Generating Tableau Provers Using METTEL² Tutorial

Dmitry Tishkovsky and Renate Schmidt

School of Computer Science The University of Manchester

THE 22ND INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON AUTOMATED REASONING WITH ANALYTIC TABLEAUX AND RELATED METHODS

16 - 19 SEPTEMBER 2013



TABLEAUX 2013

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲ 三 ▶ ∽ � ♡ ♥ ○ 1/50



Introduction

Overview and motivation

- Distribution kit and installation
- Demo
- Specification
- Syntax specification
- Tableau specification
- Options
- Optimisations and controlling derivations
 - Search strategies
 - Rule priorities
 - Rewriting

8 Blocking

- Unrestricted blocking rule
- Specifying the blocking mechanism
- Further tricks
 - Labelled tableaux
 - Signed tableaux
 - Embedding sorts
 - Eliminating expressions
 - Reducing branching factor
 - Tabular logics
- 10

Testing and benchmarking utilities

Conclusion



Introduction

Overview and motivation

Distribution kit and installation

Demo

Specification

- Syntax specification
- Tableau specification
- Options
- Optimisations and controlling derivations
 - Search strategies
 - Rule priorities
 - Rewriting

Blocking

- Unrestricted blocking rule
- Specifying the blocking mechanism
- Further tricks
 - Labelled tableaux
 - Signed tableaux
 - Embedding sorts
 - Eliminating expressions
 - Reducing branching factor
 - Tabular logics
- Testing and benchmarking utilities

http://www.mettel-prover.org





TABLEAUX 2013

Introduction

Overview and motivation

Distribution kit and installation

Demo

Specification

- Syntax specification
- Tableau specification
- Options
- Optimisations and controlling derivations
 - Search strategies
 - Rule priorities
 - Rewriting

Blocking

- Unrestricted blocking rule
- Specifying the blocking mechanism
- Further tricks
 - Labelled tableaux
 - Signed tableaux
 - Embedding sorts
 - Eliminating expressions
 - Reducing branching factor
 - Tabular logics
- Testing and benchmarking utilities



- Different applications require different (logical) formalisms
- Logics need reasoning tools
- Implementation of provers is expensive
- Altering existing provers is hard
- Translational approach requires additional knowledge and skills for the user

Solution

Generation of a prover code from a specification of a logic.



Goals and Objectives of Implementation of METTEL²

- An easy to use prover generator
- Modularity of generated code
- Hierarchy of public JAVA classes and interfaces that can be easily extended and integrated with other systems



Introduction

Overview and motivation

Distribution kit and installation

- Demo
- Specification
 - Syntax specification
 - Tableau specification
 - Options
- Optimisations and controlling derivations
 - Search strategies
 - Rule priorities
 - Rewriting

Blocking

- Unrestricted blocking rule
- Specifying the blocking mechanism
- Further tricks
 - Labelled tableaux
 - Signed tableaux
 - Embedding sorts
 - Eliminating expressions
 - Reducing branching factor
 - Tabular logics
- Testing and benchmarking utilities



Requires JAVA. Tested on JRE 1.6 and 1.7.

Installation

- Download and install JRE 1.7 from http://www.java.com.
- Download mettel-2.0-XXX.zip from http://www.mettel-prover.org.
- Place all the files from mettel-2.0-XXX.zip into some directory, e.g. ~/mettel2.



Distribution Kit and Library Dependencies

mettel-2.0-XXX.zip

- mettel2.jar main jar-file for the generator, includes all the packages, depends on the ANTLR libraries:
 - antlr.jar,
 - antlr3.jar,
 - antlr3-runtime.jar,
 - stringtemplate4.jar,

and the CSV formatting library:

- opencsv.jar required for running benchmark suites.
- mettel2-core.jar required for running the generated provers, depends on:
 - antlr3-runtime.jar required for running parsers generated by ANTLR.
- mettel2-util.jar required for running expression generators and benchmark suites.



