arXiv:1811.00699v1 [cs.LO] 2 Nov 2018

Separation Logic with Linearly Compositional Inductive Predicates and Set Data Constraints*

Chong Gao[1,2], Taolue Chen[3], Zhilin Wu[1]

[1] State Key Laboratory of Computer Science,
Institute of Software, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, China
[2] University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, China
[3] Department of Computer Science and Information Systems,
Birkbeck, University of London, UK

Abstract. We identify difference-bound set constraints (DBS), an analogy of difference-bound arithmetic constraints for sets. DBS can express not only set constraints but also arithmetic constraints over set elements. We integrate DBS into separation logic with linearly compositional inductive predicates, obtaining a logic thereof where set data constraints of linear data structures can be specified. We show that the satisfiability of this logic is decidable. A crucial step of the decision procedure is to compute the transitive closure of DBS-definable set relations, to capture which we propose an extension of quantified set constraints with Presburger Arithmetic (RQSPA). The satisfiability of RQSPA is then shown to be decidable by harnessing advanced automata-theoretic techniques.

1 Introduction

Separation Logic (SL) is a well-established approach for deductive verification of programs that manipulate dynamic data structures [25,28]. Typically, SL is used in combination with inductive definitions (SLID), which provides a natural and convenient means to specify dynamic data structures. To reason about the property (e.g. sortedness) of data values stored in data structures, it is also necessary to incorporate data constraints into the inductive definitions.

One of the most fundamental questions for a logical theory is whether its satisfiability is decidable. SLID with data constraints is no exception. This problem becomes more challenging than one would probably expect, partially due to the inherent intricacy brought up by inductive definitions and data constraints. It is somewhat surprising that only disproportional research has addressed this question (cf. *Related work*). In practice, most available tools based on SLID only support heuristics without giving completeness guarantees, especially when data constraints are involved. *Complete* decision procedures for satisfiability, however, have been found important in software engineering tasks such as symbolic execution, specification debugging, counterexample generation, etc., let along the theoretical insights they usually shed on the logic system.

* This work is partially supported by NSFC grant (No. 61472474, 61572478, 61872340), UK EPSRC grant (EP/P00430X/1), and the INRIA-CAS joint research project VIP.

The dearth of complete decision procedures for SLID with data constraints has prompted us to launch a research program as of 2015, aiming to identify decidable *and* sufficiently expressive instances. We have made encouraging progress insofar. In [15], we set up a general framework, but could only tackle linear data structures with data constraints in difference-bound arithmetic. In [34], we were able to tackle tree data structures by exploiting machineries such as order graphs and counter machines, though the data constraints therein remained to be in difference-bound arithmetic.

An important class of data constraints that is currently elusive in our investigations is set constraints. They are mandatory for reasoning about, e.g., invariants of data collections stored in data structures. For instance, when specifying the correctness of a sorting algorithm on input lists, whilst the sortedness of the list can be described by difference-bound arithmetic constraints, the property that the sorting algorithm does not change the set of data values on the list requires inductive definitions with *set* data constraints. Indeed, reviewers of the papers [15,34] constantly raised the challenge of set constraints, which compelled us to write the current paper.

Main contributions. Our *first* contribution is to carefully design the difference-bound set constraints ($\mathcal{DBS}$), and to integrate them into the linearly compositional inductive predicates introduced in [15], yielding $\mathsf{SLID}^{\mathsf{S}}_{\mathsf{LC}}$: *SL with linearly compositional inductive predicates and set data constraints*. The rationale of $\mathcal{DBS}$ is two-fold: (1) it must be sufficiently expressive to represent common set data constraints as well as arithmetic constraints over set elements one usually needs when specifying linear data structures, (2) because of the inductive predicates, it must be sufficiently "simple" to be able to capture the *transitive closure* of $\mathcal{DBS}$-definable set relations[4] in an effective means, in order to render the satisfiability of $\mathsf{SLID}^{\mathsf{S}}_{\mathsf{LC}}$ decidable. As the *second* contribution, we show that the transitive closure of $\mathcal{DBS}$ can indeed be captured in the *restricted extension of quantified set constraints with Presburger arithmetic* ($\mathcal{RQSPA}$) introduced in this paper. Finally, our *third* contribution is to show that the satisfiability of $\mathcal{RQSPA}$ is decidable by establishing a connection of $\mathcal{RQSPA}$ with Presburger automata [29]. This extends the well-known connection of Monadic Second-Order logic on words (MSOW) and finite-state automata *a la* Büchi and Elgot [5,11]. These contributions, together with a procedure which constructs an abstraction (as an $\mathcal{RQSPA}$ formula) from a given $\mathsf{SLID}^{\mathsf{S}}_{\mathsf{LC}}$ formula and which we adapt from our previous work [15], show the satisfiability of $\mathsf{SLID}^{\mathsf{S}}_{\mathsf{LC}}$ is decidable.

We remark that sets are conceptually related to second—rather than first—order logics. While the transitive closure of logic formulae with *first-order variables* is somehow well-studied (especially for simple arithmetic; cf. *Related Work*), the transitive closure of logic formulae with *second-order variables* is rarely addressed in literature. (They easily lead to undecidability.) To our best knowledge, the computation of transitive closures of $\mathcal{DBS}$ here represents one of the first practically relevant examples of the computation of this type for a class of logic formulae with second-order variables, which may be of independent interests.

[4] This shall be usually referred to as "transitive closure of $\mathcal{DBS}$" to avoid clumsiness.

Related work. We first review the work on SLID with data constraints. (Due to space limit, the work on SLID *without* data constraints will be skipped.) In [7,8,23], SLID with set/multiset/size data constraints were considered, but only (incomplete) heuristics were provided. To reason about invariants of data values stored in lists, SL with list segment predicates and data constraints in universally quantified Presburger arithmetic was considered [1]. The work [26,27] provided decision procedures for SLID with data constraints by translating into many-sorted first-order logic with reachability predicates. In particular, in [27, Section 6], extensions of basic logic GRIT are given to cover set data constraints as well as order constraints over set elements. However, it seems that this approach does not address arithmetic constraints over set elements (cf. the "Limitations" paragraph in the end of Section 6 in [27]). For instance, a list where the data values in adjacent positions are consecutive can be captured in $\mathsf{SLID}^{\mathsf{S}}_{\mathsf{LC}}$ (see the predicate *plseg* in Section 3), but appears to go beyond the work [26,27]. Moreover, there is no precise characterisation of the limit of extensions under which the decidability retains. The work [13] introduced the concept of compositional inductive predicates, which may alleviate the difficulties of the entailment problem for SLID. Nevertheless, [13] only provided sound heuristics rather than decision procedures. More recently, the work [21,31] investigated SLID with Presburger arithmetic data constraints.

Furthermore, several logics other than separation logic have been considered to reason about both shape properties and data constraints of data structures. The work [30] proposed a generic decision procedure for recursive algebraic data types with abstraction functions encompassing lengths (sizes) of data structures, sets or multisets of data values as special cases. Nevertheless, the work [30] focused on functional programs while this work aims to verify imperative programs, which requires to reason about *partial* data structures such as list segments (rather than complete data structures such as lists). It is unclear how the decision procedure in [30] can be generalised to partial data structures. The work [22] introduced STRAND, a fragment of monadic second-order logic, to reason about tree structures. Being undecidable in general, several decidable fragments were identified. STRAND does not provide an explicit means to describe sets of data values, although it allows using set variables to represent sets of locations.

Our work is also related to classical logics with set constraints, for which we can only give a brief (but by no means comprehensive) summary. Presburger arithmetic extended with sets was studied dating back to 80's, with highly undecidability results [6,16]. However, decidable fragments do exist: [33] studied the non-disjoint combination of theories that share set variables and set operations. [20] considered $\mathrm{QFBAPA}^{<}_{\infty}$, a quantifier-free logic of sets of real numbers supporting integer sets and variables, linear arithmetic, the cardinality operator, infimum and supremum. [32,17] investigated two extensions of the Bernays-Schönfinkel-Ramsey fragment of first-order predicate logic (BSR) with simple linear arithmetic over integers and difference-bound constraints over reals (but crucially, the ranges of the universally quantified variables must be bounded). Since the unary predicate symbols in BSR are uninterpreted and represent sets

over integers or reals, the two extensions of BSR can also be used to specify the set constraints on integers or reals. [10] presented a decision procedure for quantifier-free constraints on restricted intensional sets (i.e., sets given by a property rather than by enumerating their elements). None of these logics are able to capture the transitive closure of $\mathcal{DBS}$ as $\mathcal{RQSPA}$ does. MSOW extended with linear cardinality constraints was investigated in [18]. Roughly speaking, $\mathcal{RQSPA}$ can be considered as an extension of MSOW with linear arithmetic expressions on the maximum or minimum value of free set variables. Therefore, the two extensions in [18] and this paper are largely incomparable.

In contrast to set constraints, the computation of transitive closures of relations definable in first-order logic (in particular, difference-bound and octagonal arithmetic constraints) has been considered in for instance, [9,4,2,3,19].

2 Logics for sets

We write $\mathbb{Z}$, $\mathbb{N}$ for the set of integers and natural numbers; $\mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{Z}}$ and $\mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{N}}$ for *finite* subsets of $\mathbb{Z}$ and $\mathbb{N}$. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $[n]$ stands for $\{1, \cdots, n\}$. We shall work exclusively on finite subsets of $\mathbb{Z}$ or $\mathbb{N}$ unless otherwise stated. For any finite $A \neq \varnothing$, we write $\min(A)$ and $\max(A)$ for the minimum and maximum element of A. These functions, however, are *not* defined over empty sets.

In the sequel, we introduce a handful of logics for sets which will be used later in this paper. We mainly consider two data types, i.e., integer type $\mathbb{Z}$ and (finite) set type $\mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{Z}}$. Typically, $c, c', \cdots \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $A, A', \cdots \in \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{Z}}$. Accordingly, two types of variables occur: integer variables (ranged over by $x, y, \cdots$) and set variables (ranged over by $S, S', \cdots$). Furthermore, we reserve $\bowtie \in \{=, \leqslant, \geqslant\}$ for comparison operators between integers,[5] and $\asymp \in \{=, \subseteq, \supseteq, \subset, \supset\}$ for comparison operators between sets. We start with *difference-bound* set constraints ($\mathcal{DBS}$).

Definition 1 (Difference-bound set constraints). *Formulae of $\mathcal{DBS}$ are defined by the rules:*

$$\begin{array}{lll} \varphi & ::= S = S' \cup T_s \mid T_i \ \bowtie \ T_i + c \mid \varphi \wedge \varphi & \\ T_s & ::= \varnothing \mid \{\min(S)\} \mid \{\max(S)\} \mid T_s \cup T_s & (\textit{s}\text{et terms}) \\ T_i & ::= \min(S) \mid \max(S) & (\textit{i}\text{nteger terms}) \end{array}$$

Remark. $\mathcal{DBS}$ is a rather limited logic, but it has been carefully devised to serve the data formulae in inductive predicates of $\mathsf{SLID}^{\mathsf{S}}_{\mathsf{LC}}[P]$ (cf. Section 3). In particular, we remark that only conjunction, but not disjunction, of atomic constraints is allowed. The main reason is, once the disjunction is introduced, the computation of transitive closures becomes infeasible simply because one would be able to encode the computation of Minsky's two-counter machines. □

To capture the transitive closure of $\mathcal{DBS}$, we introduce *Restricted extension of Quantified Set constraints with Presburger Arithmetic*[6] ($\mathcal{RQSPA}$). Intuitively,

[5] The operators $<$ and $>$ can be seen as abbreviations, for instance, $x < y$ is equivalent to $x \leqslant y - 1$, which will be used later on as well.

[6] An unrestricted extension of quantified set constraints with Presburger Arithmetic is undecidable, as shown in [6].

an $\mathcal{RQSPA}$ formula is a *quantified* set constraint extended with Presburger Arithmetic satisfying the following restriction: each atomic formula containing quantified variables must be a difference-bound arithmetic constraint.

Definition 2 (Restricted extension of Quantified Set constraints with Presburger Arithmetic). *Formulae of $\mathcal{RQSPA}$ are defined by the rules:*

$$\begin{aligned}
\Phi &::= T_s \ \asymp \ T_s \mid T_i \ \bowtie \ T_i + c \mid T_m \ \bowtie \ 0 \mid \Phi \wedge \Phi \mid \neg\Phi \mid \forall x.\ \Phi \mid \forall S.\ \Phi,\\
T_s &::= \varnothing \mid S \mid \{T_i\} \mid T_s \cup T_s \mid T_s \cap T_s \mid T_s \backslash T_s,\\
T_i &::= c \mid x \mid \min(T_s) \mid \max(T_s),\\
T_m &::= c \mid x \mid \max(T_s) \mid \min(T_s) \mid T_m + T_m \mid T_m - T_m.
\end{aligned}$$

Here, T_s (resp. T_i) represents set (resp. integer) terms which are more general than those in $\mathcal{DBS}$, and T_m terms are *Presburger arithmetic expressions*. Let $\mathsf{Vars}(\Phi)$ (resp. $\mathsf{free}(\Phi)$) denote the set of variables (resp. free variables) occurring in Φ. We require that **all set variables in atomic formulae $T_m \ \bowtie \ 0$ are free**. To make the free variables explicit, we usually write $\Phi(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{S})$ for a $\mathcal{RQSPA}$ formula Φ. Free variable names are assumed *not* to clash with the quantified ones.

Example 1. $\max(S_1 \cup S_2) - \min(S_1) - \max(S_2) < 0$ and $\forall S_1 \forall S_2.(S_2 \neq \varnothing \rightarrow \max(S_2) \leqslant \max(S_1 \cup S_2))$ are $\mathcal{RQSPA}$ formulae, while $\forall S_2.\ \max(S_1 \cup S_2) - \min(S_1) - \max(S_2) < 0$ is *not*. □

The work [6], among others, studied *Presburger arithmetic extended with Sets* ($\mathcal{PS}$), which is *quantifier-free* $\mathcal{RQSPA}$ formulae. In this paper, $\mathcal{PS}$ will serve the data formula part of $\mathsf{SLID}^{\mathsf{S}}_{\mathsf{LC}}[P]$, and we reserve $\Delta, \Delta', \ldots$ to denote formulae from $\mathcal{PS}$ (see Section 3).

Semantics. All of these logics ($\mathcal{DBS}$, $\mathcal{RQSPA}$, $\mathcal{PS}$) can be considered as instances of weak monadic second-order logic, and thus their semantics are largely self-explanatory. In particular, set variables are interpreted as *finite* subsets of $\mathbb{Z}$ and integer variables are interpreted as integers. We emphasize that, if a set term T_s is interpreted as $\varnothing$, $\min(T_s)$ and $\max(T_s)$ are undefined. As a result, we stipulate that **any atomic formula containing an undefined term is interpreted as `false`.**

For an $\mathcal{RQSPA}$ formula $\Phi(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{S})$ with $\boldsymbol{x} = (x_1, \cdots, x_k)$ and $\boldsymbol{S} = (S_1, \cdots, S_l)$, $\mathcal{L}(\Phi(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{S}))$ denotes

$$\{(n_1, \cdots, n_k, A_1, \cdots, A_l) \in \mathbb{Z}^k \times \mathbb{S}^l_{\mathbb{Z}} \mid \Phi(n_1, \cdots, n_k, A_1, \cdots, A_l)\}.$$

As expected, typically we use $\mathcal{DBS}$ formulae to define relations between (tuples) of sets from $\mathbb{S}^k_{\mathbb{Z}}$. We say a relation $R \subseteq \mathbb{S}^k_{\mathbb{Z}} \times \mathbb{S}^k_{\mathbb{Z}}$ a *difference-bound set relation* if there is a $\mathcal{DBS}$ formula $\varphi(\boldsymbol{S}, \boldsymbol{S'})$ over set variables $\boldsymbol{S}$ and $\boldsymbol{S'}$ such that $R = \{(\boldsymbol{A}, \boldsymbol{A'}) \in \mathbb{S}^k_{\mathbb{Z}} \times \mathbb{S}^k_{\mathbb{Z}} \mid \varphi(\boldsymbol{A}, \boldsymbol{A'})\}$. The *transitive closure* of R is defined in a standard way, viz., $\bigcup_{i \geqslant 0} R^i$, where $R^0 = \{(\boldsymbol{A}, \boldsymbol{A}) \mid \boldsymbol{A} \in \mathbb{S}^k_{\mathbb{Z}}\}$ and $R^{i+1} = R^i \cdot R$.

3 Linearly compositional SLID with set data constraints

In this section, we introduce separation logic with *linearly compositional* inductive predicates and *set data* constraints, denoted by $\mathsf{SLID}^{\mathsf{S}}_{\mathsf{LC}}[P]$, where P is an

inductive predicate. In addition to the integer and set data types introduced in Section 2, we also consider the *location* data type $\mathbb{L}$. As a convention, $l, l', \cdots \in \mathbb{L}$ denote locations and $E, F, X, Y, \cdots$ range over location variables. We consider location fields associated with $\mathbb{L}$ and data fields associated with $\mathbb{Z}$.

$\mathsf{SLID}^{\mathsf{S}}_{\mathsf{LC}}[P]$ formulae may contain inductive predicates, each of which is of the form $P(\boldsymbol{\alpha}; \boldsymbol{\beta}; \boldsymbol{\xi})$ and has an associated inductive definition. The parameters are classified into three groups: *source parameters* $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$, *destination parameters* $\boldsymbol{\beta}$, and *static parameters* $\boldsymbol{\xi}$. We require that the source parameters $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ and the destination parameters $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ are *matched* in type, namely, the two tuples have the same length $\ell > 0$ and for each $i \in [\ell]$, α_i and β_i have the same data type. Static parameters are typically used to store some static (global) information of dynamic data structures, e.g., the target location of tail pointers (cf. *stlseg* in Example 2). Moreover, we assume that for each $i \in [\ell]$, α_i is of either the location type, or the *set type*. (There are no parameters of the integer type.) Without loss of generality, it is assumed that the first components of $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ are location variables; we usually explicitly write $E, \boldsymbol{\alpha}$ and $F, \boldsymbol{\beta}$.

$\mathsf{SLID}^{\mathsf{S}}_{\mathsf{LC}}[P]$ formulae comprise three types of formulae: *pure formulae* Π, *data formulae* Δ, and *spatial formulae* Σ. The data formulae are simply $\mathcal{PS}$ introduced in Section 2, while Π and Σ are defined by the following rules,

$$\begin{array}{rll} \Pi ::= & E = F \mid E \neq F \mid \Pi \wedge \Pi & \text{(pure formulae)} \\ \Sigma ::= & \mathtt{emp} \mid E \mapsto (\rho) \mid P(E, \boldsymbol{\alpha}; F, \boldsymbol{\beta}; \boldsymbol{\xi}) \mid \Sigma * \Sigma & \text{(spatial formulae)} \\ \rho ::= & (f, X) \mid (d, T_i) \mid \rho, \rho & \text{(fields)} \end{array}$$

where T_i is an integer term as in Definition 2, and f (resp. d) is a location (resp. data) field. For spatial formulae Σ, formulae of the form $\mathtt{emp}$, $E \mapsto (\rho)$, or $P(E, \boldsymbol{\alpha}; F, \boldsymbol{\beta}; \boldsymbol{\xi})$ are called *spatial atoms*. In particular, formulae of the form $E \mapsto (\rho)$ and $P(E, \boldsymbol{\alpha}; F, \boldsymbol{\beta}; \boldsymbol{\xi})$ are called *points-to* and *predicate* atoms respectively. Moreover, E is *the root* of these points-to or predicate atoms.

