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Abstract
 Analyses for sharing and freeness are important topics of logic programming with applications which include: the sound removal of the occur-check [31]; optimisation of backtracking [5]; the specialisation of unification [33]; and the identification [13, 35] and efficient exploitation [14, 28, 29] of independent and-parallelism [4].

Following the approach of abstract interpretation [9], sharing and freeness analyses are usually constructed by tracing possible program executions with descriptions of the data values (the abstract data) rather than using actual data values (the concrete data). The construction usually divides into domain and framework related issues. For the domain, suitable abstract analogs for concrete operations like renaming, unification, composition and restriction are specified and proven safe for a particular description of substitutions. For example, unification would be mimicked by an abstract unification algorithm in which substitutions are finitely represented by sharing and freeness abstractions, the abstract substitutions. The framework traces the control-flow of Prolog, the concrete semantics, calculating abstract substitutions at various points of a program thereby characterising the actual substitutions which can possibly arise at those program points. Frameworks [1, 11, 16, 17, 23, 26, 29, 30, 34] are usually parameterised by the domain operations and basically solve a set of fixed-point equations.

1 Introduction
 Analyses for sharing and freeness are important topics of logic programming with applications which include: the sound removal of the occur-check [31]; optimisation of backtracking [5]; the specialisation of unification [33]; and the identification [13, 35] and efficient exploitation [14, 28, 29] of independent and-parallelism [4].

Following the approach of abstract interpretation [9], sharing and freeness analyses are usually constructed by tracing possible program executions with descriptions of the data values (the abstract data) rather than using actual data values (the concrete data). The construction usually divides into domain and framework related issues. For the domain, suitable abstract analogs for concrete operations like renaming, unification, composition and restriction are specified and proven safe for a particular description of substitutions. For example, unification would be mimicked by an abstract unification algorithm in which substitutions are finitely represented by sharing and freeness abstractions, the abstract substitutions. The framework traces the control-flow of Prolog, the concrete semantics, calculating abstract substitutions at various points of a program thereby characterising the actual substitutions which can possibly arise at those program points. Frameworks [1, 11, 16, 17, 23, 26, 29, 30, 34] are usually parameterised by the domain operations and basically solve a set of fixed-point equations.

1.1 Abstract matching in standard frameworks
 Although the concrete semantics of logic programs are formulated in terms of unification, both matching and unification usually require to be abstracted in a framework. Frameworks typically trace the values of substitutions which, for finiteness, are restricted to sets of program variables. To
describe the sharing and freeness at a certain point in a clause, for example, it is only necessary to characterise the sharing and freeness between the variables of the clause. For finiteness, however, frameworks have to introduce explicit clause entry and exit mechanisms, the latter of which is formulated in terms of restriction and matching. The restriction and matching operations \textsc{restrg} and \textsc{extg}, for example, are used in the framework of [23].

\textsc{restrg}(l, \phi^A_{in}, \phi^A_{exit}) \text{ takes as input a literal, } l, \text{ of the form } p(u_{1}, \ldots, u_{m}) \text{ taken from a clause with variables } U = \{u_{1}, \ldots, u_{n}\}; \text{ and an abstract substitution on } U, \phi^A_{in}. \text{ \textsc{restrg} projects } \phi^A_{in} \text{ onto } \{u_{1}, \ldots, u_{m}\} \text{ returning, as output, the projection renamed by } \{u_{1} \mapsto u_{1}, \ldots, u_{m} \mapsto u_{m}\}. \\
\text{The resulting abstract substitution, } \phi^A_{\text{entry}} \text{ say, is thus expressed in terms of } \{x_{1}, \ldots, x_{m}\}. \\
\text{The result of executing } p, \phi^A_{\text{exit}} \text{ say, is also formulated in terms of } \{x_{1}, \ldots, x_{m}\} \text{.}

\textsc{extg}(l, \phi^A_{in}, \phi^A_{exit}) \text{ takes as input, like before, a literal } l = p(u_{1}, \ldots, u_{m}) \text{ from a clause with variables } U = \{u_{1}, \ldots, u_{n}\}; \text{ an abstract substitution on } U, \phi^A_{in}; \text{ and, in addition, an abstract substitution on } \{u_{1}, \ldots, u_{m}\}, \phi^A_{exit}, \text{ the result of executing } p \text{ with input } \phi^A_{\text{entry}} = \textsc{restrg}(l, \phi^A_{in}). \text{ For output, } \textsc{extg} \text{ returns the abstract substitution obtained by instantiating (abstractly) } \phi^A_{in} \text{ to take into account the result } \phi^A_{\text{exit}} \text{ of } p. \text{ }

Operations like \textsc{extg}, sometimes called extension [29], boil down to renaming and matching. Although implementation details are rarely reported in the literature, extension is usually implemented by an abstract unification algorithm [29]. This is a convenient fix, saving on the design and implementation of an abstract matching algorithm. The saving, however, comes at the cost of both inefficiency and imprecision. Implementation note 48 in appendix B of [23] explains “\textsc{extg} loses some information because it uses unification instead of matching. To achieve more precision (and we have seen that it makes a difference in precision on a real application), it is necessary to define the matching version of [the abstract unification algorithms] \textsc{unif1} and \textsc{unif} as it is known that the second substitution is always an instance of the first one.” In addition, since matching is simpler than unification, abstract matching can be faster than abstract unification and therefore should be used wherever possible.

1.2 Abstract matching in normalised frameworks

Both the concrete and abstract semantics of a logic program are simplified if the program is normalised. Normalisation, suggested first in [3], involves transforming the input program into a more restricted syntactic form which preserves the semantics yet simplifies the design and implementation of an analyser. There are various degrees of normalisation, but for brevity, just two will be distinguished. In the first form of normalisation, unification between sub-goals and clause heads is made explicit by making the (formal) arguments of each clause head distinct variables. This enables an (entry and exit) substitution for a clause, both in the concrete and the abstract, to be expressed in terms of its head variables. This is an important simplification, in turn, factoring out some of the predicate entry and exit calculations and streamlining the lub [23]. Interestingly, the normalisation transforms goal-head unification into a combination of goal-head matching and explicit unifications in the body of a clause. Thus, although abstract unification is still required for the unification builts, abstract matching is more appropriate for clause entry.

In the second, more aggressive form of normalisation, body atoms, other than the equality builts, are additionally transformed so that the (actual) arguments are distinct variables. This has the chief advantage of simplifying the matching of the sub-goal with clause head to just renaming. Other types of normalisations derive from the form of equation that can be processed by the abstract unification algorithm. For example, the \textsc{pat} algorithm of [23] requires syntactic equations of the form \(x_{i} = x_{j}\) or \(x_{i} = f(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n})\) where \(f\) is an \(n\)-ary functor; whereas algorithms which apply preunification [6, 18, 19, 20] can manipulate more general equations like \(t_{i} = t_{j}\) where \(t_{i}\) and \(t_{j}\) are arbitrary terms.

Although the rôle and affect of normalisation has only been partially explored [15, 23], it is clear that normalisation can induce a loss of precision [23] and perhaps more significantly, can...
increase the number of variables in a clause. Since the size of an abstract substitution is at least polynomial [6, 23] and is often exponential [2, 8, 14, 19, 18, 20, 28, 32] in the number of variables in a clause, normalisation can adversely affect both the time and the memory performance of an analyser [15, 27]. Fast renaming is thus not free. It is not yet clear, however, which has most affect on performance: renaming or the representation of substitutions. The potential speedup from using abstract matching techniques to implement goal-head unification (in the case of first degree normalisation) makes the performance of an analyser even harder to predict. To summarise, abstract matching algorithms need to be synthesised to quantitatively compare the speed and accuracy of the various normalisation strategies. Only then can the implementer make informed design decisions.

1.3 Abstract matching in sharing and freeness analysis

Sharing (or aliasing) analysis conventionally infers which program variables are definitely grounded and which variables can possibly be bound to terms containing a common variable. Freeness analysis usually infers which program variables are free, that is, which variables can never be bound to non-variable terms. Early proposals for sharing and freeness analyses include [36, 12, 25] and [28].

This paper contributes a series of useful, practical and formally-justified abstract matching algorithms for a number of popular sharing and freeness domains that can be used as part of extension operator or applied to abstract goal-head matching. As far as is known, the role of abstract matching has not been studied before very carefully, and certainly no abstract matching algorithms have been reported for the popular sharing and freeness domains.

The exposition is structured as follows. Section 2 describes the notation and preliminary definitions which will be used throughout. To fit with the trend of constructing a composite domain from proven and well-tried domain units [2, 7, 18, 22], abstract matching algorithms will be presented for the domains Share [14], Share × Free [28] and a variant of the [2] domain, Share × Free × Lin [32]. In section 3, the focus is on the domains. Share captures possible sharing and definite groundness, whereas the Free and Lin components denote sets of free variables and variables bound to linear terms. Linearity relates to the number of times a variable occurs in a term [6, 19, 31]. A term is linear if it definitely does not contain multiple occurrences of a variable; otherwise it is non-linear. The significance of linearity is that the unification of linear terms only yields restricted forms of aliasing. Specifically, by tracking linearity, a sharing analysis does not always have to assume that aliasing is transitive [6]. The structure of Share is particularly rich, implicitly encoding covering information [8]. Covering, in short, permits groundness to interact nicely with sharing to remove redundant aliasing. For finiteness, Share, Free and Lin are parametrised by a finite set of program variables, Pvar, which typically equate to the variables of a clause. To be precise, Share_Pvar = φ(φ(Pvar)) and Free_Pvar = Lin_Pvar = φ(Pvar).

In section 4, the emphasis changes to abstracting matching for these domains. An abstract matching algorithm is described for Share_Pvar × Free_Pvar × Lin_Pvar. Abstract matching algorithms Share_Pvar × Free_Pvar and Share_Pvar follow straightforwardly from the Share_Pvar × Free_Pvar × Lin_Pvar algorithm. The matching algorithms can outperform their corresponding unification algorithms [2, 14, 28, 32] in both precision and speed. Abstract matching is potentially faster than the abstract unification because certain forms of aliasing that arise in unification cannot occur in matching. Aliasing is tracked by calculating a union closure × operation [14, 28]. Closure has an exponential time and space complexity in the size of the abstract substitution and therefore closure calculations should be avoided, wherever possible. Since abstract matching computes fewer closures than abstract unification it is potentially faster. Moreover, since excess closures also reduce precision, the matching algorithms can also improve accurate. In addition, matching need make less conservative assumptions about the freeness and linearity of variables which, in turn, can further improve the quality of the aliasing information.

Although correctness is proved, for reasons of brevity and continuity, the proofs are relegated to an appendix, section 9. In addition, to shorten the presentation and avoid repetition, the abstract matching algorithms for Share_Pvar × Free_Pvar and Share_Pvar are respectively presented
The set of most general unifiers of the first-order language underlying the program, and the set of substitutions on $\text{Uvar}$ are considered to include the set of constants $\text{Const}$. It is sometimes convenient to abbreviate $f(t_1,\ldots,t_n)$ to $f(t)$. Let $\text{Pvar}$ denote a finite set of program variables — the variables that are in the text of the program; and let $\text{var}(\phi)$ denote the set of variables in a syntactic object $\phi$.

### 2.1 Substitutions

A substitution $\phi$ is a total mapping $\phi : \text{Uvar} \rightarrow \text{Term}$ such that its domain $\text{dom}(\phi) = \{ u \in \text{Uvar} | \phi(u) \neq u \}$ is finite. The application of a substitution $\phi$ to a variable $u$ is denoted by $\phi(u)$. Thus the codomain is given by $\text{cod}(\phi) = \cup_{u \in \text{dom}(\phi)} \text{var}(\phi(u))$. A substitution $\phi$ is sometimes represented as a finite set of variable and term pairs $\{ u \mapsto \phi(u) | u \in \text{dom}(\phi) \}$. The identity mapping on $\text{Uvar}$ is called the empty substitution and is denoted by $\epsilon$. Substitutions, sets of substitutions, and the set of substitutions on $\text{Uvar}$ are denoted by lower-case Greek letters, upper-case Greek letters, and $\text{Sub}$.

Substitutions are extended in the usual way from variables to functions, from functions to terms, and from terms to atoms. The restriction of a substitution $\phi$ to a set of variables $U \subseteq \text{Uvar}$ and the composition of two substitutions $\phi$ and $\psi$, are denoted by $\phi \upharpoonright U$ and $\phi \circ \psi$ respectively, and defined so that $(\phi \circ \psi)(u) = \phi(\psi(u))$. Restriction lifts to sets of substitutions by: $\Phi \upharpoonright U = \{ \phi \upharpoonright U | \phi \in \Phi \}$. The preorder $\text{Sub}(\subseteq)$, $\phi$ is more general than $\psi$, is defined by: $\phi \supseteq \psi$ if and only if there exists a substitution $\psi \in \text{Sub}$ such that $\phi = \psi \circ \phi$. The preorder induces an equivalence relation $\sim$ on $\text{Sub}$, that is: $\phi \sim \psi$ if and only if $\phi \supseteq \psi$ and $\psi \supseteq \phi$.

### 2.2 Equations and most general unifiers

An equation is an equality constraint of the form $a = b$ where $a$ and $b$ are terms or atoms. Let $\{ e \in \text{Eqn} \}$ denote the set of finite sets of equations. The equation set $\{ e \} \cup E$, following [6], is abbreviated by $e : E$. There is a natural mapping from substitutions to equations, that is, $\text{eqn}(\phi) = \{ u = t | u \mapsto t \in \phi \}$. Thus, when unambiguous, substitutions will be expressed as equations. The set of most general unifiers of $E$, $\text{mgu}(E)$, is defined operationally [14] in terms of a predicate $\text{mgu}$. The predicate $\text{mgu}(E, \phi)$ which is true if $\phi$ is a most general unifier of $E$.

**Definition 2.1 (mgu)** The set of most general unifiers $\text{mgu}(E) \in \phi(\text{Sub})$ is defined by: $\text{mgu}(E) = \{ \phi \mid \text{mgu}(E, \phi) \}$ where

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{mgu}(\emptyset, \epsilon) & = \text{mgu}(e : E, \zeta) & & \text{if } \text{mgu}(E, \zeta) \\
\text{mgu}(t = v : E, \zeta) & & & \text{if } \text{mgu}(v = t : E, \zeta) \\
\text{mgu}(v = t : E, \zeta \circ \eta) & & & \text{if } \text{mgu}(\eta(E), \zeta) \land \forall \varphi \exists v \varphi(v(t) \land \eta = \{ v \mapsto t \}) \\
\text{mgu}(f(t)) & = f(\{ t_i = t'_i \}) : E, \zeta & & \text{if } \text{mgu}(\{ t_i = t'_i \}) \subseteq E, \zeta
\end{align*}
\]

By induction it follows that $\text{dom}(\phi) \cap \text{cod}(\phi) = \emptyset$ if $\phi \in \text{mgu}(E)$, or put another way, that the most general unifiers are idempotent [21].

Following [14], the semantics of a logic program is formulated in terms of a single $\text{unify}$ operator. To construct $\text{unify}$, and specifically to rename apart program variables, an invertible substitution [21], $T$, is introduced. It is convenient to let $\text{Rvar}$ denote a universe of renaming variables distinct from $\text{Uvar}$, $\text{Uvar} \cap \text{Rvar} = \emptyset$, and suppose that $T : \text{Uvar} \rightarrow \text{Rvar}$.
Definition 2.2 (unify) The partial mappings unify : Atom × Sub → Atom × Sub is defined by:

\[ \text{unify}(a, φ, b, ψ) = (φ ⊙ φ) \upharpoonright \text{Pvar} \text{ where } φ \in \text{mgu}\{φ(a) = Y(ψ(b))\} \]

2.3 Linearity

To be more precise about linearity, it is necessary to introduce the variable multiplicity of a term \( t \), denoted \( χ(t) \).

Definition 2.3 (variable multiplicity, \( χ [6] \)) The variable multiplicity operator \( χ : \text{Term} \rightarrow \{0, 1, 2\} \) is defined by:

\[
χ(t) = \max\{χ_u(t) \mid u ∈ \text{Uvar}\} \text{ where } χ_u(t) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } u \text{ does not occur in } t \\ 1 & \text{if } u \text{ occurs only once in } t \\ 2 & \text{if } u \text{ occurs many times in } t \end{cases}
\]

If \( χ(t) = 0 \), \( t \) is ground; if \( χ(t) = 1 \), \( t \) is linear; and if \( χ(t) = 2 \), \( t \) is non-linear. Note that if \( φ(u) ∈ \text{Uvar} \) then \( χ(φ(u)) = 1 \) so that free variables, like \( u \), are linear. The unification of linear terms only yields restricted forms of aliasing. Lemma 2.1 states one restriction on a most general unifier which follows from unification with a linear term.