Introduction

Overview and motivation

Distribution kit and installation

Demo

- Specification
 - Syntax specification
 - Tableau specification
 - Options
- Optimisations and controlling derivations
 - Search strategies
 - Rule priorities
 - Rewriting

Blocking

- Unrestricted blocking rule
- Specifying the blocking mechanism
- Further tricks
 - Labelled tableaux
 - Signed tableaux
 - Embedding sorts
 - Eliminating expressions
 - Reducing branching factor
 - Tabular logics
- Testing and benchmarking utilities

Generating and Running Prover

- Prepare a specification file S4.s.
- Generate the prover:

```
> java -jar ~/mettel2/mettel2.jar -i S4.s
```

- Place the generated S4. jar into ~/mettel2.
- Run the prover:

```
> java -jar ~/mettel2/S4.jar
```





- Tableau related classes: S4.tableau.S4
- Executable classes:
 - Main class for the prover: S4.tableau.S4.S4TableauProver
 - Main class for running benchmark suites: S4.tableau.S4.S4Benchmark
 - Generator of random expressions for specified syntax:
 - S4.language.S4.util.S4RandomExpressionGenerator
 - Statistical analyser of expressions:
 - S4.language.S4.S4ProblemAnalyzer
- Additional resources and examples: etc



Introduction

- Overview and motivation
- Distribution kit and installation
- Demo
- Specification
- Syntax specification
- Tableau specification
- Options
- Optimisations and controlling derivations
 - Search strategies
 - Rule priorities
 - Rewriting

Blocking

- Unrestricted blocking rule
- Specifying the blocking mechanism
- Further tricks
 - Labelled tableaux
 - Signed tableaux
 - Embedding sorts
 - Eliminating expressions
 - Reducing branching factor
 - Tabular logics
- Testing and benchmarking utilities



Specification

Short syntax

```
specification <name>;
options{
```

```
syntax <name>{
```

```
tableau <name>{
```

```
...

}

syntax <name>

options{

...

}

tableau <name> in syntax <name>

options{

...

}

<other syntax and tableau blocks>
```

Full syntax

options{

specification <path>;

...

Declaration of sorts of a (multi-sorted) propositional language:

sort formula, world;

• Connective specifications as simple BNF statements:

formula at = ' @ ' world formula: formula disjunction = formula ' | ' formula;

Formula examples

P|~Q. @| P. @I(P|~Q), @I~(p|(P|~Q)), @I~p|P|~Q

 $P \vee \neg Q$. $@_{\ell}P$. $@_{\ell}(P \vee \neg Q),$ $@_{\ell} \neg (p \lor (P \lor \neg Q)),$ $@_{\ell} \neg p \lor P \lor \neg Q$

TABLEAUX 2013



$$\begin{array}{l} \phi \stackrel{\text{\tiny def}}{=} p \mid \perp \mid \neg \phi \mid \diamond \phi \mid @_w \phi \mid \phi \lor \phi \mid w \approx w \mid R(w,w) \\ w \stackrel{\text{\tiny def}}{=} i \mid f(w,\phi) \end{array}$$

syntax S4{

sort formula, world; formula false = ' false'; formula negation = ' ~' formula; formula diamond = ' <> ' formula; formula diajunction = formula; formula disjunction = formula ' | ' formula; formula equality = ' [' world ' = ' world '] '; //Equality formula relation = ' R' ' (' world ' , ' world ') '; //Relation world f = ' f' ' (' world ' , ' formula ') '; //Skolem function

MANCHESTER

• Tableau rule declaration in a premise-conclusion syntax:

@|(P|Q) / @|P\$| @|Q\$;

- Branch separator \$| and rule separator \$;
- Rule priorities:

@I(P | Q) / @I P \$| @I Q *priority* 2 \$;

• Default priority is 0



TABLEAUX 2013



Options for Tableau Specification

• Redefinable separators \$| and \$;

```
options{
...
tableau.rule.delimiter =;
tableau.rule.branch.delimiter=||
}
...
tableau S4{
...
@I (P | Q) / @I P || @I Q priority 3;
}
```

• The delimiter / between premises and conclusions can be redefined via tableau.rule.premise.delimiter property.









