weighted Path Order\*

René Thiemann ✉ 

University of Innsbruck, Austria

Elias Wenninger

University of Innsbruck, Austria

---

## Abstract

---

The Weighted Path Order of Yamada is a powerful technique for proving termination. It is also supported by **CeTA**, a certifier for checking untrusted termination proofs. To be more precise, **CeTA** contains a verified function that computes for two terms whether one of them is larger than the other for a given WPO, i.e., where all parameters of the WPO have been fixed. The problem of this verified function is its exponential runtime in the worst case.

Therefore, in this work we develop a polynomial time implementation of WPO that is based on memoization. It also improves upon an earlier verified implementation of the Recursive Path Order: the RPO-implementation uses full terms as keys for the memory, a design which simplified the soundness proofs, but has some runtime overhead. In this work, keys are just numbers, so that the lookup in the memory is faster. Although trivial on paper, this change introduces some challenges for the verification task.

**2012 ACM Subject Classification** Theory of computation → Logic and verification; Theory of computation → Equational logic and rewriting

**Keywords and phrases** certification, Isabelle/HOL, reduction pair, termination analysis

## 1 Introduction

Automatically proving termination of term rewrite systems has been an active field of research for half a century. A number of simplification orders [2, 3] are classic methods for proving termination, and these are still integrated in several current termination tools. Classical simplification orders are Knuth–Bendix orders (KBO) and lexicographic and recursive path orders (LPO and RPO). The weighted path order (WPO) [10] was introduced as a simplification order that unifies and extends classical ones.

Since implementations may be buggy, we are interested in certification, where automatically generated proofs are checked with verified implementations of the various orders. Since the verification task is usually time-intensive, one wants to minimize the number of supported orders. Here, WPO is a perfect candidate for integration into a checker, since it covers many simplification orders. Note that a direct implementation of WPO as recursive function has an exponential worst case runtime. Therefore, we will develop a non-trivial implementation that only requires polynomial time. It is based on memoization and its verification is not immediate.

We perform our formalization using Isabelle/HOL [4], based on **IsaFoR**, the **Isabelle Formalization of Rewriting** [7], which also contains soundness proofs of the certifier **CeTA**. As a result of this work we improved the execution times of **CeTA** when it comes to checking proofs of WPO. We further replaced the existing implementation of RPO by instantiating the new efficient implementation of WPO, again leading to faster implementation. The

---

\* The authors are listed in alphabetical order regardless of individual contributions or seniority. This research was supported by the Austrian Science Fund (FWF) project I 5943.

formalization of the new implementation is available in the archive of formal proofs (AFP) [8] and the new implementation is integrated in CēTA version 2.45.

## 2 Preliminaries

We assume familiarity with term rewriting [1], but briefly recall notions that are used in the following. A term built from signature  $\mathcal{F}$  and set  $\mathcal{V}$  of variables is either  $x \in \mathcal{V}$  or of form  $f(t_1, \dots, t_n)$ , where  $f \in \mathcal{F}$  is  $n$ -ary and  $t_1, \dots, t_n$  are terms.

A reduction pair is a pair  $(\succ, \lesssim)$  of two relations on terms that satisfies the following requirements:  $\succ$  is well-founded,  $\lesssim$  and  $\succ$  are compatible (i.e.,  $\lesssim \circ \succ \circ \lesssim \subseteq \succ$ ), and the relations are closed under certain operations.

A precedence is a relation  $>$  on  $\mathcal{F}$  that is both transitive and well-founded.

We write  $\succ^{\text{lex}}$  and  $\lesssim^{\text{lex}}$  for the strict- and non-strict lexicographic extension of  $(\succ, \lesssim)$ . They are defined by a comparison from left to right, e.g.,  $[s_1, \dots, s_n] \succ^{\text{lex}} [t_1, \dots, t_n]$  is satisfied iff there is some  $1 \leq i \leq n$  such that  $s_j \lesssim t_j$  for all  $1 \leq j < i$ , and  $s_i \succ t_i$ .

