

# Extending $\mathcal{ALCQIO}$ with reachability

## A description logic for shape analysis

Tomer Kotek, Mantas Šimkus, Helmut Veith, and Florian Zuleger

Vienna University of Technology

{kotek,veith,zuleger}@forsyte.at, simkus@dbai.tuwien.ac.at

**Abstract.** We introduce a description logic  $\mathcal{ALCQIO}_{b,Re}$  which adds reachability assertions to  $\mathcal{ALCQIO}$ , a sub-logic of the two-variable fragment of first order logic with counting quantifiers.  $\mathcal{ALCQIO}_{b,Re}$  is well-suited for applications in software verification and shape analysis. Shape analysis requires expressive logics which can express reachability and have good computational properties. We show that  $\mathcal{ALCQIO}_{b,Re}$  can describe complex data structures with a high degree of sharing and allows compositions such as list of trees.

We show that finite satisfiability and finite implication of  $\mathcal{ALCQIO}_{b,Re}$ -formulae are polynomial-time reducible to finite satisfiability of  $\mathcal{ALCQIO}$ -formulae. As a consequence, we get that finite satisfiability and finite implication in  $\mathcal{ALCQIO}_{b,Re}$  are NEXPTIME-complete. Description logics with transitive closure constructors have been studied before, but  $\mathcal{ALCQIO}_{b,Re}$  is the first description logic that remains decidable on finite structures while allowing at the same time nominals, inverse roles, counting quantifiers and reachability assertions,

## 1 Introduction

*Description Logics (DLs)* are a well established family of logics for Knowledge Representation and Reasoning [2]. They model the domain of interest in terms of *concepts* (classes of objects) and *roles* (binary relations between objects). These features make DLs very useful to formally describe and reason about graph-structured information. The usefulness of DLs is witnessed e.g. by the W3C choosing DLs to provide the logical foundations to the standard Web Ontology Language (OWL) [14]. Another application of DLs is formalization and static analysis of UML class diagrams and ER diagrams, which are basic modeling artifacts in object-oriented software development and database design, respectively [4,1]. In these settings, standard reasoning services provided by DLs can be used to verify e.g. the consistency of a diagram.

In complex software projects, the source code is usually accompanied by design documents which provide extensive documentation and models of data structure content (e.g., using UML and ER diagrams). This documentation is both an opportunity and a challenge for program verification. However, the verification community has focused mostly on a bottom-up approach to the analysis of programs with dynamic data structures, which examines pointers

and the shapes induced by them. It is therefore a compelling question, if DLs can be used to model and verify richer properties of dynamic data structures.

A promising framework for shape analysis based on description logics was developed in [11]. [11] is based mostly on an extension of  $\mathcal{ALCQIO}$  with fixed points.  $\mathcal{ALCQIO}$  is itself the extension of  $\mathcal{ALC}$  with nominals, number restrictions and inverses, see e.g. [3].  $\mathcal{ALC}$  is a syntactic variant of the multimodal logic  $K_m$  [19,17].  $\mathcal{ALCQIO}$  already fulfills most of the requirements for describing the memory of programs with dynamic data structures: (i) nominals allow to represent the program’s variables; (ii) number restrictions allow to model the program’s pointers by functions; (iii) inverses allow to define the incoming pointers for data structure elements, e.g., in a tree every tree element must have at most one parent. Additionally, it needs to be ensured that data structures only contain elements *reachable* from program variables via program pointers (iv). Reachability is expressible in  $\mu\mathcal{ALCQIO}$ , the extension of  $\mathcal{ALCQIO}$  with fixed points, but not in  $\mathcal{ALCQIO}$ .

The main disadvantage of [11] is that finite satisfiability and implication of  $\mu\mathcal{ALCQIO}$  formulas is undecidable [5]. No extensions of  $\mathcal{ALCQIO}$  with reachability or transitive closure were known to be decidable on finite structures.

*Our contribution:* We introduce and develop decision procedures over finite structures for the logic  $\mathcal{ALCQIO}_{b,Re}$ , which extends the closure ( $\mathcal{ALCQIO}_b$ ) of  $\mathcal{ALCQIO}$  under Boolean operations with reachability assertions. The reachability assertions guarantee that elements of the universe of a model are reachable in the graph-theoretic sense from initial sets of elements using prescribed sets of binary relation symbols. Alternatively, we can think of  $\mathcal{ALCQIO}_{b,Re}$  as  $\mathcal{ALCQIO}_b$  interpreted over structures containing an unbounded number of binary trees.

The main results of this paper are algorithms which decide the finite satisfiability and finite implication problems of  $\mathcal{ALCQIO}_{b,Re}$ . The algorithms are reductions to finite satisfiability in  $\mathcal{ALCQIO}$ , which suggests relatively simple implementation using existing  $\mathcal{ALCQIO}$  reasoners. The algorithms run in NEXPTIME, which is optimal since  $\mathcal{ALCQIO}$  is already NEXPTIME-hard.

*A description logic for shape analysis.* The logic  $\mathcal{ALCQIO}_{b,Re}$  we introduce is especially well-suited to shape analysis, since  $\mathcal{ALCQIO}_{b,Re}$  contains nominals, number restrictions, inverses and reachability.  $\mathcal{ALCQIO}_{b,Re}$  is a flexible and powerful formalism for describing complex data structures with sharing. This, together with the existence of a decision procedure for implication and not just satisfiability, makes  $\mathcal{ALCQIO}_{b,Re}$  a promising candidate for software verification applications.

We discuss in Section 2.1 that  $\mathcal{ALCQIO}_{b,Re}$  is strong enough to describe e.g. lists, trees and lists of trees, etc.  $\mathcal{ALCQIO}_{b,Re}$  supports programs with sharing, in which memory cells (which in model-theoretic terms are elements of the universe of the model) may participate in multiple data structures. In particular, we show that  $\mathcal{ALCQIO}_{b,Re}$  supports modular reasoning: Our results support composition of data structures with disjoint domains, as well as composition of data structures whose domains are not disjoint, but have disjoint pointers.

The closure of the underlying logic  $\mathcal{ALCQIO}_b$  under Boolean operations allows to describe conditional statements in programs. The decision procedure for implication for  $\mathcal{ALCQIO}_{b,Re}$  is essential for verification applications, since it allows to show that specifications relating pre- and post-conditions are correct. We demonstrate the usefulness of  $\mathcal{ALCQIO}_{b,Re}$  by giving a Hoare-style correctness proof for an example pointer-manipulating program in Section 2.2. We leave the development of a full Hoare-style verification framework for future work.

*Related Work.* We discuss further related work in the following.

*Separation Logic.* In the last decade, the leading approach for shape analysis has been separation logic [16]. While separation logic has a strong proof-theoretic tradition - in origin and in proof techniques used, model-theoretic approaches have been less prominent. We believe that recent advances in finite model theory have created an opportunity for the development of new model-theoretic approaches to shape analysis. In this paper, we explore this model-theoretic line of research building on previous results on description logics.

*Description logics and reachability.* Description logics extended with various forms of reachability have been studied in the literature, though the focus is mostly on arbitrary rather than finite structures. The important work of Schild [17] exposed a correspondence between variants of propositional dynamic logic (PDL), a logic for reasoning about program behavior, and variants of DLs extended with further role constructors, e.g. the transitive closure of a role. Close correspondences between DLs extended with fixpoints and variants of the  $\mu$ -calculus have also been identified [18,12]. Recently, extensions of DLs with regular expressions over roles have been proposed [7]. DLs with transitive roles and counting quantifiers were studied in [13,20]. [10] proved decidability over arbitrary structures for a DL with transitive closure and counting quantifiers.

*The two-variable fragment.* Our results bear similarity with a recent deep result [9] based on [15]. There, the complexity of finite satisfiability of the two-variable fragment of first order logic extended with counting quantifiers ( $C^2$ ) and additionally with two forests ( $CT^2$ ) is studied.

The results in our paper and in [9] are incomparable due to differences in several orthogonal aspects. (i)  $C^2$  strictly contains  $\mathcal{ALCQIO}_b$ . (ii)  $CT^2$  is restricted to at most two forests, whereas  $\mathcal{ALCQIO}_{b,Re}$  allows an unbounded number of reachability conditions. The decidability of the extension of  $C^2$  with three successor relations is not known, while extending  $\mathcal{ALCQIO}_b$  with three successor relations is covered by our results. (iii) we have a decision procedure for implication in  $\mathcal{ALCQIO}_{b,Re}$ , while no such decision procedure is given for  $CT^2$  in [9]. (iv) to our knowledge, no reasoners for  $C^2$  exist; the sophisticated construction in [9] makes the worthy task of implementing a reasoner for  $CT^2$  a considerable challenge. In contrast, our result reduces reasoning in  $\mathcal{ALCQIO}_{b,Re}$  to satisfiability in  $\mathcal{ALCQIO}$ , which is contained in the description logic  $\mathcal{SROIQ}$  for which several reasoners have been implemented, e.g., [22,24,21].

Due to the intricate nature of the proof in [9], the exact relationship between our result and that of [9] is difficult to ascertain. It would be beneficial in future

work to understand whether these results can be united within a natural logic containing both  $CT^2$  and  $\mathcal{ALCQIO}_{b,Re}$ .

*Shape Analysis and Content Verification.* In a recent paper [8] the use of a DL to reason and verify correctness of entity-relations-type content of data structures on top of an existing shape analysis is discussed. Technically, [8] is based on a reduction of a DL to satisfiability in  $CT^2$ . The DL in [8] cannot express reachability and the approach there depends on a combination of DL with an existing shape analysis. We believe the method of [8] can be modified to be based on  $\mathcal{ALCQIO}_{b,Re}$  alone. Exploration of this question is part of future work.

## 2 The Formalism and Examples

From the point of view of finite model theory,  $\mathcal{ALCQIO}_b$  and  $\mathcal{ALCQIO}_{b,Re}$  are syntactic variants of fragments of first or second order logic. In description logics terminology, binary relation symbols are called *atomic roles*, unary relation symbols are called *atomic concepts*, and constant symbols are called *nominals*. Let  $N_R$ ,  $N_C$  and  $N_n$  denote the sets of atomic roles, atomic concepts and nominals. A vocabulary  $\tau$  is then the union of  $N_R$ ,  $N_C$  and  $N_n$ . Let  $N_F \subseteq N_R$  be a set of atomic roles. The roles in  $N_F$  are called *functional*.

Formulae are built from the symbols in  $\tau$ . The various constructors available to build formulae determine the particular DL, giving rise to a wide family of logics with varying expressivity, and decidability and complexity of reasoning. The semantics to formulae is given in terms of structures, where atomic concepts and atomic roles are interpreted as unary and binary relations in a structure, respectively, and constants are interpreted as elements in the structure's universe. We now define  $\mathcal{ALCQIO}_b$  and  $\mathcal{ALCQIO}_{b,Re}$ . See Section 2.1 for examples.

**Definition 1 (Syntax of  $\mathcal{ALCQIO}_b$ ).** *The set of roles, concepts and formulae of  $\mathcal{ALCQIO}_b$  are defined inductively:*

- Atomic concepts and nominals are concepts; Atomic roles are roles;
- If  $r$  is a role,  $C, D$  are concepts and  $n$  is a positive integer, then  $C \sqcap D$ ,  $C \sqcup D$ ,  $\neg C$ ,  $\exists r.C$  and  $\exists^{\leq n} r.C$  are concepts, and  $r^-$  is a role;
- $C \sqsubseteq D$  (concept inclusion) and  $C \equiv D$  (concept equality) where  $C, D$  are concepts, are formulae;
- If  $\varphi$  and  $\psi$  are formulae, then  $\varphi \wedge \psi$ ,  $\varphi \vee \psi$ , and  $\neg\psi$  are formulae.

The sub-logic  $\mathcal{ALCQIO} \subseteq \mathcal{ALCQIO}_b$  does not allow negations and disjunctions.

A *structure* (or *interpretation*) is a tuple  $\mathcal{M} = (M, \tau, \cdot)$ , where  $M$  is a finite set (the *universe*),  $\tau$  is a set of *constants* and unary and binary *relation symbols* (the *vocabulary*), and  $\cdot$  is an *interpretation function*, which assigns to each constant  $c \in \tau$  an element  $c^{\mathcal{M}} \in M$ , and to each  $n$ -ary relation symbol  $R \in \tau$  an  $n$ -ary relation  $R^{\mathcal{M}}$  over  $M$ . In this paper, each relation is either unary or binary (i.e.  $n \in \{1, 2\}$ ). In this paper, all structures are finite. Satisfiability and implication always refer to finite structures only.