Linearly compositional inductive predicates. An inductive predicate P is *linearly compositional* if the inductive definition of P is given by the following two rules,

- base rule $R_0 : P(E, \boldsymbol{\alpha}; F, \boldsymbol{\beta}; \boldsymbol{\xi}) ::= E = F \wedge \boldsymbol{\alpha} = \boldsymbol{\beta} \wedge \mathtt{emp}$,
- inductive rule $R_1 : P(E, \boldsymbol{\alpha}; F, \boldsymbol{\beta}; \boldsymbol{\xi}) ::= \exists \boldsymbol{X} \exists \boldsymbol{S}.\ \varphi \wedge E \mapsto (\rho) * P(Y, \boldsymbol{\gamma}; F, \boldsymbol{\beta}; \boldsymbol{\xi})$.

The left-hand (resp. right-hand) side of a rule is called the *head* (resp. *body*) of the rule. We note that the body of R_1 does *not* contain pure formulae.

In the sequel, we specify some constraints on the inductive rule R_1 which are vital to obtain *complete* decision procedures for the satisfiability problem.

C1 None of the variables from $F, \boldsymbol{\beta}$ occur elsewhere in the right-hand side of R_1, that is, in φ, $E \mapsto (\rho)$.

C2 The data constraint φ in the body of R_1 is a $\mathcal{DBS}$ formula.

C3 For each atomic formula in φ, there is i such that all the variables in the atomic formula are from $\{\alpha_i, \gamma_i\}$.

C4 Each variable occurs in each of $P(Y, \boldsymbol{\gamma}; F, \boldsymbol{\beta}; \boldsymbol{\xi})$ and ρ at most once.

C5 $\boldsymbol{\xi}$ contains *only* location variables and all location variables from $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \cup \boldsymbol{\xi} \cup \boldsymbol{X}$ occur in ρ.

C6 $Y \in \boldsymbol{X}$ and $\boldsymbol{\gamma} \subseteq \{E\} \cup \boldsymbol{X} \cup \boldsymbol{S}$.

Note that, by **C6**, none of the variables from $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \cup \boldsymbol{\xi}$ occur in $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$. Moreover, from **C5** and **C6**, Y occurs in ρ, which guarantees that in each model of $P(E, \boldsymbol{\alpha}; F, \boldsymbol{\beta}; \boldsymbol{\xi})$, the sub-heap represented by $P(E, \boldsymbol{\alpha}; F, \boldsymbol{\beta}; \boldsymbol{\xi})$, seen as a directed graph, is connected. We remark that these constraints are undeniably technical. However, in practice the inductive predicates satisfying these constraints are usually sufficient to define linear data structures with set data constraints, cf. Example 2.

For an inductive predicate P, let $\mathrm{Flds}(P)$ denote the set of all fields occurring in the inductive rules of P. For a spatial atom a, let $\mathrm{Flds}(a)$ denote the set of fields that a refers to: if $a = E \mapsto (\rho)$, then $\mathrm{Flds}(a)$ is the set of fields occurring in ρ; if $a = P(-)$, then $\mathrm{Flds}(a) = \mathrm{Flds}(P)$.

We write $\mathsf{SLID}^{\mathsf{S}}_{\mathsf{LC}}[P]$ for the collection of separation logic formulae $\phi = \Pi \wedge \Delta \wedge \Sigma$ satisfying the following constraints: (1) P is a linearly compositional inductive predicate, and (2) each predicate atom of Σ is of the form $P(-)$, and for each points-to atom occurring in Σ, the set of fields of this atom is $\mathrm{Flds}(P)$.

For an $\mathsf{SLID}^{\mathsf{S}}_{\mathsf{LC}}[P]$ formula ϕ, let $\mathsf{Vars}(\phi)$ (resp. $\mathsf{LVars}(\phi)$, resp. $\mathsf{DVars}(\phi)$, resp. $\mathsf{SVars}(\phi)$) denote the set of (resp. location, resp. integer, resp. set) variables occurring in ϕ. Moreover, we use $\phi[\boldsymbol{\mu}/\boldsymbol{\alpha}]$ to denote the simultaneous replacement of the variables α_j by μ_j in ϕ. We adopt the standard *classic, precise semantics* of $\mathsf{SLID}^{\mathsf{S}}_{\mathsf{LC}}[P]$ in terms of *states*. In particular, a *state* is a pair (s, h), where s is an assignment and h is a heap. The details can be found in Appendix A.

Example 2. We collect a few examples of linear data structures with set data constraints definable in $\mathsf{SLID}^{\mathsf{S}}_{\mathsf{LC}}[P]$:

sdllseg for sorted doubly linked list segments, $\mathit{sdllseg}(E, P, S; F, L, S') ::= E = F \wedge P = L \wedge S = S' \wedge \mathtt{emp}$, $\mathit{sdllseg}(E, P, S; F, L, S') ::= \exists X, S''.\ S = S'' \cup \{\min(S)\} \wedge$ $E \mapsto ((\mathtt{next}, X), (\mathtt{prev}, P), (\mathtt{data}, \min(S))) * \mathit{sdllseg}(X, E, S''; F, L, S')$.
plseg for list segments where the data values are consecutive, $\mathit{plseg}(E, S; F, S') ::= E = F \wedge S = S' \wedge \mathtt{emp}$, $\mathit{plseg}(E, S; F, S') ::= \exists X, S''.\ S = S'' \cup \{\min(S)\} \wedge \min(S'') = \min(S) + 1 \wedge$ $E \mapsto ((\mathtt{next}, X), (\mathtt{data}, \min(S))) * \mathit{plseg}(X, S''; F, S')$.
ldllseg for doubly list segments, to mimic lengths with sets, $\mathit{ldllseg}(E, P, S; F, L, S') ::= E = F \wedge P = L \wedge S = S' \wedge \mathtt{emp}$, $\mathit{ldllseg}(E, P, S; F, L, S') ::= \exists X, S''.\ S = S'' \cup \{\max(S)\} \wedge \max(S'') = \max(S) - 1 \wedge$ $E \mapsto ((\mathtt{next}, X), (\mathtt{prev}, P)) * \mathit{ldllseg}(X, E, S''; F, L, S')$.

4 Satisfiability of $\mathsf{SLID}^{\mathsf{S}}_{\mathsf{LC}}[P]$

The satisfiability problem is to decide whether there is a state (an assignment-heap pair) satisfying ϕ for a given $\mathsf{SLID}^{\mathsf{S}}_{\mathsf{LC}}[P]$ formula ϕ. We shall follow the approach adopted in [12,15], i.e., to construct $\mathsf{Abs}(\phi)$, an abstraction of ϕ that is equisatisfiable to ϕ. The key ingredient of the construction is to compute the transitive closure of the data constraints extracted from the inductive rule of P.

Let $\phi = \Pi \wedge \Delta \wedge \Sigma$ be an $\mathsf{SLID}^{\mathsf{S}}_{\mathsf{LC}}[P]$ formula. Suppose $\Sigma = a_1 * \cdots * a_n$, where each a_i is either a points-to atom or a predicate atom. For predicate atom $a_i = P(Z_1, \boldsymbol{\mu}; Z_2, \boldsymbol{\nu}; \boldsymbol{\chi})$ we assume that the inductive rule for P is

$$R_1 : P(E, \boldsymbol{\alpha}; F, \boldsymbol{\beta}; \boldsymbol{\xi}) ::= \exists \boldsymbol{X} \exists \boldsymbol{S}.\ \varphi \wedge E \mapsto (\rho) * P(Y, \boldsymbol{\gamma}; F, \boldsymbol{\beta}; \boldsymbol{\xi}). \qquad (*)$$

We extract the data constraint $\varphi_P(\mathsf{dt}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}), \mathsf{dt}(\boldsymbol{\beta}))$ out of R_1. Formally, we define $\varphi_P(\mathsf{dt}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}), \mathsf{dt}(\boldsymbol{\beta}))$ as $\varphi[\mathsf{dt}(\boldsymbol{\beta})/\mathsf{dt}(\boldsymbol{\gamma})]$, where $\mathsf{dt}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$ (resp. $\mathsf{dt}(\boldsymbol{\gamma})$, $\mathsf{dt}(\boldsymbol{\beta})$) is the projection of $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ (resp. $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$, $\boldsymbol{\beta}$) to data variables. For instance, $\varphi_{ldllseg}(S, S') := (S = S'' \cup \{\max(S)\} \wedge \max(S'') = \max(S) - 1)\,[S'/S''] = S = S' \cup \{\max(S)\} \wedge \max(S') = \max(S) - 1$.

We can construct $\mathsf{Abs}(\phi)$ with necessary adaptations from [15]. For each spatial atom a_i, $\mathsf{Abs}(\phi)$ introduces a Boolean variable to denote whether a_i corresponds to a nonempty heap or not. With these Boolean variables, the semantics of separating conjunction are encoded in $\mathsf{Abs}(\phi)$. Moreover, for each predicate atom a_i, $\mathsf{Abs}(\phi)$ contains an abstraction of a_i, where the formulae $\mathsf{Ufld}_1(a_i)$ and $\mathsf{Ufld}_{\geqslant 2}(a_i)$ are used. Intuitively, $\mathsf{Ufld}_1(a_i)$ and $\mathsf{Ufld}_{\geqslant 2}(a_i)$ correspond to the separation logic formulae obtained by unfolding the rule R_1 *once* and *at least twice* respectively. We include the construction here so one can see the role of the transitive closure in $\mathsf{Abs}(\phi)$. The details of $\mathsf{Abs}(\phi)$ can be found in Appendix B.

Let $a_i = P(Z_1, \boldsymbol{\mu}; Z_2, \boldsymbol{\nu}; \boldsymbol{\chi})$ and R_1 be the inductive rule in Eqn. $(*)$. If E occurs in $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ in the body of R_1, we use $\mathsf{idx}_{(P,\boldsymbol{\gamma},E)}$ to denote the unique index j such that $\gamma_j = E$. (The uniqueness follows from **C4**.)

Definition 3 ($\mathsf{Ufld}_1(a_i)$ and $\mathsf{Ufld}_{\geqslant 2}(a_i)$). *$\mathsf{Ufld}_1(a_i)$ and $\mathsf{Ufld}_{\geqslant 2}(a_i)$ are defined by distinguishing the following two cases:*

- *If E occurs in $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ in the body of R_1, then* $\mathsf{Ufld}_1(a_i) := (E = \beta_{\mathsf{idx}_{(P,\boldsymbol{\gamma},E)}} \wedge \varphi_P(\mathsf{dt}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}), \mathsf{dt}(\boldsymbol{\beta})))[Z_1/E, \boldsymbol{\mu}/\boldsymbol{\alpha}, Z_2/F, \boldsymbol{\nu}/\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\chi}/\boldsymbol{\xi}]$ *and* $\mathsf{Ufld}_{\geqslant 2}(a_i) :=$
$$\begin{pmatrix} E \neq \beta_{\mathsf{idx}_{(P,\boldsymbol{\gamma},E)}} \wedge E \neq \gamma_{2,\mathsf{idx}_{(P,\boldsymbol{\gamma},E)}} \wedge \\ \varphi_P[\mathsf{dt}(\boldsymbol{\gamma_1})/\mathsf{dt}(\boldsymbol{\beta})] \wedge \varphi_P[\mathsf{dt}(\boldsymbol{\gamma_1})/\mathsf{dt}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}), \mathsf{dt}(\boldsymbol{\gamma_2})/\mathsf{dt}(\boldsymbol{\beta})] \wedge \\ (\mathsf{TC}[\varphi_P])[\mathsf{dt}(\boldsymbol{\gamma_2})/\mathsf{dt}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})] \end{pmatrix}[Z_1/E, \boldsymbol{\mu}/\boldsymbol{\alpha}, Z_2/F, \boldsymbol{\nu}/\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\chi}/\boldsymbol{\xi}],$$
  where $\boldsymbol{\gamma_1}$ and $\boldsymbol{\gamma_2}$ are fresh variables.
- *Otherwise, let* $\mathsf{Ufld}_1(a_i) := \varphi_P[Z_1/E, \boldsymbol{\mu}/\boldsymbol{\alpha}, Z_2/F, \boldsymbol{\nu}/\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\chi}/\boldsymbol{\xi}]$ *and*
$$\mathsf{Ufld}_{\geqslant 2}(a_i) := \begin{pmatrix} \varphi_P[\mathsf{dt}(\boldsymbol{\gamma_1})/\mathsf{dt}(\boldsymbol{\beta})] \wedge \\ \varphi_P[\mathsf{dt}(\boldsymbol{\gamma_1})/\mathsf{dt}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}), \mathsf{dt}(\boldsymbol{\gamma_2})/\mathsf{dt}(\boldsymbol{\beta})] \wedge \\ (\mathsf{TC}[\varphi_P])[\mathsf{dt}(\boldsymbol{\gamma_2})/\mathsf{dt}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})] \end{pmatrix}[Z_1/E, \boldsymbol{\mu}/\boldsymbol{\alpha}, Z_2/F, \boldsymbol{\nu}/\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\chi}/\boldsymbol{\xi}],$$
  where $\boldsymbol{\gamma_1}$ and $\boldsymbol{\gamma_2}$ are fresh variables.

Here, $\mathsf{TC}[\varphi_P](\mathsf{dt}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}), \mathsf{dt}(\boldsymbol{\beta}))$ denotes the transitive closure of φ_P. In Section 5, it will be shown that $\mathsf{TC}[\varphi_P](\mathsf{dt}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}), \mathsf{dt}(\boldsymbol{\beta}))$ can be written as an $\mathcal{RQSPA}$ formula. As a result, since we are only concerned with satisfiability and can treat the location data type $\mathbb{L}$ simply as integers $\mathbb{Z}$, $\mathsf{Abs}(\phi)$ can also be read as an $\mathcal{RQSPA}$ formula. In Section 6, we shall show that the satisfiability of $\mathcal{RQSPA}$ is decidable. Following this chain of reasoning, we conclude that *the satisfiability of $\mathsf{SLID}^{\mathsf{S}}_{\mathsf{LC}}[P]$ formulae is decidable.*

5 Transitive closure of difference-bound set relations

In this section, we show how to compute the transitive closure of the difference-bound set relation R given by a $\mathcal{DBS}$ formula $\varphi_R(\boldsymbol{S}, \boldsymbol{S'})$. Our approach is, in a

nutshell, to encode $TC[\varphi_R](\boldsymbol{S}, \boldsymbol{S}')$ into $\mathcal{RQSPA}$. We shall only sketch part of a simple case, i.e., in $\varphi_R(S, S')$ only one source and destination set parameter are present. The details are however given in Appendix C.3.

Recall that, owing to the simplicity of $\mathcal{DBS}$, the integer terms T_i in $\varphi_R(S, S')$ can only be $\min(S)$, $\max(S)$, $\min(S')$ or $\max(S')$, whereas the set terms T_s are $\varnothing$, $\{\min(S)\}$, $\{\min(S')\}$, $\{\max(S)\}$, $\{\max(S')\}$, or their union. For reference, we write $\varphi_R(S, S') = \varphi_{R,1} \wedge \varphi_{R,2}$, where $\varphi_{R,1}$ is an equality of set terms (i.e., they are of the form $S = S' \cup T_s$ or $S' = S \cup T_s$), and $\varphi_{R,2}$ is a conjunction of constraints over integer terms (i.e., a conjunction of formulae $T_i \leqslant T_i + c$). $\varphi_{R,1}$ and $\varphi_{R,2}$ will be referred to as the *set* and *integer subformula* of $\varphi_R(S, S')$ respectively. We shall focus on the case $\varphi_{R,1} := S = S' \cup T_s$. The symmetrical case $\varphi_{R,1} := S' = S \cup T_s$ can be adapted easily.

The integer subformula $\varphi_{R,2}$ can be represented by an *edge-weighted directed graph* $\mathcal{G}(\varphi_{R,2})$, where the vertices are all integer terms appearing in $\varphi_{R,2}$, and there is an edge from T_1 to T_2 with weight c iff $T_1 = T_2 + c$ (equivalent to $T_2 = T_1 - c$), or $T_1 \leqslant T_2 + c$, or $T_2 + c \geqslant T_1$ appears in $\varphi_{R,2}$. The weight of a path in $\mathcal{G}(\varphi_{R,2})$ is the sum of the weights of the edges along the path. A *negative cycle* in $\mathcal{G}(\varphi_{R,2})$ is a cycle with negative weight. It is known that $\varphi_{R,2}$ is satisfiable iff $\mathcal{G}(\varphi_{R,2})$ contains no negative cycles [24]. Suppose $\varphi_{R,2}$ is satisfiable. We define the *normal form* of $\varphi_{R,2}$, denoted by $\mathsf{Norm}(\varphi_{R,2})$, as the conjunction of the formulae $T_1 \leqslant T_2 + c$ such that $T_1 \neq T_2$, T_2 is reachable from T_1 in $\mathcal{G}(\varphi_{R,2})$, and c is path from T_1 to T_2 with the minimal weight in $\mathcal{G}(\varphi_{R,2})$.

S (resp. S') is said to be *surely nonempty* in φ_R if $\min(S)$ or $\max(S)$ (resp. $\min(S')$ or $\max(S')$) occurs in φ_R; otherwise, S (resp. S') is *possibly empty* in φ_R. Recall that, according to the semantics, an occurrence of $\min(S)$ or $\max(S)$ (resp. $\min(S')$ or $\max(S')$) in φ_R implies that S (resp. S') is interpreted as a nonempty set in every satisfiable assignment. Provided that S' is nonempty, we know that $\min(S')$ and $\max(S')$ belong to S'. Therefore, for simplicity, here we assume that in $S = S' \cup T_s$, T_s contains neither $\min(S')$ nor $\max(S')$. The situation that T_s contains $\min(S')$ and $\max(S')$ can be dealt with in a similar way.

Saturation. For technical convenience, we introduce a concept of saturation. The main purpose of saturation is to regularise T_s and $\varphi_{R,2}$, which would make the transitive closure construction more "syntactic".