Notice separators in tableau rules!

Options





Introduction

- Overview and motivation
- Distribution kit and installation
- Demo
- Specification
 - Syntax specification
 - Tableau specification
 - Options
- Optimisations and controlling derivations
 - Search strategies
 - Rule priorities
 - Rewriting

Blocking

- Unrestricted blocking rule
- Specifying the blocking mechanism
- Further tricks
 - Labelled tableaux
 - Signed tableaux
 - Embedding sorts
 - Eliminating expressions
 - Reducing branching factor
 - Tabular logics
- Testing and benchmarking utilities



Features of Generated Provers

- Dynamic backtracking
- Conflict directed backjumping
- DFLR or BF search strategy
- Rule applications are controlled via rule priorities
- Equality reasoning via backward and forward rewriting



• Option for depth-first left-to-right search strategy:

```
branch.selection.strategy = \
  mettel.core.tableau.MettelSimpleLIFOBranchSelectionStrategy
```

- Some logics, e.g. ALBO^{id}, require fair branch selection strategy for termination.
- Option for breadth-first search strategy:

```
branch.selection.strategy = \
  mettel.core.tableau.MettelSimpleFIFOBranchSelectionStrategy
```

 Other implementations of the interface MettelBranchSelectionStrategy are allowed.



- A rule can be selected only if the queue of expressions associated with the rule is not empty (rule is *selectable*).
- Selection must be fair within each priority group: if a rule is selectable then it will be selected eventually.
- A rule can be selected only if all rules with smaller priority values (higher priority) are not selectable.
- Note that selectable rule is not necessarily applicable.









Example

. . .









applied rules

. . .









Example

. . .







selectable rules

applied rules

. . .









Example

. . .









Example

. . .









. . .









applied rules

. . .









applied rules

In order to achieve that the closure rule is applied immediately after any new information is added to a branch assign to the closure rule the priority value 0 and to all other rule values higher than 0, e.g., 1.

. . .







applied rules

. . .









Example

. . .



In order to achieve that the closure rule is applied immediately after any new information is added to a branch assign to the closure rule the priority value 0 and to all other rule values higher than 0, e.g., 1.

METTEL2




applied rules

. . .









applied rules

Example

. . .



In order to achieve that the closure rule is applied immediately after any new information is added to a branch assign to the closure rule the priority value 0 and to all other rule values higher than 0, e.g., 1.

A Guideline for Choosing Rule Priorities

Given two rules ρ and ρ' , set priority value of ρ less than the priority value of ρ' if

- ρ has lower branching factor than $\rho',$ or
- $\bullet\,$ branching factors of ρ and ρ' are equal but ρ has less premises.

Additional optimisation is possible, if each set of expressions has a complexity measure.

Example

tableau S4{

 $\begin{array}{l} @i ~(~P) / @i \ P \ \textit{priority 1; //Double-negation removal} \\ @i(P|Q) / @i \ P \ || @i \ Q \ \textit{priority 3; //Disjunction rule} \\ @i~(P|Q) / @i~P \ @i~Q \ \textit{priority 1; //"Conjunction" rule} \\ @i~(>P) / R(i,f(i,P)) \ @f(i,P) \ \textit{priority 7; //Diamond rule} \\ @i~(<>P) \ R(i,j) / @j~P \ \textit{priority 2; //"Box" propagation rule} \\ @i \ P \ R(i,i) \ \textit{priority 1; //Reflexivity} \\ R(i,j) \ R(i,k) \ / R(i,k) \ \textit{priority 2; //Transitivity} \\ @i \ P \ @i~P \ / \textit{priority 0; //Closure rule} \\ R(i,j) / [i=j] || ~([i=j]) \ \textit{priority 0; //Closure rule for inequality} \\ \end{array}$



Outline

Introduction

- Overview and motivation
- Distribution kit and installation
- Demo
- Specification
 - Syntax specification
 - Tableau specification
 - Options
- Optimisations and controlling derivations
 - Search strategies
 - Rule priorities
 - Rewriting

Blocking

- Unrestricted blocking rule
- Specifying the blocking mechanism
- Further tricks
 - Labelled tableaux
 - Signed tableaux
 - Embedding sorts
 - Eliminating expressions
 - Reducing branching factor
 - Tabular logics
- Testing and benchmarking utilities



Why Rewriting?