**Definition 2 (Semantics of  $\mathcal{ALCQIO}_b$ ).** The semantics of an  $\mathcal{ALCQIO}_b(\tau)$ -formula  $\varphi$  is given in terms of  $\tau$ -structures such that every  $f \in \mathbf{N}_F$ ,  $f^\mathcal{M}$  is a partial function. The function  $\cdot^\mathcal{M}$  is extended to the remaining concepts and roles inductively below. The satisfaction relation  $\models$  is also given below. If  $\mathcal{M} \models \varphi$ , then  $\mathcal{M}$  is a model of  $\varphi$ . We write  $\psi \models \varphi$  and say that  $\psi$  implies  $\varphi$  if every model of  $\psi$  is also a model of  $\varphi$ .

$$\begin{aligned}
(C \sqcap D)^\mathcal{M} &= C^\mathcal{M} \cap D^\mathcal{M} \\
(C \sqcup D)^\mathcal{M} &= C^\mathcal{M} \cup D^\mathcal{M} \\
(\neg C)^\mathcal{M} &= M \setminus C^\mathcal{M} \\
(r^-)^\mathcal{M} &= \{(e, e') \mid (e', e) \in r^\mathcal{M}\} \\
(\exists r.C)^\mathcal{M} &= \{e \mid \exists e' : (e, e') \in r^\mathcal{M}, e' \in C^\mathcal{M}\} \\
(\exists^{\leq n} r.C)^\mathcal{M} &= \{e \mid \exists^{\leq n} e' : (e, e') \in r^\mathcal{M}, e' \in C^\mathcal{M}\} \\
\mathcal{M} \models C \sqsubseteq D &\text{ if } C^\mathcal{M} \subseteq D^\mathcal{M} \\
\mathcal{M} \models \varphi \wedge \psi &\text{ if } \mathcal{M} \models \varphi \text{ and } \mathcal{M} \models \psi \\
\mathcal{M} \models \neg \varphi &\text{ if } \mathcal{M} \not\models \varphi \\
\mathcal{M} \models \varphi \vee \psi &\text{ if } \mathcal{M} \models \varphi \text{ or } \mathcal{M} \models \psi
\end{aligned}$$

We will use the following abbreviations.  $\top = C \sqcup \neg C$ , where  $C$  is an arbitrary atomic concept and  $\perp = \neg \top$ ;  $\alpha \equiv \beta$  for the formula  $\alpha \sqsubseteq \beta \wedge \beta \sqsubseteq \alpha$ ;  $\exists r$  for the concept  $\exists r.\top$ ;  $\exists^{\leq n} r.C$  for the concept  $\exists^{\leq n} r.C \sqcap \neg \exists^{\leq n-1} r.C$ ; Note that  $\top^\mathcal{M} = M$  and  $\perp^\mathcal{M} = \emptyset$  for any structure  $\mathcal{M}$  with universe  $M$ . For a formula  $\varphi$ , we denote by  $|\varphi|$  the length of  $\varphi$  as a string.

For  $\mathcal{ALCQIO}_{b,Re}$ , we define two new types of assertions.

**Reachability Assertion**  $B \xrightarrow{S} A$  where  $A, B \in \mathbf{N}_C$  and  $S \subseteq \mathbf{N}_F$ . Intuitively, it says that  $B$  is contained in  $A$  and that  $A$  is a set of elements reachable from  $B$ , without leaving  $A$ , through the roles of  $S$ .

**Disjointness Assertion**  $Disj(A_1, A_2) = (A_1 \sqcap A_2 \equiv \perp)$  for  $A_1, A_2 \in \mathbf{N}_C$ .

Let  $RE$  and  $DI$  be sets of reachability respectively disjointness assertions.

**Compatibility**  $RE$  and  $DI$  compatible if for every  $B_1 \xrightarrow{S_1} A_1$  and  $B_2 \xrightarrow{S_2} A_2$  in  $RE$  such that  $S_1 \cap S_2 \neq \emptyset$ ,  $Disj(A_1, A_2)$  is in  $DI$ .

**Definition 3 (Syntax of  $\mathcal{ALCQIO}_{b,Re}$ ).**  $\Phi = \phi \wedge \bigwedge RE \wedge \bigwedge DI$  is an  $\mathcal{ALCQIO}_{b,Re}$ -formula if

- (A)  $\phi \in \mathcal{ALCQIO}_b$
- (B)  $RE$  is a set of reachability assertions
- (C)  $DI$  is a set of disjointness assertions
- (D)  $RE$  and  $DI$  are compatible

The set of containment assertions

$$CO(RE) = \left\{ B \sqsubseteq A \mid B \xrightarrow{S} A \in RE \right\}.$$

**Definition 4 (Semantics of  $\mathcal{ALCQIO}_{b,Re}$ ).** Let  $\Phi = \phi \wedge \bigwedge RE \wedge \bigwedge DI \in \mathcal{ALCQIO}_{b,Re}$ . Let  $assoc(\Phi) = \phi \wedge \bigwedge CO(RE) \wedge DI$  be the  $\mathcal{ALCQIO}_b$  formula associated to  $\Phi$ .

For every  $\beta = B \xrightarrow{\underline{c}}^S A \in RE$  and  $\tau$ -structure  $\mathcal{M}$ , let  $D_\beta^{\mathcal{M}}$  be the directed subgraph  $\langle M, \bigcup_{s \in S} s^{\mathcal{M}} \rangle$  induced by  $A^{\mathcal{M}}$ ; we call  $D_\beta^{\mathcal{M}}$  connected, if every vertex of  $D_\beta^{\mathcal{M}}$  is reachable from a vertex of  $B^{\mathcal{M}}$ .

For every  $\tau$ -structure  $\mathcal{M}$ ,  $\mathcal{M} \models \Phi$  if  $\mathcal{M} \models assoc(\Phi)$  (in  $\mathcal{ALCQIO}_b$  semantics) and  $D_\beta^{\mathcal{M}}$  is connected for every  $\beta = B \xrightarrow{\underline{c}}^S A \in RE$ .

*Comment 1:* For illustration purposes, we state an equivalent definition of the semantics of  $\mathcal{ALCQIO}_{b,Re}$  in the following: Let  $*$  denote the reflexive-transitive closure,  $\circ$  denote role composition,  $R^{\mathcal{M}} = (\bigcup_{s \in S} s^{\mathcal{M}} \cap A^{\mathcal{M}} \times A^{\mathcal{M}})^*$  and  $R^{\mathcal{M}}(B^{\mathcal{M}}) = \{v \mid \exists (u, v) \in R^{\mathcal{M}}. u \in B^{\mathcal{M}}\}$ . We have  $\mathcal{M} \models \Phi$  iff  $\mathcal{M} \models assoc(\Phi)$  and  $R^{\mathcal{M}}(B^{\mathcal{M}}) = A^{\mathcal{M}}$  for every  $\beta = B \xrightarrow{\underline{c}}^S A \in RE$ .

*Comment 2:* The motivation for  $CO(RE)$  is to guarantee that data structures over the same roles have disjoint domains (see *Compositionality 1* in the examples).

## 2.1 Examples

*List-segments and successor relations.* Given a concept  $L$ , a nominal  $head$  and a functional role  $next$ ,  $L^{\mathcal{M}}$  is a singly-linked list-segment from  $head^{\mathcal{M}}$  via  $next^{\mathcal{M}}$ , if the directed subgraph of  $\langle M, next^{\mathcal{M}} \rangle$  induced by  $L^{\mathcal{M}}$  is a (potentially cyclic) successor relation. This can be expressed by the  $\mathcal{ALCQIO}_{b,Re}$  formula  $\Phi_{List}^{head,next,L}$  obtained as the conjunction of  $\top \sqsubseteq \top$ ,  $RE_l = \{head \xrightarrow{\underline{c}}^{next} L\}$  and  $DI_l = \emptyset$ .  $RE_l$  expresses that  $head^{\mathcal{M}} \in L^{\mathcal{M}}$  and all elements of  $L^{\mathcal{M}}$  are reachable from  $head^{\mathcal{M}}$  via  $next^{\mathcal{M}}$ ;  $DI_l$  is empty since we have described no other data structure which could be disjoint from this list.  $\Phi_{List}^{head,next,L}$  does not determine where the  $next$  role of the last element of the list points. Acyclic and cyclic list-segments are defined as follows:  $\Phi_{aList}^{head,next,L} = \Phi_{List}^{head,next,L} \wedge \neg(L \sqsubseteq \exists next)$  and  $\Phi_{cList}^{head,next,L} = \Phi_{List}^{head,next,L} \wedge (head \sqsubseteq \exists next \neg .L)$ .

*d-ary trees.* Given a concept  $T$ , a nominal  $root$  and functional roles  $left$  and  $right$ ,  $T^{\mathcal{M}}$  is a binary tree rooted at  $root^{\mathcal{M}}$  via  $left^{\mathcal{M}}$  and  $right^{\mathcal{M}}$  if the directed subgraph of  $\langle M, left^{\mathcal{M}} \cup right^{\mathcal{M}} \rangle$  induced by  $T^{\mathcal{M}}$  is a directed tree rooted at  $root^{\mathcal{M}}$  in the graph-theoretic sense. This can be expressed by the  $\mathcal{ALCQIO}_{b,Re}$  formula  $\Phi_T$  obtained as the conjunction of (a)  $root \sqsubseteq \neg \exists left \neg .T \sqcap \neg \exists right \neg .T$ , (b)  $T \sqcap \neg root \sqsubseteq \exists^{=1} left \neg .T \sqcap \neg \exists right \neg .T \sqcup \exists^{=1} right \neg .T \sqcap \neg \exists left \neg .T$ , (c)  $RE_t = \{root \xrightarrow{\underline{c}}^{\{left,right\}} T\}$  and (d)  $DI_t = \emptyset$ . (a) expresses that  $root^{\mathcal{M}}$  belongs to  $T^{\mathcal{M}}$  and is not pointed to from  $T^{\mathcal{M}}$ ; (b) expresses that every element of  $T^{\mathcal{M}}$  besides the root has exactly one incoming pointer from a  $T^{\mathcal{M}}$  element. (c) expresses that  $root^{\mathcal{M}}$  belongs to  $T^{\mathcal{M}}$  and that all elements of  $T^{\mathcal{M}}$  are reachable from  $root^{\mathcal{M}}$  via  $left^{\mathcal{M}}$  and  $right^{\mathcal{M}}$ . The case of  $d$ -ary trees,  $d > 2$ , is similar, using

$d$  functional roles  $child_1, \dots, child_d$ . We remark that 1-ary trees correspond to acyclic list-segments.

*Compositionality 1.*  $\mathcal{ALCQIO}_{b,Re}$  is closed under taking memory disjoint union of data structures. E.g.  $\mathcal{ALCQIO}_{b,Re}$ -formulae  $\Phi_i = \varphi_i \wedge \{B_i \xrightarrow{S_i} A_i\}$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ , the following formula expresses that the domains of its models consist of two disjoint parts, corresponding to the  $\Phi_i$ :  $\Phi = \varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2 \wedge \bigwedge RE \wedge \bigwedge DI$ , where  $RE = \{B_i \xrightarrow{S_i} A_i \mid i = 1, 2\}$  and  $DI = \{Disj(A_1, A_2)\}$ . There is no disjointness requirement on the roles in  $S_1$  and  $S_2$ .

*Compositionality 2.*  $\mathcal{ALCQIO}_{b,Re}$  allows to define multiple data structures which may overlap in memory, as long as they do not share the same pointers. E.g. given  $\mathcal{ALCQIO}_{b,Re}$ -formulae  $\Phi_i = \varphi_i \wedge \{B_i \xrightarrow{S_i} A_i\}$ ,  $i = 1, 2, 3$ , such that  $S_1, S_2$  and  $S_3$  are pairwise disjoint, the following formula expresses that the three data structures are defined simultaneously with possibly overlapping domain:  $\Phi = \varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2 \wedge \varphi_3 \wedge \bigwedge RE$ , where  $RE = \{B_i \xrightarrow{S_i} A_i \mid i = 1, 2, 3\}$ . We note that this compositionality property allows us to define three successor relations.

*Compositional Data Structures.*  $\mathcal{ALCQIO}_{b,Re}$  allows us to define compositional data structures such as list of lists, list of trees, tree of lists of lists, etc. For example, let us define an acyclic list of acyclic lists: Given a concept  $L$ , a nominal  $head$ , and functional roles  $next_1$  and  $next_2$ ,  $L^M$  is a acyclic list of acyclic lists from  $head^M$  via  $next_1^M$  and  $next_2^M$  if there exists  $L_1^M \subseteq L^M$  such that  $L_1^M$  is an acyclic list from  $var_1^M$  via  $next_1^M$ , and  $L^M$  is a disjoint union of acyclic lists via  $next_2^M$  whose heads belong to  $L_1^M$ . This can be expressed by the acyclic list-segment formulae  $\Phi_{aList}^{head, next_1, L_1}$  and  $\Phi_{aList}^{L_1, next_2, L}$ , which can be composed because of disjoint roles in the reachability assertions (see Compositionality 2).

## 2.2 Verification of Pointer-manipulating Programs using $\mathcal{ALCQIO}_{b,Re}$

The focus of this paper is the development of a logic and decision procedures which can be used for shape analysis in future work. However, we believe that it is important to relate the logic we develop in this paper to its intended application. We illustrate in this section how to use  $\mathcal{ALCQIO}_{b,Re}$  for the verification of pointer-manipulating programs. We will discuss on the example program given in Fig. 2.1 how to formulate verification conditions for a Hoare-style correctness proof. We leave the non-trivial task of developing a full verification framework based on  $\mathcal{ALCQIO}_{b,Re}$  for future work. Section 3 can be read independently of this section.

The program in Fig. 2.1 receives as input a list pointed to by  $head$  in which some elements may be marked but  $head$  is not marked. The program removes from the list all marked elements.