Definition 4. *Let $\varphi_R(S, S') := S = S' \cup T_s \wedge \varphi_{R,2}$ be a $\mathcal{DBS}$ formula. Then $\varphi_R(S, S')$ is saturated if $\varphi_R(S, S')$ satisfies the following conditions*

- *$\varphi_{R,2}$ is satisfiable and in normal forms,*
- *$T_s \subseteq \{\max(S), \min(S)\}$,*
- *if S (resp. S') is surely nonempty in φ_R, then $\varphi_{R,2}$ contains a conjunct $\min(S) \leqslant \max(S) - c$ for some $c \geqslant 0$ (resp. $\min(S') \leqslant \max(S') - c'$ for some $c' \geqslant 0$),*
- *if both S and S' are surely nonempty in φ_R, then*
  - *$\varphi_{R,2}$ contains two conjuncts $\min(S) \leqslant \min(S') - c$ and $\max(S') \leqslant \max(S) - c'$ for some $c, c' \geqslant 0$,*
  - *$\min(S) \notin T_s$ iff $\varphi_{R,2}$ contains the conjuncts $\min(S) \leqslant \min(S')$ and $\min(S') \leqslant \min(S)$,*

- $\max(S) \notin T_s$ *iff* $\varphi_{R,2}$ *contains the conjuncts* $\max(S') \leqslant \max(S)$ *and* $\max(S) \leqslant \max(S')$*,*

– *if* $\varphi_{R,2}$ *contains the conjuncts* $\min(S) \leqslant \max(S)$ *and* $\max(S) \leqslant \min(S)$*, then* $\max(S) \notin T_s$ *(possibly* $\min(S) \in T_s$*).*

For a formula $\varphi_R(S, S') := S = S' \cup T_s \wedge \varphi_{R,2}$, one can easily saturate φ_R, yielding a saturated formula $\mathsf{Strt}(\varphi_R(S, S'))$. (It is possible, however, to arrive at an unsatisfiable formula, then we are done.)

Proposition 1. *Let* $\varphi_R(S, S') := \varphi_{R,1} \wedge \varphi_{R,2}$ *be a* $\mathcal{DBS}$ *formula such that* $\varphi_{R,1} := S = S' \cup T_s$ *and* $\varphi_{R,2}$ *is satisfiable. Then* φ_R *can be transformed, in polynomial time, to an equisatisfiable formula* $\mathsf{Strt}(\varphi_R(S, S'))$*, and if the integer subformula of* $\mathsf{Strt}(\varphi_R(S, S'))$ *is satisfiable, then* $\mathsf{Strt}(\varphi_R(S, S'))$ *is saturated.*

In the sequel, we assume that $\varphi_R(S, S') := \varphi_{R,1} \wedge \varphi_{R,2}$ is satisfiable and *saturated*. For notational convenience, for $A \subseteq \{\min(S), \max(S), \min(S'), \max(S')\}$ with $|A| = 2$, let $\lfloor \varphi_{R,2} \rfloor_A$ denote the conjunction of atomic formulae in $\varphi_{R,2}$ where *all* the elements of A occur.

Evidently, $\lfloor \varphi_{R,2} \rfloor_A$ gives a partition of atomic formulae of $\varphi_{R,2}$. Namely,

$$\varphi_{R,2} = \bigwedge\nolimits_{A \subseteq \{\min(S), \max(S), \min(S'), \max(S')\}, |A|=2} \lfloor \varphi_{R,2} \rfloor_A.$$

We proceed by a case-by-case analysis of $\varphi_{R,1}$. There are four cases: (I) $\varphi_{R,1} := S = S'$, (II) $\varphi_{R,1} := S = S' \cup \{\min(S)\}$, (III) $\varphi_{R,1} = S = S' \cup \{\max(S)\}$ and (IV) $\varphi_{R,1} = S = S' \cup \{\min(S), \max(S)\}$. Case (I) is trivial, and Case (III) is symmetrical to (II). However, both (II) and (IV) are technically involved. We shall only give a "sample" treatment of these cases, i.e., part of arguments for Case (II); the full account of Case (II) and (IV) are given in Appendix C.3.

To start with, Case (II) can be illustrated schematically as $\underbrace{|\,-\overbrace{|\,-\,-\,-\,-\,-\,-\,-|}^{S'}}_{S}$.

We observe that S is surely nonempty in φ_R. We then distinguish two subcases depending on whether S' is possibly empty or surely nonempty in φ_R. Here we give the details of the latter subcase because it is more interesting. In this case, both S and S' are surely nonempty in φ_R. By Definition 4(4–5), $\varphi_{R,2}$ contains a conjunct $\min(S) \leqslant \min(S') - c$ for some $c \geqslant 0$, as well as $\max(S') \leqslant \max(S)$ and $\max(S) \leqslant \max(S')$ (i.e., $\max(S') = \max(S)$). Therefore, we can assume

$$\varphi_{R,2} = \max(S') \leqslant \max(S) \wedge \max(S) \leqslant \max(S') \wedge \lfloor \varphi_{R,2} \rfloor_{\min(S),\min(S')} \wedge \lfloor \varphi_{R,2} \rfloor_{\min(S),\max(S)} \wedge \lfloor \varphi_{R,2} \rfloor_{\min(S'),\max(S')}.$$

Note that in $\varphi_{R,2}$ above, the redundant subformulae $\lfloor \varphi_{R,2} \rfloor_{\min(S),\max(S')}$ and $\lfloor \varphi_{R,2} \rfloor_{\min(S'),\max(S)}$ have been omitted.

The formula $\lfloor \varphi_{R,2} \rfloor_{\min(S),\min(S')}$ is said to be *strict* if it contains a conjunct $\min(S) \leqslant \min(S') - c$ for some $c > 0$. Otherwise, it is said to be *non-strict*. Intuitively, if $\lfloor \varphi_{R,2} \rfloor_{\min(S),\min(S')}$ is strict, then for $n, n' \in \mathbb{Z}$, the validity of $(\lfloor \varphi_{R,2} \rfloor_{\min(S),\min(S')})[n/\min(S), n'/\min(S')]$ implies that $n < n'$. For the sketch we only present *the case that* $\lfloor \varphi_{R,2} \rfloor_{\min(S),\min(S')}$ *is strict*; the other cases are similar and can be found in Appendix C.3.

Evidently, $\mathsf{TC}[\varphi_R](S,S')$ can be written as $(S=S') \vee \bigvee_{n\geqslant 1} \varphi_R^{(n)}$, where $\varphi_R^{(n)}$ is obtained by unfolding φ_R for n times, that is,

$$\varphi_R^{(n)} = \exists S_1,\cdots,S_{n+1}.\left(\begin{array}{l} S_1 = S \wedge S_{n+1} = S' \wedge \\ \bigwedge_{i\in[n]} (S_i = S_{i+1} \cup \{\min(S_i)\} \wedge \varphi_{R,2}[S_i/S, S_{i+1}/S'])\end{array}\right),$$

where $\varphi_{R,2}[S_i/S, S_{i+1}/S']$ is obtained from $\varphi_{R,2}$ by replacing S (resp. S') with S_i (resp. S_{i+1}).

Clearly, $\varphi_R^{(1)} = \varphi_R$, and

$$\varphi_R^{(2)} = \exists S_2.\ (S = S_2 \cup \{\min(S)\} \wedge S_2 = S' \cup \{\min(S_2)\} \wedge \varphi_{R,2}[S_2/S'] \wedge \varphi_{R,2}[S_2/S]).$$

For $\varphi_R^{(n)}$ where $n \geqslant 3$, we first simplify $\varphi_R^{(n)}$ to construct a finite formula for $\mathsf{TC}[\varphi_R](S,S')$. The subformula $\bigwedge_{i\in[n]} (S_i = S_{i+1} \cup \{\min(S_i)\} \wedge \varphi_{R,2}[S_i/S, S_{i+1}/S'])$ can be rewritten as

$$\bigwedge_{i\in[n]} \left(\begin{array}{l} S_i = S_{i+1} \cup \{\min(S_i)\} \wedge \max(S_i) = \max(S_{i+1}) \wedge \\ (\lfloor\varphi_{R,2}\rfloor_{\min(S),\min(S')}[S_i/S, S_{i+1}/S']) \wedge (\lfloor\varphi_{R,2}\rfloor_{\min(S),\max(S)}[S_i/S]) \wedge \\ (\lfloor\varphi_{R,2}\rfloor_{\min(S'),\max(S')}[S_{i+1}/S'])\end{array}\right).$$

Because $S_i = S_{i+1} \cup \{\min(S_i)\}$ for each $i \in [n]$, we have $\max(S_1) = \cdots = \max(S_n)$ and $\min(S_1) \leqslant \cdots \leqslant \min(S_n)$. Since $\lfloor\varphi_{R,2}\rfloor_{\min(S),\max(S)}$ is a conjunction of difference-bound constraints involving $\min(S)$ and $\max(S)$ only, we have $\bigwedge_{i\in[n]} \lfloor\varphi_{R,2}\rfloor_{\min(S),\max(S)}[S_i/S]$ is equivalent to $\lfloor\varphi_{R,2}\rfloor_{\min(S),\max(S)}[S_1/S] \wedge \lfloor\varphi_{R,2}\rfloor_{\min(S),\max(S)}[S_n/S]$. To see this, assume, for instance,

$$\lfloor\varphi_{R,2}\rfloor_{\min(S),\max(S)} \equiv c \leqslant \max(S) - \min(S) \leqslant c'$$

for some constants $c, c' \geqslant 0$ with $c \leqslant c'$. Then $\max(S_1) - \min(S_1) \leqslant c'$ implies $\max(S_i) - \min(S_i) \leqslant c'$ for each $i \in [n]$, and $c \leqslant \max(S_n) - \min(S_n)$ implies $c \leqslant \max(S_i) - \min(S_i)$ for each $i \in [n]$. Therefore, $\lfloor\varphi_{R,2}\rfloor_{\min(S),\max(S)}[S_1/S] \wedge \lfloor\varphi_{R,2}\rfloor_{\min(S),\max(S)}[S_n/S] \equiv c \leqslant \max(S_1) - \min(S_1) \leqslant c' \wedge c \leqslant \max(S_n) - \min(S_n) \leqslant c'$ implies that $\bigwedge_{i\in[n]} \lfloor\varphi_{R,2}\rfloor_{\min(S),\max(S)}[S_i/S]$, thus they are equivalent. (The other direction is trivial.) Likewise, one has $\lfloor\varphi_{R,2}\rfloor_{\min(S'),\max(S')}[S_2/S'] \wedge \lfloor\varphi_{R,2}\rfloor_{\min(S'),\max(S')}[S_{n+1}/S']$ implies $\bigwedge_{i\in[n]} \lfloor\varphi_{R,2}\rfloor_{\min(S'),\max(S')}[S_{i+1}/S']$, thus they are equivalent. Therefore, $\varphi_R^{(n)}$ can be transformed into

$$\exists S_2, S_n.\left(\begin{array}{l} \lfloor\varphi_{R,2}\rfloor_{\min(S),\max(S)} \wedge (\lfloor\varphi_{R,2}\rfloor_{\min(S),\max(S)}[S_n/S]) \wedge \\ (\lfloor\varphi_{R,2}\rfloor_{\min(S'),\max(S')}[S_2/S']) \wedge \lfloor\varphi_{R,2}\rfloor_{\min(S'),\max(S')} \wedge S = S_2 \cup \{\min(S)\} \wedge \\ S_n = S' \cup \{\min(S_n)\} \wedge \max(S) = \max(S_2) \wedge \max(S_n) = \max(S') \wedge \\ (\lfloor\varphi_{R,2}\rfloor_{\min(S),\min(S')}[S_2/S']) \wedge (\lfloor\varphi_{R,2}\rfloor_{\min(S),\min(S')}[S_n/S]) \wedge \\ \exists S_3,\cdots,S_{n-1}.\ \bigwedge_{2\leqslant i\leqslant n-1} \left(\begin{array}{l} S_i = S_{i+1} \cup \{\min(S_i)\} \wedge \max(S_i) = \max(S_{i+1}) \wedge \\ (\lfloor\varphi_{R,2}\rfloor_{\min(S),\min(S')}[S_i/S, S_{i+1}/S'])\end{array}\right)\end{array}\right).$$

Claim. *Suppose $n \geqslant 3$ and $\lfloor\varphi_{R,2}\rfloor_{\min(S),\min(S')}$ is strict. Then*

$$\exists S_3,\cdots,S_{n-1}.\ \bigwedge_{2\leqslant i\leqslant n-1} \left(\begin{array}{l} S_i = S_{i+1} \cup \{\min(S_i)\} \wedge \max(S_i) = \max(S_{i+1}) \wedge \\ (\lfloor\varphi_{R,2}\rfloor_{\min(S),\min(S')}[S_i/S, S_{i+1}/S'])\end{array}\right)$$

is equivalent to

$$S_n \neq \varnothing \wedge S_2 \backslash S_n \neq \varnothing \wedge S_n \subseteq S_2 \wedge |S_2 \backslash S_n| = n-2 \wedge \max(S_2 \backslash S_n) < \min(S_n) \wedge$$
$$\forall y, z.\ \mathsf{succ}((S_2 \backslash S_n) \cup \{\min(S_n)\}, y, z) \rightarrow (\lfloor\varphi_{R,2}\rfloor_{\min(S),\min(S')}[y/\min(S), z/\min(S')]),$$

where $\mathsf{succ}(S, x, y)$ specifies intuitively that y is the successor of x in S, that is,

$$\mathsf{succ}(S, x, y) = x \in S \wedge y \in S \wedge x < y \wedge \forall z \in S.\ (z \leqslant x \vee y \leqslant z).$$

Note that $|\cdot|$ denotes the set cardinality which can be easily encoded into $\mathcal{RQSPA}$. (Appendix C.3 gives the proof of the claim.) It follows that $\mathsf{TC}[\varphi_R](S, S') =$

$$(S = S') \vee \varphi_R(S, S') \vee \varphi_R^{(2)}(S, S') \vee$$
$$\exists S_1, S_2.\ \left(\begin{array}{l} S = S_1 \cup \{\min(S)\} \wedge S_2 = S' \cup \{\min(S_2)\} \wedge \\ \max(S) = \max(S_1) \wedge \max(S_2) = \max(S') \wedge \\ S_2 \neq \varnothing \wedge S_1 \backslash S_2 \neq \varnothing \wedge S_2 \subseteq S_1 \wedge \max(S_1 \backslash S_2) < \min(S_2) \wedge \\ \lfloor \varphi_{R,2} \rfloor_{\min(S),\max(S)} \wedge (\lfloor \varphi_{R,2} \rfloor_{\min(S),\max(S)}[S_2/S]) \wedge \\ (\lfloor \varphi_{R,2} \rfloor_{\min(S'),\max(S')}[S_1/S']) \wedge \lfloor \varphi_{R,2} \rfloor_{\min(S'),\max(S')} \wedge \\ (\lfloor \varphi_{R,2} \rfloor_{\min(S),\min(S')}[S_1/S']) \wedge (\lfloor \varphi_{R,2} \rfloor_{\min(S),\min(S')}[S_2/S]) \wedge \\ \forall y, z.\ \left(\begin{array}{r} \mathsf{succ}((S_1 \backslash S_2) \cup \{\min(S_2)\}, y, z) \rightarrow \\ (\lfloor \varphi_{R,2} \rfloor_{\min(S),\min(S')}[y/\min(S), z/\min(S')]) \end{array}\right) \end{array}\right).$$

6 Satisfiability of $\mathcal{RQSPA}$

In this section, we focus on the second ingredient of the procedure for deciding satisfiability of $\mathsf{SLID}^{\mathsf{S}}_{\mathsf{LC}}[P]$, i.e., the satisfiability of $\mathcal{RQSPA}$. We first note that $\mathcal{RQSPA}$ is defined over $\mathbb{Z}$. To show the decidability, it turns to be much easier to work on $\mathbb{N}$. We shall write $\mathcal{RQSPA}_{\mathbb{Z}}$ and $\mathcal{RQSPA}_{\mathbb{N}}$ to differentiate them when necessary. Moreover, for technical reasons, we also introduce $\mathcal{RQSPA}^{-}$, the fragment of $\mathcal{RQSPA}$ excluding formulae of the form $T_m \bowtie 0$.

The decision procedure for the satisfiability of $\mathcal{RQSPA}$ proceeds with the following three steps:

Step I. Translate $\mathcal{RQSPA}_{\mathbb{Z}}$ to $\mathcal{RQSPA}_{\mathbb{N}}$,

Step II. Normalize an $\mathcal{RQSPA}_{\mathbb{N}}$ formula $\Phi(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{S})$ into $\bigvee_i (\Phi^{(i)}_{\text{core}} \wedge \Phi^{(i)}_{\text{count}})$, where $\Phi^{(i)}_{\text{core}}$ is an $\mathcal{RQSPA}^{-}_{\mathbb{N}}$ formula, and $\Phi^{(i)}_{\text{count}}$ is a conjunction of formulae of the form $T_m \bowtie 0$ which contain only variables from $\boldsymbol{x} \cup \boldsymbol{S}$,

Step III. For each disjunct $\Phi^{(i)}_{\text{core}} \wedge \Phi^{(i)}_{\text{count}}$, construct a Presburger automaton (PA) $\mathcal{A}^{(i)}_{\Phi}$ which captures the models of $\Phi^{(i)}_{\text{core}} \wedge \Phi^{(i)}_{\text{count}}$. Satisfiability is thus reducible to the nonemptiness of PA, which is decidable [29].

These steps are technically involved. In particular, the third step requires exploiting Presburger automata [29]. The details can be found in Appendix D.

7 Conclusion

In this paper, we have defined $\mathsf{SLID}^{\mathsf{S}}_{\mathsf{LC}}$, SL with linearly compositional inductive predicates and set data constraints. The main feature is to identify $\mathcal{DBS}$ as a special class of set data constraints in the inductive definitions. We encoded the transitive closure of $\mathcal{DBS}$ into $\mathcal{RQSPA}$, which was shown to be decidable. These together yield a complete decision procedure for the satisfiability of $\mathsf{SLID}^{\mathsf{S}}_{\mathsf{LC}}$.

The precise complexity of the decision procedure—NONELEMENTARY is the best upper-bound we have now—is left open for further studies. Furthermore, the entailment problem of $\mathsf{SLID}^{\mathsf{S}}_{\mathsf{LC}}$ is immediate future work.