Lemma 2.1 \( χ(b) ≠ 2 \land \text{var}(a) \cap \text{var}(b) = \emptyset \land φ ∈ \text{mgu}\{a = b\} \) implies:

1. \( ∀u, u' ∈ \text{Uvar}. \ u ≠ u' \land \text{var}(φ(u)) \cap \text{var}(φ(u')) ≠ \emptyset \Rightarrow u \notin \text{var}(a) \land u' \notin \text{var}(a) \).

Lemma 2.1 represents one case of a three part result which is formally established in [19]. The lemma differs from the corresponding lemma in [6] (lemma 2.2) because lemma 2.1 requires that \( a \) and \( b \) do not share variables. This is essentially a work-around for a subtle mistake in lemma 2.2 [10].

3 Abstracting substitutions

Abstract interpretation clarifies how data is represented in the abstract by requiring the relationship between the data and the abstract data to be made explicit. To keep the paper self-contained the \( \text{Share}_{Pvar} × \text{Free}_{Pvar} × \text{Lin}_{Pvar} \) domain and its abstraction and concretisation mappings will be briefly reviewed. The mappings for \( \text{Share}_{Pvar} × \text{Free}_{Pvar} \) are presented in appendix 7.

3.1 On the domain \( \text{Share}_{Pvar} × \text{Free}_{Pvar} × \text{Lin}_{Pvar} \)

\( \text{Share}_{Pvar} \) is formulated in terms of sharing groups [14, 29] which record which program variables potentially share variables. A sharing group is a (possibly empty) set of program variables, \( \text{Free}_{Pvar} \) and \( \text{Lin}_{Pvar} \), on the other hand, represents the free and linear program variables as sets.

Definition 3.1 (\( \text{Share}_{Pvar} \), \( \text{Free}_{Pvar} \) and \( \text{Lin}_{Pvar} \)) The domains \( \text{Share}_{Pvar} \), \( \text{Free}_{Pvar} \) and \( \text{Lin}_{Pvar} \) are defined by:

\[
\text{Share}_{Pvar} = φ(\text{Pvar}), \quad \text{Free}_{Pvar} = φ(\text{Pvar}), \quad \text{Lin}_{Pvar} = φ(\text{Pvar})
\]

The intuition is that a sharing group records which program variables are bound to terms that share a variable. \( \text{Share}_{Pvar} × \text{Free}_{Pvar} × \text{Lin}_{Pvar} \) is finite since \( \text{Pvar} \) is finite.
3.2 On the abstraction and concretisation mappings $\alpha^{SF}_P$ and $\gamma^{SF}_P$

In the spirit of [29], the abstraction and concretisation mappings are constructed by lifting three mappings, $sh_P$, $fr_P$ and $ln_P$, to sets of substitutions. The mappings $sh_P$, $fr_P$ and $ln_P$ detail how a single substitution is abstracted.

Definition 3.2 (sh, fr and ln) The abstraction mappings $sh_P : Sub \rightarrow Share_P$, $fr_P : Sub \rightarrow Free_P$ and $ln_P : Sub \rightarrow Lin_P$ are defined by:

\[
sh_P(\phi) = \{ occ_P(u, \phi) \mid u \in U \}, \quad occ_P(u, \phi) = \{ v \in P \mid \phi(v) \in \text{var}(\phi) \}
\]

\[
fr_P(\phi) = \{ v \in P \mid \text{var}(\phi(v)) \in \text{Uvar} \}
\]

\[
ln_P(\phi) = \{ v \in P \mid \chi(\phi(v)) \leq 1 \}
\]

The abstraction $sh_P$ is analogous to the abstraction $\alpha$ used in [29]. Observe that for $\phi \equiv \psi$, $sh_P(\phi) = sh_P(\psi)$, $fr_P(\phi) = fr_P(\psi)$ and $ln_P(\phi) = ln_P(\psi)$. The mapping $\alpha_P$ and $\gamma_P$ follow directly from $sh_P$, $fr_P$ and $ln_P$.

Definition 3.3 ($\alpha^{SF}_P$ and $\gamma^{SF}_P$) The abstraction and concretisation mappings $\alpha^{SF}_P : \psi(Sub) \rightarrow Share_P \times Free_P$ and $\gamma^{SF}_P : Share_P \times Free_P \times Lin_P \rightarrow \psi(Sub)$ are defined by:

\[
\alpha^{SF}_P(\phi) = \langle \alpha^S_P(\phi), \alpha^T_P(\phi), \alpha^C_P(\phi) \rangle, \quad \gamma^{SF}_P(\phi^S) = \gamma^T_P(\phi^T) = \gamma^C_P(\phi^C)
\]

where

\[
\alpha^S_P(\phi) = \bigcup_{\phi \in \phi} sh_P(\phi), \quad \gamma^S_P(\phi^S) = \{ \phi \mid sh_P(\phi) \subseteq \phi^S \}
\]

\[
\alpha^T_P(\phi) = \bigcap_{\phi \in \phi} fr_P(\phi), \quad \gamma^T_P(\phi^T) = \{ \phi \mid \phi^T \subseteq fr_P(\phi) \}
\]

\[
\alpha^C_P(\phi) = \bigcap_{\phi \in \phi} ln_P(\phi), \quad \gamma^C_P(\phi^C) = \{ \phi \mid \phi^C \subseteq ln_P(\phi) \}
\]

Note that $\alpha^S(\emptyset) = \emptyset$ whereas $\alpha^S(\emptyset) = \emptyset$ if $\phi$ is a set of substitutions which all ground $P$.

This distinction is preserved in $Share_P \times Free_P \times Lin_P$.

4 Abstracting matching

Abstract interpretation can help to focus the development of an analysis by illuminating the connection between an operation (like matching) and its abstract counterpart.

4.1 On the abstract matching relation mgu$^{SF}$

Matching is abstracted by tracing the steps of a standard unification algorithm [21]. To trace unification, the abstract algorithm mimics the recursive simplification steps of $mgu$ in a relation $mgu^{SF}$, relegating the solution of simplified equations of the form $u = t$ or $t = u$ to a mapping $mgu^{SF}$. Unification, or more precisely pre-unification [6], cannot be used to implement the simplification steps. Instead a simplification algorithm like that of [28] is used.

The relation $mgu^{SF}$ is defined to abstract a slight variant of $mgu$. Specifically, if $\varphi \in mgu\{\phi(t) = \phi(t')\}$, $\varphi(\phi(t)) = \phi(t')$ and $\phi \in \gamma_P^{SF}(\phi^{SF})$ then $mgu^{SF}(t, t', \phi^{SF})$ abstracts the composition $\varphi \circ \phi$ (rather than $\varphi$), that is, $\varphi \circ \phi \in \gamma_P^{SF}(mgu^{SF}(t, t', \phi^{SF}))$. This spares the need to define an extra (composition) operator.

Definition 4.1 (mgu$^{SF}$) The relation $mgu^{SF}$ : $Eqn \times (Share_P \times Free_P \times Lin_P) \times (Share_P \times Free_P \times Lin_P)$ is defined by:

\[
mgu^{SF}(\emptyset, \emptyset^{SF}, \emptyset^{SF})
\]

\[
mgu^{SF}(u = u : E, \emptyset^{SF}, \emptyset^{SF}) \text{ if } mgu^{SF}(E, \emptyset^{SF}, \emptyset^{SF})
\]

\[
mgu^{SF}(t = u : E, \emptyset^{SF}, \emptyset^{SF}) \text{ if } mgu^{SF}(E, \emptyset^{SF}, \emptyset^{SF}) \land u \notin var(t)
\]

\[
mgu^{SF}(u = t : E, \emptyset^{SF}, \emptyset^{SF}) \text{ if } mgu^{SF}(E, \emptyset^{SF}, \emptyset^{SF}) \land u \notin var(t)
\]

\[
mgu^{SF}(f(t)) = f(t') : E, \emptyset^{SF}, \emptyset^{SF}) \text{ if } mgu^{SF}((t) = t') \text{, if } mgu^{SF}(u, t, v, E, \emptyset^{SF}, \emptyset^{SF}) \land u \notin var(t)
\]

\[
mgu^{SF}(f(t)) = f(t') : E, \emptyset^{SF}, \emptyset^{SF}) \text{ if } mgu^{SF}((t) = t') \}
\]
4.2 On the auxiliary operations

To define the mapping $mgu^{SF\mathcal{L}}$ (and thus the relation $mgu^{SF\mathcal{L}}$) a number of standard auxiliary operators are required [14, 29]. First, $rel(t, \phi^S)$ represents the sharing groups of $\phi^S$ which are relevant to the term $t$, that is, those sharing groups of $\phi^{SF\mathcal{L}}$ which share variables with $t$. Second, in the absence of useful freeness and linearity information worst-case aliasing is assumed. Thus, as in [14, 29], a closure under union operator, $\sqcup$, is employed to enumerate all the possible sharing groups that can possibly arise in unification. Third, to succinctly define $mgu^{SF\mathcal{L}}$, it is convenient to lift $\sqcup$ to sets of sharing groups with a pair-wise union operator, denoted $\boxplus$.