We annotate the labels **start**, **end** and **loop** with the pre-condition, the post condition and the loop invariant respectively:

```

start: b := head;
loop:  while (b != null)
        if (b.next != null && b.next.marked)
            b.next := b.next.next;
        else
            b := b.next;
end:   ;

```

**Fig. 2.1.**

**[Pre-condition]** *head* points to the first element of an acyclic list. *head* is not marked.

**[Post-condition]**

1. After the program is executed, *head* points to the first element of an acyclic list containing only unmarked elements.
2. Moreover, the elements removed from the input list are exactly the marked elements.

The following loop invariant suffices to prove the correctness of the program with respect to the pre- and post-conditions:

**[Loop invariant]**

1. The pre-condition holds.
2. *b* points to an element of the list.
3. the set of unmarked elements in the list is exactly the same set as at the beginning of the program.
4. all elements in the list before *b* are unmarked.

The correctness of the program is achieved by proving that the annotations are correct. More precisely,  $S_2$  is the piece of loopless code inside the while loop, i.e., the sequence of `assume(b != null)` and the code in the if-then-else statement,  $S_1$  is the assignment `b := head` and  $S_3$  is the statement `assume(b == null)`. To prove the correctness of the program we need to prove that:

[VC<sub>1</sub>] If the pre-condition holds, then after executing  $S_1$  the loop invariant will hold.

[VC<sub>2</sub>] If the loop invariant holds, then after executing on iteration of the loop, i.e., executing  $S_2$  once, the loop invariant will hold again.

[VC<sub>3</sub>] If the loop-invariant holds, then after executing  $S_3$  the post-condition will hold.

*Annotations in  $\mathcal{ALCQIO}_{b,Re}$ :* Next we write the annotations in  $\mathcal{ALCQIO}_{b,Re}$ . The memory is represented as  $\rho$ -structures and  $\tau$ -structures with  $\rho \subseteq \tau$ .  $\rho$  contains the nominals *head*, *b* and *Null*, the role *next* and the concept *Marked*. We think of each element of the memory as a fixed size block of memory containing the next pointer field and the `marked` field, except for the special element which



interprets *Null* and represent the value *null*. *head* and *b* are the elements which head and *b* point to. *next* is a function on the elements of the memory defined by the pointer *next*. *Marked* contains the set of elements whose *marked* field is set to true.

Our presentation here is a simplification of the memory model in [8], which further supports dynamic allocation and deallocation memory.

$\tau$  extend  $\rho$  with the concepts  $L$  and  $L_b$ .  $L$  will contain the elements of the list.  $L_b$  will contain the elements of the list segment starting at *head* up to *b* (not including *b*).

The annotations  $\Phi_{pre}$ ,  $\Phi_{l-inv}$  and  $\Phi_{post}$  refer to the memory at the labels *start*, *loop* and *post* respectively. The pre-condition  $\Phi_{pre}$  is

$$\Phi_{pre} = \Phi_{aList}^{head,next,L} \wedge head \sqsubseteq \neg Marked$$

$\Phi_{aList}^{head,next,L} = head \xrightarrow{\sqsubseteq}^{next} L \wedge \neg(L \sqsubseteq \exists next)$  is the formula defining an acyclic list from Section 2.1. The post-condition is given by  $\Phi_{post} = \Phi_{post1} \wedge \Phi_{post2}$ , where

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_{post1} &= \Phi_{aList}^{head,next,L} \wedge L \sqsubseteq \neg Marked \\ \Phi_{post2} &= L \equiv L_{ghost} \sqcap \neg Marked_{ghost} \end{aligned}$$

$L_{ghost}$  and  $Marked_{ghost}$  represent the values of  $L$  and  $Marked$  at the start of the program.

$$\Phi_{l-inv} = \Phi_{l-inv1} \wedge \Phi_{l-inv2} \wedge \Phi_{l-inv3} \wedge \Phi_{l-inv4}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_{l-inv1} &= \Phi_{pre} \\ \Phi_{l-inv2} &= b \sqsubseteq L \\ \Phi_{l-inv3} &= L \sqcap \neg Marked \equiv L_{ghost} \sqcap \neg Marked_{ghost} \\ \Phi_{l-inv4} &= (L_b \sqsubseteq L) \wedge (head \sqsubseteq L_b \sqcup b) \wedge (b \sqsubseteq \neg L_b) \\ &\quad \wedge (L_b \sqsubseteq \forall next.L_b \sqcup b) \wedge (\neg L_b \sqsubseteq \forall next.\neg L_b) \\ &\quad \wedge (L_b \sqsubseteq \neg Marked) \end{aligned}$$

$\Phi_{l-inv4}$  expresses that  $L_b$  is exactly the set of elements in  $L$  from *head* to *b*, not including *b*.

*Verification conditions in  $\mathcal{ALCQIO}_{b,Re}$ :* Expressing the verification conditions exactly requires us first to relate the loopless pieces of code  $S \in \{S_1, S_2, S_3\}$  with the annotations  $\Phi_{pre}$ ,  $\Phi_{post}$  and  $\Phi_{l-inv}$ . Each  $S_i$  is associated with two annotations  $\Phi_{start}^i, \Phi_{end}^i \in \{\Phi_{pre}, \Phi_{post}, \Phi_{l-inv}\}$  (e.g., for  $S_1$  we have  $\Phi_{start}^1 = \Phi_{pre}$  and  $\Phi_{end}^1 = \Phi_{l-inv}$ ).

We need three formulas  $\Psi_1, \Psi_2, \Psi_3 \in \mathcal{ALCQIO}_{b,Re}(\tau)$  such that  $\psi_i$  is satisfiable iff  $\mathbf{VC}_i$  does not hold. The verification conditions  $\mathbf{VC}_1$ ,  $\mathbf{VC}_2$ , and  $\mathbf{VC}_3$  refer to the memory both at the start and at the end of  $S_i$ . In contrast, the truth-values of  $\Psi_1$ ,  $\Psi_2$  and  $\Psi_3$  will be evaluated on  $\tau$ -structures corresponding to the memory at the start of  $S_i$  only.

The main observation which is required to write  $\Psi_i$  is that the symbols of  $\tau$  in  $\Phi_{end}^i$  referring to the memory at the end of  $S_i$  can be written in terms of the same symbols when they refer to the memory at the start of  $S_i$ .

Let  $\underline{\rho}$  and  $\underline{\tau}$  be disjoint copies of  $\rho$  and  $\tau$  with symbols sym corresponding to *sym*. Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be a  $\rho$ -structure. Let  $\mathcal{M}_{S_i}$  be the unique  $\underline{\rho}$ -structure obtained by executing  $S_i$  on  $\mathcal{M}$  and renaming all symbols *sym* to sym. Similarly, we write  $\mathcal{N}_{S_i}$  for the unique  $(\tau \setminus \rho) \cup \underline{\rho}$ -structure obtained by replacing the sub-structure  $\mathcal{M}$  with vocabulary  $\rho$  of  $\mathcal{N}$  with  $\mathcal{M}_{S_i}$ . Let  $\underline{\Phi}_{end}^i$  be obtained from  $\Phi_{end}^i$  by replacing each  $\tau$ -symbol *sym* with the  $\underline{\tau}$ -symbol sym.

We will define  $\Psi_i$  by expressing all symbols of  $\underline{\tau}$  referring to the memory at the end of  $S_i$  by  $\tau$ -symbols referring to the memory at the start of  $S_i$ .

Consider  $\text{VC}_i$ . The following are equivalent:

- (A)  $\text{VC}_i$  does not hold
- (B) There exist a  $\tau$ -structure  $\mathcal{N}$  such that  $\mathcal{N} \models \Phi_{start}^i$  and for every extension  $\mathcal{P}'$  of the  $\tau \cup \underline{\rho}$ -structure  $\mathcal{P} = \langle \mathcal{N}, \mathcal{N}_{S_i} \rangle$  to a  $\tau \cup \underline{\tau}$ -structure we have  $\mathcal{P}' \not\models \underline{\Phi}_{end}^i$ .

Let  $\phi_i = \text{assoc}(\Phi_{end}^i)$ . (A) and (B) are equivalent to (C):

- (C) There exists a  $\tau$ -structure  $\mathcal{N}$  such that  $\mathcal{N} \models \Phi_{start}^i$  and for every extension  $\mathcal{P}'$  of the  $\tau \cup \underline{\rho}$ -structure  $\mathcal{P} = \langle \mathcal{N}, \mathcal{N}_{S_i} \rangle$  to a  $\tau \cup \underline{\tau}$ -structure such that  $\mathcal{P}' \models \bigwedge RE \wedge \bigwedge DI$ , we have  $\mathcal{P}' \models \neg \phi_i$ .

The next step is to show that the set of possible extensions of  $\mathcal{P}$  to  $\mathcal{P}'$  with  $\mathcal{P}' \models \bigwedge RE \wedge \bigwedge DI$  is definable. Let  $W_i$  be a concept which contains all possible memory cells accessed during the run of  $S_i$ . E.g. for  $S_2$  (see Fig. 2.2),


$$\begin{aligned} W_2 &\equiv Z_I \sqcup Z_{II} \sqcup Z_{III} \\ Z_I &\equiv b \\ Z_{II} &\equiv \exists next^-.b \\ Z_{III} &\equiv \exists next^-. \exists next^-.b \end{aligned}$$

$W_2$  can be extracted naively from  $S_2$ . The remaining elements of the memory at the start of  $S_2$  are two lists segments

$$\begin{aligned} Z_{IV} &\equiv L_b \sqcap \neg W_2 \\ Z_V &\equiv L \sqcap \neg L_b \sqcap \neg W_2 \end{aligned}$$

which are guaranteed not to be accessed during the run of  $S_2$ .

Since the elements of  $Z_{IV}$  are not accessed and their pointers remain unchanged, they agree on which list segments they belong to in  $\mathcal{M}_{S_i}$ , and similarly for  $Z_V$ . In other words, every list segment in  $\mathcal{M}_{S_i}$  consists of a concatenation of a subset of the elements and list segments  $\{Z_I, \dots, Z_V\}$ . I.e. every list segment in  $\mathcal{M}_{S_i}$  can be characterized entirely by whether, and in what order,  $Z_I, \dots, Z_V$  occur in it.



**Fig. 2.2.** The figure depicts the input of one iteration of the loopless code  $S_2$  inside the loop, namely a list starting at  $head$  with  $b$  pointing to an element in the list.  $S_2$  only accesses  $b$ ,  $b.next$  and  $b.next.next$ . Therefore, after the execution of  $S_2$ ,  $Z_{IV}$  and  $Z_V$  appear in any list segment as entirely or not at all.

Let  $\sigma = \{C_y \mid y \subseteq \{Z_I, \dots, Z_V\}\}$  be a vocabulary consisting of fresh concepts. For  $y \subseteq \{Z_I, \dots, Z_V\}$ , let  $\alpha_y = \bigsqcup_{Z_s \in y} Z_s \equiv C_y$ . The formula

$$\alpha = \bigwedge_{y \subseteq \{Z_I, \dots, Z_V\}} \alpha_y$$

defines the  $C_y$  to be all possible candidates for list segments in  $\mathcal{M}_{S_i}$ .

A concept  $C_y$  is a list segment if there is a linear ordering witnessing the concatenation of the elements and list segments in  $y$  in  $\mathcal{M}_{S_i}$ . Let  $\beta_y^o$  be the disjunction over all linear orderings  $\leq$  of  $y$  with minimal element  $min_{\leq}$  of  $\beta_{\leq}^o$ , where

$$\beta_{\leq}^o = min_{\leq} \equiv o \wedge \bigwedge_{Z_s \leq Z_t \in y} \perp \neq (\exists next^-.Z_s) \sqcap Z_t$$

$\beta_{\leq}^o$  expresses that the elements and list segments in  $y$  are concatenated according to  $\leq$  starting from  $o$ , and  $\beta_y^o$  expresses that such an ordering exists. E.g.,  $\alpha_y \wedge \beta_y^{head}$  holds iff  $C_y$  consists exactly of  $\bigsqcup_{Z_s \in y} Z_s$  and is a list segment starting at  $head$ . Let  $Y$  be the set of pairs  $(y_1, y_2)$  of disjoint subsets of  $\{Z_I, \dots, Z_V\}$ . (C) is equivalent to:

(D) There exist a  $\tau$ -structure  $\mathcal{N}$  such that  $\mathcal{N} \models \Phi_{start}^2$  and we have

$$\langle \mathcal{N}, \mathcal{N}_{S_2} \rangle \models \gamma$$

where  $\gamma$  is

$$\alpha \wedge \bigwedge_{(y_1, y_2) \in Y} ((\beta_{y_1}^{head} \wedge \beta_{y_2}^b) \rightarrow \neg \phi_i[\underline{L}_b \setminus C_{y_1}, \underline{L} \setminus C_{y_1} \sqcup C_{y_2}])$$

The notation  $\phi_i[A \setminus B]$  denotes the syntactical substitution of  $A$  with  $B$  in  $\phi_i$ .

$\gamma$  expresses that for every two list segments starting in  $head$  and  $b$  respectively,  $\phi_i$  does not hold.

Now we can turn to the symbols of  $\rho$ . We can apply backwards propagation to  $head$ ,  $b$ ,  $Marked$  and  $next$ , i.e. we can compute the weakest precondition

predicate transformer for each of these with respect to  $S_i$ . For  $next$  we apply the transformer directly on concepts  $\exists next.C$  and  $\exists next^-.C$  for any  $C$  which use  $next$ .

In [8] the following is proven<sup>1</sup>:

**Theorem 1.** *For every disjoint vocabularies  $\xi$  and  $\tau$ , every  $\mathcal{ALCQIO}_b(\tau \cup \bar{\tau} \cup \xi)$ -formula  $\phi_i$ , and loopless code  $S$ , it is possible to compute a  $\mathcal{ALCQIO}_b(\rho \cup (\bar{\tau} \setminus \rho) \cup \xi)$ -formula  $\theta_{S,\phi_i}$  such that  $\mathcal{P} \models \theta_{S,\phi_i}$  iff  $\mathcal{P}' = \langle \mathcal{P}, \mathcal{P}_S \rangle \models \phi_i$ .*

We apply the backwards propagation to  $\gamma$ .

For  $S = S_2$ , let  $\phi_{false}$  be obtained from  $\gamma$  by syntactically substituting  $b$  to  $\exists next^-.b$ . Let  $\phi_{true}$  be obtained from  $\gamma$  by syntactically substituting<sup>2</sup>  $\exists next.D$  to

$$\overbrace{(b \sqcap \exists next.\exists next.D)}^{(\bullet)} \sqcup \overbrace{(\neg b \sqcap \exists next.D)}^{(\bullet\bullet)}$$

and  $\exists next^-.D$  to

$$\overbrace{(\exists next^-. \exists next^-.(b \sqcap D))}^{(\bullet)} \sqcup \overbrace{(\exists next^-.(D \sqcap \neg b))}^{(\bullet\bullet)}$$

for every concept  $D$ .  $(\bullet)$  expresses the new value of  $next$  on  $b$ .  $(\bullet\bullet)$  expresses the unchanged values of  $next$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_{S_2,\gamma} &= (\phi_{cond} \wedge \phi_{true}) \vee (\neg \phi_{cond} \wedge \phi_{false}) \\ \phi_{cond} &= \exists next^-.b \sqsubseteq \neg null \sqcap Marked \end{aligned}$$

As a consequence we get that (D) is equivalent to (E):

(E) There exist a  $\tau$ -structure  $\mathcal{N}$  such that  $\mathcal{N} \models \Phi_{start}^2 \wedge \theta_{S_2,\gamma}$ .

Whether (E) holds reduces to the finite satisfiability problem of  $\mathcal{ALCQIO}_{b,Re}$ .


In [8] a functional program analysis based on Theorem 1 was discussed. The memory model of [8] is considerably more developed in order to allow allocation and deallocation of memory. However the step between (D) and (E) was not considered there, leading to a program analysis which is based on an existing shape analysis. Since the goal of this section is not to develop a program analysis but rather give the reader intuition via an example, we did not strive to make the formulas here most efficient or small. We will consider the development of a full program analysis based on this logic in future work.

<sup>1</sup> The description logic used in [8] is slightly more powerful, allowing also role inclusion.

However, this is easy to overcome, see footnote 2.

<sup>2</sup> In [8]  $next$  would have been substituted syntactically for an expression such as  $next \setminus (b \times \top) \cup (\exists next^-.b \times \exists next^-. \exists next^-.b)$ . Since we do not allow role inclusions and  $\times$  in out logic, we make the substitutions on the concepts which use  $next$  instead.

*Content analysis* The program in Fig. 2.1 fits naturally to the type of content analysis of [8]. Consider the information system of a hotel. A partial UML of the system is depicted in Fig. 2.3. The information system of the hotel contains data about rooms, guests, bookings, payments, personnel, etc. A simple implementation of the system from Fig. 2.3 may contain three disjoint lists for the rooms, the guests and the active bookings. [8] shows how to express UML-like content invariants in the context of programs with dynamic data structures.



**Fig. 2.3.**

When a guest who has a booking has not checked-in until the next morning, they are charged for one night and the rest of their booking is canceled. The program in Fig. 2.4 is executed once a day before the reception counter is opened. The program traverses the list  $Bk$  of active bookings to search for non-arrivals. When such a booking is found, it is removed from the list and the function `non-arrival`, which charges the guest for one night, is run.

```

start: b := hBk;
loop:  while (b != null) {
        if (b.next != null &&
            !b.next.chkd_in)
        {
            non-arrival(b);
            b.next := b.next.next;
        }
        else
            b := b.next;
    }
end:   ;
  
```

**Fig. 2.4.**

In this case, the pre-condition is

$$\Phi_{pre} = \Phi_{aList}^{hBk, next, Bk} \wedge hBk \sqsubseteq CheckedIn$$

and the post-condition is given by  $\Phi_{post} = \Phi_{post1} \wedge \Phi_{post2}$  where

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi_{post1} &= \Phi_{aList}^{hBk,next,Bk} \wedge Bk \sqsubseteq CheckedIn \\ \Phi_{post2} &= Bk \equiv Bk_{ghost} \sqcap CheckedIn_{ghost}\end{aligned}$$

The correctness proof for the program in Fig. 2.4 is the same as the correctness proof of the program in Fig. 2.1.

### 3 Decision procedures for $\mathcal{ALCQIO}_{b,Re}$

Let  $\Phi = \varphi \wedge \bigwedge RE \wedge \bigwedge DI$  be an  $\mathcal{ALCQIO}_{b,Re}$ -formula. Let  $\tau = \mathbf{N}_C \cup \mathbf{N}_R \cup \mathbf{N}_n$  be the vocabulary of  $\varphi$ . We denote  $RE = \{B_1 \xrightarrow{S_1} A_1, \dots, B_h \xrightarrow{S_h} A_h\}$ .

In this section we prove the existence a decision procedure of finite satisfiability and implication for  $\mathcal{ALCQIO}_{b,Re}$ :

**Theorem 2 1** *Let  $\Phi_i = \varphi_i \wedge \bigwedge RE_i \wedge \bigwedge DI_i \in \mathcal{ALCQIO}_{b,Re}$ , for  $i = 1, 2$ . There are  $\mathcal{ALCQIO}$  formulas  $\mu$  and  $\kappa$  over an extended vocabulary such that*

- (1)  $\Phi_1$  is finitely satisfiable iff  $\mu$  is finitely satisfiable.
- (2)  $\Phi_1$  implies  $\Phi_2$  iff  $\kappa$  is not finitely satisfiable.

*Outline of proof.*  $assoc(\Phi)$  already belongs to  $\mathcal{ALCQIO}_b$ . The reachability requirements are missing in order to capture  $\Phi$ . The models of  $assoc(\Phi)$  can be partitioned into *standard* and *non-standard models*, depending on whether they satisfy  $\bigwedge RE$ . In general, we cannot augment  $assoc(\Phi)$  in  $\mathcal{ALCQIO}_b$  to eliminate the non-standard models, since reachability is not expressible in  $\mathcal{ALCQIO}_b$ . However, we can augment it so that it is guaranteed that whenever a non-standard model exists, so does a standard model. To do so, we define *semi-connectedness*, which is a weaker requirement than satisfying  $\bigwedge RE$ . A model is semi-connected if every element of its universe which should be reachable according to some  $B_i \xrightarrow{S_i} A_i$  and is not, is reachable from a cycle in  $A_i$ . We show that semi-connectedness is expressible in  $\mathcal{ALCQIO}_b$ .

Under certain conditions, it is possible to repeatedly apply an operation  $\triangleright$ , which turns non-standard but semi-connected models into standard models, by eliminating the said cycles. The existence of a non-standard semi-connected model then implies the existence of a standard model. A sufficient condition under which semi-connected models can be turned to standard models using  $\triangleright$  is that the elements in  $A_i$  admit so-called *useful labelings*. Useful labelings mimic an order relation on the types of the elements in  $A_i$  and guarantee that applying the operation  $\triangleright$  makes progress towards a standard model. We show that having useful labelings is expressible in  $\mathcal{ALCQIO}_b$ .

As a consequence we get a decision procedure for satisfiability of  $\Phi$ , which amounts to adding to  $assoc(\Phi)$  the requirements that models are semi-connected and have useful labelings. The resulting  $\mathcal{ALCQIO}$ -formula is satisfiable iff  $\Phi$  is. A decision procedure for implication is obtained as consequence. Decision

procedures which are tight in terms of complexity are given in Section 3.4. In Section 3.3 we give simpler but complexity-wise suboptimal decision procedures. The decision procedures in Section 3.4 follow the same plan, and differ only in the construction and sizes of the formulae expressing the existence of useful labelings.

### 3.1 Types and the operation $\triangleright$

We write  $C \in \varphi$  if there exists a concept  $D$  and an inclusion  $C \sqsubseteq D$  or  $D \sqsubseteq C$  which occurs in  $\varphi$ .  $C$  and  $D$  need not be atomic.

**Definition 5** ( $\triangleright$ ). *Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be a  $\tau$ -structure. Let  $a_0, a_1 \in M$  and  $r \in \mathbf{N}_F$  and  $\mathfrak{t} = (a_0, a_1, r)$ . Let  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathfrak{t}\triangleright}$  be the structure such that  $\mathcal{M}$  and  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathfrak{t}\triangleright}$  have the same universe  $M$  and the same interpretations of every atomic concept, nominal and atomic role except for  $r$ , and  $r^{\mathcal{M}_{\mathfrak{t}\triangleright}} = r^{\mathcal{M}} \setminus \{(a_i, b) \mid (a_i, b) \in r \text{ and } i \in \{0, 1\}\} \cup \{(a_{1-i}, b) \mid (a_i, b) \in r \text{ and } i \in \{0, 1\}\}$ .*

For the main property of  $\triangleright$  we need the notion of types:

**Definition 6 (Types)**. *We define  $\text{TYPES}_\varphi = \mathcal{P}^{\{C \mid C \in \varphi\}}$  as the powerset over the set of concepts appearing in  $\varphi$ . Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be a  $\tau$ -structure  $\mathcal{M}$  and  $u \in M$ . We denote by  $\overline{tp}_\mathcal{M}^\varphi(u) \in \text{TYPES}_\varphi$  the set of concepts  $C \in \varphi$  such that  $u \in C^{\mathcal{M}}$ . We call  $\overline{tp}_\mathcal{M}^\varphi(u)$  the type of  $u$ . We sometimes omit the subscript  $\mathcal{M}$  when it is clear from the context.*

We note that the size of  $\text{TYPES}_\varphi$  is at most  $2^{|\varphi|}$ .

**Lemma 1.** *Let  $\mathcal{M}_1$  and  $\mathcal{M}_2$  be two  $\tau$ -structures with the same universe  $M$ . If for all  $u \in M$  we have  $\overline{tp}_{\mathcal{M}_1}^\varphi(u) = \overline{tp}_{\mathcal{M}_2}^\varphi(u)$ , then  $\mathcal{M}_1$  and  $\mathcal{M}_2$  agree on  $\varphi$ .*

*Proof.*  $\varphi$  is a Boolean combination of inclusion assertions. Therefore, it is enough to show  $\mathcal{M}_1 \models C \sqsubseteq D$  iff  $\mathcal{M}_2 \models C \sqsubseteq D$  for all of the inclusion assertions  $C \sqsubseteq D$  which occur in  $\varphi$ . Let  $C \sqsubseteq D$  be such an inclusion assertion. For  $u \in M$ ,  $u \in C^{\mathcal{M}_1}$  iff  $u \in C^{\mathcal{M}_2}$ , and  $u \in D^{\mathcal{M}_1}$  iff  $u \in D^{\mathcal{M}_2}$ . Hence,  $C^{\mathcal{M}_1} = C^{\mathcal{M}_2}$  and  $D^{\mathcal{M}_1} = D^{\mathcal{M}_2}$ , implying  $\mathcal{M}_1 \models C \sqsubseteq D$  iff  $\mathcal{M}_2 \models C \sqsubseteq D$ .

The crucial property of  $\triangleright$  is that  $\mathcal{M}$  and  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathfrak{t}\triangleright}$  agree on  $\varphi$  if  $a_0$  and  $a_1$  have the same type:

**Lemma 2.** *Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be a  $\tau$ -structure, let  $a_0, a_1 \in M$  such that  $\overline{tp}_\mathcal{M}^\varphi(a_0) = \overline{tp}_\mathcal{M}^\varphi(a_1)$ , let  $r \in \mathbf{N}_F$ , and let  $\mathfrak{t} = (a_0, a_1, r)$ .*

(1)  $C^{\mathcal{M}} = C^{\mathcal{M}_{\mathfrak{t}\triangleright}}$  for all  $C \in \varphi$ .

Consequently:

(2) For every  $u \in M$ ,  $\overline{tp}_\mathcal{M}^\varphi(u) = \overline{tp}_{\mathcal{M}_{\mathfrak{t}\triangleright}}^\varphi(u)$ .

(3)  $\mathcal{M} \models \varphi$  iff  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathfrak{t}\triangleright} \models \varphi$ .

Statement (1) of Lemma 2 is proven by induction on the construction of concepts in  $\varphi$ . (2) follows directly from (1). (3) follows using Lemma 1. See Appendix C for a detailed proof.

### 3.2 Semi-connectedness and useful labelings

Here we define semi-connectedness and useful labelings exactly and prove that they capture reachability (Lemma 4).

**Definition 7 (Semi-connected Structure).** *For every reachability assertion  $\beta_{h'} = B_{h'} \xrightarrow{S_{h'}} A_{h'}$ , we write  $D_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}$  for the directed graph  $D_{\beta_{h'}}^{\mathcal{M}}$ . Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be a  $\tau$ -structure.  $\mathcal{M}$  is  $\Phi$ -semi-connected, if (I)  $\mathcal{M} \models \text{assoc}(\Phi)$  and (II) for every  $B_{h'} \xrightarrow{S_{h'}} A_{h'} \in RE$  and  $u \in A_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}$ , either  $u$  is reachable in  $D_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}$  from  $B_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}$  or  $u$  is reachable from a cycle.*

Observe that if  $\mathcal{M}$  is  $\Phi$ -semi-connected, then  $\mathcal{M} \models \bigwedge RE \wedge \bigwedge DI$  iff  $\mathcal{M}$  satisfies the following strengthening of (II): for every  $B_{h'} \xrightarrow{S_{h'}} A_{h'} \in RE$  and  $u \in A_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}$ ,  $u$  is reachable from  $B_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}$ . The  $h'$ -useful labelings we define next mimic linear orderings on the types of the elements in  $A_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}$  that can be obtained from a Depth-First Search (DFS) run on  $D_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}$  starting from elements in  $B_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}$ .

**Definition 8 (Useful Labeling).** *Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be a  $\tau$ -structure. Let  $1 \leq h' \leq h$ . A function  $f_{h'} : A_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}} \rightarrow [1, |\text{TYPES}_{\varphi}|]$  is a  $h'$ -useful labeling for  $\mathcal{M}$ , if (1)  $f_{h'}(u) = f_{h'}(v)$  implies  $\overline{tp}_{\mathcal{M}}^{\varphi}(u) = \overline{tp}_{\mathcal{M}}^{\varphi}(v)$  for all  $u, v \in A_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}$  and if (2) for every element  $u \in A_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}$ , either  $u \in B_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}$ , or there exist elements  $v, w \in A_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}$  such that  $f_{h'}(u) = f_{h'}(v)$ ,  $f_{h'}(w) < f_{h'}(v)$  and the graph  $D_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}$  has an edge  $(w, v)$ .*

**Lemma 3.** *Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be a  $\tau$ -structure. If  $\mathcal{M} \models \Phi$ , then there are  $h'$ -useful labelings  $f_{h'}$  for  $\mathcal{M}$ , for every  $1 \leq h' \leq h$ .*

*Proof.* We assume  $\mathcal{M}$  satisfies  $\Phi = \varphi \wedge \bigwedge RE \wedge \bigwedge DI$ . We fix some  $1 \leq h' \leq h$ . We have that  $B_{h'} \xrightarrow{S_{h'}} A_{h'}$  holds for  $\mathcal{M}$ . We explain how to build a  $h'$ -useful labeling for  $\mathcal{M}$  by executing a Depth-First Search (DFS) from the elements in  $B_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}$ . If an element  $u$  is visited during the DFS,  $u$  is assigned a number according to its type  $\overline{tp}_{\mathcal{M}}^{\varphi}(u)$ . If the type  $\overline{tp}_{\mathcal{M}}^{\varphi}(u)$  has not appeared during the DFS yet,  $u$  is assigned the smallest number in  $[1, |\text{TYPES}_{\varphi}|]$  that has not been used so far; if the type has already appeared,  $u$  is assigned the number associated with this type. Let  $f_{h'}$  be the labeling resulting from this process. We show that  $f_{h'}$  is a  $h'$ -useful labeling for  $\mathcal{M}$ .

By construction  $f_{h'}$  is a function from  $A_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}$  to  $[1, |\text{TYPES}_{\varphi}|]$ . Moreover, for all  $u, v \in A_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}$  it holds that  $f_{h'}(u) = f_{h'}(v)$  iff  $\overline{tp}_{\mathcal{M}}^{\varphi}(u) = \overline{tp}_{\mathcal{M}}^{\varphi}(v)$  (\*). It remains to show that for every element  $u \in A_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}$ , either  $u \in B_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}$ , or there exist elements  $v, w \in A_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}$  such that  $f_{h'}(u) = f_{h'}(v)$ ,  $f_{h'}(w) < f_{h'}(v)$  and the graph  $D_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}$  has an edge  $(w, v)$ : Let  $u \in A_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}} \setminus B_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}$ . We proceed by a case distinction: (1) The type  $\overline{tp}_{\mathcal{M}}^{\varphi}(u)$  of  $u$  has not been seen during the DFS before  $u$  is visited. Because of  $u \notin B_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}$  there is a predecessor  $w \in A_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}$  of  $u$  in  $D_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}$  through which  $u$  has been reached during the DFS. Because  $w$  has been reached before  $u$  and because  $u$  is assigned the smallest number in  $[1, |\text{TYPES}_{\varphi}|]$  that has not been used so far, we have  $f_{h'}(w) < f_{h'}(u)$ . (2) The type  $\overline{tp}_{\mathcal{M}}^{\varphi}(u)$  of  $u$  has already been seen during the DFS before  $u$  is visited. Let  $v \in A_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}$  be the first node with type  $\overline{tp}_{\mathcal{M}}^{\varphi}(v) = \overline{tp}_{\mathcal{M}}^{\varphi}(u)$  to be visited during the DFS. By case (1) there is a predecessor  $w$  of  $v$  in  $D_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}$  with  $f_{h'}(w) < f_{h'}(v)$ . By (\*) we have  $f_{h'}(u) = f_{h'}(v)$ . Thus, the claim follows.



This gives direction  $\Rightarrow$  of the following lemma:

**Lemma 4.**  $\Phi = \varphi \wedge \bigwedge RE \wedge \bigwedge DI$  is satisfiable iff there is a  $\Phi$ -semi-connected structure with  $h'$ -useful labelings for every  $1 \leq h' \leq h$ .

Next, we introduce definitions that will be needed for the proof of direction  $\Leftarrow$ .

Let  $G = (V, E)$  be a directed graph.  $Reach_G(X) = Y$  denotes the set of elements  $Y \subseteq V$  that are *reachable* from  $X \subseteq V$  in  $G$ .

**Definition 9 (Base and Values).** Let  $f$  be a  $h'$ -useful labeling for  $\mathcal{M}$ . We call a set  $X \subseteq A_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}$  a *base* for  $D_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}$ , if  $Reach_{D_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}}(X) = A_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}$ . We call a member  $x$  of a base  $X$  a *base element*. We define the value  $val_f(X) = \sum_{x \in X \setminus B_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}} f(x)$  of a base  $X$  to be the sum over the label values of the base elements of  $X$  that are not in  $B_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}$ . We define the value  $val_f(D_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}) = \min\{val_f(X) \mid X \text{ is a base for } D_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}\}$  of the graph  $D_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}$  to be the minimum of the values of its bases. We omit the subscript  $f$  in  $val(X)$  and  $val(D_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}})$  when  $f$  is clear from the context.

Intuitively, values  $val_f(D_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}})$  capture how close the graph  $D_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}$  is to being connected:

**Lemma 5.** Let  $f$  be a  $h'$ -useful labeling for  $\mathcal{M}$ .  $val_f(D_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}) = 0$  iff  $D_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}$  is connected.

*Proof.* Assume  $D_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}$  is connected. Then  $B_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}$  is a base for  $D_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}$ . Thus  $val(B_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}) = 0$ , which implies  $val(D_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}) = 0$ .

Assume  $val(D_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}) = 0$ . Then there is a base  $X$  for  $D_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}$  with  $val(X) = 0$ . Because  $f$  maps all nodes to positive values, we must have  $X \subseteq B_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}$ . Thus, every node in  $D_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}$  is reachable from  $B_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}$ .

The following lemma states a property of bases in semi-connected structures:

**Lemma 6.** Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be a structure that is  $\Phi$ -semi-connected. Let  $f$  be a  $h'$ -useful labeling for  $\mathcal{M}$ . Let  $X$  be a base for  $D_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}$  with  $val_f(X) = val_f(D_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}})$ . Then every base element  $x \in X$  either belongs to  $B_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}$  or to a cycle of  $D_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}$ .

*Proof.* We fix some base element  $x \in X$ . Let us assume  $x$  does not belong to  $B_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}$  or to a cycle of  $D_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}$ . By definition we have  $val(X) = val(D_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}) = \min\{val(X) \mid X \text{ is a base for } D_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}\}$ . By the semi-connectedness of  $\mathcal{M}$ ,  $x$  is either reachable from  $B_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}$  (1) or from a cycle in  $D_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}$  (2). Case (1):  $x$  is reachable from some  $z \in B_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}$ . However,  $X' = X \setminus \{x\} \cup \{z\}$  is a base for  $D_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}$  with  $val(X') < val(X)$ . Contradiction. Case (2):  $x$  is reachable from some cycle  $C$  in  $D_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}$ . We fix an element  $y$  on  $C$ . Because  $X$  is a base, there is a base element  $z \in X$  such that  $y$  can be reached from  $z$ . We have  $z \neq x$ , because otherwise  $x$  would belong to a cycle of  $D_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}$ . However,  $X' = X \setminus \{x\}$  is a base for  $D_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}$  with  $val(X') < val(X)$ . Contradiction.


The next lemma, Lemma 7, shows that  $\triangleright$  can be applied to  $D_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}$  such that  $val(D_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}})$  decreases for some  $1 \leq h' \leq h$ . The compatibility of  $RE$  and  $DI$  ensures that  $\triangleright$  does not modify the graphs  $D_{\ell}^{\mathcal{M}}$  with  $\ell \neq h'$ .

**Lemma 7.** *Let  $1 \leq h' \leq h$  and let  $\mathcal{M}$  be a structure such that  $\mathcal{M} \models \text{assoc}(\Phi)$ ,  $\mathcal{M}$  is  $\Phi$ -semi-connected and has  $\ell$ -useful labelings  $f_\ell$  for all  $1 \leq \ell \leq h$ . If  $\text{val}_{f_{h'}}(D_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}) > 0$ , then there is a tuple  $\mathfrak{t} = (a_0, a_1, r)$  such that*

1. For all  $\ell \neq h'$ ,  $D_\ell^{\mathcal{M}} = D_\ell^{\mathcal{M}_{\mathfrak{t}\triangleright}}$ .
2. For all  $u \in M$ ,  $\overline{tp}_{\mathcal{M}}^\varphi(u) = \overline{tp}_{\mathcal{M}_{\mathfrak{t}\triangleright}}^\varphi(u)$ .
3.  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathfrak{t}\triangleright} \models \text{assoc}(\Phi)$ .
4.  $\text{val}_{f_{h'}}(D_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}) > \text{val}_{f_{h'}}(D_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}_{\mathfrak{t}\triangleright}})$ .
5.  $\text{val}_{f_\ell}(D_\ell^{\mathcal{M}}) = \text{val}_{f_\ell}(D_\ell^{\mathcal{M}_{\mathfrak{t}\triangleright}})$  for all  $\ell \neq h'$ .
6.  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathfrak{t}\triangleright}$  is  $\Phi$ -semi-connected.
7.  $f_\ell$  is a  $\ell$ -useful labeling for  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathfrak{t}\triangleright}$  for all  $1 \leq \ell \leq h$ .

*Proof (Proof Sketch).* In the following, we will give an intuition on the proof of Lemma 7. We delay the full proof to Section 3.5. We fix some base  $X$  for  $D_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}$  with  $\text{val}(X) = \text{val}(D_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}) > 0$ . We choose a base element  $a_1 \in X \setminus B_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}$ . Because  $f_{h'}$  is a  $h'$ -useful labeling for  $\mathcal{M}$  there are  $a_0, w \in A_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}$  such that  $f_{h'}(a_0) = f_{h'}(a_1)$ ,  $f_{h'}(w) < f_{h'}(a_0)$  and the graph  $D_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}$  has an edge  $(w, a_0)$ .  $a_0$  and  $a_1$  cannot belong to the same cycle in  $D_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}$  by the minimality of  $X$ . By Lemma 6,  $a_1$  belongs to a cycle in  $D_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}$ .  $b_1$  denotes the successor of  $a_1$  by some edge  $r$  in this cycle.

Figure 3.1 shows the result (II) of applying  $\triangleright$  on (I) (we depict here the case, where  $a_0$  has an  $r$ -successor  $b_0$ ). The black vertex belongs to the base  $X$ , dotted arrows denote paths inside  $A_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}$  whose edges belong to  $S_{h'}$ , and solid arrows belong to  $S_{h'}$ . Applying  $\triangleright$  increases the reachability of the structure: all vertices in (II) are now reachable from the black vertex. However, in the special case where the black vertex and  $a_1$  coincide, a new cycle is created. In both cases we have that  $X' = X \setminus \{a_1\} \cup \{w\}$  is a base for  $D_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}_{\mathfrak{t}\triangleright}}$  with  $\text{val}(X') < \text{val}(X)$  and that  $D_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}_{\mathfrak{t}\triangleright}}$  remains semi-connected.