References

1. A. Bouajjani, C. Dragoi, C. Enea, and M. Sighireanu. Accurate invariant checking for programs manipulating lists and arrays with infinite data. In *ATVA*, pages 167–182, 2012.
2. M. Bozga, C. Gîrlea, and R. Iosif. Iterating octagons. In *TACAS*, pages 337–351, 2009.
3. M. Bozga, R. Iosif, and F. Konecný. Fast acceleration of ultimately periodic relations. In *CAV*, pages 227–242, 2010.
4. M. Bozga, R. Iosif, and Y. Lakhnech. Flat parametric counter automata. *Fundam. Inform.*, 91(2):275–303, 2009.
5. R. J. Büchi. Weak Second-Order arithmetic and finite automata. *Zeitschrift für Mathematische Logik und Grundlagen der Mathematik*, 6(1-6):66–92, 1960.
6. D. Cantone, V. Cutello, and J. T. Schwartz. Decision problems for Tarski and presburger arithmetics extended with sets. In *CSL*, pages 95–109, 1990.
7. W.-N. Chin, C. David, H. H. Nguyen, and S. Qin. Automated verification of shape, size and bag properties via user-defined predicates in separation logic. *Sci. Comput. Program.*, 77(9):1006–1036, 2012.
8. D.-H. Chu, J. Jaffar, and M.-T. Trinh. Automatic induction proofs of data-structures in imperative programs. In *PLDI*, pages 457–466, 2015.
9. H. Comon and Y. Jurski. Multiple counters automata, safety analysis and presburger arithmetic. In *CAV*, pages 268–279, 1998.
10. M. Cristiá and G. Rossi. A decision procedure for restricted intensional sets. In *CADE 26*, pages 185–201, 2017.
11. C. C. Elgot. Decision problems of finite automata design and related arithmetics. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 98(1):21–51, 1961.
12. C. Enea, O. Lengál, M. Sighireanu, and T. Vojnar. Compositional entailment checking for a fragment of separation logic. In *APLAS*, pages 314–333, 2014.
13. C. Enea, M. Sighireanu, and Z. Wu. On automated lemma generation for separation logic with inductive definitions. In *ATVA*, pages 80–96, 2015.
14. C. Gao, T. Chen, and Z. Wu. Separation logic with linearly compositional inductive predicates and set data constraints (full version). `http://www.dcs.bbk.ac.uk/~taolue/sub-papers/GCW18-full.pdf`.
15. X. Gu, T. Chen, and Z. Wu. A complete decision procedure for linearly compositional separation logic with data constraints. In *IJCAR*, pages 532–549, 2016.
16. J. Y. Halpern. Presburger arithmetic with unary predicates is Π^1_1-complete. *J. Symb. Logic*, 56(2):637–642, 1991.
17. M. Horbach, M. Voigt, and C. Weidenbach. On the combination of the Bernays-Schönfinkel-Ramsey fragment with simple linear integer arithmetic. In *CADE 26*, pages 77–94, 2017.
18. F. Klaedtke and H. Rueß. Monadic second-order logics with cardinalities. In *ICALP*, pages 681–696, 2003.
19. F. Konecny. PTIME computation of transitive closures of octagonal relations. In *TACAS*, 2016.
20. V. Kuncak, R. Piskac, and P. Suter. Ordered sets in the calculus of data structures. In *CSL*, pages 34–48. Springer-Verlag, 2010.
21. Q. L. Le, J. Sun, and W.-N. Chin. Satisfiability modulo heap-based programs. In *CAV*, pages 382–404, 2016.
22. P. Madhusudan, G. Parlato, and X. Qiu. Decidable logics combining heap structures and data. In *POPL 2011*, pages 611–622. ACM, 2011.

23. P. Madhusudan, X. Qiu, and A. Stefanescu. Recursive proofs for inductive tree data-structures. In *POPL*, pages 123–136, 2012.
24. A. Miné. A new numerical abstract domain based on difference-bound matrices. In *PADO*, pages 155–172, 2001.
25. P. W. O'Hearn, J. C. Reynolds, and H. Yang. Local reasoning about programs that alter data structures. In *CSL*, pages 1–19, 2001.
26. R. Piskac, T. Wies, and D. Zufferey. Automating separation logic using SMT. In *CAV*, pages 773–789, 2013.
27. R. Piskac, T. Wies, and D. Zufferey. Automating separation logic with trees and data. In *CAV*, pages 711–728, 2014.
28. J. C. Reynolds. Separation logic: A logic for shared mutable data structures. In *LICS*, pages 55–74, 2002.
29. H. Seidl, T. Schwentick, and A. Muscholl. Counting in trees. In *Logic and Automata: History and Perspectives*, pages 575–612, 2008.
30. P. Suter, M. Dotta, and V. Kuncak. Decision procedures for algebraic data types with abstractions. In *POPL 2010*, pages 199–210. ACM, 2010.
31. M. Tatsuta, Q. L. Le, and W. Chin. Decision procedure for separation logic with inductive definitions and presburger arithmetic. In *APLAS*, pages 423–443, 2016.
32. M. Voigt. The bernays-schönfinkel-ramsey fragment with bounded difference constraints over the reals is decidable. In *FroCoS*, pages 244–261, 2017.
33. T. Wies, R. Piskac, and V. Kuncak. Combining theories with shared set operations. In *FroCoS*, pages 366–382, 2009.
34. Z. Xu, T. Chen, and Z. Wu. Satisfiability of compositional separation logic with tree predicates and data constraints. In *CADE 26*, pages 509–527, 2017.

A Semantics of $\mathsf{SLID}^{\mathsf{S}}_{\mathsf{LC}}[P]$

Each formula in $\mathsf{SLID}^{\mathsf{S}}_{\mathsf{LC}}[P]$ is interpreted on the states. Formally, a *state* is a pair (s, h), where

- s is an assignment function which is a partial function from $\mathsf{LVars} \cup \mathsf{DVars} \cup \mathsf{SVars}$ to $\mathbb{L} \cup \mathbb{Z} \cup \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{Z}}$ such that $dom(s)$ is finite and s respects the data type,
- h is a *heap* which is a partial function from $\mathbb{L} \times (\mathcal{F} \cup \mathcal{D})$ to $\mathbb{L} \cup \mathbb{D}$ such that
  - h respects the data type of fields, that is, for each $l \in \mathbb{L}$ and $f \in \mathcal{F}$ (resp. $l \in \mathbb{L}$ and $d \in \mathcal{D}$), if $h(l, f)$ (resp. $h(l, d)$) is defined, then $h(l, f) \in \mathbb{L}$ (resp. $h(l, d) \in \mathbb{Z}$); and
  - h is field-consistent, i.e. every location in h possesses the same set of fields.

For a heap h, we use $\mathsf{ldom}(h)$ to denote the set of locations $l \in \mathbb{L}$ such that $h(l, f)$ or $h(l, d)$ is defined for some $f \in \mathcal{F}$ and $d \in \mathcal{D}$. Moreover, we use $\mathrm{Flds}(h)$ to denote the set of fields $f \in \mathcal{F}$ or $d \in \mathcal{D}$ such that $h(l, f)$ or $h(l, d)$ is defined for some $l \in \mathbb{L}$. Two heaps h_1 and h_2 are said to be *field-compatible* if $\mathrm{Flds}(h_1) = \mathrm{Flds}(h_2)$. We write $h_1 \# h_2$ if $\mathsf{ldom}(h_1) \cap \mathsf{ldom}(h_2) = \varnothing$ and $\mathrm{Flds}(h_1) = \mathrm{Flds}(h_2)$. Moreover, we write $h_1 \uplus h_2$ for the disjoint union of two field-compatible heaps h_1 and h_2, which implies $h_1 \# h_2$.

Let (s, h) be a state and ϕ be an $\mathsf{SLID}^{\mathsf{S}}_{\mathsf{LC}}[P]$ formula. Then the semantics of $\mathsf{SLID}^{\mathsf{S}}_{\mathsf{LC}}[P]$ formulae is defined as follows,

- $(s, h) \models E = F$ (resp. $(s, h) \models E \neq F$) if $s(E) = s(F)$ (resp. $s(E) \neq s(F)$),
- $(s, h) \models \Pi_1 \wedge \Pi_2$ if $(s, h) \models \Pi_1$ and $(s, h) \models \Pi_2$,
- $(s, h) \models \Delta$ if $s \models \Delta$ (see semantics of $\mathcal{RQSPA}$ in Section 2),
- $(s, h) \models \mathsf{emp}$ if $\mathsf{ldom}(h) = \varnothing$,
- $(s, h) \models E \mapsto (\rho)$ if $\mathsf{ldom}(h) = s(E)$, and for each $(f, X) \in \rho$ (resp. $(d, x) \in \rho$), $h(s(E), f) = s(X)$ (resp. $h(s(E), d) = s(x)$),
- $(s, h) \models P(E, \boldsymbol{\alpha}; F, \boldsymbol{\beta}; \boldsymbol{\xi})$ if $(s, h) \in [\![P(E, \boldsymbol{\alpha}; F, \boldsymbol{\beta}; \boldsymbol{\xi})]\!]$,
- $(s, h) \models \Sigma_1 * \Sigma_2$ if there are h_1, h_2 such that $h = h_1 \uplus h_2$, $(s, h_1) \models \Sigma_1$ and $(s, h_2) \models \Sigma_2$.

where the semantics of predicates $[\![P(E, \boldsymbol{\alpha}; F, \boldsymbol{\beta}; \boldsymbol{\xi})]\!]$ is given by the least fixed point of a monotone operator constructed from the body of rules for P in a standard way as in [**?**].

B Construction of $\mathsf{Abs}(\phi)$ for $\phi = \Pi \wedge \Delta \wedge \Sigma$

For each spatial atom a_i rooted at Z, $\mathsf{Abs}(\phi)$ introduces a Boolean variable $[Z, i]$ to denote whether a_i corresponds to a nonempty heap or not. Moreover, for each predicate atom $a_i = P(Z_1, \boldsymbol{\mu}; Z_2, \boldsymbol{\nu}; \boldsymbol{\chi})$ in Σ such that in the inductive rule of P, E occurs in $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$, we introduce a Boolean variable $[\nu_{\mathsf{idx}_{(P,\boldsymbol{\gamma},E)}}, i]$. Let $\mathsf{BVars}(\phi)$ denote the set of introduced Boolean variables. *The abstraction of* ϕ is defined as $\mathsf{Abs}(\phi) ::= \Pi \wedge \Delta \wedge \phi_\Sigma \wedge \phi_*$ over $\mathsf{BVars}(\phi) \cup \mathsf{Vars}(\phi)$, where ϕ_Σ and ϕ_* are defined as follows.

– $\phi_\Sigma = \bigwedge_{1 \leqslant i \leqslant n} \mathsf{Abs}(a_i)$ is an abstraction of Σ where
  - if $a_i = E \mapsto \rho$, then $\mathsf{Abs}(a_i) = [E, i]$,
  - if $a_i = P(Z_1, \boldsymbol{\mu}; Z_2, \boldsymbol{\nu}; \boldsymbol{\chi})$ and in the body of the inductive rule of P, E occurs in $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$, then

$$\begin{aligned}\mathsf{Abs}(a_i) = (Z_1 = Z_2 \wedge \boldsymbol{\mu} = \boldsymbol{\nu}) \vee \\ ([Z_1, i] \wedge [\nu_{\mathsf{idx}_{(P,\boldsymbol{\gamma},E)}}, i] \wedge \mathsf{Ufld}_1(P(Z_1, \boldsymbol{\mu}; Z_2, \boldsymbol{\nu}; \boldsymbol{\chi}))) \\ \vee ([Z_1, i] \wedge [\nu_{\mathsf{idx}_{(P,\boldsymbol{\gamma},E)}}, i] \wedge \mathsf{Ufld}_{\geqslant 2}(P(Z_1, \boldsymbol{\mu}; Z_2, \boldsymbol{\nu}; \boldsymbol{\chi}))),\end{aligned}$$

  - if $a_i = P(Z_1, \boldsymbol{\mu}; Z_2, \boldsymbol{\nu}; \boldsymbol{\chi})$ and in the body of the inductive rule of P, E does not occur in $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$, then

$$\begin{aligned}\mathsf{Abs}(a_i) = (Z_1 = Z_2 \wedge \boldsymbol{\mu} = \boldsymbol{\nu}) \vee \\ ([Z_1, i] \wedge \mathsf{Ufld}_1(P(Z_1, \boldsymbol{\mu}; Z_2, \boldsymbol{\nu}; \boldsymbol{\chi}))) \\ \vee ([Z_1, i] \wedge \mathsf{Ufld}_{\geqslant 2}(P(Z_1, \boldsymbol{\mu}; Z_2, \boldsymbol{\nu}; \boldsymbol{\chi}))),\end{aligned}$$

– ϕ_* encodes the semantics of separating conjunction,

$$\phi_* = \bigwedge_{[Z_1,i],[Z_1',j] \in \mathsf{BVars}(\phi), i \neq j} (Z_1 = Z_1' \wedge [Z_1, i]) \rightarrow \neg [Z_1', j].$$

Proposition 2. *For each* $\mathsf{SLID}^{\mathsf{S}}_{\mathsf{LC}}[P]$ *formula* ϕ, ϕ *is satisfiable iff* $\mathsf{Abs}(\phi)$ *is satisfiable.*

Remark 1. From the construction of $\mathsf{Abs}(\phi)$, one can observe that the static parameters of the predicate atoms are irrelevant to the satisfiability of ϕ.

C Details of Section 5

C.1 Proof of Proposition 1

Proposition 1. *Let* $\varphi_R(S, S') := \varphi_{R,1} \wedge \varphi_{R,2}$ *be a* $\mathcal{DBS}$ *formula such that* $\varphi_{R,1} := S = S' \cup T_s$ *and* $\varphi_{R,2}$ *is satisfiable. Then* φ_R *can be transformed, in polynomial time, to a saturated formula* $\mathsf{Strt}(\varphi_R(S, S'))$ *or to a formula where the integer subformula is unsatisfiable.*

Proof. Firstly, $\varphi_R := \varphi_{R,1} \wedge \varphi_{R,2}$ can be transformed, in polynomial time, to a saturated formula $\mathsf{Strt}(\varphi_R(S, S')) := \mathsf{Strt}(\varphi_{R,1}) \wedge \mathsf{Strt}(\varphi_{R,2})$, satisfying the conditions of Definition 4.

1. $\mathsf{Strt}(\varphi_R(S, S'))$ satisfy the condition 1.
   $\varphi_{R,2}$ is satisfiable. Obviously, $\varphi_{R,2}(S, S')$ can be transformed to $\mathsf{Norm}(\varphi_{R,2}(S, S'))$. The Definition 4 (1) is ok. So, we can add $\mathsf{Norm}(\varphi_{R,2}(S, S'))$ into $\mathsf{Strt}(\varphi_{R,2})$.
2. $\mathsf{Strt}(\varphi_R(S, S'))$ satisfy the condition 2.
   We focus on the case $\varphi_{R,1} := S = S' \cup T_s$. The symmetrical case $\varphi_{R,1} := S' = S \cup T_s$ can be adapted easily. According to the $\mathcal{DBS}$ syntax, $S' \in T_S$ is possible. Owing to $\varphi_{R,1} := S = S' \cup T_s$ and $min(S'), max(S') \in S'$. For example, $\varphi_{R,1} := S = S' \cup \{min(S), min(S')\}$ is equivalent to $\varphi_{R,1} := S = S' \cup \{min(S)\}$. Hence, $\varphi_{R,1}$ can be transformed to $\mathsf{Strt}(\varphi_{R,1}) := S \cup T_s, \quad T_s \in \{\varnothing, \{min(S)\}, \{max(S)\}, \{min(S), max(S)\}\}$. The Definition 4 (2) is ok.

3. $\mathsf{Strt}(\varphi_R(S, S'))$ satisfy the condition 3.
   If S is surely nonempty in φ_R, we can add $min(S) \leqslant max(S)$ into $\mathsf{Strt}(\varphi_{R,2})$. Obviously, $\mathsf{Strt}(\varphi_{R,2})$ contains a conjuct $min(S) \leqslant max(S) - c$ for some $c \geqslant 0$.
   If S' is surely nonempty in φ_R, we can add $min(S') \leqslant max(S')$ into $\mathsf{Strt}(\varphi_{R,2})$. Obviously, $\mathsf{Strt}(\varphi_{R,2})$ contains a conjuct $min(S') \leqslant max(S') - c'$ for some $c' \geqslant 0$. Hence, the Definition 4 (3) is ok.
4. $\mathsf{Strt}(\varphi_R(S, S'))$ satisfy the condition 4.
   If S and S' are surely nonempty in φ_R, we can add $min(S) \leqslant min(S')$ and $max(S') \leqslant max(S)$ into $\mathsf{Strt}(\varphi_{R,2})$ owing to $S' \subseteq S$. If $min(S) \notin T_s$, we can get $min(S) = min(S')$. Hence, we can add $min(S) \leqslant min(S')$ and $min(S') \leqslant min(S)$ into $\mathsf{Strt}(\varphi_{R,2})$. If $\mathsf{Strt}(\varphi_{R,2})$ contains $min(S) \leqslant min(S')$ and $min(S') \leqslant min(S)$, we can get $min(S) = min(S')$. Hence, we get $min(S) \notin T_s$. If $max(S) \notin T_s$, we can get $max(S) = max(S')$. Hence, we can add $max(S) \leqslant max(S')$ and $max(S') \leqslant max(S)$ into $\mathsf{Strt}(\varphi_{R,2})$. If $\mathsf{Strt}(\varphi_{R,2})$ contains $max(S) \leqslant max(S')$ and $max(S') \leqslant max(S)$, we can get $max(S) = max(S')$. Hence, we get $max(S) \notin T_s$. If $\mathsf{Strt}(\varphi_{R,2})$ contains the conjucts $min(S) \leqslant max(S)$ and $max(S) \leqslant min(S)$, we can get $min(S) = max(S)$. Hence, we can get $\mathsf{Strt}(\varphi_{R,1}) := S \cup T_s$, in which $max(S) \notin T_s$. Hence, the Definition 4 (4) is ok.
   Finally, $\varphi_{R,2}$ is satisfiable, but $\mathsf{Strt}(\varphi_{R,2})$ may be unsatisfiable, so the integer subformula in $\mathsf{Strt}(\varphi_R(S, S'))$ may be unsatisfiable.

C.2 An example of Saturation

Example 3. Let $\varphi_R(S, S') = \varphi_{R,1} \wedge \varphi_{R,2}$, where $\varphi_{R,1} := S = S' \cup \{\min(S)\}$ and $\varphi_{R,2} := \min(S') = \min(S) + 1$. Then $\mathsf{Strt}(\varphi_R(S, S'))$ is constructed as follows:

1. Since both S and S' are surely nonempty in φ_R, according to Definition 4(3), add the conjuncts $\min(S) \leqslant \max(S)$, $\min(S') \leqslant \max(S')$ into $\varphi_{R,2}$.
2. Because both S and S' are surely nonempty in φ_R and $\max(S) \notin T_s$, according to Definition 4(4), add the conjuncts $\min(S) \leqslant \min(S')$, $\max(S') \leqslant \max(S)$, and $\max(S) \leqslant \max(S')$ into $\varphi_{R,2}$. Then $\varphi_{R,2}$ becomes

$$\varphi'_{R,2} = \min(S') = \min(S) + 1 \wedge \min(S) \leqslant \max(S) \wedge \min(S') \leqslant \max(S') \wedge \min(S) \leqslant \min(S') \wedge \max(S') \leqslant \max(S) \wedge \max(S) \leqslant \max(S').$$

   See Figure 1(a) for $\mathcal{G}(\varphi'_{R,2})$, where an edge from $\min(S')$ to $\min(S)$ with weight $+1$ and an edge from $\min(S)$ to $\min(S')$ with weight -1 are from $\min(S') = \min(S) + 1$.
3. Turn $\varphi'_{R,2}$ into the normal form (see Figure 1(b)).

Therefore, $\mathsf{Strt}(\varphi_R(S, S'))$ is a conjunction of $S = S' \cup \{\min(S)\}$ and the integer subformula illustrated in Figure 1(b).




Fig. 1. $\varphi'_{R,2}$ and its normal form.

C.3 The situation that there are only one source and destination set parameter

Case I: $\varphi_{R,1} := S = S'$. Then $\mathsf{TC}[\varphi_R](S, S') := S = S'$.


Case II: $\varphi_{R,1} := S = S' \cup \{\min(S)\}$. This case is illustrated schematically as $\underbrace{|-\overbrace{|-----|}^{S'}}_{S}$. We observe that S is surely nonempty in φ_R. We now distinguish the subcases according to whether S' is possibly empty or surely nonempty in φ_R.

Subcase II(i): S' is possibly empty in φ_R. In this case, neither $\min(S')$ nor $\max(S')$ occurs in $\varphi_{R,2}$. Therefore, $\varphi_{R,2}$ is a formula involving $\min(S)$ or $\max(S)$ only. Moreover, if S' is nonempty, then $\max(S) = \max(S')$.

Evidently, $\mathsf{TC}[\varphi_R](S, S')$ can be specified by (an infinite disjunction) $(S = S') \vee \bigvee_{n \geqslant 1} \varphi_R^{(n)}$, where $\varphi_R^{(n)}$ is obtained by unfolding φ_R for n times, that is,

$$\exists S_1, \cdots, S_{n+1}.\ S_1 = S \wedge S_{n+1} = S' \wedge \bigwedge_{i \in [n]} (S_i = S_{i+1} \cup \{\min(S_i)\} \wedge \varphi_{R,2}[S_i/S]),$$

where $\varphi_{R,2}[S_i/S]$ is obtained from $\varphi_{R,2}$ by replacing S with S_i. We use the following figure to help the reader understand $\varphi_R^{(n)}$.



Evidently, $\varphi_R^{(1)} = \varphi_R$, and

$$\varphi_R^{(2)} = \exists S_2.\ (S = S_2 \cup \{\min(S)\} \wedge S_2 = S' \cup \{\min(S_2)\} \wedge \varphi_{R,2} \wedge \varphi_{R,2}[S_2/S]).$$

Let us consider $\varphi_R^{(n)}$ for $n \geqslant 3$ in the following.

Because $S_i = S_{i+1} \cup \{\min(S_i\}$ for each $i \in [n]$, we have $\max(S_1) = \cdots = \max(S_n)$ and $\min(S_1) \leqslant \cdots \leqslant \min(S_n)$. Then from the fact that $\varphi_{R,2}$ is a conjunction of difference-bound constraints involving $\min(S)$ and $\max(S)$ only, we deduce that $\bigwedge_{i\in[n]} \varphi_{R,2}[S_i/S]$ is equivalent to $\varphi_{R,2}[S_1/S] \wedge \varphi_{R,2}[S_n/S]$. For instance, if $\varphi_{R,2} \equiv c \leqslant \max(S) - \min(S) \leqslant c'$ for some constants $c, c' \geqslant 0$ with $c \leqslant c'$, then $\max(S_1) - \min(S_1) \leqslant c'$ implies $\max(S_i) - \min(S_i) \leqslant c'$ for each $i \in [n]$, and $c \leqslant \max(S_n) - \min(S_n)$ implies $c \leqslant \max(S_i) - \min(S_i)$ for each $i \in [n]$. Therefore, in this situation, $\varphi_{R,2}[S_1/S] \wedge \varphi_{R,2}[S_n/S] \equiv c \leqslant \max(S_1) - \min(S_1) \leqslant c' \wedge c \leqslant \max(S_n) - \min(S_n) \leqslant c'$ implies $\bigwedge_{i\in[n]} \varphi_{R,2}[S_i/S]$, thus they are equivalent. We then have that $\bigwedge_{i\in[n]} (S_i = S_{i+1} \cup \{\min(S_i)\} \wedge \varphi_{R,2}[S_i/S])$ is equivalent to

$$\varphi_{R,2}[S_1/S] \wedge \varphi_{R,2}[S_n/S] \wedge \bigwedge_{i\in[n]} S_i = S_{i+1} \cup \{\min(S_i)\}.$$

Thus $\varphi_R^{(n)}$ (where $n \geqslant 3$) can be rewritten into

$$\exists S_n. \left(\begin{array}{l} S_n = S' \cup \{\min(S_n)\} \wedge \varphi_{R,2} \wedge \varphi_{R,2}[S_n/S] \wedge \\ \exists S_2, \cdots, S_{n-1}. \left(S = S_2 \cup \{\min(S)\} \wedge \bigwedge_{2\leqslant i\leqslant n-1} S_i = S_{i+1} \cup \{\min(S_i)\} \right) \end{array} \right).$$

Claim. The formula $\theta(S, S_n) :=$

$$\exists S_2, \cdots, S_{n-1}. \left(S = S_2 \cup \{\min(S)\} \wedge \bigwedge_{2\leqslant i\leqslant n-1} S_i = S_{i+1} \cup \{\min(S_i)\} \right)$$

is equivalent to $\theta'(S, S_n) :=$

$$S \neq \varnothing \wedge S_n \subseteq S \wedge |S \backslash S_n| \leqslant n-1 \wedge \left(\begin{array}{r} (S \backslash S_n \neq \varnothing \wedge S_n \neq \varnothing) \rightarrow \\ \max(S \backslash S_n) < \min(S_n) \end{array} \right).$$

Proof (of the claim).

– $\theta(S, S_n)$ implies $\theta'(S, S_n)$. Suppose that A, A_n are two finite subsets of $\mathbb{Z}$ such that $\theta(A, A_n)$ holds. Then there are finite subsets $A_2, \cdots, A_{n-1} \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$ such that $A = A_2 \cup \{\min(A)\} \wedge \bigwedge_{2\leqslant i\leqslant n-1} A_i = A_{i+1} \cup \{\min(A_i)\}$ holds. Therefore,

$$A = A_n \cup \{\min(A), \min(A_2), \cdots, \min(A_{n-1})\}.$$

From this, we deduce that $A \neq \varnothing$ and $A_n \subseteq A$. Moreover, from

$$A \backslash A_n \subseteq \{\min(A), \min(A_2), \cdots, \min(A_{n-1})\},$$

we have $|A\backslash A_n| \leqslant n-1$.
Now suppose $A_n \neq \varnothing$ and $A\backslash A_n \neq \varnothing$. Then

$$\max(A\backslash A_n) \in \{\min(A), \min(A_2), \cdots, \min(A_{n-1})\}.$$

From $A_n \subseteq A$ and $A_n \subseteq A_i$ for each $2 \leqslant i \leqslant n-1$, we have $\min(A_n) \geqslant \min(A)$ and $\min(A_n) \geqslant \min(A_i)$ for each $2 \leqslant i \leqslant n-1$. In other words, $\min(A_n)$ is an upper bound of $\{\min(A), \min(A_2), \cdots, \min(A_{n-1})\}$. Consequently, $\max(A\backslash A_n) \leqslant \min(A_n)$. Since $\max(A\backslash A_n) \neq \min(A_n)$, we have $\max(A\backslash A_n) < \min(A_n)$. We conclude that $\theta'(A, A_n)$ holds.

– $\theta'(S, S_n)$ implies $\theta(S, S_n)$. Suppose that A, A_n are two finite subsets of $\mathbb{Z}$ such that $\theta'(A, A_n)$ holds. Then $A \neq \varnothing$, $A_n \subseteq A$, $|A\backslash A_n| \leqslant n-1$. Moreover, if $A\backslash A_n \neq \varnothing$ and $A_n \neq \varnothing$, then $\max(A\backslash A_n) < \min(A_n)$.
If $A\backslash A_n = \varnothing$, then define $A_2, \cdots, A_{n-1}$ as A_n. Since $A = A_2 = \cdots A_{n-1} = A_n$, we deduce that $A = A_2 \cup \{\min(A)\}$, and $A_i = A_{i+1} \cup \{\min(A_i)\}$ for each $i : 2 \leqslant i \leqslant n-1$. Therefore $\theta(A, A_n)$ holds.
We now assume $A\backslash A_n \neq \varnothing$. From $|A\backslash A_n| \leqslant n-1$, we know that there are $r \in [n-1]$ and $i_1, \cdots, i_r \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $i_1 < \cdots < i_r$ and $A\backslash A_n = \{i_1, \cdots, i_r\}$. Moreover, if $A_n \neq \varnothing$, then $i_r = \max(A\backslash A_n) < \min(A_n)$. We then define $A_2, \cdots, A_{n-1}$ as follows:
  - For each $j \in [r-1]$, define A_{j+1} as $A_n \cup \{i_{j+1}, \cdots, i_r\}$.
  - For each $j : r+1 \leqslant j \leqslant n-1$, define A_j as A_r.

  From $A\backslash A_n = \{i_1, \cdots, i_r\}$ and $i_r = \max(A\backslash A_n) < \min(A_n)$ if $A_n \neq \varnothing$, we deduce that $\min(A) = i_1$. Moreover, for each $j \in [r-1]$, $\min(A_{j+1}) = i_{j+1}$, and for each $j : r+1 \leqslant j \leqslant n-1$, $\min(A_j) = \min(A_r) = i_r$. Therefore,
  - $A = A_n \cup \{i_1, \cdots, i_r\} = (A_n \cup \{i_2, \cdots, i_r\}) \cup \{i_1\} = A_2 \cup \{i_1\} = A_2 \cup \{\min(A)\}$,
  - for each $j \in [r-1]$, $A_{j+1} = A_n \cup \{i_{j+1}, \cdots, i_r\} = (A_n \cup \{i_{j+2}, \cdots, i_r\}) \cup \{i_{j+1}\} = A_{j+2} \cup \{i_{j+1}\} = A_{j+2} \cup \{\min(A_{j+1})\}$,
  - for each $j : r+1 \leqslant j \leqslant n-1$, $A_j = A_r = A_{j+1} \cup \{\min(A_j)\}$.

  We conclude that $\theta(A, A_n)$ holds.

□

According to the claim, $\varphi_R^{(n)}$ for $n \geqslant 3$ can be simplified into

$$\exists S''. \left(\begin{array}{l} S'' = S' \cup \{\min(S'')\} \wedge \varphi_{R,2} \wedge (\varphi_{R,2}[S''/S]) \wedge S \neq \varnothing \wedge S'' \subseteq S \wedge \\ |S\backslash S''| \leqslant n-1 \wedge ((S\backslash S'' \neq \varnothing \wedge S'' \neq \varnothing) \rightarrow \max(S\backslash S'') < \min(S'')) \end{array} \right). (*)$$

Moreover, it is not hard to observe that the formula $(*)$ above is equivalent to $\varphi_R^{(n)}$ even for $n = 1, 2$. Since $\mathsf{TC}[\varphi_R](S, S')$ is equal to $(S = S') \vee \bigvee\limits_{n \geqslant 1} \varphi_R^{(n)}$, we conclude that

$$\begin{array}{l} \mathsf{TC}[\varphi_R](S, S') = (S = S') \vee \\ \exists S''. \left(\begin{array}{l} S'' = S' \cup \{\min(S'')\} \wedge \varphi_{R,2} \wedge (\varphi_{R,2}[S''/S]) \wedge \\ S \neq \varnothing \wedge S'' \subseteq S \wedge ((S\backslash S'' \neq \varnothing \wedge S'' \neq \varnothing) \rightarrow \max(S\backslash S'') < \min(S'')) \end{array} \right). \end{array}$$

Subcase II(ii): S' is surely nonempty in φ_R. We distinguish between whether $\lfloor \varphi_{R,2} \rfloor_{\min(S), \min(S')}$ is strict or not.

Case that $\lfloor\varphi_{R,2}\rfloor_{\min(S),\min(S')}$ *is strict.* The arguments for Subcase II(ii) in this situation have already been presented in the main text, but with the proof of the claim missing. In the following, we will present this proof.

Claim. *Suppose* $n \geqslant 3$ *and* $\lfloor\varphi_{R,2}\rfloor_{\min(S),\min(S')}$ *is strict. Then*

$$\exists S_3, \cdots, S_{n-1}. \bigwedge_{2\leqslant i\leqslant n-1} \begin{pmatrix} S_i = S_{i+1} \cup \{\min(S_i)\} \wedge \max(S_i) = \max(S_{i+1}) \wedge \\ (\lfloor\varphi_{R,2}\rfloor_{\min(S),\min(S')}[S_i/S, S_{i+1}/S']) \end{pmatrix}$$

is equivalent to

$$S_n \neq \varnothing \wedge S_2 \backslash S_n \neq \varnothing \wedge S_n \subseteq S_2 \wedge |S_2 \backslash S_n| = n-2 \wedge \max(S_2 \backslash S_n) < \min(S_n) \wedge$$
$$\forall y, z.\ \mathit{succ}((S_2 \backslash S_n) \cup \{\min(S_n)\}, y, z) \rightarrow (\lfloor\varphi_{R,2}\rfloor_{\min(S),\min(S')}[y/\min(S), z/\min(S')]).$$

Proof (of the claim). Let $\theta(S_2, S_n)$ and $\theta'(S_2, S_n)$ denote the two formulae in the claim. Our goal is to show the equivalence of $\theta(S_2, S_n)$ and $\theta'(S_2, S_n)$.

From the fact that $\lfloor\varphi_{R,2}\rfloor_{\min(S),\min(S')}$ is strict, we know that

$$\lfloor\varphi_{R,2}\rfloor_{\min(S),\min(S')} \equiv c \leqslant \min(S') - \min(S) \leqslant c'$$

for some $c, c' : 0 < c \leqslant c'$.

- $\theta(S_2, S_n)$ implies $\theta'(S_2, S_n)$. Suppose A_2, A_n are finite subsets of $\mathbb{Z}$ such that $\theta(A_2, A_n)$ holds. Then there are *nonempty* finite subsets $A_3, \cdots, A_{n-1} \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$ such that $A_i = A_{i+1} \cup \{\min(A_i)\}$, $\max(A_i) = \max(A_{i+1})$, and for each $i : 2 \leqslant i \leqslant n-1$, $(\lfloor\varphi_{R,2}\rfloor_{\min(S),\min(S')}[S_i/S, S_{i+1}/S'])(A_i, A_{i+1})$.
  From the fact that $(\lfloor\varphi_{R,2}\rfloor_{\min(S),\min(S')}[S_i/S, S_{i+1}/S'])(A_{n-1}, A_n)$ holds, we know that $0 < c \leqslant \min(A_n) - \min(A_{n-1}) \leqslant c'$. Therefore, $A_n \neq \varnothing$. Moreover, it is easy to observe that $A_n \subseteq A_2$.
  From $A_i = A_{i+1} \cup \{\min(A_i)\}$ for each $i : 2 \leqslant i \leqslant n-1$, we deduce that $\min(A_2) \leqslant \cdots \leqslant \min(A_n)$. In addition, from the fact that $\lfloor\varphi_{R,2}\rfloor_{\min(S),\min(S')}$ is strict and $(\lfloor\varphi_{R,2}\rfloor_{\min(S),\min(S')}[S_i/S, S_{i+1}/S'])(A_i, A_{i+1})$ holds for each $i : 2 \leqslant i \leqslant n-1$, we have $\min(A_2) < \cdots < \min(A_n)$. We then deduce that $A_2 \backslash A_n \neq \varnothing$ and $|A_2 \backslash A_n| = |\{\min(A_2), \cdots, \min(A_{n-1})\}| = n-2$.
  Because $\max(A_2 \backslash A_n) \in \{\min(A_2), \cdots, \min(A_{n-1})\}$ and $\min(A_n)$ is an upper bound of $\{\min(A_2), \cdots, \min(A_{n-1})\}$, we have $\max(A_2 \backslash A_n) < \min(A_n)$.
  Finally, from the fact that $(\lfloor\varphi_{R,2}\rfloor_{\min(S),\min(S')}[S_i/S, S_{i+1}/S'])(A_i, A_{i+1})$ holds for each $i : 2 \leqslant i \leqslant n-1$, and $A_2 \backslash A_n = \{\min(A_2), \cdots, \min(A_{n-1})\}$, we deduce that for each pair of distinct numbers $i_1, i_2 \in A_2 \backslash A_n$ such that $i_1 < i_2$ and $A_2 \backslash A_n$ contains no other numbers (strictly) between i_1 and i_2,

  $$(\lfloor\varphi_{R,2}\rfloor_{\min(S),\min(S')}[y/\min(S), z/\min(S')])(i_1, i_2)$$

  holds. Therefore, the pair (A_2, A_n) satisfies the formula

  $$\forall y, z.\ \mathsf{succ}((S_2 \backslash S_n) \cup \{\min(S_n)\}, y, z) \rightarrow (\lfloor\varphi_{R,2}\rfloor_{\min(S),\min(S')}[y/\min(S), z/\min(S')]).$$

  We conclude that $\theta'(A_2, A_n)$ holds.
- $\theta'(S_2, S_n)$ implies $\theta(S_2, S_n)$. Suppose that A_2, A_n are finite subsets of $\mathbb{Z}$ such that $\theta'(A_2, A_n)$ holds. Then $A_n \neq \varnothing$, $A_2 \backslash A_n \neq \varnothing$, $A_n \subseteq A_2$, $|A_2 \backslash A_n| = n-2$, and $\max(A_2 \backslash A_n) < \min(A_n)$.

Suppose $A_2\backslash A_n = \{m_1, \cdots, m_{n-2}\}$ with $m_1 < \cdots < m_{n-2}$. Moreover, for convenience, we use m_{n-1} to denote $\min(A_n)$. Then for each $i \in [n-2]$, we have

$$(\lfloor\varphi_{R,2}\rfloor_{\min(S),\min(S')}[y/\min(S), z/\min(S')])(m_i, m_{i+1})$$

holds, that is, $c \leqslant m_{i+1} - m_i \leqslant c'$.
Define $A_3, \cdots, A_{n-1}$ as follows: For each $i : 3 \leqslant i \leqslant n-1$, define A_i as $A_n \cup \{m_{i-1}, \cdots, m_{n-2}\}$. Then for each $i : 2 \leqslant i \leqslant n-1$, $\min(A_i) = m_{i-1}$. Therefore, for each $i : 2 \leqslant i \leqslant n-1$, $A_i = A_{i+1} \cup \{\min(A_i)\}$, $\max(A_i) = \max(A_{i+1})$, and

$$\begin{aligned}(\lfloor\varphi_{R,2}\rfloor_{\min(S),\min(S')}[S_i/S, S_{i+1}/S'])(A_i, A_{i+1}) &\equiv c \leqslant \min(A_{i+1}) - \min(A_i) \leqslant c' \\ &\equiv c \leqslant m_{i+1} - m_i \leqslant c'\end{aligned}$$

holds. We conclude that $\theta(A_2, A_n)$ holds.

□

Case that $\lfloor\varphi_{R,2}\rfloor_{\min(S),\min(S')}$ *is non-strict.* The arguments are similar to the situation that $\lfloor\varphi_{R,2}\rfloor_{\min(S),\min(S')}$ is strict, but with the following adaptation: The claim is adapted into the following one and the construction of $\mathsf{TC}[\varphi_R](S, S')$ is adapted accordingly.

Claim'. *Suppose* $n \geqslant 3$ *and* $\lfloor\varphi_{R,2}\rfloor_{\min(S),\min(S')}$ *is non-strict. Then*

$$\exists S_3, \cdots, S_{n-1}. \bigwedge_{2\leqslant i\leqslant n-1} \begin{pmatrix} S_i = S_{i+1} \cup \{\min(S_i)\} \wedge \max(S_i) = \max(S_{i+1}) \wedge \\ (\lfloor\varphi_{R,2}\rfloor_{\min(S),\min(S')}[S_i/S, S_{i+1}/S']) \end{pmatrix}$$

is equivalent to

$$S_n \neq \varnothing \wedge S_n \subseteq S_2 \wedge |S_2\backslash S_n| \leqslant n-2 \wedge (S_2\backslash S_n \neq \varnothing \rightarrow \max(S_2\backslash S_n) < \min(S_n)) \wedge$$
$$\forall y, z.\ \mathit{succ}((S_2\backslash S_n) \cup \{\min(S_n)\}, y, z) \rightarrow (\lfloor\varphi_{R,2}\rfloor_{\min(S),\min(S')}[y/\min(S), z/\min(S')]).$$

Example 4. Let $\varphi_R(S, S') \equiv S = S' \cup \{\min(S)\} \wedge \max(S) = \max(S') \wedge \min(S') = \min(S) + 1 \wedge \min(S) \leqslant \max(S) - 1 \wedge \min(S') \leqslant \max(S')$. This falls into Subcase II(ii). One can obtain that $\mathsf{TC}[\varphi_R](S, S') =$

$$(S = S') \vee \varphi_R(S, S') \vee \varphi_R^{(2)}(S, S') \vee$$
$$\exists S_1, S_2. \begin{pmatrix} S = S_1 \cup \{\min(S)\} \wedge S_2 = S' \cup \{\min(S_2)\} \wedge \\ \max(S) = \max(S_1) \wedge \max(S_2) = \max(S') \wedge \\ S_2 \neq \varnothing \wedge S_1\backslash S_2 \neq \varnothing \wedge S_2 \subseteq S_1 \wedge \max(S_1\backslash S_2) < \min(S_2) \wedge \\ \min(S) \leqslant \max(S) - 1 \wedge \min(S_2) \leqslant \max(S_2) - 1 \wedge \min(S_1) \leqslant \max(S_1) \wedge \\ \min(S') \leqslant \max(S') \wedge \min(S) + 1 = \min(S_1) \wedge \min(S_2) + 1 = \min(S') \wedge \\ \forall y, z.\ \mathsf{succ}((S_1\backslash S_2) \cup \{\min(S_2)\}, y, z) \rightarrow y + 1 = z \end{pmatrix},$$

which can be simplified into

$$(S = S') \vee \varphi_R(S, S') \vee \varphi_R^{(2)}(S, S') \vee$$
$$\exists S_1, S_2. \begin{pmatrix} S = S_1 \cup \{\min(S)\} \wedge S_2 = S' \cup \{\min(S_2)\} \wedge \\ S_2 \neq \varnothing \wedge S_1\backslash S_2 \neq \varnothing \wedge S_2 \subseteq S_1 \wedge \max(S_1\backslash S_2) < \min(S_2) \wedge \\ \min(S) + 1 = \min(S_1) \wedge \min(S_2) + 1 = \min(S') \wedge \\ \forall y, z.\ \mathsf{succ}((S_1\backslash S_2) \cup \{\min(S_2)\}, y, z) \rightarrow y + 1 = z \end{pmatrix}.$$

Case III: $\varphi_{R,1} = S = S' \cup \{\max(S)\}$.

This is similar to (actually symmetrical to) Case II.

Case IV: $\varphi_{R,1} = S = S' \cup \{\min(S), \max(S)\}$.

We still distinguish between whether S' is possibly empty in φ_R or not.

Subcase IV(i): S' is possibly empty in φ_R.

In this case, neither $\min(S')$ nor $\max(S')$ occurs in $\varphi_{R,2}$. Therefore, $\varphi_{R,2}$ is a formula involving $\min(S)$ or $\max(S)$ only. As before, we analyse the structure of $\varphi_R^{(n)}$ and construct $\mathsf{TC}[\varphi_R](S, S')$.

$$\begin{array}{l}\mathsf{TC}[\varphi_R](S,S') = (S = S') \vee \\ \exists S_1, S_2, S_3.\left(\begin{array}{l} S_2 = S' \cup \{\min(S_2), \max(S_2)\} \ \wedge \\ S = S_1 \cup S_2 \cup S_3 \ \wedge \varphi_{R,2} \wedge (\varphi_{R,2}[S_2/S]) \ \wedge \\ (S_1 \neq \varnothing \rightarrow \max(S_1) < \min(S_2)) \ \wedge \\ (S_3 \neq \varnothing \rightarrow \max(S_2) < \min(S_3)) \end{array}\right).\end{array}$$

Example 5. Let $\varphi_R(S, S')$ be the normal form of $S = S' \cup \{\min(S), \max(S)\} \wedge \min(S) \leqslant \max(S) - 10 \wedge \max(S) \leqslant \min(S) + 100$. Then $\mathsf{TC}[\varphi_R](S, S') =$

$$\begin{array}{l}(S = S') \ \vee \\ \exists S_1, S_2, S_3.\left(\begin{array}{l} S_2 = S' \cup \{\min(S_2), \max(S_2)\} \ \wedge S = S_1 \cup S_2 \cup S_3 \ \wedge \\ \min(S) + 10 \leqslant \max(S) \leqslant \min(S) + 100 \ \wedge \\ \min(S_2) + 10 \leqslant \max(S_2) \leqslant \min(S_2) + 100 \ \wedge \\ (S_1 \neq \varnothing \rightarrow \max(S_1) < \min(S_2)) \ \wedge \\ (S_3 \neq \varnothing \rightarrow \max(S_2) < \min(S_3)) \end{array}\right).\end{array}$$

Subcase IV(ii): S' is surely nonempty in φ_R. Similar to Subcase II(ii), we distinguish between whether $\lfloor\varphi_R\rfloor_{\min(S),\min(S')}$ and $\lfloor\varphi_R\rfloor_{\max(S),\max(S')}$ are strict or not. We exemplify the arguments by considering the situation that both $\lfloor\varphi_R\rfloor_{\min(S),\min(S')}$ and $\lfloor\varphi_R\rfloor_{\max(S),\max(S')}$ are strict. The arguments for the other situations are similar.

Suppose that both $\lfloor\varphi_R\rfloor_{\min(S),\min(S')}$ and $\lfloor\varphi_R\rfloor_{\max(S),\max(S')}$ are strict. As before, we analyse the structure of $\varphi_R^{(n)}$ and construct $\mathsf{TC}[\varphi_R](S,S')$.

$$
\begin{array}{l}
\mathsf{TC}[\varphi_R](S,S') = (S=S') \vee \varphi_R(S,S') \vee \varphi_R^{(2)}(S,S') \vee \\
\exists S_1,S_2,S_3,S_4.\left(\begin{array}{l}
S = S_1 \cup \{\min(S),\max(S)\} \wedge S_1 = S_3 \cup S_2 \cup S_4 \wedge \\
S_2 = S' \cup \{\min(S_2),\max(S_2)\} \wedge S_3 \neq \varnothing \wedge S_4 \neq \varnothing \wedge \\
\max(S_3) < \min(S_2) \wedge \max(S_2) < \min(S_4) \wedge \\
\lfloor\varphi_{R,2}\rfloor_{\min(S),\max(S)} \wedge \lfloor\varphi_{R,2}\rfloor_{\min(S),\max(S)}[S_2/S] \wedge \\
\lfloor\varphi_{R,2}\rfloor_{\min(S'),\max(S')}[S_1/S'] \wedge \lfloor\varphi_{R,2}\rfloor_{\min(S'),\max(S')} \wedge \\
\lfloor\varphi_{R,2}\rfloor_{\min(S),\max(S')}[S_1/S'] \wedge \lfloor\varphi_{R,2}\rfloor_{\min(S),\max(S')}[S_2/S] \wedge \\
\lfloor\varphi_{R,2}\rfloor_{\min(S'),\max(S)}[S_1/S'] \wedge \lfloor\varphi_{R,2}\rfloor_{\min(S'),\max(S)}[S_2/S] \wedge \\
\lfloor\varphi_{R,2}\rfloor_{\min(S),\min(S')}[S_1/S'] \wedge \lfloor\varphi_{R,2}\rfloor_{\min(S),\min(S')}[S_2/S] \wedge \\
\lfloor\varphi_{R,2}\rfloor_{\max(S),\max(S')}[S_1/S'] \wedge \lfloor\varphi_{R,2}\rfloor_{\max(S),\max(S')}[S_2/S] \wedge \\
\forall y,z.\left(\begin{array}{l}\mathsf{succ}(S_3 \cup \{\min(S_2)\},y,z) \rightarrow \\ \qquad \lfloor\varphi_{R,2}\rfloor_{\min(S),\min(S')}[y/\min(S),z/\min(S')]\end{array}\right) \wedge \\
\forall y,z.\left(\begin{array}{l}\mathsf{succ}(S_4 \cup \{\max(S_2)\},y,z) \rightarrow \\ \qquad \lfloor\varphi_{R,2}\rfloor_{\max(S),\max(S')}[y/\max(S'),z/\max(S)]\end{array}\right) \wedge \\
\mathsf{quantElmt}\left(\exists x.\left(\begin{array}{l}x>0 \wedge (\lfloor\varphi_{R,2}\rfloor_{\min(S),\min(S')})' \wedge \\ (\lfloor\varphi_{R,2}\rfloor_{\max(S),\max(S')})'\end{array}\right)\right)
\end{array}\right),
\end{array}
$$

where $\mathsf{quantElmt}$ means quantifier elimination, $(\lfloor\varphi_{R,2}\rfloor_{\min(S),\min(S')})'$ is obtained from $\lfloor\varphi_{R,2}\rfloor_{\min(S),\min(S')}$ by replacing any (possible) occurrence of $\min(S) \leqslant \min(S') - c$ with $\min(S) \leqslant \min(S') - cx$, and any (possible) occurrence of $\min(S') \leqslant \min(S) + c'$ with $\min(S') \leqslant \min(S) + c'x$. Similarly, $(\lfloor\varphi_{R,2}\rfloor_{\max(S),\max(S')})'$ is obtained from $\lfloor\varphi_{R,2}\rfloor_{\max(S),\max(S')}$ by replacing any (possible) occurrence of $\max(S') \leqslant \max(S) - c$ with $\max(S') \leqslant \max(S) - cx$, and any (possible) occurrence of $\max(S) \leqslant \max(S') + c'$ with $\max(S) \leqslant \max(S') + c'x$. Note that the aforementioned formula $\mathsf{quantElmt}(x > 0 \wedge \cdots)$ contains no first-order variables, moreover, the conjunct $S_3 \neq \varnothing$ (resp. $S_4 \neq \varnothing$) is a result of the fact that $\lfloor\varphi_{R,2}\rfloor_{\min(S),\min(S')}$ (resp. $\lfloor\varphi_{R,2}\rfloor_{\max(S),\max(S')}$) is strict.

Example 6. Suppose $\varphi_R(S,S')$ is the normal form of the formula

$$S = S' \cup \{\min(S),\max(S)\} \wedge \min(S') = \min(S) + 2 \wedge \max(S) = \max(S') + 3.$$

We have

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\lfloor\varphi_{R,2}\rfloor_{\min(S),\max(S)} & = \min(S) \leqslant \max(S) - 5, \\
\lfloor\varphi_{R,2}\rfloor_{\min(S'),\max(S')} & = \min(S') \leqslant \max(S'), \\
\lfloor\varphi_{R,2}\rfloor_{\min(S),\min(S')} & = \min(S') = \min(S) + 2, \\
\lfloor\varphi_{R,2}\rfloor_{\max(S),\max(S')} & = \max(S) = \max(S') + 3, \\
\lfloor\varphi_{R,2}\rfloor_{\min(S),\max(S')} & = \min(S) \leqslant \max(S') - 2, \\
\lfloor\varphi_{R,2}\rfloor_{\min(S'),\max(S)} & = \min(S') \leqslant \max(S) - 3.
\end{array}
$$

Then

$$\mathsf{TC}[\varphi_R](S,S') = (S=S') \vee \varphi_R(S,S') \vee$$
$$\exists S_1,S_2,S_3,S_4.\ \begin{pmatrix} S = S_1 \cup \{\min(S),\max(S)\} \wedge S_1 = S_3 \cup S_2 \cup S_4 \wedge \\ S_2 = S' \cup \{\min(S_2),\max(S_2)\} \wedge S_3 \neq \varnothing \wedge S_4 \neq \varnothing \wedge \\ \max(S_3) < \min(S_2)) \wedge \max(S_2) < \min(S_4) \wedge \\ \min(S) \leqslant \max(S) - 5 \wedge \min(S_2) \leqslant \max(S_2) - 5 \wedge \\ \min(S_1) \leqslant \max(S_1) \wedge \min(S') \leqslant \max(S') \wedge \\ \min(S_1) = \min(S) + 2 \wedge \min(S') = \min(S_2) + 2 \wedge \\ \max(S) = \max(S_1) + 3 \wedge \max(S_2) = \max(S') + 3 \wedge \\ \min(S) \leqslant \max(S_1) - 2 \wedge \min(S_2) \leqslant \max(S') - 2 \wedge \\ \min(S_1) \leqslant \max(S) - 3 \wedge \min(S') \leqslant \max(S_2) - 3 \wedge \\ \forall y,z.\ (\mathsf{succ}(S_3 \cup \{\min(S_2)\},y,z) \rightarrow z = y+2) \wedge \\ \forall y,z.\ (\mathsf{succ}(S_4 \cup \{\max(S_2)\},y,z) \rightarrow z = y+3) \wedge \\ 3(\min(S') - \min(S)) = 2(\max(S) - \max(S')) \end{pmatrix}.$$

C.4 The general situation that there are at least two source and destination parameters

In this section, we consider the general situation $\varphi_R(\boldsymbol{S},\boldsymbol{S'})$ that there are at least two source and destination parameters. We write $len(\boldsymbol{S})$ for the *length* of $\boldsymbol{S}$.

Recall two conditions **C3** and **C4** in Section 3. It follows that, for a predicate P, the data formula $\varphi_P(\boldsymbol{S};\boldsymbol{S'})$ extracted from the inductive rule of P satisfies the *independence* property. Namely, for each atomic formula φ in $\varphi_P(\boldsymbol{S},\boldsymbol{S'})$, there is some $i \in [len(\boldsymbol{S})]$ such that all the variables in φ are from $\{S_i, S'_i\}$. This property is crucial to obtain a complete decision procedure.

Let $len(\boldsymbol{S}) = k$. Then $\varphi_R(\boldsymbol{S},\boldsymbol{S'})$ can be rewritten into $\bigwedge\limits_{i\in[k]} \varphi_R^{(i)}(S_i,S'_i)$, where $\varphi_R^{(i)}$ is the conjunction of the atomic formulae of φ_R that involve only the variables from $\{S_i,S'_i\}$. Moreover, for $i \in [k]$, let $\varphi_R^{(i)}(S_i,S'_i) = \varphi_{R,1}^{(i)}(S_i,S'_i) \wedge \varphi_{R,2}^{(i)}(S_i,S'_i)$, where $\varphi_{R,1}^{(i)}(S_i,S'_i)$ and $\varphi_{R,2}^{(i)}(S_i,S'_i)$ are the set and integer subformula of $\varphi_R^{(i)}(S_i,S'_i)$ respectively.

To compute the transitive closure for $\varphi_R(\boldsymbol{S},\boldsymbol{S'}) = \bigwedge\limits_{i\in[k]} \varphi_R^{(i)}(S_i,S'_i)$, we compute $\mathsf{TC}[\varphi_R^{(i)}](S_i,S'_i)$ separately for each $i \in [k]$, but we also need to take the *synchronisation* of $\varphi_R^{(i)}(S_i,S'_i)$ into account. For instance, let $\varphi_R(S_1,S_2,S'_1,S'_2) \equiv \varphi_R^{(1)}(S_1,S'_1) \wedge \varphi_R^{(2)}(S_2,S'_2)$, where $\varphi_R^{(i)}(S_i,S'_i)$ is obtained from

$$S = S' \cup \{\min(S)\} \wedge \max(S) = \max(S') \wedge \min(S') = \min(S) + 1 \wedge \\ \min(S) \leqslant \max(S) - 1 \wedge \min(S') \leqslant \max(S')$$

by replacing S,S' with S_i,S'_i respectively for $i = 1,2$. It is not hard to see that $\mathsf{TC}[\varphi_R](S_1,S_2,S'_1,S'_2)$ should also include $\min(S'_1) - \min(S_1) = \min(S'_2) - \min(S_2)$.

For $i \in [k]$, let Φ_i denote the formula obtained from $\mathsf{TC}[\varphi_R^{(i)}](S_i,S'_i)$ by removing the disjunct $S_i = S'_i$. Then we compute $\mathsf{TC}[\varphi_R](\boldsymbol{S},\boldsymbol{S'})$ as,

$$TC[\varphi_R](\boldsymbol{S},\boldsymbol{S}') = \left(\bigwedge_{i\in[k]} S_i = S_i'\right) \vee \left(\bigwedge_{i\in[k]} \Phi_i \wedge \mathsf{quantElmt}\left(\exists x.\ x>0 \wedge \bigwedge_{i\in[k]} \begin{pmatrix} (\lfloor\varphi_{R,2}^{(i)}\rfloor_{\min(S_i),\min(S_i')})' \wedge \\ (\lfloor\varphi_{R,2}^{(i)}\rfloor_{\max(S_i),\max(S_i')})' \end{pmatrix}\right)\right),$$

where $(\lfloor\varphi_{R,2}^{(i)}\rfloor_{\min(S_i),\min(S_i')})'$ is obtained from $\lfloor\varphi_R^{(i)}\rfloor_{\min(S_i),\min(S_i')}$ by replacing $\min(S_i) \leqslant \min(S_i') - c$ with $\min(S_i) \leqslant \min(S_i') - cx$, and $\min(S_i') \leqslant \min(S_i) + c'$ with $\min(S_i') \leqslant \min(S_i) + c'x$; similarly for $(\lfloor\varphi_{R,2}^{(i)}\rfloor_{\max(S_i),\max(S_i')})'$. Here, $\mathsf{quantElmt}$ denotes the quantifier elimination procedure to remove the variable x. This is possible as $(\lfloor\varphi_{R,2}^{(i)}\rfloor_{\min(S_i),\min(S_i')})'$ and $(\lfloor\varphi_{R,2}^{(i)}\rfloor_{\max(S_i),\max(S_i')})'$ are both Presburger arithmetic formulae.

Example 7. Let $\varphi_R(S_1,S_2,S_1',S_2') \equiv \varphi_R^{(1)}(S_1,S_1') \wedge \varphi_R^{(2)}(S_2,S_2')$, where for $i = 1,2$, $\varphi_R^{(i)}(S_i,S_i')$ is obtained from the formula

$$S = S' \cup \{\min(S)\} \wedge \max(S) = \max(S') \wedge \min(S') = \min(S) + 1 \wedge \min(S) \leqslant \max(S) - 1 \wedge \min(S') \leqslant \max(S')$$

by replacing S, S' with S_i, S_i' respectively. Then in $TC[\varphi_R](\boldsymbol{S},\boldsymbol{S}')$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathsf{quantElmt}\left(\exists x.\ x>0 \wedge \bigwedge_{i\in[k]} \begin{pmatrix} (\lfloor\varphi_{R,2}^{(i)}\rfloor_{\min(S_i),\min(S_i')})' \wedge \\ (\lfloor\varphi_{R,2}^{(i)}\rfloor_{\max(S_i),\max(S_i')})' \end{pmatrix}\right) \\ &= \exists x.\ x>0 \wedge \textstyle\bigwedge_{i=1,2}(\min(S_i') = \min(S_i) + x \wedge \max(S_i) = \max(S_i')) \\ &= \min(S_1) < \min(S_1') \wedge \min(S_1') - \min(S_1) = \min(S_2') - \min(S_2) \wedge \\ &\quad \max(S_1) = \max(S_1') \wedge \max(S_2) = \max(S_2'). \end{aligned}$$

Example 8. Let $\varphi_R(S_1,S_2,S_1',S_2') \equiv \varphi_R^{[1]}(S_1,S_1') \wedge \varphi_R^{[2]}(S_2,S_2')$, where for $i = 1,2$, $\varphi_R^{[i]}(S_i,S_i')$ is obtained from

$$S = S' \cup \{\min(S)\} \wedge \max(S) = \max(S') \wedge \min(S') = \min(S) + 1 \wedge \min(S) \leqslant \max(S) - 1 \wedge \min(S') \leqslant \max(S')$$

by replacing S, S' with S_i, S_i' respectively. From Example 4, we know that for $i = 1,2$,

$$TC[\varphi_R^{[i]}](S_i,S_i') = (S_i = S_i') \vee \varphi_R^{[i]}(S_i,S_i') \vee (\varphi_R^{[i]})^{(2)}(S_i,S_i') \vee \exists S_{i,1}, S_{i,2}.\ \begin{pmatrix} S_i = S_{i,1} \cup \{\min(S_i)\} \wedge S_{i,2} = S_i' \cup \{\min(S_{i,2})\} \wedge S_{i,2} \neq \varnothing \wedge \\ S_{i,2} \subseteq S_{i,1} \wedge S_{i,1} \backslash S_{i,2} \neq \varnothing \wedge \max(S_{i,1}\backslash S_{i,2}) < \min(S_{i,2}) \wedge \\ \min(S_i) + 1 = \min(S_{i,1}) \wedge \min(S_{i,2}) + 1 = \min(S_i') \wedge \\ \forall y,z.\ \mathsf{succ}((S_{i,1}\backslash S_{i,2}) \cup \{\min(S_{i,2})\}, y, z) \rightarrow y + 1 = z \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then

$$TC[\varphi_R](\boldsymbol{S},\boldsymbol{S}') = (S_1 = S_1' \wedge S_2 = S_2') \vee \left(\Phi_1 \wedge \Phi_2 \wedge \mathsf{quantElmt}\left(\exists x.\ x>0 \wedge \bigwedge_{i=1,2} \begin{pmatrix} (\lfloor\varphi_{R,2}^{(i)}\rfloor_{\min(S_i),\min(S_i')})' \wedge \\ (\lfloor\varphi_{R,2}^{(i)}\rfloor_{\max(S_i),\max(S_i')})' \end{pmatrix}\right)\right),$$

where Φ_1 and Φ_2 are obtained from $TC[\varphi_R^{[1]}](S_1, S_1')$ and $TC[\varphi_R^{[2]}](S_2, S_2')$ by removing the disjunct $S_1 = S_1'$ and $S_2 = S_2'$ respectively. Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathsf{quantElmt}\left(\exists x.\ x > 0 \wedge \textstyle\bigwedge_{i=1,2}\left(\begin{array}{l}(\lfloor\varphi_{R,2}^{[i]}\rfloor_{\min(S_i),\min(S_i')})' \wedge \\ (\lfloor\varphi_{R,2}^{[i]}\rfloor_{\max(S_i),\max(S_i')})'\end{array}\right)\right)\\
&= \exists x.\ x > 0 \wedge \textstyle\bigwedge_{i=1,2}(\min(S_i') = \min(S_i) + x \wedge \max(S_i) = \max(S_i'))\\
&= \min(S_1) < \min(S_1') \wedge \min(S_1') - \min(S_1) = \min(S_2') - \min(S_2) \wedge\\
&\quad \max(S_1) = \max(S_1') \wedge \max(S_2) = \max(S_2').
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $TC[\varphi_R](\boldsymbol{S}, \boldsymbol{S}')$ can be simplified into

$$\begin{array}{l}
(S_1 = S_1' \wedge S_2 = S_2') \vee \varphi_R^{[1]}(S_1, S_1') \vee (\varphi_R^{[1]})^{(2)}(S_1, S_1') \vee\\
\left(\begin{array}{l}
\left(\begin{array}{l}(\min(S_1) + 1 = \min(S_1')) \vee\\ \exists S_{1,1}, S_{1,2}.\left(\begin{array}{l}S_1 = S_{1,1} \cup \{\min(S_1)\} \wedge S_{1,2} = S_1' \cup \{\min(S_{1,2})\} \wedge S_{1,2} \neq \varnothing \wedge\\ S_{1,2} \subseteq S_{1,1} \wedge S_{1,1}\backslash S_{1,2} \neq \varnothing \wedge \max(S_{1,1}\backslash S_{1,2}) < \min(S_{1,2}) \wedge\\ \min(S_1) + 1 = \min(S_{1,1}) \wedge \min(S_{1,2}) + 1 = \min(S_1') \wedge\\ \forall y, z.\ \mathsf{succ}((S_{1,1}\backslash S_{1,2}) \cup \{\min(S_{1,2})\}, y, z) \rightarrow y + 1 = z\end{array}\right)\end{array}\right) \wedge\\
\left(\begin{array}{l}(\min(S_2) + 1 = \min(S_2')) \vee \varphi_R^{[2]}(S_2, S_2') \vee (\varphi_R^{[2]})^{(2)}(S_2, S_2') \vee\\ \exists S_{2,1}, S_{2,2}.\left(\begin{array}{l}S_2 = S_{2,1} \cup \{\min(S_2)\} \wedge S_{2,2} = S_2' \cup \{\min(S_{2,2})\} \wedge S_{2,2} \neq \varnothing \wedge\\ S_{2,2} \subseteq S_{2,1} \wedge S_{2,1}\backslash S_{2,2} \neq \varnothing \wedge \max(S_{2,1}\backslash S_{2,2}) < \min(S_{2,2}) \wedge\\ \min(S_2) + 1 = \min(S_{2,1}) \wedge \min(S_{2,2}) + 1 = \min(S_2') \wedge\\ \forall y, z.\ \mathsf{succ}((S_{2,1}\backslash S_{2,2}) \cup \{\min(S_{2,2})\}, y, z) \rightarrow y + 1 = z\end{array}\right)\end{array}\right) \wedge\\
\begin{array}{l}\min(S_1) < \min(S_1') \wedge \min(S_1') - \min(S_1) = \min(S_2') - \min(S_2) \wedge\\ \max(S_1) = \max(S_1') \wedge \max(S_2) = \max(S_2').\end{array}
\end{array}\right).
\end{array}$$

D Details of Section 6

D.1 Details of Step I

To transform the formulae from $\mathcal{RQSPA}_{\mathbb{Z}}$ (resp. $\mathcal{RQSPA}_{\mathbb{Z}}^{-}$) into $\mathcal{RQSPA}_{\mathbb{N}}$ (resp. $\mathcal{RQSPA}_{\mathbb{N}}^{-}$), while preserving the set of models, we use an encoding $\mathcal{M} : \mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} \uplus \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{Z}} \to \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{N}} \times \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{N}}$, viz., $\mathcal{M}(n) = (n^+, n^-)$, where $(n^+, n^-) = (n, 0)$ if $n \geqslant 0$ and $(n^+, n^-) = (0, -n)$ if $n < 0$, $\mathcal{M}(A) = (A^+, A^-)$ where $A^+ = A \cap \mathbb{N}$ and $A^- = \{-n \mid n \in A\backslash A^+\}$. Naturally, we extend $\mathcal{M}$ to tuples of elements from $\mathbb{Z} \uplus \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{Z}}$ as follows: For $(n_1, \cdots, n_k, A_1, \cdots, A_l) \in \mathbb{Z}^k \times \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{Z}}^l$, $\mathcal{M}(n_1, \cdots, n_k, A_1, \cdots, A_l) = (n_1^+, n_1^-, \cdots, n_k^+, n_k^-, A_1^+, A_1^-, \cdots, A_l^+, A_l^-)$.

Lemma 1. *Let $\Phi(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{S})$ be an $\mathcal{RQSPA}_{\mathbb{Z}}$ formula, where $\boldsymbol{x} = (x_1, \cdots, x_k)$ and $\boldsymbol{S} = (S_1, \cdots, S_l)$. Then an $\mathcal{RQSPA}_{\mathbb{N}}$ formula $\Phi'(\boldsymbol{x}^{\pm}, \boldsymbol{S}^{\pm})$ can be constructed effectively such that $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{L}(\Phi)) = \mathcal{L}(\Phi')$, where $\boldsymbol{x}^{\pm} = (x_1^+, x_1^-, \cdots, x_k^+, x_k^-)$ and $\boldsymbol{S}^{\pm} = (S_1^+, S_1^-, \cdots, S_l^+, S_l^-)$. Moreover, if $\Phi(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{S})$ is an $\mathcal{RQSPA}_{\mathbb{Z}}^{-}$ formula, then $\Phi'(\boldsymbol{x}^{\pm}, \boldsymbol{S}^{\pm})$ is an $\mathcal{RQSPA}_{\mathbb{N}}^{-}$ formula.*

Proof. Let $\Phi(x_1, \cdots, x_k, S_1, \cdots, S_l)$ be an $\mathcal{RQSPA}_{\mathbb{Z}}$ formula. W.l.o.g. we assume that for each variable from $\{x_1, \cdots, x_k, S_1, \cdots, S_l\}$, there are no quantified occurrences of the variable in Φ; moreover, each variable is quantified at most

once. By adding fresh free set variables for terms, we can transform Φ into a formula satisfying that for each integer term of the form $\max(T_s)$ or $\min(T_s)$ in Φ, T_s is a set variable. For instance, if $\Phi \equiv \min(S_1 \backslash S_2) \leqslant \max(S_3 \cup S_4) + 1$, then we can introduce fresh free set variables S_1', S_2' and turn Φ' into the formula $S_1' = S_1 \backslash S_2 \wedge S_2' = S_3 \backslash S_4 \wedge \min(S_1') \leqslant \max(S_2') + 1$. Therefore, from now on, we assume that Φ satisfies that whenever $\max(T_s)$ or $\min(T_s)$ occurs, T_s is a set variable.

We use $\mathsf{Vars}_{fo}(\Phi)$ (resp. $\mathsf{Vars}_{so}(\Phi)$) to denote the set of (not necessarily free) first-order (resp. second-order) variables occurring in Φ. A *Φ-context* ctx is a function from $\mathsf{Vars}(\Phi)$ to $\{+, -, \pm, \perp\}$ such that for each $x \in \mathsf{Vars}_{fo}(\Phi)$, $\mathsf{ctx}(x) \in \{+, -\}$. Intuitively, $\mathsf{ctx}(x) = +$ (resp. $\mathsf{ctx}(x) = -$) denotes that x is a non-negative number (resp. x is a negative number), and $\mathsf{ctx}(S) = +$ ($\mathsf{ctx}(S) = -, \pm, \perp$) denotes that S contains only non-negative numbers (resp. S contains only negative numbers, S contains both non-negative and negative numbers, S is an empty set). We will first show how to transform Φ into a $\mathcal{RQSPA}_{\mathbb{N}}$ formula $tr_{\mathsf{ctx}}(\Phi)$, for a given Φ-context ctx. Then we define the desired $\mathcal{RQSPA}_{\mathbb{N}}$ formula Φ' as

$$\bigvee_{\mathsf{ctx}} \left(\begin{array}{l} \bigwedge\limits_{j\in[l],\mathsf{ctx}(S_j)=+} (S_j^+ \neq \varnothing \wedge S_j^- = \varnothing) \wedge \bigwedge\limits_{j\in[l],\mathsf{ctx}(S_j)=-} (S_j^+ = \varnothing \wedge S_j^- \neq \varnothing) \wedge \\ \bigwedge\limits_{j\in[l],\mathsf{ctx}(S_j)=\pm} (S_j^+ \neq \varnothing \wedge S_j^- \neq \varnothing) \wedge \bigwedge\limits_{j\in[l],\mathsf{ctx}(S_j)=\perp} (S_j^+ = \varnothing \wedge S_j^- = \varnothing) \wedge \\ \bigwedge\limits_{i\in[k],\mathsf{ctx}(x_i)=+} (x_i^- = 0) \wedge \bigwedge\limits_{i\in[k],\mathsf{ctx}(x_i)=-} (x_i^+ = 0 \wedge x_i^- > 0) \wedge tr_{\mathsf{ctx}}(\Phi) \end{array} \right).$$

Moreover, we can construct $tr_{\mathsf{ctx}}(\Phi)$ in a way that if Φ is a $\mathcal{RQSPA}_{\mathbb{Z}}^-$ formula, then $tr_{\mathsf{ctx}}(\Phi)$ is a $\mathcal{RQSPA}_{\mathbb{N}}^-$ formula, thus Φ' is a $\mathcal{RQSPA}_{\mathbb{N}}^-$ formula formula as well.

Suppose that Φ is a $\mathcal{RQSPA}_{\mathbb{Z}}$ formula, ctx is a Φ-context, and Ψ is a sub-formula of Φ. We construct $tr_{\mathsf{ctx}}(\Psi)$ inductively as follows.

We start with the atomic formulae of the form $T_m \bowtie 0$ in Φ. From the definition of $\mathcal{RQSPA}_{\mathbb{Z}}$, all the variables occurring in T_m are free variables in Φ. We construct $tr_{\mathsf{ctx}}(T_m \bowtie 0)$ by the following three-step procedure.

Step 1. For each first-order variable x occurring in $T_m \bowtie 0$, replace x with x^+ if $\mathsf{ctx}(x) = +$, and replace x with $-x^-$ otherwise.

Step 2. For each set variable S occurring in $T_m \bowtie 0$,
- if $\mathsf{ctx}(S) = \perp$, then replace each occurrence of $\max(S)$ or $\min(S)$ in $T_m \bowtie 0$ with $\perp$,
- if $\mathsf{ctx}(S) = +$, then replace each occurrence of $\max(S)$ (resp. $\min(S)$) in $T_m \bowtie 0$ with $\max(S^+)$ (resp. $\min(S^+)$),
- if $\mathsf{ctx}(S) = -$, then replace each occurrence of $\max(S)$ (resp. $\min(S)$) in $T_m \bowtie 0$ with $-\min(S^-)$ (resp. $-\max(S^-)$),
- if $\mathsf{ctx}(S) = \pm$, then replace each occurrence of $\max(S)$ (resp. $\min(S)$) in $T_m \bowtie 0$ with $\max(S^+)$ (resp. $-\max(S^-)$).

Step 3. Let $T_m' \bowtie 0$ denote the formula obtained after the two steps above. If $T_m' \bowtie 0$ contains at least one occurrence of $\perp$, then $tr_{\mathsf{ctx}}(T_m \bowtie 0) = \texttt{false}$, otherwise, $tr_{\mathsf{ctx}}(T_m \bowtie 0) = T_m' \bowtie 0$.

$tr^+_{\mathsf{ctx}}(\varnothing) = \varnothing$	$tr^-_{\mathsf{ctx}}(\varnothing) = \varnothing$
$tr^+_{\mathsf{ctx}}(S) = \begin{cases} S^+, & \text{if } \mathsf{ctx}(S) = \pm \text{ or } + \\ \varnothing, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$	$tr^-_{\mathsf{ctx}}(S) = \begin{cases} S^-, & \text{if } \mathsf{ctx}(S) = \pm \text{ or } - \\ \varnothing, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$
$tr^+_{\mathsf{ctx}}(\{x\}) = \begin{cases} \{x^+\}, & \text{if } \mathsf{ctx}(x) = + \\ \varnothing, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$	$tr^-_{\mathsf{ctx}}(\{x\}) = \begin{cases} \{x^-\}, & \text{if } \mathsf{ctx}(x) = - \\ \varnothing, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$
$tr^+_{\mathsf{ctx}}(\{\min(S)\}) = \begin{cases} \varnothing, & \text{if } \mathsf{ctx}(S) = \pm \text{ or } - \\ \{\min(S^+)\}, & \text{if } \mathsf{ctx}(S) = + \\ \bot, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$	$tr^-_{\mathsf{ctx}}(\{\min(S)\}) = \begin{cases} \{\max(S^-)\}, & \text{if } \mathsf{ctx}(S) = \pm \text{ or } - \\ \varnothing, & \text{if } \mathsf{ctx}(S) = + \\ \bot, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$
$tr^+_{\mathsf{ctx}}(\{\max(S)\}) = \begin{cases} \{\max(S^+)\}, & \text{if } \mathsf{ctx}(S) = \pm \text{ or } + \\ \varnothing, & \text{if } \mathsf{ctx}(S) = - \\ \bot, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$	$tr^-_{\mathsf{ctx}}(\{\max(S)\}) = \begin{cases} \varnothing, & \text{if } \mathsf{ctx}(S) = \pm \text{ or } + \\ \{\min(S^-)\}, & \text{if } \mathsf{ctx}(S) = - \\ \bot, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$
$tr^+_{\mathsf{ctx}}(T_s \cup T'_s) = tr^+_{\mathsf{ctx}}(T_s) \cup tr^+_{\mathsf{ctx}}(T'_s)$	$tr^-_{\mathsf{ctx}}(T_s \cup T'_s) = tr^-_{\mathsf{ctx}}(T_s) \cup tr^-_{\mathsf{ctx}}(T'_s)$
$tr^+_{\mathsf{ctx}}(T_s \cap T'_s) = tr^+_{\mathsf{ctx}}(T_s) \cap tr^+_{\mathsf{ctx}}(T'_s)$	$tr^-_{\mathsf{ctx}}(T_s \cap T'_s) = tr^-_{\mathsf{ctx}}(T_s) \cap tr^-_{\mathsf{ctx}}(T'_s)$
$tr^+_{\mathsf{ctx}}(T_s \backslash T'_s) = tr^+_{\mathsf{ctx}}(T_s) \backslash tr^+_{\mathsf{ctx}}(T'_s)$	$tr^-_{\mathsf{ctx}}(T_s \backslash T'_s) = tr^-_{\mathsf{ctx}}(T_s) \backslash tr^-_{\mathsf{ctx}}(T'_s)$

Table 1. Definition of $tr^+_{\mathsf{ctx}}(T_s)$ and $tr^-_{\mathsf{ctx}}(T_s)$

We then consider the atomic formulae of the form $T_{s,1} \asymp T_{s,2}$. For this purpose, we define two functions $tr^+_{\mathsf{ctx}}(T_s)$ and $tr^-_{\mathsf{ctx}}(T_s)$ as shown in Table 1. Intuitively, $tr^+_{\mathsf{ctx}}(T_s)$ represents the set of non-negative numbers in T_s under the context ctx, and $tr^-_{\mathsf{ctx}}(T_s)$ represents the set of $-n$ such that n is a negative number in T_s under the context ctx. Then $tr_{\mathsf{ctx}}(T_{s,1} \asymp T_{s,2})$ is defined as follows,

- if any of $tr^+_{\mathsf{ctx}}(T_{s,1})$, $tr^-_{\mathsf{ctx}}(T_{s,1})$, $tr^+_{\mathsf{ctx}}(T_{s,2})$, or $tr^-_{\mathsf{ctx}}(T_{s,2})$ contains an occurrence of $\bot$, then $tr_{\mathsf{ctx}}(T_{s,1} \asymp T_{s,2}) = \mathtt{false}$,
- otherwise, $tr_{\mathsf{ctx}}(T_{s,1} \asymp T_{s,2}) = tr^+_{\mathsf{ctx}}(T_{s,1}) \asymp tr^+_{\mathsf{ctx}}(T_{s,2}) \wedge tr^-_{\mathsf{ctx}}(T_{s,1}) \asymp tr^-_{\mathsf{ctx}}(T_{s,2})$.

The transformation of the atomic formulae of the form $T_{i,1} \bowtie T_{i,2} + c$ is more involved, since we want to construct a $\mathcal{RQSPA}^-_{\mathbb{N}}$ formula to encode $T_{i,1} \bowtie T_{i,2} + c$, so that if the original formula Φ is a $\mathcal{RQSPA}^-_{\mathbb{Z}}$ formula, then $tr_{\mathsf{ctx}}(\Phi)$ is a $\mathcal{RQSPA}^-_{\mathbb{N}}$ formula. We distinguish between whether $T_{i,2}$ is a constant or not. We construct $tr_{\mathsf{ctx}}(T_{i,1} \bowtie T_{i,2} + c)$ by the following two-step procedure.

Step 1. At first, apply the following replacements:

- For each integer variable x occurring in $T_{i,1} \bowtie T_{i,2} + c$, if $\mathsf{ctx}(x) = +$, then replace each occurrence of x with x^+, otherwise, replace each occurrence of x with $-x^-$.
- For each set variable S occurring in $T_{i,1} \bowtie T_{i,2} + c$,
  - if $\mathsf{ctx}(S) = +$, then replace each occurrence of $\min(S)$ (resp. $\max(S)$) with $\min(S^+)$ (resp. $\max(S^+)$),
  - if $\mathsf{ctx}(S) = -$, then replace each occurrence of $\min(S)$ (resp. $\max(S)$) with $-\max(S^-)$ (resp. $-\min(S^-)$),

- if $\mathsf{ctx}(S) = \pm$, then replace each occurrence of $\min(S)$ (resp. $\max(S)$) with $-\max(S^-)$ (resp. $\max(S^+)$),
- if $\mathsf{ctx}(S) = \bot$, then replace each occurrence of $\min(S)$ (resp. $\max(S)$) with $\bot$.

Step 2. Let $T'_{i,1} \bowtie T'_{i,2} + c$ be the resulting formula after the replacements above.

- If $T'_{i,1} \bowtie T'_{i,2}+c$ contains an occurrence of $\bot$, the $tr_{\mathsf{ctx}}(T'_{i,1} \bowtie T'_{i,2}+c) = \mathtt{false}$.
- Otherwise, we construct $tr_{\mathsf{ctx}}(T_{i,1} \bowtie T_{i,2}+c)$ by rewriting $T'_{i,1} \bowtie T'_{i,2}+c$ into a $\mathcal{RQSPA}^-_{\mathbb{N}}$ formula as follows: Note that $T'_{i,1} \bowtie T'_{i,2} + c$ is of the form $\alpha \bowtie \beta + c$, $\alpha \bowtie -\beta + c$, $-\alpha \bowtie \beta + c$, or $-\alpha \bowtie -\beta + c$, where α, β are of the form x^+, x^-, $\max(S^+)$, $\min(S^+)$, $\max(S^-)$, $\min(S^-)$.
  - $T'_{i,1} \bowtie T'_{i,2}+c$ is of the form $\alpha \bowtie \beta+c$: then $tr_{\mathsf{ctx}}(T_{i,1} \bowtie T_{i,2}+c) = \alpha \bowtie \beta + c$.
  - $T'_{i,1} \bowtie T'_{i,2}+c$ is of the form $\alpha \bowtie -\beta+c$: If $c \geqslant 0$, then $tr_{\mathsf{ctx}}(T_{i,1} \bowtie T_{i,2} + c) = \bigvee_{c_1+c_2=c, c_1,c_2 \geqslant 0} (\alpha \bowtie c_1 \wedge \beta \bowtie c_2)$. Otherwise, if $\bowtie \in \{=, \leqslant\}$, then $tr_{\mathsf{ctx}}(T_{i,1} \bowtie T_{i,2} + c) = \mathtt{false}$, otherwise, $tr_{\mathsf{ctx}}(T_{i,1} \bowtie T_{i,2} + c) = \mathtt{true}$.
  - $T'_{i,1} \bowtie T'_{i,2}+c$ is of the form $-\alpha \bowtie \beta+c$: If $c \leqslant 0$, then $tr_{\mathsf{ctx}}(T_{i,1} \bowtie T_{i,2} + c) = \bigvee_{c_1+c_2=-c, c_1,c_2 \geqslant 0} (c_1 \bowtie \alpha \wedge c_2 \bowtie \beta)$. Otherwise, if $\bowtie \in \{=, \geqslant\}$, then $tr_{\mathsf{ctx}}(T_{i,1} \bowtie T_{i,2} + c) = \mathtt{false}$, otherwise, $tr_{\mathsf{ctx}}(T_{i,1} \bowtie T_{i,2} + c) = \mathtt{true}$.
  - $T'_{i,1} \bowtie T'_{i,2} + c$ is of the form $-\alpha \bowtie -\beta + c$: Then $tr_{\mathsf{ctx}}(T_{i,1} \bowtie T_{i,2} + c) = \beta \bowtie \alpha + c$.

We then consider non-atomic subformulae of Φ.

- $tr_{\mathsf{ctx}}(\Psi_1 \wedge \Psi_2) = tr_{\mathsf{ctx}}(\Psi_1) \wedge tr_{\mathsf{ctx}}(\Psi_2)$,
- $tr_{\mathsf{ctx}}(\neg\Psi_1) = \neg tr_{\mathsf{ctx}}(\Psi_1)$,
- $tr_{\mathsf{ctx}}(\forall x.\ \Psi_1) = \forall x^+.\forall x^-.\ (x^- = 0 \to tr_{\mathsf{ctx}[x\to+]}(\Psi_1)) \wedge ((x^+ = 0 \wedge x^- > 0) \to tr_{\mathsf{ctx}[x\to-]}(\Psi_1))$.
- $tr_{\mathsf{ctx}}(\forall S.\ \Psi_1) = \forall S^+.\forall S^-.\ ((S^+ \neq \varnothing \wedge S^- \neq \varnothing) \to tr_{\mathsf{ctx}[S\to\pm]}(\Psi_1)) \wedge ((S^+ \neq \varnothing \wedge S^- = \varnothing) \to tr_{\mathsf{ctx}[S\to+]}(\Psi_1)) \wedge ((S^+ = \varnothing \wedge S^- \neq \varnothing) \to tr_{\mathsf{ctx}[S\to-]}(\Psi_1)) \wedge ((S^+ = \varnothing \wedge S^- = \varnothing) \to tr_{\mathsf{ctx}[S\to\bot]}(\Psi_1))$.

□

D.2 Details of Step II

Let $\Delta(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{S})$ be a formula in $\mathcal{RQSPA}_{\mathbb{N}}$, where $\boldsymbol{x} = (x_1, \cdots, x_k)$ and $\boldsymbol{S} = (S_1, \cdots, S_l)$. W.l.o.g., we assume that for each variable from $\boldsymbol{x} \cup \boldsymbol{S}$, there are no quantified occurrences of the variable in Φ. Intuitively, as none of the variables from $\boldsymbol{x} \cup \boldsymbol{S}$ are quantified, we can separate out all atomic formulae of the form $T_m \bowtie 0$ which contain *only* variables from $\boldsymbol{x} \cup \boldsymbol{S}$. In detail, let $\mathfrak{F}_{\mathsf{free}}(\Phi)$ denote

the set of all atomic formulae $T_m \bowtie 0$ occurring in Φ such that it contain only variables from $\boldsymbol{x} \cup \boldsymbol{S}$. Then it is not difficult to see that Φ can be rewritten into

$$\bigvee_{\mathfrak{F}' \subseteq \mathfrak{F}_{\mathsf{free}}(\Phi)} \left(\mathsf{Red}_{\mathfrak{F}'}(\Phi) \wedge \bigwedge_{\Phi' \in \mathfrak{F}'} \Phi' \wedge \bigwedge_{\Phi' \in \mathfrak{F}_{\mathsf{free}}(\Phi) \setminus \mathfrak{F}'} \neg \Phi' \right),$$

where $\mathsf{Red}_{\mathfrak{F}'}(\Phi)$ is obtained from Φ by replacing each atomic formula in $\mathfrak{F}'$ (resp. $\mathfrak{F}_{\mathsf{free}}(\Phi) \setminus \mathfrak{F}'$) with `true` (resp. `false`). Evidently, $\mathsf{Red}_{\mathfrak{F}'}(\Phi)$ is a formula in $\mathcal{RQSPA}_{\mathbb{N}}^{-}$. Moreover, $\neg\Phi'$ can be easily rewritten into a formula of the form $T_m \bowtie 0$. For instance, $\neg(T_m \geqslant 0) \equiv T_m < 0$.

D.3 Details of Step III

We start with some additional notations. First observe that there is a one-to-one correspondence between models of $\Phi(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{S})$ and finite words over 2^{AP} with $AP = \{x_1, \cdots, x_k, S_1, \cdots, S_l\}$ satisfying that x_j occurs in *exactly one* position for each $j \in [k]$. A finite word $w = w_0 \cdots w_{n-1}$ over 2^{AP} is a finite sequence such that $w_i \in 2^{AP}$ for each $i \in \{0\} \cup [n-1]$. On the one hand, any model $(n_1, \cdots, n_k, A_1, \cdots, A_l) \in \mathbb{N}^k \times \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{N}}^l$ of $\Phi(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{S})$ can be interpreted as a finite word w as follows: If $k = 0$ and $A_i = \varnothing$ for all $i \in [l]$, then $w = \varepsilon$; otherwise let $|w| = 1 + \max(\{n_1, \cdots, n_k\} \cup \bigcup_{i \in [l]} A_i)$, and, for each position $i \in \{0\} \cup [|w| - 1]$, $w_i = P \subseteq AP$ iff $P = \{x_j \mid j \in [k], i = n_j\} \cup \{S_j \mid j \in [l], i \in A_j\}$. On the other hand, for a word $w \in (2^{AP})^*$ where x_j occurs in exactly one position for each $j \in [k]$, a tuple $(n_1, \cdots, n_k, A_1, \cdots, A_l) \in \mathbb{N}^k \times \mathbb{S}_{\mathbb{N}}^l$ can be constructed such that for each $j \in [k]$, $n_j = i$ iff $x_j \in w_i$, and for each $j \in [l]$, $A_j = \{i \in \{0\} \cup [|w| - 1] \mid S_j \in w_i\}$. By slightly abusing the notation, we also use $\mathcal{L}(\Phi(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{S}))$ to denote the set of words $w \in (2^{AP})^*$ such that $w \models \Phi$.

Definition 5 (Presburger automata). *A Presburger automaton (PA) $\mathcal{A}$ is a tuple $(Q, \Sigma, \delta, q_0, F, \Psi)$, where $(Q, \Sigma, \delta, q_0, F)$ is an NFA with $Q = \{q_0, q_1, \ldots, q_m\}$, and $\Psi(x_{q_0}, \cdots, x_{q_m})$ is a* quantifier-free Presburger arithmetic *formula over the set of variables $\{x_{q_i} \mid i \in \{0\} \cup [m]\}$.*

A word $w = w_0 \cdots w_{n-1} \in (2^{AP})^*$ is accepted by $\mathcal{A}$ if there is a run $R = q_0 \xrightarrow{w_0} q_1 \cdots q_{n-1} \xrightarrow{w_{n-1}} q_n$ such that $q_n \in F$ and $\Psi(|R|_{q_0}/x_{q_0}, \cdots, |R|_{q_m}/x_{q_m})$ holds, where the vector $(|R|_q)_{q \in Q}$ is the Parikh image of the sequence $q_0, \cdots, q_n$, that is, $|R|_q$ is the number of occurrences of q in R. We use $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A})$ to denote the set of words accepted by $\mathcal{A}$.

Theorem 1 ([29]). *Nonemptiness of Presburger automata is decidable.*

Given $\Phi_{\text{core}} \wedge \Phi_{\text{count}}$, where Φ_{core} is an $\mathcal{RQSPA}_{\mathbb{N}}^{-}$ formula and Φ_{count} is a conjunction of the formulae of the form $T_m \bowtie 0$ which contains only variables from $\boldsymbol{x} \cup \boldsymbol{S}$, our aim is to construct a PA to accept models—as words—of $\Phi_{\text{core}} \wedge \Phi_{\text{count}}$. To this end, we first show how to construct an NFA from Φ_{core}, an $\mathcal{RQSPA}_{\mathbb{N}}^{-}$ formula.

It is a simple observation that an $\mathcal{RQSPA}_{\mathbb{N}}^{-}$ formula can be rewritten in exponential time into a formula in MSOW defined by the following rules,

$$\Phi ::= x + 1 = y \mid x < y \mid S(x) \mid \Phi \wedge \Phi \mid \neg\Phi \mid \forall x.\ \Phi \mid \forall S.\ \Phi,$$

where x, y are variables ranging over $\mathbb{N}$, and S is a (second-order) set variable ranging over the set of *finite* subsets of $\mathbb{N}$. Note that the exponential blow-up is because, only the successor operator is available in MSOW while constants c are encoded in binary. For instance, $x_1 \leqslant x_2 + 2$ has to be rewritten into $\exists z, z'.\ z = x_2 + 1 \wedge z' = z + 1 \wedge x_1 \leqslant z'$.

We can then invoke the celebrated Büchi-Elgot theorem:

Theorem 2 ([5,11]). *Let $\Phi(S_1, \cdots, S_k)$ be an MSOW formula. Then an NFA $\mathcal{A}_\Phi$ over $2^{\{S_1,\cdots,S_k\}}$ can be constructed so that $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A}_\Phi) = \mathcal{L}(\Phi(S_1, \cdots, S_k))$.*

It follows from Theorem 2 that an NFA $\mathcal{A}_\Phi = (Q, AP, \delta, q_0, F)$ can be constructed from a $\mathcal{RQSPA}_{\mathbb{N}}^{-}$ formula $\Phi(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{S})$ such that $\mathcal{L}(\Phi) = \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A}_\Phi)$. As the next step we construct a *quantifier-free Presburger arithmetic* formula Ψ for the sought PA out of Φ_{count}. We first construct, for each x_i, an NFA $\mathcal{A}_i$ illustrated in Fig.2(a), and for each S_j, an NFA $\mathcal{B}_j$ illustrated in Fig.2(b). We then consider an NFA $\mathcal{A}_\Phi^\times$ which is the product of $\mathcal{A}_\Phi$ and all $\mathcal{A}_i$ for $i \in [k]$ and $\mathcal{B}_j$ for $j \in [l]$. Note that each state of $\mathcal{A}_\Phi^\times$ is a vector of states $\boldsymbol{q} = (q, q_1, \cdots, q_k, q_{k+1}, \cdots, q_{k+l})$ such that $q \in Q$, $q_i \in \{p_{0,i}, p_{1,i}\}$ for each $i \in [k]$, and $q_{k+j} \in \{q_{0,j}, q_{1,j}, q_{2,j}\}$ for each $j \in [l]$. We write $\boldsymbol{q}_r$ for the r-th entry of $\boldsymbol{q}$, i.e., $\boldsymbol{q}_0 = q$ and $\boldsymbol{q}_i = q_i$ for each $i \in [k + l]$.

We observe that, for each $i \in [k]$, x_i is expressed by $\sum_{\{\boldsymbol{q} \mid \boldsymbol{q}_i = p_{0,i}\}} x_{\boldsymbol{q}} - 1$, and for each $j \in [l]$, $\min(S_j)$ is expressed by $\sum_{\{\boldsymbol{q} \mid \boldsymbol{q}_{k+j} = q_{0,j}\}} x_{\boldsymbol{q}} - 1$ and $\max(S_j)$ is expressed by $\sum_{\{\boldsymbol{q} \mid \boldsymbol{q}_{k+j} = q_{0,j}\}} x_{\boldsymbol{q}} + \sum_{\{\boldsymbol{q} \mid \boldsymbol{q}_{k+j} = q_{1,j}\}} x_{\boldsymbol{q}} - 1$. We then substitute them into Φ_{count} and obtain Ψ which is over the variables $x_{\boldsymbol{q}}$.




Fig. 2. NFA $\mathcal{A}_i$ for x_i and $\mathcal{B}_j$ for S_j

Proposition 3. *For an $\mathcal{RQSPA}_{\mathbb{N}}$ formula $\Phi = \Phi_{\text{core}} \wedge \Phi_{\text{count}}$, Φ_{core} is an $\mathcal{RQSPA}_{\mathbb{N}}^{-}$ formula, and Φ_{count} is a conjunction of formulae of the form $T_m \bowtie 0$ which contain only variables from $\boldsymbol{x} \cup \boldsymbol{S}$, a PA $\mathcal{A}_\Phi = (\mathcal{A}_\Phi^\times, \Psi)$ can be constructed effectively such that $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{A}_\Phi) = \mathcal{L}(\Phi)$.*