**Definition 4.2** ($rel$, $\sqcup$ [14, 29] and $\boxplus$)

$$rel(t, \phi^S) = \{U \in \phi^S \mid U \cap \text{var}(t) \neq \emptyset\}$$

$$\phi^{S^+} = \phi^S \cup \{U \cup U' \mid U, U' \in \phi^{S^+}\}$$

The mappings $share^{SF\mathcal{L}}$, $free^{SF\mathcal{L}}$ and $lin^{SF\mathcal{L}}$ apply different analysis strategies according to the freeness and linearity of $\phi(t)$ and $\phi(t')$ for $\phi \in \gamma^{SF\mathcal{L}}(\phi^{SF\mathcal{L}})$.

The $Lin_{var}$ component of the domain encodes the variable multiplicity of a substitution. More significantly, if $\phi \in \gamma_{Lin_{var}}^{SF\mathcal{L}}(\phi^{SF\mathcal{L}})$ then the variable multiplicity of $\phi(t)$ can be (partially) deduced from $t$ and $\phi^{SF\mathcal{L}}$. The precise relationship between $\phi(t)$, $t$ and $\phi^{SF\mathcal{L}}$ is formalised in definition 4.3 and lemma 4.1. Proof of lemma 4.1 is given in proof 9.1.

**Definition 4.3** ($\chi^{SF\mathcal{L}}$) The abstract variable multiplicity operator $\chi^{SF\mathcal{L}} : \text{Term} \times (\text{Share}_{P_{var}} \times \text{Free}_{P_{var}} \times Lin_{\var}) \rightarrow \{0, 1, 2\}$ is defined by:

$$\chi^{SF\mathcal{L}}(t, \phi^{SF\mathcal{L}}) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \text{var}(t) \cap \var(\phi^S) = \emptyset \\ 1 & \text{else if } \forall u \in \var(\phi^S), \chi_u(t) = 1 \land \var(t) \subseteq \phi^L \land \forall u, v \in \var(t), rel(u, \phi^S) \cap rel(v, \phi^S) = \emptyset \\ 2 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

**Lemma 4.1**

$$\text{var}(t) \subseteq P_{var} \land \phi \in \gamma_{Lin_{var}}^{SF\mathcal{L}}(\phi^{SF\mathcal{L}}) \Rightarrow \chi(\phi(t)) \leq \chi^{SF\mathcal{L}}(t, \phi^{SF\mathcal{L}})$$

4.3 On the abstract matching mapping $mgu^{SF\mathcal{L}}$

The mapping $mgu^{SF\mathcal{L}}(t, t', \phi^{SF\mathcal{L}})$ abstracts the matching of two terms, $\phi(t)$ and $\phi(t')$, where $\phi \in \phi^{SF\mathcal{L}}$. The mapping assumes that $\phi(t)$ is more general than $\phi(t')$. The different cases of $mgu^{SF\mathcal{L}}$ apply different analysis strategies according to whether $\phi(t)$ is free or $\phi(t')$ is free or linear. Simplification ensures that the equation $t = t'$ assumes the form of either $u = t'$ or $t = u$.

**Definition 4.4** ($mgu^{SF\mathcal{L}}$)

$$mgu^{SF\mathcal{L}}(t, t', \phi^{SF\mathcal{L}}) = \mu^{SF\mathcal{L}}$$

where

$$\mu^S = \phi^S \setminus (rel(t, \phi^S) \cup rel(t', \phi^S)) \cup \begin{cases} rel(t, \phi^S) \setminus \mu^S & \text{if } t' \in \phi^L \lor \chi^{SF\mathcal{L}}(t', \phi^{SF\mathcal{L}}) \leq 1 \\\nrel(t, \phi^S) \setminus \mu^S & \text{if } \phi(t') \setminus \text{var}(rel(t, \phi^S)) \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

$$\mu^L = \begin{cases} \phi^L \setminus \text{var}(rel(t, \phi^S)) & \text{if } \chi^{SF\mathcal{L}}(t', \phi^{SF\mathcal{L}}) \leq 1 \\
\phi^L \setminus \text{var}(rel(t, \phi^S)) \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

$$\mu^C = \begin{cases} \phi^C \setminus \text{var}(rel(t, \phi^S)) & \text{if } \chi^{SF\mathcal{L}}(t', \phi^{SF\mathcal{L}}) \leq 1 \\
\phi^C \setminus \text{var}(rel(t, \phi^S)) \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$
Note that rel(t, φS) □ rel(t', φS) = ∅ and rel(t, φS) □ rel(t', φS) = ∅ if rel(t, φS) = ∅. Thus, in the first case of μF', rel(t, φS) need not be calculated if rel(u, φS) = ∅ and similarly in case two, rel(t, φS) need not be computed or closed under union if rel(u, φS) = ∅. Analogous refinements follow if rel(t, φS) = ∅.

Observe that mguSF,CL improves on a refinement suggested in [28]. In abstract unification, the calculation of a closure can be avoided if either t or t' are free. If neither t nor t' are free, two closure calculations are required. Abstract matching, however, requires at most one closure computation. This follows from the restricted forms of aliasing that can arise from matching. Moreover, if t or t' are free, or φ(t') is linear, no closures need be calculated.

The correctness of the mapping mguSF,CL is stated as lemma 4.2. The corresponding proof is numbered 9.2.

Lemma 4.2

\[ \phi \in \gamma_{\mathbf{Pvar}}(\phi^{SF,CL}) \land \]
\[ \text{var}(\phi(t)) \cap \text{var}(\phi(t')) = \emptyset \land \]
\[ \text{var}(t) \cup \text{var}(t') \subseteq \mathbf{Pvar} \land \]
\[ \varphi \in \text{mgu}\{\phi(t) = \varphi(t')\} \land \]
\[ \varphi(\phi(t)) = \varphi(t') \land \]
\[ \text{mgu}^{SF,CL}(t, t', \phi^{SF,CL}) = \mu^{SF,CL} \Rightarrow \varphi \circ \phi \in \gamma_{\mathbf{Pvar}}(\mu^{SF,CL}) \]

The correctness of the relation mguSF,CL follows from lemma 4.2 and is stated as theorem 4.1. The corresponding proof is numbered 9.3.

Theorem 4.1

\[ \phi \in \gamma_{\mathbf{Pvar}}(\phi^{SF,CL}) \land \]
\[ E = \{t_i = t'_i\}_{i=1}^\text{\#}\land \]
\[ \text{var}(\phi(t_i)) \cap \text{var}(\phi(t'_i)) = \emptyset \land \]
\[ \text{var}(E) \subseteq \mathbf{Pvar} \land \]
\[ \varphi \in \text{mgu}(\phi(E)) \land \]
\[ \varphi(\phi(t_i)) = \phi(t'_i) \land \]
\[ \text{mgu}^{SF,CL}(E, \phi^{SF,CL}, \mu^{SF,CL}) \Rightarrow \varphi \circ \phi \in \gamma_{\mathbf{Pvar}}(\mu^{SF,CL}) \]

It is convenient shorthand to regard mguSF,CL as a mapping, that is, mguSF,CL(E, φSF,CL) = ψSF,CL if mguSF,CL(E, φSF,CL, ψSF,CL). Strictly, it is necessary to show that mguSF,CL(E, φSF,CL, ψSF,CL) is deterministic for mguSF,CL(E, φSF,CL) to be well-defined. Like in [6], the conjecture is that mguSF,CL yields a unique abstract substitution ψSF,CL for φSF,CL regardless of the order in which E is solved (though, in practice, any ψSF,CL is safe).

4.4 On the mappings entrySF,CL and exitSF,CL

To finally define the matching versions of clause entry and exit, abstract restriction has to be introduced. An abstract substitution, φSF,CL say, is implicitly defined in terms of a set of program variables Pvar. If φSF,CL = φSF,CL |SF,CL Pvar then φSF,CL', the restricted abstract substitution, is defined in terms of the variables Pvar ∩ Pvar'. Abstract restriction thus restricts the variable set of an abstract substitution and does not abstract concrete restriction. The precise relationship between φSF,CL and φSF,CL' is stated as lemma 4.3 and established in proof 9.4.

Definition 4.5 (abstract restriction) The abstract restriction operator, ∥SF,CL, is defined by:

\[ \phi^{SF,CL} \parallel_{SF,CL} U = \{\phi^S \parallel U, \phi^F \parallel U, \phi^C \parallel U\} \]

where \( \phi^S \parallel U = U \cap U'\) \( \cup U' \in \phi^S \)

\[ \phi^F \parallel U = U \cap \phi^F \]

\[ \phi^C \parallel U = U \cap \phi^C \]
Lemma 4.3

\[ \gamma_{P\varnothing}^{SF\xi}(\phi^{SF\xi}) \subseteq \gamma_{P\varnothing\varnothing}^{SF\xi}(\phi^{SF\xi} |^{SF\xi} P\varnothing P\varnothing) \]

The definitions of \textit{entry}^{SF\xi} and \textit{exit}^{SF\xi} are given below with their safety stated as theorems 4.2 and 4.3. Clause entry abstracts the unification of a (renamed) goal atom \( T(\phi_{in}(a_{call})) \) and a head atom \( a_{head} \) where \( \phi_{in} \in \gamma_{P\varnothing\varnothing}^{SF\xi}(\phi^{SF\xi}) \). The resulting abstract substitution is restricted to the variables of the clause to obtain the clause entry substitution \( \phi^{SF\xi}_{\text{enter}} \). To clarify, \( \phi_{in} \) and \( \phi_{\text{out}} \) represent the input and output pairs for goal, or equivalently a program literal/;; whereas \( \phi_{\text{enter}} \) and \( \phi_{\text{exit}} \) represent the exit and entry substitutions for a clause which invoked by the literal. Matching arises if the arguments of \( a_{head} \) are distinct variables.

Clause exit abstracts the unification of a goal atom \( \phi_{in}(a_{call}) \) and a (renamed) head atom \( \Upsilon(\phi_{\text{exit}}(a_{head})) \) where \( \phi_{in} \in \gamma_{P\varnothing\varnothing}^{SF\xi}(\phi^{SF\xi}) \) and \( \phi_{\text{exit}} \in \gamma_{P\varnothing\varnothing}^{SF\xi}(\phi^{SF\xi}) \). Matching arises because \( \phi_{in}(a_{call}) \) is more general than \( \Upsilon(\phi_{\text{exit}}(a_{head})) \) since \( \phi_{\text{enter}} \) is more general than \( \phi_{\text{exit}} \).

**Definition 4.6 (entry^{SF\xi} and exit^{SF\xi})** The entry^{SF\xi} and exit^{SF\xi} mappings are defined by:

- entry^{SF\xi}(a_{call}, \phi^{SF\xi}_{in}, a_{head}) = \phi^{SF\xi}_{\text{enter}},
- exit^{SF\xi}(a_{call}, \phi^{SF\xi}_{in}, a_{head}, \phi^{SF\xi}_{\text{exit}}) = \phi^{SF\xi}_{\text{out}}

\[ \phi^{SF\xi}_{\text{enter}} = \text{mgu}^{SF\xi}(\{ T(a_{call}) = a_{head} \}, \Upsilon(\phi^{SF\xi}_{in}) |^{SF\xi} P\varnothing \]

\[ \phi^{SF\xi}_{\text{out}} = \text{mgu}^{SF\xi}(\{ a_{call} = \Upsilon(a_{head}) \}, \phi^{SF\xi}_{in} |^{SF\xi} P\varnothing \]

Theorems 4.2 and 4.3 assume \( \text{var}(a_{call}) \cup \text{var}(a_{head}) \subseteq P\varnothing \) and are established by proofs 9.5 and 9.6.

**Theorem 4.2 (local safety of entry^{SF\xi})**

- \( \phi_{in} \in \gamma_{P\varnothing\varnothing}^{SF\xi}(\phi^{SF\xi}) \)
- \( \varphi \in \text{mgu}(\{ T(\phi_{in}(a_{call})) = a_{head} \}) \)
- \( \Upsilon(\phi_{in}(a_{call})) = \varphi(a_{head}) \Rightarrow \text{unify}(a_{head}, \varphi, \phi_{in}, \phi_{in} |^{SF\xi} (\text{entry}^{SF\xi}(a_{call}, \phi^{SF\xi}_{in}, a_{head})) \)

**Theorem 4.3 (local safety of exit^{SF\xi})**

- \( \phi_{in} \in \gamma_{P\varnothing\varnothing}^{SF\xi}(\phi^{SF\xi}) \land \phi_{\text{exit}} \in \gamma_{P\varnothing\varnothing}^{SF\xi}(\phi^{SF\xi}) \)
- \( \varphi \in \text{mgu}(\{ \phi_{in}(a_{call}) = \Upsilon(\phi_{\text{exit}}(a_{head})) \}) \)
- \( \Upsilon(\phi_{in}(a_{call})) = \Upsilon(\varphi(a_{head})) \Rightarrow \text{unify}(a_{call}, \phi_{in}, a_{head}, \phi_{\text{exit}}) \in \gamma_{P\varnothing\varnothing}^{SF\xi}(\text{exit}^{SF\xi}(a_{call}, \phi^{SF\xi}_{in}, a_{head}, \phi^{SF\xi}_{\text{exit}})) \)

5 Related and future work

Abstract unification algorithms for sharing and freeness have been studied in some detail [2, 6, 7, 8, 12, 14, 18, 19, 22, 25, 28, 32, 36] but, curiously, there is a dearth of work on abstract matching. Abstract matching, in fact, is rarely given special attention and is usually implemented by abstract unification.

Future work will focus on implementation and benchmarking (which is a non-trivial study within itself) to measure the speedup from substituting matching for unification. The role and affect of normalisation will also be explored particularly in regard to goal-head unification. Another direction for future work is in extending the abstract matching algorithms to trace sure structural information [2, 18, 23]. This would avoid any loss of precision that might be introduced through normalisation.
6 Conclusions

Most of the execution time of an analyser is typically spent, not in the framework, but on domain operations like unification and matching [15]. Thus, if the performance of sharing and freeness analysis is to be improved, it is crucial that operations like abstract matching are both precise and efficient. Improving the efficiency of abstract matching speeds up extension, clause exit, for arbitrary programs; and goal-head unification clause entry, for normalised programs with head arguments that are distinct variables.

A series of useful, practical and formally-justified abstract matching algorithms have been synthesised for the popular domains $\text{Share}$, $\text{Share \times Free}$ and $\text{Share \times Free \times Lin}$. The matching algorithms can outperform their corresponding unification algorithms in both precision and speed. The techniques are significant because they can underpin a number of important optimisation and parallelisation techniques.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported, in part, by ESPRIT project (6707) “ParForce” and undertaken while Mark Longley was visiting the University of Kent at Canterbury.

References


7 SharePvar × FreePvar Appendix

As with SharePvar × FreePvar × LinPvar, the mapping \( \alpha^{sf}_{Pvar} \) and \( \gamma^{sf}_{Pvar} \) follow directly from \( sh_{Pvar} \) and \( fr_{Pvar} \).