**Fig. 3.1.**

Finally, we show that the repeated application of  $\triangleright$  on a semi-connected structure with useful labelings leads eventually to a structure satisfying  $\Phi$ :

*Proof (Proof of Lemma 4).* By Lemma 3 if  $\Phi$  is satisfied by a structure  $\mathcal{M}$ , then  $\mathcal{M}$  has  $h'$ -useful labelings for every  $h'$  and is semi-connected.

For the other direction, there is a  $\Phi$ -semi-connected structure  $\mathcal{M}$  with  $h'$ -useful labelings for every  $1 \leq h' \leq h$ . There is a sequence  $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_1, \dots, \mathcal{M}_p = \mathcal{M}'$  of structures such that each  $\mathcal{M}_{j+1}$  is obtained from  $\mathcal{M}_j$  by one application of  $\triangleright$  and  $\text{val}(D_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}_j}) = 0$  for all  $h'$ . There is guaranteed to be such a sequence because

1. the premise of Lemma 7 holds for  $\mathcal{M}$ ,
2. for all  $j$ , if the premise of Lemma 7 holds for  $\mathcal{M}_j$  and  $\phi$ , then the premise of Lemma 7 holds for  $\mathcal{M}_{j+1}$ , and
3. The tuple  $(\text{val}(D_1^{\mathcal{M}}), \dots, \text{val}(D_h^{\mathcal{M}}))$  is decreasing with regard to the component-wise ordering of  $h$ -tuples over  $\mathbb{N}$ , so eventually  $(0, \dots, 0)$  must be reached.

By Lemma 5,  $D_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}'}$  is connected for all  $h'$ .

### 3.3 Reducing connected satisfiability to (plain finite) satisfiability

Here we show how to express semi-connectedness and existence of useful labelings in  $\mathcal{ALCQIO}_b$ . For semi-connectedness, this is easy:

**Lemma 8.** *There exists a formula  $\text{semi}(\Phi) \in \mathcal{ALCQIO}_b$  such that  $\mathcal{M} \models \text{semi}(\Phi)$  iff  $\mathcal{M}$  is  $\Phi$ -semi-connected.*

*Proof.* Let  $\text{semi}(\Phi) = \text{assoc}(\Phi) \wedge \bigwedge_{1 \leq h' \leq h} \delta_{\text{reach-cyc}}^{h'}$  and  $\delta_{\text{reach-cyc}}^{h'} = A_{h'} \sqcap \neg B_{h'} \sqsubseteq \bigsqcup_{s \in S_{h'}} \exists s^-. A_{h'}$ . Assume  $\mathcal{M}$  is  $\Phi$ -semi-connected. We fix some  $1 \leq h' \leq h$ . Every  $u \in A_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}$  is reachable from  $B_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}$  or is reachable from a cycle, and therefore  $u$  has a predecessor in  $A_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}$  with respect to  $\bigcup_{s \in S_{h'}} s^{\mathcal{M}}$ , unless  $u \in B_{h'}$ , so  $\mathcal{M} \models \delta_{\text{reach-cyc}}^{h'}$ .

Conversely, we consider a structure  $\mathcal{M}$  with  $\mathcal{M} \models \text{assoc}(\Phi)$ , but which is not  $\Phi$ -semi-connected. There exists a vertex  $u$  and a  $1 \leq h' \leq h$  such that  $u$  is not reachable from  $B_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}$  nor from a cycle. There must exist a vertex  $v$  in  $A_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}$  which is a predecessor of  $u$  (possibly  $u$  itself) and which does not have a predecessor in  $A_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}$ , otherwise  $u$  lies on a cycle (using the finiteness of the universe). Since  $u$  is reachable from  $v$ , we must have that, like  $u$ ,  $v$  not reachable from  $B_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}$ . Therefore,  $v$  is not in  $B_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}$  but belongs to  $A_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}$  and does not have a predecessor, so  $\mathcal{M} \not\models \delta_{\text{reach-cyc}}^{RE,DI}$ .

Next we define a set of structures  $\text{ORD}(\varphi)$  that represent models of  $\varphi$  and at the same time also contain useful labelings. After this definition we will show that  $\text{ORD}(\varphi)$  can be defined inside the logic  $\mathcal{ALCQIO}_b$ .

**Definition 10.** *Let  $\varphi$  be a  $\mathcal{ALCQIO}_b$  formula over vocabulary  $\tau$ . Let  $k = |\text{TYPES}_\varphi|$ . We define an extended vocabulary  $\text{ext}(\tau)$  that extends  $\tau$  with a new atomic concept  $M$ , new nominals  $o_1, \dots, o_k$ , a new atomic role  $\text{ord}$  and new functional atomic roles  $f_1, \dots, f_h$ .*

*Let  $\mathcal{N}$  be a  $\text{ext}(\tau)$ -structure with universe  $N$ . We denote the substructure of  $\mathcal{N}$  with universe  $M^{\mathcal{N}}$  by  $\mathcal{M}$ . We denote the set  $N \setminus M^{\mathcal{N}}$  by  $O^{\mathcal{N}}$ . The structure  $\mathcal{N}$  belongs to  $\text{ORD}(\varphi)$  if the following conditions hold:*

1.  $\mathcal{M}$  satisfies  $\varphi$ .
2.  $N$  is partitioned into  $M^{\mathcal{N}}$  and  $O^{\mathcal{N}} = \{\sigma_1^{\mathcal{N}}, \dots, \sigma_k^{\mathcal{N}}\}$ .
3. We have that  $(\sigma_i^{\mathcal{N}}, \sigma_j^{\mathcal{N}}) \in \text{ord}^{\mathcal{N}}$  iff  $i < j$ .
4.  $f_{h'}^{\mathcal{N}}$  is a function from  $A_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}$  to  $O^{\mathcal{N}}$ , for every  $1 \leq h' \leq h$ .
5.  $f_{h'}^{\mathcal{N}}$  is a  $h'$ -useful labeling for  $\mathcal{M}$ , using  $O^{\mathcal{N}}$  for the natural numbers  $[1, k]$  and  $\text{ord}$  for the order on the natural numbers in Definition 8, for every  $1 \leq h' \leq h$ .

**Lemma 9.**  *$\text{ORD}(\varphi)$  is non-empty iff there is a model  $\mathcal{M}$  of  $\varphi$  with  $h'$ -useful labelings for  $\mathcal{M}$  for every  $1 \leq h' \leq h$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be a model of  $\varphi$  with  $h'$ -useful labelings  $f_{h'}'$  for every  $1 \leq h' \leq h$ . Let  $M'$  be the universe of  $\mathcal{M}$ . We define a model  $\mathcal{N}$  with universe  $N := M' \cup [1, k]$  by

- $M^{\mathcal{N}} = M'$ ,
- $\alpha_i^{\mathcal{N}} := i$ ,
- $ord^{\mathcal{N}} = \{(i, j) \mid 1 \leq i < j \leq k\}$ ,
- $f_i^{\mathcal{N}} := f'_i$ , and
- $C^{\mathcal{N}} = C^{\mathcal{M}}$  for all  $C \in \varphi$ .

Clearly,  $\mathcal{N}$  satisfies properties 1,2, 3, 4 and 5 of Definition 10.

Let  $\mathcal{N} \in \text{ORD}(\varphi)$ . Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be the substructure of  $\mathcal{N}$  with universe  $M^{\mathcal{N}}$ . By property 1,  $\mathcal{M}$  satisfies  $\varphi$ . By property 2,  $O^{\mathcal{N}} = \{\alpha_1^{\mathcal{N}}, \dots, \alpha_k^{\mathcal{N}}\}$ . By property 3,  $(\alpha_i^{\mathcal{N}}, \alpha_j^{\mathcal{N}}) \in ord^{\mathcal{N}}$  iff  $i < j$ . Thus  $(O^{\mathcal{N}}, ord^{\mathcal{N}})$  is isomorphic to  $([1, k], \leq)$ . By property 4,  $f_{h'}^{\mathcal{N}}$  is a function from  $A_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}$  to  $O^{\mathcal{N}}$ , for every  $1 \leq h' \leq h$ . By property 5,  $f_{h'}^{\mathcal{N}}$  is a  $h'$ -useful labeling for  $\mathcal{M}$ , using  $O^{\mathcal{N}}$  for the natural numbers  $[1, k]$  and  $ord^{\mathcal{N}}$  for the order on the natural numbers in Definition 8, for every  $1 \leq h' \leq h$ . Because  $(O^{\mathcal{N}}, ord^{\mathcal{N}})$  is isomorphic to  $([1, k], \leq)$ , the last property implies that  $f_{h'}^{\mathcal{N}}$  is a useful labeling, for every  $1 \leq h' \leq h$ .

**Lemma 10.** *For every formula  $\varphi \in \mathcal{ALCCQIO}_b$  there exists a formula  $ext(\varphi)$  such that  $ext(\varphi)$  defines  $\text{ORD}(\varphi)$ .*

*Proof.* We set  $ext(\varphi) = \theta^1 \wedge \theta^2 \wedge \theta^3 \wedge \theta^4 \wedge \theta^{5a} \wedge \theta^{5b}$ .  $\theta^X$  defines the property  $X$  in Definition 10.

- For every atomic concept  $A$ , let  $g(A) = A \sqcap M$ . For every concept  $C$ ,  $g(C)$  is obtained by replacing its sub-concepts with their  $g$  image and intersecting with  $M$  (e.g.,  $g(C_1 \sqcup C_2) = (g(C_1) \sqcup g(C_2)) \sqcap M$ ). Let  $g(\varphi)$  be obtained from  $\varphi$  by replacing every inclusion  $C \sqsubseteq D$  in  $\varphi$  by  $g(C) \sqsubseteq g(D)$ . Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be the substructure of  $\mathcal{N}$  with universe  $M^{\mathcal{N}}$  by  $\mathcal{M}$ . We have  $\mathcal{M} \models \varphi$  iff  $\mathcal{N} \models g(\varphi)$  (this holds because we have  $C^{\mathcal{M}} = g(C)^{\mathcal{N}}$  for all  $C \in \varphi$ ).
- Let  $\theta^2 = \neg M \equiv (o_1 \sqcup \dots \sqcup o_k)$ .  $\theta^2$  says that the universe of  $N \setminus M^{\mathcal{N}} = O^{\mathcal{N}} = \{\alpha_1^{\mathcal{N}}, \dots, \alpha_k^{\mathcal{N}}\}$ .
- Let  $\theta^3$  be the conjunction of  $o_i \sqsubseteq (\neg \bigsqcup_{1 \leq j \leq i} \exists ord.o_j)$  and  $o_i \sqsubseteq \prod_{i < j \leq k} \exists ord.o_j$  for  $1 \leq i \leq k$ .  $\theta^3$  says that  $\alpha_i^{\mathcal{N}} \in \prod_{i < j \leq k} \{u \mid (u, \alpha_j^{\mathcal{N}}) \in ord^{\mathcal{N}}\}$  and  $\alpha_i^{\mathcal{N}} \notin \bigsqcup_{1 \leq j \leq i} \{u \mid (u, \alpha_j^{\mathcal{N}}) \in ord^{\mathcal{N}}\}$ , i.e.,  $(\alpha_i^{\mathcal{N}}, \alpha_j^{\mathcal{N}}) \in ord^{\mathcal{N}}$  iff  $i < j$ .
- Let  $\theta^4$  be the conjunction of the formulas  $(\exists f_{h'} \equiv A_{h'} \sqcap M)$  and  $(\exists f_{h'}^- \sqsubseteq \neg M)$  for  $1 \leq h' \leq h$ .  $\theta^4$  says that  $f_{h'}^{\mathcal{N}}$  is a function from  $A^{\mathcal{N}} \cap M^{\mathcal{N}} = A_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}$  to  $N \setminus M^{\mathcal{N}} = O^{\mathcal{N}}$ .
- Let  $\theta^{5a}$  be the conjunction of  $(\exists f_{h'}^- . C) \sqcap (\exists f_{h'}^- . \neg C) \equiv \perp$  for all  $1 \leq h' \leq h$  and  $C \in \varphi$ .  $\theta^{5a}$  says that if  $u, v \in A_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}$  point to the same nominal (i.e.,  $f_{h'}^{\mathcal{N}}(u) = f_{h'}^{\mathcal{N}}(v)$ ), then they must agree on every concept  $C \in \varphi$  (i.e.,  $u \in C^{\mathcal{N}}$  iff  $v \in C^{\mathcal{N}}$ ), thus  $\overline{tp}_{\mathcal{M}}^{\varphi}(u) = \overline{tp}_{\mathcal{M}}^{\varphi}(v)$ .
- Let  $\theta^{5b}$  be the conjunction, for all  $1 \leq \ell \leq k$  and

$$1 \leq h' \leq h, \text{ of } (\exists f_{h'} . o_{\ell} \sqcap \neg B_{h'} \not\equiv \perp) \rightarrow \\ (\perp \not\equiv (\bigsqcup_{s \in S_{h'}} \exists s . \exists f_{h'} . o_{\ell}) \sqcap \exists f_{h'} . \exists ord . o_{\ell})$$

$\theta^{5b}$  says that if  $u \in A_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}} \setminus B_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}$  is pointing to some nominal  $\alpha_{\ell}^{\mathcal{N}}$  with  $f_{h'}^{\mathcal{N}}$ , then there is a  $v \in A_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}$  that has a successor pointing to the same nominal  $\alpha_{\ell}^{\mathcal{N}}$

with  $f_{h'}^N$  and that is pointing to a smaller nominal with  $f_{h'}^N$  (i.e., pointing to some nominal in  $(\exists \text{ord}.o_\ell)^N$ ).

**Theorem 2.** *Let  $\Phi_i = \varphi_i \wedge \bigwedge RE_i \wedge \bigwedge DI_i \in \mathcal{ALCQIO}_{b,Re}$ , for  $i = 1, 2$ . There are  $\mathcal{ALCQIO}$  formulas  $\mu$  and  $\kappa$  over an extended vocabulary such that*

- (1)  $\Phi_1$  is satisfiable iff  $\mu$  is satisfiable.
- (2)  $\Phi_1$  implies  $\Phi_2$  iff  $\kappa$  is not satisfiable.

*Proof.* (1) follows from Lemmas 4, 8, 9, and 10 by setting  $\mu = \text{ext}(\text{semi}(\Phi))$ .

(2): For every  $h'$ , let  $X_{h'}$  be a fresh atomic concept and let  $\alpha_{h'}$  be the conjunction of  $(B_{h'} \sqsubseteq X_{h'}) \wedge (A_{h'} \sqcap \neg X_{h'} \neq \perp)$  and  $\bigwedge_{s \in S_{h'}} (\exists s. \neg X_{h'} \sqsubseteq \neg X_{h'})$ . For every  $\mathcal{M}$ ,  $\mathcal{M} \models \neg B_{h'} \xrightarrow{S_{h'}} A_{h'}$  iff there is  $X_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}$  such that  $\langle \mathcal{M}, X_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}} \rangle \models \alpha_{h'}$ . Hence,  $\mathcal{M} \models \neg \Phi_2$  iff there are  $X_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}} \subseteq M$ ,  $1 \leq h' \leq h$ , such that  $\langle \mathcal{M}, X_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}} : 1 \leq h' \leq h \rangle \models \neg \varphi_2 \vee \neg \bigwedge DI_2 \vee \bigvee_{1 \leq h' \leq h} \alpha_{h'}$ . Hence,  $\kappa_\varphi = \Phi_1 \wedge (\neg \varphi_2 \vee \neg \bigwedge DI_2 \vee \bigvee_{1 \leq h' \leq h} \alpha_{h'})$  is satisfiable iff  $\Phi_1 \rightarrow \Phi_2$  is not a tautology and we get (2). In both (1) and (2) we use that satisfiability in  $\mathcal{ALCQIO}_b$  is reducible to that in  $\mathcal{ALCQIO}$ , see Appendix B.

### 3.4 NEXPTIME decision procedures

The algorithm in Theorem 2 produces, for a formula  $\varphi$ , a formula whose size is exponential in the size of  $\varphi$ . Most of the constructions along the proof introduce only a polynomial growth, except for the nominals in Definition 10 and the formulae that use them. We discuss here how to effectively compute an  $\mathcal{ALCQIO}$ -formula of polynomial size in  $\varphi$ , which introduces the required linear ordering of exponential length without use of the nominals. Since satisfiability in  $\mathcal{ALCQIO}$  is NEXPTIME-complete [23], so is satisfiability and implication in  $\mathcal{ALCQIO}_{b,Re}$ . We sketch the idea first.

In Section 3.3 a structure  $\mathcal{N} \in \text{ORD}(\varphi)$  with universe  $N$  represents a model  $\mathcal{M}$  of  $\varphi$  with universe  $M$  and at the same time also contains useful labelings for  $\mathcal{M}$ . Here, we define structures  $\mathcal{N}$  which extend  $\mathcal{M}$  in a different though similar way. Let  $k = |\{C \mid C \in \varphi\}|$ . We introduce new concepts  $P_1, \dots, P_k$  and use them to require that  $O := N \setminus M$  is of size  $2^k$  and that  $\text{succ}$  is interpreted as a successor relation on  $O$ . We think of the reflexive-transitive closure of  $\text{succ}^{\mathcal{N}}$  as  $\text{ord}^{\mathcal{N}}$  from Definition 10, but we will not compute  $\text{ord}^{\mathcal{N}}$  explicitly. For every binary word  $b_1 \dots b_k$ , there will be exactly one element of  $O$  in  $\bigcap_{i:b_i=1} P_i^{\mathcal{N}} \cap \bigcap_{i:b_i=0} \neg P_i^{\mathcal{N}}$ . I.e.,  $P_i^{\mathcal{M}}$  represents elements whose corresponding binary word has  $b_i = 1$ .  $\text{succ}^{\mathcal{N}}$  will be induced by the usual successor relation on binary words of length  $k$ : an element  $u \in O$  is the successor of  $v \in O$  in  $\text{succ}^{\mathcal{N}}$  iff there is  $\ell$  such that (1)  $u$  and  $v$  agree on  $P_i^{\mathcal{N}}$ ,  $i > \ell$ , (2)  $u \in P_\ell^{\mathcal{N}}$  and  $v \notin P_\ell^{\mathcal{N}}$  and (3)  $v \in P_i^{\mathcal{N}}$  and  $u \notin P_i^{\mathcal{N}}$ ,  $i < \ell$ . Similarly as in Definition 10, the functions  $f_{h'}^N$  need to be useful labelings, using  $O$  for the numbers  $[1, 2^k]$  and  $(\text{succ}^{\mathcal{N}})^*$  for the linear order on natural numbers in Definition 8. Importantly, we do not define the transitive closure  $(\text{succ}^{\mathcal{N}})^*$  explicitly. Instead, we exploit the fact that  $b_y \dots b_1$  is less than  $d_y \dots d_1$  iff there exists an index  $i$  such that  $b_y \dots b_{i+1} = d_y \dots d_{i+1}$ ,  $b_i = 0$  and  $d_i = 1$ .

**Definition 11.** Let  $\varphi$  be a  $\mathcal{ALCQIO}_b$  formula over vocabulary  $\tau$ . Let  $k = |\{C \mid C \in \varphi\}|$ . We define an extended vocabulary  $\text{ext}(\tau)$  that extends  $\tau$  with new atomic concepts  $M, P_1, \dots, P_k$ , a new nominal  $o_{\text{start}}$ , and new atomic functional roles  $\text{succ}, f_1, \dots, f_h$ .

Let  $\mathcal{N}$  be a  $\text{ext}(\tau)$ -structure with universe  $N$ . We denote the substructure of  $\mathcal{N}$  with universe  $M^{\mathcal{N}}$  by  $\mathcal{M}$ . We denote the set  $N \setminus M^{\mathcal{N}}$  by  $O^{\mathcal{N}}$ . We denote by  $\text{eval} : O^{\mathcal{N}} \rightarrow [1, 2^k]$  the function that maps an element  $u \in O^{\mathcal{N}}$  to  $\text{eval}(u) = 1 + \sum_{i: u \in P_i^{\mathcal{N}}} 2^{i-1}$ . We denote by  $(\text{succ}^{\mathcal{N}})^*$  the reflexive-transitive closure of  $\text{succ}^{\mathcal{N}}$ . The structure  $\mathcal{N}$  belongs to  $\text{ORD}(\varphi)$  if the following conditions hold:

1.  $\mathcal{M}$  satisfies  $\varphi$ .
2. We have  $O^{\mathcal{N}} = \{o_{\text{start}}^{\mathcal{N}}\} \cup \bigcup_{1 \leq i \leq k} P_i^{\mathcal{N}}$ .
3.  $\text{eval}$  is a bijective function,  $\text{eval}(o_{\text{start}}^{\mathcal{N}}) = 1$ , and  $\text{succ}(u) = v$  iff  $\text{eval}(u) + 1 = \text{eval}(v)$  for all  $u, v \in O^{\mathcal{N}}$ .
4.  $f_{h'}^{\mathcal{N}}$  is a function from  $A_\ell^{\mathcal{M}}$  to  $O^{\mathcal{N}}$ , for every  $1 \leq h' \leq h$ .
5.  $f_{h'}^{\mathcal{N}}$  is a  $h'$ -useful labeling for  $\mathcal{M}$ , using  $O^{\mathcal{N}}$  for the natural numbers  $[1, 2^k]$  and  $(\text{succ}^{\mathcal{N}})^*$  for the order on the natural numbers in Definition 8, for every  $1 \leq h' \leq h$ .

**Lemma 11.**  $\text{ORD}(\varphi)$  is non-empty iff there is a model  $\mathcal{M}$  of  $\varphi$  with  $h'$ -useful labelings for  $\mathcal{M}$  for every  $1 \leq h' \leq h$ .

**Lemma 12.** For every formula  $\varphi \in \mathcal{ALCQIO}_b$  there exists a formula  $\text{ext}(\varphi)$ , of size polynomial in  $k$ , such that  $\text{ext}(\varphi)$  defines  $\text{ORD}(\varphi)$ .

*Proof.* We set  $\text{ext}(\varphi) = \theta^1 \wedge \theta^2 \wedge \theta^3 \wedge \theta^4 \wedge \theta^{5a} \wedge \theta^{5b}$ .  $\theta^X$  defines the property  $X$  in Definition 11. The formulae  $\theta^1, \theta^4$  and  $\theta^{5a}$  are the same as in the proof of Lemma 10.

- Let  $\theta^2 = \neg M \equiv o_{\text{start}} \sqcup \bigsqcup_{1 \leq i \leq k} P_i$ .  $\theta^2$  says that  $O^{\mathcal{N}} = N \setminus M^{\mathcal{N}} = \{o_{\text{start}}^{\mathcal{N}}\} \cup \bigcup_{1 \leq i \leq k} P_i^{\mathcal{N}}$ .
- Let  $\theta^3 = \zeta_{\text{consec}} \wedge \zeta_{\text{first}} \wedge \zeta_{\text{last}} \wedge \zeta_{\text{consec}}$  expresses that the successor relation mimics the binary words: two words  $b_k \dots b_1$  and  $d_k \dots d_1$  are consecutive in  $\text{succ}$  iff there exists an index  $i$  such that  $b_i \dots b_1 = 01^{i-1}$ ,  $d_i \dots d_1 = 10^{i-1}$ , and  $b_k \dots b_{i+1} = d_k \dots d_{i+1}$ . We introduce concepts  $C_i$ , for every  $1 \leq i \leq k$  (the concepts  $C_i$  can be either added as fresh concepts or used as abbreviations; the resulting formula  $\zeta_{\text{consec}}$  will be of polynomial size in both cases):

$$\begin{aligned}
C_i &= \neg P_i \sqcap \exists \text{succ}. P_i \\
C_{<i} &= \bigsqcap_{j < i} (P_j \sqcap \exists \text{succ}. \neg P_j) \\
C_{>i} &= \bigsqcap_{i < j \leq k} (P_j \sqcap \exists \text{succ}. P_j \sqcup \neg P_j \sqcap \exists \text{succ}. \neg P_j) \\
\zeta_{\text{consec}} &= (\neg M \sqcap \neg (P_1 \sqcap \dots \sqcap P_k)) \sqsubseteq \\
&\quad \bigsqcap_{1 \leq i \leq k} C_{<i} \sqcap C_i \sqcap C_{>i}
\end{aligned}$$

The formulae

$$\begin{aligned}\zeta_{first} = o_{start} &\equiv (\neg P_1 \sqcap \dots \sqcap \neg P_k) \wedge \\ &\quad \exists succ^- \equiv \neg M \sqcap o_{start} \\ \zeta_{last} &= \exists succ \equiv \neg M \sqcap \neg (P_1 \sqcap \dots \sqcap P_k)\end{aligned}$$

specify that all elements in  $O^{\mathcal{N}}$  except for  $(P_1 \sqcap \dots \sqcap P_k)^{\mathcal{N}}$  have a successor, that all elements except for  $\sigma_{start}^{\mathcal{N}}$  have a predecessor and that  $(\neg P_1 \sqcap \dots \sqcap \neg P_y)^{\mathcal{N}}$  contains exactly the single element  $\sigma_{start}^{\mathcal{N}}$ . The above stated facts imply that for every vector  $(b_1, \dots, b_k) \in \{0, 1\}^k$  there is exactly one element of  $O^{\mathcal{N}}$  in

$$\left( \prod_{i:b_i=1} P_i \sqcap \prod_{i:b_i=0} \neg P_i \right)^{\mathcal{N}}.$$

- We do not define the transitive closure  $(succ^{\mathcal{N}})^*$  explicitly. Instead, we exploit the fact that  $b_y \dots b_1$  is less than  $d_y \dots d_1$  iff there exists an index  $i$  such that  $b_y \dots b_{i+1} = d_y \dots d_{i+1}$ ,  $b_i = 0$  and  $d_i = 1$ . We introduce concepts  $E_{h',s,i}^{\mathcal{N}}$ , for every  $1 \leq h' \leq h$ ,  $s \in S_{h'}$  and  $i \in [1, k]$ , which will contain all of the elements  $u \in M$  such that the types of  $u$  and  $s^{\mathcal{N}}(u)$  agree on membership in  $P_{i+1}^{\mathcal{N}}, \dots, P_y^{\mathcal{N}}$ ,  $u \notin P_i^{\mathcal{N}}$  and  $s^{\mathcal{N}}(u) \in P_i^{\mathcal{N}}$  (the concepts  $E_{h',s,i}^{\mathcal{N}}$  can be either added as fresh concepts or used as abbreviations; the resulting formula  $\theta^{5b}$  will be of polynomial size in both cases).

$$\begin{aligned}E_{h',s,i} &\equiv \exists f_{h'}. \neg P_i \sqcap \exists s. \exists f_{h'}. P_i \sqcap \\ &\quad \prod_{i+1 \leq j \leq y} \left( \exists f_{h'}. P_j \sqcap \exists s. \exists f_{h'}. P_j \sqcup \right. \\ &\quad \left. \exists f_{h'}. \neg P_j \sqcap \exists s. \exists f_{h'}. \neg P_j \right)\end{aligned}$$

The formula  $\theta^{5b}$  states that for every element  $u \in A_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}$  with  $u \notin B_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}$  there is an element  $v$  with the same value (i.e.,  $v$  points to the same element as  $u$  via  $f_{h'}$ ) such that  $v$  is again in  $A_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}$  and  $v$  has a previous element which is smaller than  $v$ .  $\theta^{5b}$  is the conjunction of

$$\exists f_{h'}^-. \neg B_{h'} \sqsubseteq \exists f_{h'}^- \cdot \left( \bigsqcup_{s \in S_{h'}, i \in [1, k]} \exists s^- \cdot E_{h',s,i} \right)$$

for every  $1 \leq h' \leq h$ .

**Theorem 3.** *Let  $\Phi_i = \varphi_i \wedge \bigwedge RE_i \wedge \bigwedge DI_i \in \mathcal{ALCQIO}_{b,Re}$  for  $i = 1, 2$ . There are polynomial-time computable  $\mathcal{ALCQIO}$  formulas  $\eta$  and  $\rho$  over an extended vocabulary such that*

1.  $\Phi_1$  is satisfiable iff  $\eta$  is satisfiable.
2.  $\Phi_1$  implies  $\Phi_2$  iff  $\rho$  is not satisfiable.
3. Satisfiability and implication in  $\mathcal{ALCQIO}_{b,Re}$  is NEXPTIME-complete.

(1) follows from Lemmas 4, 8, 11 and 12 by setting  $\eta = \text{ext}(\text{semi}(\Phi))$ .

(2) follows from (1) similarly to Theorem 2.

(3): We use here the reduction from  $\mathcal{ALCQIO}_b$  to  $\mathcal{ALCQIO}$  in Appendix B. Satisfiability in  $\mathcal{ALCQIO}$  is NEXPTIME-complete [23]. Since  $\mathcal{ALCQIO}_{b,Re}$  contains  $\mathcal{ALCQIO}$ , and at the same time, satisfiability and implication of  $\mathcal{ALCQIO}_{b,Re}$ -formulae are polynomial-time reducible to  $\mathcal{ALCQIO}$  satisfiability, (3) holds.

### 3.5 Applying $\triangleright$ leads to Standard Models

In the proof of Lemma 4 we have shown how to turn non-standard models into standard models by repeated applications of  $\triangleright$  and based on Lemma 7, which we prove here.

*Proof (Proof of Lemma 7).* We assume  $\text{val}(D_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}) > 0$ . Let  $X$  be a base for  $D_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}$  such that  $\text{val}(X) = \text{val}(D_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}})$ . Because of  $\text{val}(D_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}) > 0$ , there is a base element  $a_1 \in X$  with  $a_1 \notin B_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}$ . By the  $h'$ -usefulness of  $f_{h'}$ , there are  $a_0, w \in A_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}$  such that  $f_{h'}(a_0) = f_{h'}(a_1)$ ,  $f_{h'}(w) < f_{h'}(a_0)$  and the graph  $D_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}$  has an edge  $(w, a_0)$ .

By Lemma 6  $a_1$  belongs to some cycle  $C$  in  $D_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}$ . We denote the successor of  $a_1$  in  $C$  by  $b_1$ . Let  $r \in \mathbf{N}_F$  be the functional role with  $(a_1, b_1) \in r^{\mathcal{M}}$  and  $r \in S_{h'}$  (recall that the set  $S_{h'}$  belongs to the reachability-assertion  $B_{h'} \xrightarrow{S_{h'}} A_{h'}$ ). We denote the remaining path from  $b_1$  to  $a_1$  in  $C$  by  $\pi_{b_1, a_1}$ . We note that  $\pi_{b_1, a_1}$  does not contain  $a_0$ ; otherwise  $X' = X \setminus \{a_1\} \cup \{w\}$  would be a basis for  $D_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}$  with  $\text{val}(D_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}) = \text{val}(X) > \text{val}(X')$ , contradiction. We denote by  $b_0$  the  $r^{\mathcal{M}}$ -successor of  $a_0$ , if it exists (i.e., if there is an edge  $(a_0, b_0) \in r^{\mathcal{M}}$ ).

We set  $\mathfrak{t} = (a_0, a_1, r)$ . For all  $1 \leq \ell \leq h$  we define the shorthand  $D_\ell^\triangleright = D_\ell^{\mathcal{M}\mathfrak{t}\triangleright}$ ,  $A_\ell^\triangleright = A_\ell^{\mathcal{M}\mathfrak{t}\triangleright}$ ,  $B_\ell^\triangleright = B_\ell^{\mathcal{M}\mathfrak{t}\triangleright}$ .

1. By the compatibility of  $RE$  and  $DI$ ,  $D_\ell^{\mathcal{M}} = D_\ell^\triangleright$  for all  $\ell \neq h'$ .
2. By Lemma 2,  $\overline{tp}_{\mathcal{M}}(u) = \overline{tp}_{\mathcal{M}\mathfrak{t}\triangleright}^\varphi(u)$  for all  $u \in M$ . Since the outgoing edges of every vertex  $u \notin \{a_0, a_1\}$  do not change by applying  $\triangleright$ ,  $\overline{tp}_{\mathcal{M}}(u) = \overline{tp}_{\mathcal{M}\mathfrak{t}\triangleright}^\varphi(u)$ . For  $a_0, a_1$ , the only change is in  $s$ , but  $a_0$  and  $a_1$  have outgoing edges corresponding to  $r$  both in  $\mathcal{M}$  and in  $\mathcal{M}\mathfrak{t}\triangleright$ . So,  $\overline{tp}_{\mathcal{M}}(u) = \overline{tp}_{\mathcal{M}\mathfrak{t}\triangleright}^\varphi(u)$  for  $u \in \{a_0, a_1\}$ .
3. By Lemma 2,  $\mathcal{M}$  and  $\mathcal{M}\mathfrak{t}\triangleright$  agree on  $\varphi$ .
4. We show that  $X' = X \setminus \{a_1\} \cup \{w\}$  is a base for  $D_{h'}^\triangleright$ . We have  $\text{val}(X) > \text{val}(X')$  by  $f_{h'}(a_0) = f_{h'}(a_1)$  and  $f_{h'}(w) < f_{h'}(a_0)$ . This is sufficient to establish  $\text{val}(D_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}) = \text{val}(X) > \text{val}(X') \geq \text{val}(D_{h'}^\triangleright)$ .

We consider some node  $v \in D_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}$ . Because  $X$  is a basis,  $v$  is reachable from some  $u \in X$  by some path  $\pi$ . We introduce  $Z = \{a_0, b_0, a_1, b_1\}$  as a shorthand. We proceed by a case distinction.

Case 1:  $\pi$  does not contain any node from  $Z$  (in particular  $u \neq a_1$ ). Then,  $\pi$  also witnesses that  $v$  is reachable from  $u \in X'$  by  $\pi$  in  $D_{h'}^\triangleright$ .

Case 2:  $\pi$  contains a node from  $Z$ . Then there is a decomposition of  $\pi$  into two paths  $\pi_1$  and  $\pi_2$ , i.e.,  $\pi = \pi_1\pi_2$ , such that  $\pi_2$  starts with a node  $z \in Z$  but otherwise does not visit  $Z$ . We construct a path  $\pi_0$  from  $w$  to  $z$  using a suitable combination of the edges  $(w, a_0), (a_0, b_1), (a_1, b_0)$  and the path



$\pi_{b_1, a_1}$ . Then the composition  $\pi' = \pi_0 \pi_2$  witnesses that  $v$  is reachable from  $w \in X'$  by  $\pi'$  in  $D_{h'}^\triangleright$ .

For use in 6), we point out that the special case of  $v = w$  establishes that  $w$  is either reachable from a node in  $X \setminus \{a_1\}$  (case 1) or belongs to a cycle in  $D_{h'}^\triangleright$  (case 2).

5. Follows directly from 1 and 2.
6. Follows directly from 1 for every  $1 \leq \ell \leq h$  with  $h' \neq \ell$ . In 4), we have established that  $X' = X \setminus \{a_1\} \cup \{w\}$  is a basis for  $D_{h'}^\triangleright$  and that  $w$  is either reachable from a node in  $X \setminus \{a_1\}$  or belongs to a cycle. It remains to show that every  $u \in X \setminus \{a_1\}$  either belongs to  $B_{h'}^\triangleright$  or to a cycle of  $D_{h'}^\triangleright$ . We fix some  $u \in X \setminus \{a_1\}$ . By Lemma 6  $u$  either belongs to  $B_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}$  or to a cycle of  $D_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}$ . If  $u \in B_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}$ , then  $u \in B_{h'}^\triangleright$  by 2). Otherwise,  $u$  belongs to a cycle  $C$  in  $D_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}$ .  $C$  cannot contain  $a_1$ ; otherwise  $X \setminus \{a_1\}$  would be a base with  $val(X \setminus \{a_1\}) < val(X) = val(D_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}})$ . We obtain the cycle  $C'$  in  $D_{h'}^\triangleright$  by replacing every edge  $(a_0, b_0)$  in  $C$  with the path  $(a_0, b_1), \pi_{b_1, a_1}, (a_1, b_0)$ .
7. Follows directly from 1 and 2 for every  $1 \leq \ell \leq h$  with  $h' \neq \ell$ . Because  $f_{h'}$  is a  $h'$ -useful labeling for  $D_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}$  we have that (1)  $f_{h'}(u) = f_{h'}(v)$  implies  $\overline{tp}_{\mathcal{M}}^\varphi(u) = \overline{tp}_{\mathcal{M}}^\varphi(v)$  for all  $u, v \in A_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}$  and (2) for every element  $u \in A_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}$ , either  $u \in B_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}$ , or there exist elements  $v, w \in A_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}$  such that  $f_{h'}(u) = f_{h'}(v)$ ,  $f_{h'}(w) < f_{h'}(v)$  and the graph  $D_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}$  has an edge  $(w, v)$ . We have that  $\overline{tp}_{\mathcal{M}}^\varphi(u) = \overline{tp}_{\mathcal{M}_{\triangleright}}^\varphi(u)$  for all  $u \in M$  by 2). Thus,  $A_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}} = A_{h'}^\triangleright$ . Further,  $f_{h'}$  has the same values on  $A_{h'}^{\mathcal{M}}$  and  $A_{h'}^\triangleright$ . Because the operation  $\triangleright$  changed only the edges  $(a_0, b_0)$  and  $(a_1, b_1)$  these facts almost show that  $f_{h'}$  is a  $h'$ -useful labeling for  $D_{h'}^\triangleright$ . It remains to argue that for every element  $u$  with  $f_{h'}(u) = f_{h'}(a_0)$  ( $= f_{h'}(a_1)$ ) there exist elements  $v, w \in A_{h'}^\triangleright$  such that  $f_{h'}(u) = f_{h'}(v)$ ,  $f_{h'}(w) < f_{h'}(v)$  and the graph  $D_{h'}^\triangleright$  has an edge  $(w, v)$ . This fact is witnessed by the edge  $(w, a_1)$ .

## References

1. A. Artale, D. Calvanese, R. Kontchakov, V. Ryzhikov, and M. Zakharyashev. Reasoning over extended ER models. In *Conceptual Modeling-ER 2007*, volume 4801, pages 277–292, 2007.
2. F. Baader, D. Calvanese, D. L. McGuinness, D. Nardi, and P. F. Patel-Schneider, editors. *The Description Logic handbook: theory, implementation, and applications*. Cambridge University Press, 2003.
3. F. Baader, C. Lutz, M. Milicic, U. Sattler, and F. Wolter. Integrating description logics and action formalisms: First results. In *AAAI*, pages 572–577, 2005.
4. D. Berardi, D. Calvanese, and G. De Giacomo. Reasoning on UML class diagrams. *Artificial Intelligence*, 168(1–2):70–118, 2005.
5. P. A. Bonatti and A. Peron. On the undecidability of logics with converse, nominals, recursion and counting. *Artificial Intelligence*, 158(1):75–96, 2004.
6. A. Borgida. On the relative expressiveness of description logics and predicate logics. *Artif. Intell.*, 82(1-2):353–367, 1996.
7. D. Calvanese, T. Eiter, and M. Ortiz. Regular path queries in expressive description logics with nominals. In *IJCAI*, pages 714–720, 2009.

8. D. Calvanese, T. