

relational recursion: fixpoint logics

$\varphi(X, \mathbf{x}) \in \text{FO}_k(\sigma \cup \{X\})$ with k -ary X and matching \mathbf{x}
induces operation on $\mathcal{P}(A^k)$, uniformly across all $\mathfrak{A} \in \text{Fin}(\sigma)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}_\varphi^{\mathfrak{A}}: \mathcal{P}(A^k) &\longrightarrow \mathcal{P}(A^k) \\ P &\longmapsto \{\mathbf{a} \in A^k : \mathfrak{A}, P, \mathbf{a} \models \varphi\} \end{aligned}$$

easy to see: if $\varphi(X, \mathbf{x})$ is X -positive, this operation is monotone
(preservation result/classically only: matching expressive completeness)

natural extensions of FO, esp. for FMT, provide recursion
mechanisms based on such definable operations

- **least fixpoint logic LFP** has least and greatest fixpoints
for positive/monotone operations
- **partial fixpoint logic PFP** has fixpoints
for arbitrary operations (with default \emptyset)

capturing results with order

thm (Immerman–Vardi)

$\text{Ptime} \equiv \text{LFP}$ over linearly ordered structures

i.e., t.f.a.e. for every class $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \text{Fin}(\sigma)$

of linearly ordered σ -structures:

- (i) $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \text{Fin}(\sigma)$ is decidable in NP
- (ii) \mathcal{C} is definable within $\text{Fin}(\sigma)$ by a sentence of $\text{LFP}(\sigma)$

thm (Abiteboul–Vianu)

$\text{Pspace} \equiv \text{PFP}$ over linearly ordered structures

remarks: order is crucial, simple fixpoints over FO suffice
model-checking in Ptime/Pspace is obvious
expressive completeness: coding & fixpoint recursion

proof ideas: coding over linearly ordered structures

Ptime/LFP:

encode run $(C_t)_{t < n^k}$ of DTM on input $\mathfrak{A} = (n, <, \dots)$
as a relation $R \subseteq A^{3k+2}$, which is definable as the least fixpoint
of monotone/ X -positive inductive process that allows to add
new X -entries (for C_{t+1}) based on existing X -entries (for C_t)

Pspace/PFP:

produce sequence of n^k -bounded configurations (C_t) of DTM
on input $\mathfrak{A} = (n, <, \dots)$ as stages of FO-definable operation
mapping X (for C_t) to $\mathcal{F}_\varphi^{\mathfrak{A}}$ (for C_{t+1})

so that termination within space bound n^k yields
encoding of final configuration as PFP fixpoint

in both cases, get 'normal form' with single (unnested)
application of fixpoint operators to first-order formulae

fixpoint operations and k-variable logic

lemma

for $\varphi(X, \mathbf{x}) \in \text{FO}_k^k(\sigma)$ with X and \mathbf{x} of arity k :

$\mathcal{F}_\varphi^{\mathfrak{A}}$ is compatible with \simeq_∞^k and preserves closure under \simeq_∞^k

\rightsquigarrow resulting least or partial fixpoints are closed under \simeq_∞^k

and fixpoint iteration over \mathfrak{A} is faithfully represented
over the linearly ordered k -pebble invariant $\mathfrak{I}^k(\mathfrak{A}, \mathbf{a})$,
where LFP captures Ptime and PFP captures Pspace

lemma

the linearly ordered k -pebble invariant $\mathfrak{I}^k(\mathfrak{A}, \mathbf{a})$ itself is
LFP-definable (interpretable) over \mathfrak{A} (without ordering)

easy: complement of \simeq_∞^k is a least fixed point of stages $\not\sim_i$ based on
induction step $\mathbf{x} \not\sim_{i+1} \mathbf{x}'$ if $\mathbf{x} \not\sim_i \mathbf{x}' \vee \bigvee_{j \in [k]} \exists y \forall y' (\mathbf{x}_j^y \not\sim_i \mathbf{x}'_j^{y'}) \vee \dots$

Abiteboul–Vianu theorem

question:

what does the relationship between LFP and PFP over not necessarily ordered finite structures tell us about Ptime vs. Pspace?

clearly Pspace collapses to Ptime if, and only if, $\text{LFP} \equiv \text{PFP}$ over the class of all linearly ordered finite σ -structures, even just for $\sigma = \{<, P\}$ with one unary predicate P

surprisingly strong link:

the collapse of Pspace to Ptime implies that $\text{LFP} \equiv \text{PFP}$ over the class of all finite σ -structures (for any σ)

thm (Abiteboul–Vianu)

$\text{Pspace} = \text{Ptime}$ if, and only if, $\text{LFP} \equiv \text{PFP}$ (in FMT throughout)

Abiteboul–Vianu thm: proof idea

suppose $(*)$ $\text{Pspace} = \text{Ptime}$, and let $\mathcal{C} = \text{FMod}(\varphi)$, $\varphi \in \text{PFP}(\sigma)$

choose k such that all subformulae of φ are preserved under \simeq_{∞}^k

then, uniformly across all $\mathfrak{A} \in \text{Fin}(\sigma)$:

- $\varphi^{\mathfrak{A}}$ can be evaluated on $\mathfrak{J}^k(\mathfrak{A})$;
- this evaluation on $\mathfrak{J}^k(\mathfrak{A})$ is in Pspace, hence in Ptime by $(*)$;
- as $\mathfrak{J}^k(\mathfrak{A})$ is linearly ordered, the outcome is LFP-definable over $\mathfrak{J}^k(\mathfrak{A})$ by the Immerman–Vardi theorem;
- as $\mathfrak{J}^k(\mathfrak{A})$ is LFP-interpretable over \mathfrak{A} , \mathcal{C} is LFP-definable

in fact: $\text{LFP} \equiv \bigcup_k \text{Ptime}(\mathfrak{J}^k)$

$\text{PFP} \equiv \bigcup_k \text{Pspace}(\mathfrak{J}^k)$

and the collapse in size from \mathfrak{A} to $\mathfrak{J}^k(\mathfrak{A})$ for unordered \mathfrak{A} accounts for the possible deviation from the ordered case