## 3 The Weighted Path Order

In this section we provide a recursive definition of a variant of WPO. We deviate from the original definition by dropping the status function  $\pi$  of WPO, since this feature is not important to illustrate the results of this paper. Actually, the formalization of WPO [5] includes several currently known extensions of WPO, e.g., quasi-precedences, comparison of variables with least elements, the support of multiset comparisons as an alternative to lexicographic comparisons [9], and Refinements (2c) and (2d) of WPO [10, Section 4.2].

Let  $>$  be some precedence. Let  $(\succ, \lesssim)$  be some reduction pair such that  $\succ$  is transitive,  $\lesssim$  is a preorder, and  $t \lesssim s$  for all terms  $t$  and subterms  $s$  of  $t$ . Then WPO is defined by a strict and non-strict relation on terms ( $\succ_{\text{WPO}}$  and  $\lesssim_{\text{WPO}}$ ) as follows:  $s \succ_{\text{WPO}} t$  iff

1.  $s \succ t$ , or
2.  $s \lesssim t$  and
  - a.  $s = f(s_1, \dots, s_n)$  and  $\exists i \in \{1, \dots, n\}. s_i \lesssim_{\text{WPO}} t$ , or
  - b.  $s = f(s_1, \dots, s_n)$ ,  $t = g(t_1, \dots, t_m)$  and
    - i.  $\forall j \in \{1, \dots, m\}. s \succ_{\text{WPO}} t_j$  and
    - ii. **A.**  $f > g$  or
    - B.**  $f = g$  and  $n = m$  and  $[s_1, \dots, s_n] \succ_{\text{WPO}}^{\text{lex}} [t_1, \dots, t_n]$

The relation  $s \lesssim_{\text{WPO}} t$  is defined in the same way, where  $\succ_{\text{WPO}}^{\text{lex}}$  in case **2.b.ii.B** is replaced by  $\lesssim_{\text{WPO}}^{\text{lex}}$ , and there is an additional subcase that includes  $x \lesssim_{\text{WPO}}^{\text{lex}} x$ . Yamada proved that  $(\succ_{\text{WPO}}, \lesssim_{\text{WPO}})$  is a reduction pair, and can thus be used for termination proofs.

The previous verified implementation of WPO just implements the recursive definition of WPO directly. This can lead to exponentially many recursive calls.

► **Example 1.** We consider a WPO where  $\succ = \emptyset$  and  $\lesssim$  relates all terms. Let us now evaluate  $f^{n+1}(x) \succ_{\text{WPO}} f^{n+1}(x)$ . We have to consider case **2.a** where we arrive at  $f^n(x) \succ_{\text{WPO}} f^{n+1}(x)$  and then in case **2.b.i** a recursive call to  $f^n(x) \succ_{\text{WPO}} f^n(x)$  is triggered. For evaluating  $f^{n+1}(x) \succ_{\text{WPO}} f^{n+1}(x)$  we further have to apply case **2.b.ii.B** to arrive at  $[f^n(x)] \succ_{\text{WPO}}^{\text{lex}} [f^n(x)]$  which in turn will again evaluate  $f^n(x) \succ_{\text{WPO}} f^n(x)$ .

So, evaluation of  $f^{n+1}(x) \succ_{\text{WPO}} f^{n+1}(x)$  will result in at least two invocations of  $f^n(x) \succ_{\text{WPO}} f^n(x)$ , which in turn leads to four invocations of  $f^{n-1}(x) \succ_{\text{WPO}} f^{n-1}(x)$ , then eight invocations of  $f^{n-2}(x) \succ_{\text{WPO}} f^{n-2}(x)$ , etc.

## 4 The Efficient Implementation of the Weighted Path Order

The exponential runtime of WPO as seen in Example 1 is also present in other term orders. For instance, a memoized implementation of RPO was developed by Nagele to circumvent these problems [6]. There, for an RPO comparison of terms  $s$  and  $t$  a dictionary was used to lookup and store the results of RPO comparisons of subterms. The keys of the dictionary were pairs of terms  $(s_i, t_j)$  where  $s_i$  is a subterm of  $s$  and  $t_j$  is a subterm of  $t$ . Consequently, each lookup and store operation on the dictionary (implemented via red-black trees) requires several term comparisons, which clearly is not optimal when it comes to execution time. And from the formalization viewpoint it also had its costs, namely the approach required the definition of a linear order on terms, which was not automatic at that time.

Similarly, our approach also adds memoization to WPO, but avoiding the problem of term comparisons in dictionary operations. We use pairs of integer indices as keys instead, which have the advantage of being easy and fast to compare. The indices are uniquely assigned to all subterms of  $s$  and  $t$  at the very beginning using an index function. This index function adds a consecutive integer value to every subterm in the term.

Technically this is done as follows. Terms are represented by a datatype  $(f, v)\text{term}$ , where  $f$  is a type variable for function symbols and  $v$  for variables. Indexed terms are then defined as terms with function symbols and variables adjusted.

**type\_synonym**  $(f, v)\text{indexed\_term} = (f \times (f, v)\text{term} \times \text{index}, v \times (f, v)\text{term} \times \text{index})\text{term}$

In this way an indexed term is a term, so one can recurse on its structure. Additionally one has constant time access to the index of a term ( $\text{index} :: (f, v)\text{indexed\_term} \Rightarrow \text{index}$ ) and to the original term ( $\text{stored} :: (f, v)\text{indexed\_term} \Rightarrow (f, v)\text{term}$ ) by accessing the additional informations that are stored in the root symbols, i.e., variables and function symbols.

The crucial property of the function to create an index ( $\text{index\_term}$ ) is formulated as:

**lemma**  $\text{index\_term}: \exists ri. \forall t. \text{index\_term } s \triangleright t \longrightarrow ri(\text{index } t) = \text{unindex } t \wedge \text{stored } t = \text{unindex } t$

Here,  $\text{unindex}$  is the function to recursively flatten an indexed term to a term by removing the extra informations in the variables and function symbols.<sup>1</sup> The existentially quantified function  $ri$  (reverse index) is important to show that each index uniquely identifies a subterm. The equality  $\text{unindex}(\text{index\_term } t) = t$  is also available.

We can now define a memoized implementation of WPO as follows: it takes two indexed terms  $s$  and  $t$  and a dictionary  $d$  as input and then returns the result  $(s \succ_{\text{WPO}} t, s \lesssim_{\text{WPO}} t)$  in combination with an updated dictionary. Here,  $\text{wpo\_mem}$  is the function which tries to perform a lookup, and if this is not successful, stores the result of the computation of  $\text{wpo\_main}$ , which in turn implements the inference rules of WPO and recurses via  $\text{wpo\_mem}$ .

**fun**  $\text{wpo\_mem}$  **and**  $\text{wpo\_main}$  **where**

```

wpo_mem d (s,t) = (let i = index s; j = index t in
  case lookup d (i,j) of Some result  $\Rightarrow$  (result, d)      (* use memoized result if available *)
  | None  $\Rightarrow$  case wpo_main mem (s,t)                    (* otherwise compute result *)
    of (result, d')  $\Rightarrow$  (result, update (i,j) result d')) (* and memoize it *)

wpo_main d (s,t) = (if stored s  $\succ$  stored t then ((True, True), d) (* WPO case 1 *)

```

<sup>1</sup> A previous name of the  $\text{unindex}$  function was  $\text{flatten}$ . This old name is still present in AFP 2022 and CeTA version 2.45, but it will be  $\text{unindex}$  in future versions of the AFP and CeTA.

```

else if stored s  $\not\prec$  stored t then ((False, False), d)      (* WPO case 2 not applicable *)
else case s of Fun f ss  $\Rightarrow$  case exists_mem ( $\lambda s_i. (s_i, t)$ ) wpo_mem snd d ss
  of (wpo_2a, d')  $\Rightarrow$  if wpo_2a then ((True, True), d')    (* WPO case 2.a *)
  else ...

```

Observe that in the (full) definition of `wpo_main` several higher-order functions have been replaced by higher-order memoized functions, e.g., the existential quantification over list elements in WPO case **2.a** is implemented via the memoized version `exists_mem`; similarly there are `forall_mem` for case **2.b.i** and `lex_ext_mem` for case **2.b.ii.B**.

In the memoized implementation of WPO each pair of subterms  $s_i \trianglelefteq s$  and  $t_j \trianglelefteq t$  is compared at most once, leading to at most  $|s| \times |t|$  many invocations of `wpo_main` to compute  $s \succ_{\text{WPO}} t$ . If we assume that  $\succ$  and  $\prec$  can be evaluated in polynomial time, then we get an overall polynomial runtime for the variant of WPO that we presented here.<sup>2</sup>

Now the question is, how we can relate the original implementation `wpo` ::  $(f, v)\text{term} \times (f, v)\text{term} \Rightarrow \text{bool} \times \text{bool}$  to its memoized implementation `wpo_mem` ::  $(\text{index} \times \text{index}, \text{bool} \times \text{bool}) \text{ mapping} \Rightarrow (f, v)\text{indexed\_term} \times (f, v)\text{indexed\_term} \Rightarrow (\text{bool} \times \text{bool}) \times (\text{index} \times \text{index}, \text{bool} \times \text{bool}) \text{ mapping}$ . One prerequisite is to enforce that the dictionary only stores valid results. Note, however, that in our setting the dictionary stores indices of actual inputs. Therefore, we define a valid dictionary for a function `f` as follows, where `rev_ind` is the inverse of an index function, i.e., it computes from a given index of type `'i` the original value of type `'a` which is then used as input to `f`.

**definition** `valid_memory` ::  $(a \Rightarrow b) \Rightarrow (i \Rightarrow a) \Rightarrow (i, b) \text{ mapping} \Rightarrow \text{bool}$  **where**  
`valid_memory f rev_ind mem = ( $\forall i b. \text{lookup mem } i = \text{Some } b \longrightarrow f (\text{rev\_ind } i) = b$ )`

For proving soundness of `wpo_mem` we require—among others—the precondition `valid_memory wpo ri d` where `ri` is a combination of the two reverse index functions of `s` and `t`. Both of these exist by lemma `index_term`. Note that `ri` does not occur in the implementation.

Before we can prove soundness of `wpo_mem`, we also need to prove soundness of auxiliary memoized functions such as `exists_mem`. At this point, let us have a look a bit more closely on how `exists_mem` is actually defined and used. To this end, consider the type of `exists_mem`.

$$(a \Rightarrow b) \Rightarrow (m \Rightarrow b \Rightarrow (c \times m)) \Rightarrow (c \Rightarrow \text{bool}) \Rightarrow m \Rightarrow a \text{ list} \Rightarrow (\text{bool} \times m)$$

This type clearly deviates from the usual type of a function that checks whether some list element satisfies a predicate:  $(a \Rightarrow \text{bool}) \Rightarrow a \text{ list} \Rightarrow \text{bool}$ .

The second argument to `exists_mem` is a memoized function that, for a given input of type `'b` and some input memory of type `'m`, computes the result of type `'c` and an updated memory. Note, however, that the input list takes elements of type `'a` which first need to be converted to inputs for the memoized function. This is exactly the task of the function that is provided as the first argument of `exists_mem`. Once we get the result of type `'c` from the memoized implementation, we further need to convert this into a Boolean to check the predicate, and this is done by the third argument of `exists_mem`.

In the WPO-example, we need the full flexibility of `exists_mem`. The memoized function is `wpo_mem` which works on pairs of indexed terms and computes pairs of Booleans. Here the first argument to `exists_mem` is a function that takes some arbitrary subterm  $s_i$  from the arguments of  $s = f(ss)$  with  $ss = [s_1, \dots, s_n]$  and combines the single indexed term  $s_i$  into

<sup>2</sup> The version of WPO in the AFP includes several improvements. With these improvements, polynomial runtime is still ensured when fixing a finite signature, but not if arities can grow arbitrarily.

the pair  $(s_i, t)$  such that `wpo_mem` can be invoked on such a pair. Then the resulting pair  $(s_i \succ_{\text{WPO}} t, s_i \lesssim_{\text{WPO}} t)$  is converted by `snd` into  $s_i \lesssim_{\text{WPO}} t$  so that eventually we compute  $\exists s_i. s_i \lesssim_{\text{WPO}} t$ , i.e., we check precisely whether WPO case 2.a is applicable.

For making this reasoning formal, we further need a notion to express that a memoized function (e.g., `wpo_mem`) is an implementation of some function (e.g., `wpo`).

For space reasons we only provide the definition and soundness lemma here, without going into detail. Note that the handling of the indirection of indices makes the definitions and properties more complicated than they are in Nagele's formalization without this indirection.

**definition** `memoize_fun impl f g rev_ind A =`

$$(\forall x \ m \ y \ m'. \text{valid\_memory } f \ \text{rev\_ind } m \longrightarrow \text{impl } m \ x = (y, m') \longrightarrow x \in A \longrightarrow y = f \ (g \ x) \wedge \text{valid\_memory } f \ \text{rev\_ind } m')$$

**lemma** `exists_mem: assumes valid_memory fun rev_ind m`

**and** `exists_mem f impl h m xs = (b, m')`

**and** `memoize_fun impl fun g rev_ind (f ' set xs)`

**shows** `b = ( $\exists x \in \text{set } xs. h \ (fun \ (g \ (f \ x)))$ ) \wedge \text{valid\_memory fun rev\_ind } m'`

We arrive at the main soundness lemma which shows that `wpo_mem` implements `wpo`.

**lemma** `wpo_mem: assumes ri = ( $\lambda \ (i, j). (rli \ i, rri \ j)$ )`

**and**  $\bigwedge s_i. s \triangleright s_i \implies rli \ (\text{index } s_i) = \text{unindex } s_i \wedge \text{stored } s_i = \text{flatten } s_i$

**and**  $\bigwedge t_i. t \triangleright t_i \implies rri \ (\text{index } t_i) = \text{unindex } t_i \wedge \text{stored } t_i = \text{unindex } t_i$

**and** `valid_memory wpo ri d`

**and** `wpo_mem d (s,t) = (result,d')`

**shows** `result = wpo (unindex s, unindex t) \wedge \text{valid\_memory wpo ri d}'`

We finally define a wrapper that invokes `wpo_mem` with an empty memory:

**definition** `wpo_mem_impl s t = fst (wpo_mem Mapping.empty (index_term s, index_term t))`

Soundness of `wpo_mem_impl` is easily proven with the help of lemmas `index_term` and `wpo_mem`. The `[code]` attribute tells the code generator of Isabelle to implement `wpo` via the defining equations of the memoized implementation.


**lemma** `wpo_mem_impl[code]: wpo s t = wpo_mem_impl s t`

Based on `wpo_mem` and `wpo_mem_impl` we also obtain `rpo_mem` and `rpo_mem_impl`, a memoized implementation of RPO. It just instantiates WPO<sup>3</sup> by choosing the trivial reduction pair, i.e.,  $\succ = \emptyset$  and  $\lesssim$  compares all terms. In this way, case 1 of WPO is never applicable and the condition  $s \lesssim t$  in case 2 is always satisfied.

## 5 Evaluation

The new implementations of WPO and RPO are integrated in CeTA version 2.45 and we experimentally evaluate it against CeTA version 2.44 which uses a non-memoized WPO and Nagele's implementation of RPO. For the experiments we use TRSs  $\mathcal{R}_n$  whose termination

<sup>3</sup> Recall that the formalization contains a variant of WPO that also supports multiset comparisons. In this way RPO is fully subsumed by WPO.



■ **Figure 1** Results of running WPO and RPO with CeTA versions 2.44 and 2.45.

can be proven by both RPO and WPO. Eleven of the twelve rules of  $\mathcal{R}_n$  are identical for each  $n$ , and there is one rule that is parametrized by  $n$  as follows.

$$f(\text{term}(n), \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{s}(y))) \rightarrow f(\text{term}'(n), \mathbf{s}(\mathbf{s}(\mathbf{g}(y))))$$

Here, both  $\text{term}(n)$  and  $\text{term}'(n)$  are terms of the form  $(\mathbf{g}/\mathbf{h})^n(x)$  where each  $\mathbf{g}/\mathbf{h}$  is randomly replaced by either  $\mathbf{g}$  or  $\mathbf{h}$ . For instance,  $\text{term}(3)$  might be  $\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{h}(\mathbf{h}(x)))$  and  $\text{term}'(3)$  is  $\mathbf{h}(\mathbf{h}(\mathbf{g}(x)))$ . If you download CeTA version 2.45,<sup>4</sup> then  $\mathcal{R}_{48}$  is available as `examples/wpo_large_proof.xml`, though in a variant where the  $(\mathbf{g}/\mathbf{h})^{48}(x)$  terms have a non-random structure.

We tested the implementations on  $\mathcal{R}_{10}, \mathcal{R}_{20}, \dots, \mathcal{R}_{1000}$  and the results are displayed in Figure 1. All experiments have been conducted using an 3.2 GHz 8-Core Intel Xeon W processor running macOS Ventura 13.4.

- The RPO implementation in CeTA 2.44 needs cubic time ( $\approx 0.09 \cdot n^3 \mu\text{s}$ ) to certify the proofs:  $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$  many term pairs are compared, and each lookup has a cost of  $\mathcal{O}(n)$ .
- The WPO implementation in CeTA 2.44 can only solve  $\mathcal{R}_{10}$  and needs 46 seconds. The attempt to certify  $\mathcal{R}_{20}$  was aborted after 10 minutes.
- The new version of RPO in CeTA 2.45 needs only quadratic time ( $\approx 1.10 \cdot n^2 \mu\text{s}$ ), since now the lookup costs are negligible. So, there is a linear speedup compared to CeTA 2.44.
- The new version of WPO in CeTA 2.45 needs cubic time ( $\approx 0.11 \cdot n^3 \mu\text{s}$ ), since each comparison in WPO cases 1 and 2 requires  $\mathcal{O}(n)$  time for the chosen parameters.

---

## References

- 1 Franz Baader and Tobias Nipkow. *Term rewriting and all that*. Cambridge University Press, 1998. doi:10.1017/CB09781139172752.
- 2 Nachum Dershowitz. Orderings for term-rewriting systems. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 17:279–301, 1982. doi:10.1016/0304-3975(82)90026-3.
- 3 Donald E. Knuth and Peter Bendix. Simple word problems in universal algebras. In *Computational Problems in Abstract Algebra*, pages 263–297. Pergamon Press, New York, 1970. doi:10.1016/B978-0-08-012975-4.50028-X.
- 4 Tobias Nipkow, Lawrence C. Paulson, and Markus Wenzel. *Isabelle/HOL: A Proof Assistant for Higher-Order Logic*, volume 2283 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*. Springer, 2002. doi:10.1007/3-540-45949-9.
- 5 Christian Sternagel, René Thiemann, and Akihisa Yamada. A formalization of weighted path orders and recursive path orders. *Archive of Formal Proofs*, 2021. [https://isa-afp.org/entries/Weighted\\_Path\\_Order.html](https://isa-afp.org/entries/Weighted_Path_Order.html), Formal proof development.

---

<sup>4</sup> Available at <http://cl-informatik.uibk.ac.at/isafor/src/CeTA-2.45.tgz>.

- 6 René Thiemann, Guillaume Allais, and Julian Nagele. On the formalization of termination techniques based on multiset orderings. In *Proc. RTA 2012*, volume 15 of *LIPICs*, pages 339–354, 2012. doi:10.4230/LIPICs.RTA.2012.339.
- 7 René Thiemann and Christian Sternagel. Certification of termination proofs using CeTA. In *Proc. TPHOLs 2009*, volume 5674 of *LNCS*, pages 452–468, 2009. doi:10.1007/978-3-642-03359-9\_31.
- 8 René Thiemann and Elias Wenninger. A verified efficient implementation of the weighted path order. *Archive of Formal Proofs*, June 2023. [https://isa-afp.org/entries/Efficient\\_Weighted\\_Path\\_Order.html](https://isa-afp.org/entries/Efficient_Weighted_Path_Order.html), Formal proof development.
- 9 René Thiemann and Akihisa Yamada. Efficient formalization of simplification orders. Proc. WST 2022, <https://sws.cs.ru.nl/pmwiki/uploads/Main/wst2022proceedings.pdf>, 2022.
- 10 Akihisa Yamada, Keiichirou Kusakari, and Toshiki Sakabe. A unified ordering for termination proving. *Sci. Comput. Program.*, 111:110–134, 2015. doi:10.1016/j.scico.2014.07.009.