- Considerably simplifies derivations:
 - Exhaustive rewriting:

 $\text{if } f(i,P) \overset{\mathcal{R}}{\rightarrow} i \text{ then } f(f(f(i,P),P),P) \overset{\mathcal{R}}{\rightarrow} i.$

- On-the-fly simplification forward rewriting.
- Rewrite system can be efficiently maintained.
- Equality reasoning is required for the generic blocking mechanism.



Equality Reasoning via Forward and Backward Rewriting

- A lexicographic path ordering \prec on all expressions of current tableau branch.
- Rewrite relation *R*.
- Forward rewriting: every new expression in a branch is rewritten wrt R.
- Backward rewriting is triggered by equality expressions:
 - every equality expression $E(\alpha, \beta)$ in current branch is oriented wrt \prec , and
 - either $\alpha \stackrel{\mathcal{R}}{\rightarrow} \beta$ or $\beta \stackrel{\mathcal{R}}{\rightarrow} \alpha$ is added to \mathcal{R} , and
 - all the expressions in the branch are rewritten wrt R.



Specifying Equality Expressions

Option equality.keywords:

Default: equality.keywords = {equality}

```
options{
  equality.keywords = {equality, equivalence}
}
```

• Corresponding name in a binary connective specification:

```
syntax SomeLogic{
    ...
    formula equality = ' [' nominal ' =' nominal ']';
    formula equivalence = formula ' <->' formula;
}
```



Outline

Introduction

- Overview and motivation
- Distribution kit and installation
- Demo
- Specification
 - Syntax specification
 - Tableau specification
 - Options
- Optimisations and controlling derivations
 - Search strategies
 - Rule priorities
 - Rewriting

Blocking

- Unrestricted blocking rule
- Specifying the blocking mechanism
- Further tricks
 - Labelled tableaux
 - Signed tableaux
 - Embedding sorts
 - Eliminating expressions
 - Reducing branching factor
 - Tabular logics
- Testing and benchmarking utilities



Blocking Mechanisms

- There are periodicities in tableau derivations.
- They are usually detected with some form of loop checking mechanisms:
 - subset or equality blocking,
 - ancestor or anywhere blocking,
 - static or dynamic blocking,
 - pattern-based blocking, etc.
- The standard loop-checking mechanisms are tied to particular logics.
- In METTEL², a generic blocking mechanism, called unrestricted blocking mechanism, can be specified.



(ub): $\overline{x \approx y \mid x \not\approx y}$

Termination Condition

In every open branch there is some node from which point onwards, all possible applications of the (ub) rule have been performed before any application of any term-generating rule.

• Early blocking:





- Relies on tableau backtracking
- Provides termination for logics with FMP

$$\stackrel{\mathsf{ub}):}{x \approx y \mid x \not\approx y}$$

Termination Condition

In every open branch there is some node from which point onwards, all possible applications of the (ub) rule have been performed before any application of any term-generating rule.

• Early blocking:





- Relies on tableau backtracking
- Provides termination for logics with FMP

$$\stackrel{\mathsf{ub}):}{x \approx y \mid x \not\approx y}$$

Termination Condition

In every open branch there is some node from which point onwards, all possible applications of the (ub) rule have been performed before any application of any term-generating rule.

• Early blocking:





- Relies on tableau backtracking
- Provides termination for logics with FMP

$$\stackrel{\text{ub}):}{x \approx y \mid x \not\approx y}$$

Termination Condition

In every open branch there is some node from which point onwards, all possible applications of the (ub) rule have been performed before any application of any term-generating rule.

• Early blocking:





- Relies on tableau backtracking
- Provides termination for logics with FMP

(ub): $\overline{x \approx y \mid x \not\approx y}$

Termination Condition

In every open branch there is some node from which point onwards, all possible applications of the (ub) rule have been performed before any application of any term-generating rule.

• Early blocking:





- Relies on tableau backtracking
- Provides termination for logics with FMP

(ub): $\overline{x \approx y \mid x \not\approx y}$

Termination Condition

In every open branch there is some node from which point onwards, all possible applications of the (ub) rule have been performed before any application of any term-generating rule.

• Early blocking:





- Relies on tableau backtracking
- Provides termination for logics with FMP

(ub): $\overline{x \approx y \mid x \not\approx y}$

Termination Condition

In every open branch there is some node from which point onwards, all possible applications of the (ub) rule have been performed before any application of any term-generating rule.

• Early blocking:

Standard loop checking:

(ub):



- Relies on tableau backtracking
- Provides termination for logics with FMP







(ub): $\overline{x \approx y \mid x \not\approx y}$

Termination Condition

In every open branch there is some node from which point onwards, all possible applications of the (ub) rule have been performed before any application of any term-generating rule.

Early blocking:

Standard loop checking:

(ub):



- Relies on tableau backtracking
- Provides termination for logics with FMP







(ub): $\overline{x \approx y \mid x \not\approx y}$

Termination Condition

In every open branch there is some node from which point onwards, all possible applications of the (ub) rule have been performed before any application of any term-generating rule.

• Early blocking:

Standard loop checking:

(ub):



- Relies on tableau backtracking
- Provides termination for logics with FMP





(ub): $\overline{x \approx y \mid x \not\approx y}$

Termination Condition

In every open branch there is some node from which point onwards, all possible applications of the (ub) rule have been performed before any application of any term-generating rule.

• Early blocking:

Standard loop checking:

(ub):







- Relies on tableau backtracking
- Provides termination for logics with FMP

METTEL2

Specifying the Unrestricted Blocking Mechanism

- Ensure that equality reasoning is turned on.
- Append equality expressions to the syntax specification.
- Specify the unrestricted blocking rule:

```
tableau S4{
...
@i P @j Q / [i=j] || ~[i=j];
}
```

• Satisfy the termination condition by using rule priorities:

```
tableau S4{
    ...
    @i<>P / R(i,f(i,P)) @f(i,P)P priority 7; //Diamond rule
    ...
    @i P @j Q / [i=j] || ~([i=j]) priority 6; //Blocking rule
}
```

METTEL²

Example

syntax S4{ sort formula, world; formula false = ' false'; formula negation = ' ~' formula; formula diamond = ' <>' formula; formula diamond = ' <>' formula; formula at = ' @' world formula; formula disjunction = formula ' | ' formula; formula equality = ' [' world ' =' world ']'; //Equality formula relation = ' R' ' (' world ', ' world ') '; //Relation world f = ' f' ' (' world ', ' formula ') '; //Skolem function } tableau S4{ @i ~(~P) / @i P priority 1; //Double-negation removal

(@) ~(~P) / (@) P priority 1; //Double—negation removal (@i(P|Q) / @i P || @i Q priority 3; //Disjunction rule (@i~(P|Q) / @i~P @i~Q priority 1; //'Conjunction" rule (@i~(>P) R(i,j) / @j~P priority 7; //Diamond rule (@i~(<>P) R(i,j) / @j~P priority 2; //'Box" propagation rule (@i P / R(i,i) priority 1; //Reflexivity (R(i,j) R(j,k) / R(i,k) priority 2; //Transitivity (@i P @i~P / priority 0; //Closure rule R(i,j) / [i=j] || ~([i=j]) priority 6; //Ancestor blocking rule ~([i=i])/ priority 0; //Closure rule for inequality



Outline

Introduction

Overview and motivation

- Distribution kit and installation
- Demo
- Specification
 - Syntax specification
 - Tableau specification
 - Options
- Optimisations and controlling derivations
 - Search strategies
 - Rule priorities
 - Rewriting

Blocking

- Unrestricted blocking rule
- Specifying the blocking mechanism
- Further tricks
 - Labelled tableaux
 - Signed tableaux
 - Embedding sorts
 - Eliminating expressions
 - Reducing branching factor
 - Tabular logics
- Testing and benchmarking utilitiesConclusion



Labelled Tableaux

sort labelledFormula, formula, label;

```
labelledFormula at = ' @' label formula;
```

•••

Example

```
syntax S4{
    sort tableauFormula, formula, world;
    formula false = ' false';
    formula negation = ' ~' formula;
    formula diamond = ' <>' formula;
    tableauFormula at = ' @' world formula;
    tableauFormula equality = ' [' world ' =' world ']'; //Equality
    tableauFormula inequality = ' ~' (' world ' =' world ']'; //Equality
    tableauFormula relation = ' R' ' (' world ', ' world ') '; //Relation
    world f = ' f' ' (' world ', ' formula ') '; //Skolem function
```



Signed Tableaux

```
sort signedFormula, formula;
```

```
signedFormula trueValue = ' T' formula;
signedFormula falseValue = ' F' formula;
```

Example

```
syntax Int{
   sort formula, individual;
   formula false = 'false';
   formula false = 'fr' formula;
   formula trueValue = 'I' formula;
   formula at = '@' individual formula;
   formula negation = '~' formula;
   formula cogliunction = formula 'I' formula;
   formula disjunction = formula 'I' formula;
   formula disjunction = formula ' ' formula;
   formula disjunction = formula ' ' formula;
   formula implication = formula ' ' formula;
   formula relation = 'f' (' individual ', ' formula ', ' formula ')';
   formula equality = '[' individual '=' individual ']';
```

Embedding Sorts

```
sort formula, proposition;
```

```
formula proposition = ' #' proposition;
```

...

```
syntax IEL{
    sort formula, individual, prop, agent;
    formula true = 'true':
    formula false = ' false';
    formula singleton = ' { ' individual ' } ':
    formula atom = ' #' prop;
    formula negation = ' \sim ' formula;
    formula diamondQ = ' <q>' agent formula;
    formula diamondK = ' < k > ' agent formula:
    formula diamondX = ' < x > ' agent formula;
    formula at = ' @' individual formula:
    formula query = ' [?' formula ']' agent formula;
    formula resol = ' [ ! ] ' agent formula;
    formula disjunction = formula ' | ' formula;
    formula equality = ' [ ' individual ' = ' individual ' ] ' :
    individual fq = ' fq' ' (' individual ', ' agent ', ' formula ') ';
    individual fk = ' fk' ' (' individual ', ' agent ', ' formula ') ';
    individual fx = ' fx' ' (' individual ', ' agent ', ' formula ') ';
```



TABLEAUX 2013

Example

```
options{
   equality.keywords={equality,equivalence}
}
syntax LTL{
   formula equivalence = formula ' < ->' formula;
   formula eventuality = ' E' ' (' world ', ' formula ') ';
tableau LTL{
   @i (<>P) / @i (E(i,P)) priority 1;
   @i (E(j,P)) / @i P ((E(j,P)) <-> (<>P)) || @f(i) (E(j,P)) priority 7;
   @i E(j,P) / priority 8;//"Bad" loop check
```

$\overline{\neg R(i,j) \ | \ \neg R(j,k) \ | \ R(i,k)}$

$$\frac{@_i \neg \diamondsuit p}{\neg R(i,j) \mid @_j \neg p}$$



:	$rac{R(i,j), \ R(j,k)}{R(i,k)}$

$$\frac{\underline{\bigcirc}_i \quad \forall p}{\neg R(i,j) \mid @_j \neg p}$$



R(i,j),	R(j,k)
R(i	(k,k)

$$\frac{@_i \neg \diamondsuit p}{\neg R(i,j) ~|~ @_j \neg p}$$



TABLEAUX 2013

 $rac{R(i,j), \ R(j,k)}{R(i,k)}$	
$rac{@_i \neg \diamondsuit p, \; R(i,j)}{@_j \neg p}$	



```
specification Lukasiewicz3;
syntax Lukasiewicz{
   sort valuation, formula;
   valuation true = 'T' formula | unknown = 'U' formula | false = 'F' formula:
    formula true = 'true' | false = 'false';
    formula negation = ' \sim ' formula:
   formula conjunction = formula ' & ' formula;
    formula disjunction = formula ' | ' formula;
   formula implication = formula ' \rightarrow ' formula;
tableau Lukasiewicz{
TPFP/priority0$;TPUP/priority0$;
UPFP/priority0$;UPFP/priority0$;
T~P/FP priority 1$; U~P/UP priority 1$; F~P/TP priority 1$;
T (P & Q) / T P T Q priority 2$; F (P & Q) / F P $| F Q priority 1$;
   U (P & Q) / T P U Q $| U P T Q $| U P U Q priority 3$;
T (P | Q) / T P $| T Q priority 2$; F (P | Q) / F P F Q priority 1$;
   U(P|Q) / FPUQ $| UPFQ$| UPUQ priority 3$;
F(P \rightarrow Q) / TPFQ priority 1$; U(P \rightarrow Q) / UPFQ $| TPUQ priority 2$;
   T(P \rightarrow Q) / TQ $| FP $| UPUQ priority 3$;
T false / priority 0$; U false / priority 0$;
U true / priority 0$; F true / priority 0$;
```

Outline

Introduction

- Overview and motivation
- Distribution kit and installation
- Demo
 - Specification
 - Syntax specification
 - Tableau specification
 - Options
- Optimisations and controlling derivations
 - Search strategies
 - Rule priorities
 - Rewriting

Blocking

- Unrestricted blocking rule
- Specifying the blocking mechanism
- Further tricks
 - Labelled tableaux
 - Signed tableaux
 - Embedding sorts
 - Eliminating expressions
 - Reducing branching factor
 - Tabular logics





Copy S4RandomExpressionGenerator.properties from output/S4/etc and edit it.

```
world.f.frequency = 1
world.variable.frequency = 1
world.depth = 1
world.variables = i, j, k
world.variables.number = 3
world.generate = 0
world.top.connectives =
formula.false.frequency = 1
formula.negation.frequency = 1
formula.diamond.frequency = 1
formula.at.frequency = 1
formula.disjunction.frequency = 1
formula.worldEquality.frequency = 1
formula.relation.frequency = 1
formula.variable.frequency = 1
formula.depth = 10
formula.variables = p, q, r
formula.variables.number = 3
formula.generate = 1000
formula.top.connectives = at
```



Generating Random Problems and Benchmarking

Generate problems

```
> java -cp S4.jar:mettel2-util.jar \
S4.language.S4.util.S4RandomExpressionGenerator \
-p S4RandomExpressionGenerator.properties
```

Run a benchmark

```
> java -cp S4.jar:mettel2-util.jar:opencsv.jar \
S4.language.S4.util.S4Benchmark \
-d random_problems
```



Outline

- - Syntax specification

 - Options
- - Search strategies
 - Rule priorities

- Unrestricted blocking rule
- Specifying the blocking
- - I abelled tableaux
 - Signed tableaux
 - Embedding sorts

 - Tabular logics

Conclusion



Summary

- METTEL² is easy-to-use and flexible tool
- METTEL² allows specification of various types of tableau calculi
- Case sudies:
 - Boolean logic
 - S4
 - IPC
 - *ALCO*
 - $\mathcal{ALBO}^{\mathsf{id}}$
 - SHOI
 - LTL and temporal logic with cardinality constraints
 - Tree-valued Łukasiewicz logic
 - K with global counting operators
 - Interrogative epistemic logics
 - etc


Outlook

Local aims:

- Further optimisations of generated provers.
- More options to allow the user to control the generation process.
- Extending specification languages.
- Increase level of abstraction of the tableau core.
- An *ultimate goal* is to enable automatic generation of provers from other definitions of logics. In particular:
 - Implement the tableau synthesis framework for synthesis of tableau calculi from semantics of logics.
 - Investigate a possibility to generate tableau provers from Hilbert axiomatisations.











■ ▶ < □ ▶ < □ ▶ < □ ▶ < □ ▶ < ○
50/50























































