**Definition 7.1 (\( \alpha^{sf}_{Pvar} \) and \( \gamma^{sf}_{Pvar} \))** The abstraction and concretisation mappings \( \alpha^{sf}_{Pvar} : \var(\text{Sub}) \to \text{SharePvar} \times \text{FreePvar} \) and \( \gamma^{sf}_{Pvar} : \text{SharePvar} \times \text{FreePvar} \to \var(\text{Sub}) \) are defined by:

\[
\alpha^{sf}_{Pvar}(\Phi) = (\alpha^{sf}_{Pvar}(\Phi), \alpha^{sf}(\Phi)) \quad \gamma^{sf}_{Pvar}(\phi^{sf}) = \gamma^{sf}_{Pvar}(\phi^{sf}) \cap \gamma^{sf}_{Pvar}(\phi^{sf})
\]

Linearity can be tracked because, like before, if \( \phi \in \gamma^{sf}_{Pvar}(\phi^{sf}) \) then the variable multiplicity of \( \phi(t) \) can be (partially) deduced from \( t \) and \( \phi^{sf} \). Lemma 4.1 explains how \( \chi^{sf} \) approximates \( \chi \).

**Definition 7.2 (\( \chi^{sf} \))** The abstract variable multiplicity operator \( \chi^{sf} : \text{Term} \times (\text{SharePvar} \times \text{FreePvar} \times \text{LinPvar}) \to \{0, 1, 2\} \) is defined by:

\[
\chi^{sf}(t, \phi^{sf}) = \begin{cases} 
0 & \text{if } \text{var}(t) \cap \text{var}(\phi^{sf}) = \emptyset \\
1 & \text{if } \forall u \in \text{var}(\phi^{sf}), \chi_u(t) \leq 1 \land \\
& \text{var}(t) \cap \phi^{sf} = \phi^{sf} \land \\
& \forall u, v \in \text{var}(t), \text{rel}(u, \phi^{sf}) \cap \text{rel}(v, \phi^{sf}) = \emptyset \\
2 & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}
\]

**Lemma 7.1**

\( \text{var}(t) \subseteq Pvar \land \phi \in \gamma^{sf}_{Pvar}(\phi^{sf}) \Rightarrow \chi(\phi(t)) \leq \chi^{sf}(t, \phi^{sf}) \)

The corresponding proof is numbered 9.7.

**Definition 7.3 (\( mgu^{sf} \))**

\( mgu^{sf}(t, t', \phi^{sf}) = \mu^{sf} \)

\[
\mu^{sf} = \phi^{sf} \setminus (\text{rel}(t, \phi^{sf}) \cup \text{rel}(t', \phi^{sf})) \cup \\
(\text{rel}(t, \phi^{sf}), \phi^{sf}) \text{if } t \in \phi^{sf} \lor \chi^{sf}(t, \phi^{sf}) \leq 1 \\
(\phi^{sf}, \text{rel}(t', \phi^{sf})) \text{otherwise}
\]

\[
\mu^{sf} = \begin{cases} 
\phi^{sf} \cup \{t\} & \text{if } t' \in \phi^{sf} \\
\phi^{sf} \setminus \text{var}(\text{rel}(t, \phi^{sf})) & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}
\]

The mapping \( mgu^{sf} \) divides into two cases, like before, applying different analysis strategies according to whether \( \phi(t) \) is free or \( \phi(t') \) is free or linear. Because of the lack of precise linearity information, however, the second, less precise case is likely to be selected more frequently in \( mgu^{sf} \) than in \( mgu_{sf} \). Lemma 9.8 is established in proof 9.8.

**Lemma 7.2**

\( \phi \in \gamma^{sf}_{Pvar}(\phi^{sf}) \land \text{var}(\phi(t)) \cap \text{var}(\phi(t')) = \emptyset \land \text{var}(t) \cup \text{var}(t') \subseteq Pvar \land \\
\varphi \in mgu(\{\phi(t) = \phi(t')\}) \land \varphi(\phi(t)) = \phi(t') \land mgu^{sf}(t, t', \phi^{sf}) = \mu^{sf} \Rightarrow \varphi \circ \phi \in \gamma^{sf}_{Pvar}(\mu^{sf}) \)

The \( mgu^{sf} \) relation, \( \text{restriction}^{sf} \), \( \text{entry}^{sf} \) and \( \text{exit}^{sf} \) are defined in a similar way to before.
8 \textbf{Share}_{P_{\text{var}}} \textbf{ Appendix}

For \textbf{Share}_{P_{\text{var}}}, without freeness or linearity information, a closure calculation cannot be avoided. However, this compares favourably with the two closure that are required in the standard abstract unification algorithm [14]. The proof for lemma 8.1 is numbered 9.9.

\textbf{Definition 8.1 (\text{mgu}^S)}

\[ \text{mgu}^S(t, t', \phi^S) = \phi^S \setminus (\text{rel} (t, \phi^S) \cup \text{rel} (t', \phi^S)) \cup \text{rel}(t, \phi^S)^* \bigcup \text{rel}(t', \phi^S) \]

\textbf{Lemma 8.1}

\[ \phi \in \gamma^G_{P_{\text{var}}} (\phi^S) \land \text{var} (\phi(t)) \cap \text{var} (\phi(t')) = \emptyset \land \text{var} (t) \cup \text{var} (t') \subseteq P_{\text{var}} \land \]
\[ \varphi \in \text{mgu} (\{ \phi (t) = \phi (t') \}) \land \varphi (\phi (t)) = \phi (t') \land \text{mgu}^S (t, t', \phi^S) = \mu^S \Rightarrow \varphi \circ \phi \in \gamma^G_{P_{\text{var}}} (\mu^S) \]

9 \textbf{ Proof Appendix}

\textbf{Proof 9.1 (for lemma 4.1)} Let \( \text{var}(t) \subseteq P_{\text{var}} \) and \( \phi \in \gamma^S_{P_{\text{var}}} (\phi^{S\ell}) \).

1. Suppose \( \chi (\phi (t)) = 0 \). Immediate.

2. Suppose \( \chi (\phi (t)) = 1 \). Thus there exists \( v \in \text{var} (t) \) such that \( u \in \text{var} (\phi (v)) \). Since \( v \in P_{\text{var}} \), \( v \in \text{var} (\text{occ}_{P_{\text{var}}} (u, \phi)) \) and thus \( v \in \text{var} (\phi^S) \). Hence \( \chi^S_{\text{occ}} (t, \phi^{S\ell}) \neq 0 \).

3. Suppose \( \chi (\phi (t)) = 2 \).

(a) Suppose \( u \in \text{var} (t) \) such that \( \chi_u (t) = 2 \) and \( v \in \text{var} (\phi(u)) \). Thus, since \( u \in P_{\text{var}} \), \( u \in \text{var} (\text{occ}_{P_{\text{var}}} (v, \phi)) \) and thus \( v \in \text{var} (\phi^S) \). Hence \( \chi^S_{\text{occ}} (t, \phi^{S\ell}) = 2 \).

(b) Suppose \( u, v \in \text{var} (t) \) such that \( w \in \text{var} (\phi (u)) \cap \text{var} (\phi (v)) \) and \( u \neq v \). Thus, since \( u, v \in P_{\text{var}} \), \( u \in \text{var} (\text{occ}_{P_{\text{var}}} (w, \phi)) \) and therefore \( \text{rel} (u, \phi^S) \cap \text{rel} (v, \phi^S) \neq \emptyset \). Hence \( \chi^S_{\text{occ}} (t, \phi^{S\ell}) = 2 \).

(c) Suppose \( v \in \text{var} (t) \) such that \( \chi_u (\phi (v)) = 2 \). Thus, since \( v \in P_{\text{var}} \), \( v \not \in \phi^S \). Hence \( \chi^S_{\text{occ}} (t, \phi^{S\ell}) = 2 \).

\textbf{Proof 9.2 (for lemma 4.2)} Let \( \phi \in \gamma^S_{P_{\text{var}}} (\phi^{S\ell}) \), \( \text{var} (\phi (t)) \cap \text{var} (\phi (t')) = \emptyset \), \( \text{var} (t) \cup \text{var} (t') \subseteq P_{\text{var}} \), \( \varphi \in \text{mgu} (\{ \phi (t) = \phi (t') \}) \), \( \varphi (\phi (t)) = \phi (t') \) and \( \text{mgu}^{S\ell} (t, t', \phi^{S\ell}) = \mu^{S\ell} \).

1. Let \( v \in U_{\text{var}} \). To show \( \text{occ}_{P_{\text{var}}} (v, \varphi \circ \phi) \in \mu^S \).

(a) Suppose \( v \not \in \text{cod} (\varphi \circ \phi) \). Thus \( v \not \in \text{var} (\varphi \circ \phi (w)) \) for all \( w \in \text{dom} (\varphi \circ \phi) \).

i. Suppose \( v \not \in \text{dom} (\varphi \circ \phi) \), that is, \( \varphi \circ \phi (v) = \emptyset \). Thus \( \phi (v) = v' \) and \( \varphi (v') = v \). Suppose \( v \not = v' \). Hence \( \varphi (\phi (v)) \cup \varphi (\phi (v')) \). Thus there exists \( \text{var} (t) \cup \varphi (\phi (v)) \) such that \( v \in \text{var} (\phi (w)) \). But since \( \phi (v) = v' \), \( v \not \in \phi^S \) and because \( \text{dom} (\varphi) \cap \text{dom} (\varphi) = \emptyset \), \( \varphi (v) = v \) and therefore \( v \in \text{var} (\varphi \circ \phi (w)) \). Hence \( v \in \text{cod} (\varphi \circ \phi) \) which is a contradiction. Thus \( v = v' \).

A. Suppose \( v \not \in \text{var} (\phi (t)) \) and \( v \not \in \text{var} (\phi (t')) \). Hence \( v \not \in \text{cod} (\varphi) \) and therefore \( \text{occ}_{P_{\text{var}}} (v, \varphi \circ \phi) = \text{occ}_{P_{\text{var}}} (v, \phi) \). But \( \text{var} (t) \cap \text{var} (\text{occ}_{P_{\text{var}}} (v, \phi)) = \emptyset \) and \( \text{var}(t') \cap \text{var} (\text{occ}_{P_{\text{var}}} (v, \phi)) = \emptyset \). Hence \( \text{occ}_{P_{\text{var}}} (v, \varphi \circ \phi) \in \mu^S \).

B. Suppose \( v \in \text{var} (\phi (t)) \) and \( v \not \in \text{var} (\phi (t')) \). Since \( \varphi \in \text{mgu} (\{ \phi (t) = \phi (t') \}) \), \( v \in \text{dom} (\varphi) \) or \( v \in \text{cod} (\varphi) \). Since \( \varphi (v) = v \) and \( v \not \in \text{dom} (\varphi) \) and therefore \( v \in \text{cod} (\varphi) \).

Thus \( v \in \text{var} (\varphi \circ \phi) \) and therefore \( v \in \text{var} (\varphi \circ \phi (t')) \). Since \( v \not \in \text{var} (\phi (t')) \), there exists \( w \in \text{var} (\phi (t')) \) such that \( v \in \text{var} (\varphi (w)) \). Thus \( v \in \text{var} (\varphi \circ \phi (t')) \) and since \( v \not \in \text{cod} (\varphi \circ \phi) \), \( v = t' \) so that \( \phi (t') = v \) which is a contradiction.

C. Suppose \( v \not \in \text{var} (\phi (t)) \) and \( v \in \text{var} (\phi (t')) \). Like case 1(a)iB.
D. Suppose \( v \in \text{var}(\phi(t)) \) and \( v \in \text{var}(\phi(t')) \). Since \( \phi(v) = v \) and \( v \not\in \text{cod}(\phi \circ \phi) \), it follows that \( v \in \text{var}(t) \) and \( v \in \text{var}(t') \) so that \( \text{var}(t) \cap \text{var}(t') \neq \emptyset \), which is a contradiction.

ii. Suppose \( v \in \text{dom}(\phi \circ \phi) \). Since \( v \not\in \text{cod}(\phi \circ \phi) \), \( \text{occ}_{P \varphi}(v, \phi \circ \phi) = \emptyset \in \mu^S \).

(b) Suppose \( v \in \text{cod}(\phi \circ \phi') \). Suppose \( v \in \text{var}(\phi) \). Thus \( v \in \text{var}(\phi \circ \phi(t)) \) which is a contradiction. Suppose \( v \notin \text{dom}(\phi) \). Thus \( v \not\in \text{cod}(\phi) \) and hence \( v \not\in \text{cod}(\phi \circ \phi) \) which is a contradiction. Hence \( \text{occ}_{P \varphi}(v, \phi \circ \phi) = \emptyset \). Suppose \( v \in \text{var}(\phi(t)) \). Since \( v \not\in \text{var}(\phi \circ \phi(t)) \), \( v \in \text{dom}(\phi) \) and therefore \( v \not\in \text{cod}(\phi) \). Hence \( v \notin \text{cod}(\phi \circ \phi) \) which is a contradiction. Thus \( \text{var}(t) \cap \text{var} \left( \text{occ}_{P \varphi}(v, \phi \circ \phi) \right) = \emptyset \) and therefore \( \text{occ}_{P \varphi}(v, \phi \circ \phi) \in \mu^S \).

(c) Suppose \( v \in \text{cod}(\phi \circ \phi) \cap \text{var}(\phi \circ (t')) \). Note that \( \text{occ}_{P \varphi}(v, \phi \circ \phi) = \bigcup_{v \in \text{var}(\phi(v))} \text{occ}_{P \varphi}(w, \phi) \).

i. Suppose \( t \in \phi^F \) with \( \phi(t) = v_t \). Thus \( \phi = \{ v_t \mapsto \phi(t') \} \). Since \( v \in \text{var}(\phi \circ \phi(t)) \), \( v \in \text{var}(\phi(t')) \). Thus \( \{ w \mid v \in \text{var}(\phi(w)) \} = \{ v_t, v \} \). Hence \( \text{occ}_{P \varphi}(v, \phi \circ \phi) \in \text{rel}(t, \phi^S) \triangle \text{rel}(t', \phi^S) \subseteq \mu^S \).

ii. Suppose \( \chi^{SF \ell}(t', \phi^{SF \ell}) \leq 1 \). There exists \( W_t \subseteq \text{var}(\phi(t)) \) and \( W_t \subseteq \text{var}(\phi(t')) \) such that \( \text{occ}_{P \varphi}(v, \phi \circ \phi) \subseteq \text{occ}_{P \varphi}(w, \phi) \). Since \( v \in \text{var}(\phi \circ \phi) \), \( W_t \neq \emptyset \) and thus \( W_t \neq \emptyset \). Let \( w \in W_t \) and \( w \neq W_t \). Since \( \chi^{SF \ell}(t', \phi^{SF \ell}) \leq 1 \), by lemma 4.1, \( \chi(\phi(t)) \leq 1 \) and because \( \text{var}(\phi(t)) \cap \text{var}(\phi(t')) = \emptyset \), by lemma 2.1, \( w \notin \text{var}(\phi(t)) \) or \( w \notin \text{var}(\phi(t')) \) which is a contradiction. Now suppose \( w, w' \in W_t \) and \( w \neq w' \). Since \( \text{dom}(\phi) \cap W_t = \emptyset \), \( \text{var}(\phi(w)) \cap \text{var}(\phi(w')) = \emptyset \) which is a contradiction. Thus \( \text{occ}_{P \varphi}(t, \phi \circ \phi) \in \text{rel}(t, \phi^S) \triangle \text{rel}(t', \phi^S) \subseteq \mu^S \).

iii. Suppose \( t \notin \phi^F \) and \( \chi^{SF \ell}(t', \phi^{SF \ell}) = 2 \). There exists \( W_t \subseteq \text{var}(\phi(t)) \) and \( W_t \subseteq \text{var}(\phi(t')) \) such that \( \text{occ}_{P \varphi}(v, \phi \circ \phi) = \bigcup_{w \in \text{var}(\phi(w))} \text{occ}_{P \varphi}(w, \phi) \). Like in case 1(c), \( W_t = \{ w \} \) so that \( \text{occ}_{P \varphi}(t, \phi \circ \phi) \in \text{rel}(t, \phi^S) \triangle \text{rel}(t', \phi^S) \subseteq \mu^S \).

2. Let \( v \in \mu^F \).

(a) Suppose \( t' \in \phi^F \) where \( \phi(t) = v_t \).

i. If \( v = t \) then \( v \in \text{fr}_{P \varphi}(\phi \circ \phi) \) since \( \phi \circ \phi(t) = v_t \).

ii. If \( v \in \phi^S \) then \( v \in \text{fr}_{P \varphi}(\phi \circ \phi) \) since \( \text{fr}_{P \varphi}(\phi \circ \phi) = \text{fr}_{P \varphi}(\phi) \subseteq \phi^S \).

(b) Suppose \( t' \notin \phi^F \). Since \( v \notin \text{var}(\text{rel}(t, \phi^S)) \), \( \text{var}(\phi(v)) \cap \text{var}(\phi(t)) = \emptyset \) and because \( \text{dom}(\phi) \subseteq \text{var}(\phi(t)) \), \( \phi \circ \phi(v) = \phi(v) \in \text{fr}_{P \varphi}(\phi) \).

3. Let \( v \in \mu^L \).

(a) Suppose \( \chi^{SF \ell}(t', \phi^{SF \ell}) \leq 1 \), by lemma 4.1, \( \chi(\phi(t')) \leq 1 \) and thus \( \chi(\phi \circ \phi(t')) \leq 1 \).

i. If \( v \in \text{var}(t) \) then \( v \in \text{fr}_{P \varphi}(\phi \circ \phi) \) since \( \phi \circ \phi(t) \leq 1 \).

ii. If \( v \in \phi^S \) then \( v \in \text{fr}_{P \varphi}(\phi \circ \phi) \) since \( \text{fr}_{P \varphi}(\phi \circ \phi) = \text{fr}_{P \varphi}(\phi) \subseteq \phi^S \).

(b) Suppose \( \chi^{SF \ell}(t', \phi^{SF \ell}) = 2 \). Since \( v \notin \text{var}(\text{rel}(t, \phi^S)) \), \( \text{var}(\phi(v)) \cap \text{var}(\phi(t)) = \emptyset \) and because \( \text{dom}(\phi) \subseteq \text{var}(\phi(t)) \), \( \phi \circ \phi(v) = \phi(v) \in \text{fr}_{P \varphi}(\phi) \).

Proof 9.3 (for theorem 4.1) Let \( \phi \in \gamma_{P \varphi}(\phi^{SF \ell}) \), \( E = \{ t_i = t_i \} \text{ var}(\phi(t_i)) \cap \text{var}(\phi(t_i)) = \emptyset \), \( \text{var}(E) \subseteq P \varphi \), \( \phi \in \text{mgv}(\phi(E)) \phi(\phi(t_i)) = \phi(t_i') \) and \( \text{mgv}(E, \phi^{SF \ell}) \subseteq \mu^{SF \ell} \). By induction on the steps of \( \text{mgv}(\phi(E)) \) and by lemma 4.2 there exists \( \theta \in \text{mgv}(\phi(E)) \) such that \( \theta \circ \phi \in \gamma_{P \varphi}(\psi^{SF \ell}) \). But \( \theta \leq \phi \) and therefore \( \theta \circ \phi \leq \phi \). Hence \( \phi \circ \phi \in \gamma_{P \varphi}(\psi^{SF \ell}) \).

Proof 9.4 (for lemma 4.3) Let \( \phi \in \gamma_{P \varphi}(\phi^{SF \ell}) \) and \( u \in U \text{ var} \). Now \( \text{occ}_{P \varphi \cap P \varphi'}(u, \phi) \) and \( P \varphi \in \phi^S \) \( \text{rel}(P \varphi') \). Thus \( \phi \in \gamma_{P \varphi \cap P \varphi'}(\phi^S \cap \phi^S \text{ rel}(P \varphi') \). Moreover, \( \phi \in \gamma_{P \varphi \cap P \varphi'}(\phi^S \cap \phi^S \text{ rel}(P \varphi')) \) since \( \phi^S \nu \text{ var} \) \( \subseteq \text{fr}_{P \varphi \cap P \varphi'}(\phi^S \cap \phi^S \text{ rel}(P \varphi')) \). Similarly, \( \phi \in \gamma_{P \varphi \cap P \varphi'}(\phi^S \cap \phi^S \text{ rel}(P \varphi')) \).
Proof 9.5 (for theorem 4.2) Let \( \phi_{in} \in \gamma^{SF}_{Pvar}(\phi^{SF}_{in}) \), \( \varphi \in mgu(\{ Y(\phi_{in}(a_{call})) = a_{head} \}) \), 
\( Y(\phi_{in}(a_{call})) = \varphi(a_{head}) \) and \( \theta = \text{unify}(a_{head}, \epsilon, a_{call}, \phi_{in}) \).

Thus \( \theta = (\varphi \circ \epsilon) \uparrow \text{Pvar} \) where \( \varphi \in mgu(\{ \epsilon(a_{head}) = Y(\phi_{in}(a_{call})) \}) \). Observe that \( \varphi \in mgu(\{ \epsilon(a_{head}) = Y(\phi_{in}(Y^{-1}(Y(a_{call})))) \}) \) and thus putting \( \sigma = \epsilon \cup (Y \circ \phi_{in} \circ Y^{-1}) \), \( \varphi \in mgu(\{ \epsilon(a_{head}) = Y(a_{call}) \}) \). Note that \( \epsilon \in \gamma^{SF}_{Pvar}(\phi^{SF}_{in}) \) and \( \phi_{in} \circ Y^{-1} \in \gamma^{SF}_{Pvar}(Y(\phi^{SF}_{in})) \) and hence \( Y \circ \phi_{in} \circ Y^{-1} \in \gamma^{SF}_{Pvar}(\phi^{SF}_{in}) \). Since \( \text{var}(\epsilon) \cap \text{var}(Y \circ \phi_{in} \circ Y^{-1}) = \emptyset \), \( \sigma \in \gamma^{SF}_{Pvar}(\phi^{SF}_{in}) \).

Thus, by theorem 4.1, since \( \text{var}(\epsilon(a_{head})) \cup \text{var}(Y(a_{call})) = \emptyset \), \( \text{var}(a_{head}) \cup \text{var}(Y(a_{call})) \subseteq \text{Pvar} \cup Y(\text{Pvar}) \), \( \varphi \in \text{mgu}(\{ \epsilon(a_{head}) = Y(a_{call}) \}) \) and \( \varphi(\sigma(a_{head})) = \sigma(Y(a_{call})) \) it follows that \( \varphi \circ \sigma \in \gamma^{SF}_{Pvar}(\phi^{SF}_{in}) \) where \( \mu^{SFL} = \text{mgu}(\{ \epsilon(a_{head}) = Y(a_{call}) \}) \).

Thus, by lemma 4.3, \( \varphi \circ \sigma \in \gamma^{SF}_{Pvar}(\mu^{SFL} \uparrow \text{Pvar}) \) and because \( (\varphi \circ \sigma) \uparrow \text{Pvar} = (\varphi \circ \sigma) | \text{Pvar} = (\varphi \circ \epsilon) | \text{Pvar} = (\varphi \circ \epsilon) | \text{Pvar} \) and \( \epsilon \in \gamma^{SF}_{Pvar}(\phi^{SF}_{in}) \).

Therefore, \( \theta \in \gamma^{SF}_{Pvar}(\phi^{SF}_{in}) \).

Proof 9.6 (for theorem 4.3) Like proof 9.5.

Proof 9.7 (for lemma 7.1) Let \( \text{var}(t) \subseteq \text{Pvar} \) and \( \phi \in \gamma^{SF}_{Pvar}(\phi^{SF}_{in}) \).

1. Suppose \( \chi^{SF}(t, \phi^{SF}) = 0 \). Put \( \phi^{SF} = \emptyset \). Then \( \phi^{SF} \subseteq mgu_{Pvar}(\phi) \) and \( \phi \in \gamma^{SF}_{Pvar}(\phi^{SF}) \). But \( \chi^{SF}(t, \phi^{SF}) = 0 \). Suppose \( \chi^{SF}(t, \phi^{SF}) = 1 \). Let \( v \in \text{var}(t) \).

   (a) Suppose \( v \in \phi^{SF} \). Then \( v \in \phi^{SF} \) and hence \( \chi^{SF}(v) = 1 \) so that \( \text{var}(v) \).

   (b) Suppose \( v \not\in \phi^{SF} \). Then \( \chi^{SF}(v) = 0 \) so that \( \text{var}(v) \).

   Put \( \phi^{SF} = \text{var}(t) \). Thus \( \phi^{SF} \subseteq mgu_{Pvar}(\phi) \) and hence \( \phi \in \gamma^{SF}_{Pvar}(\phi^{SF}) \). But \( \chi^{SF}(t, \phi^{SF}) = 1 \). Suppose \( \chi^{SF}(t, \phi^{SF}) = 2 \). Immediate.

Proof 9.8 (for lemma 7.2) Like cases 1a, 1b, 1c, 2 of lemma 4.2.

Proof 9.9 (for lemma 8.1) Like cases 1a, 1b, 1c, 2 of lemma 4.2.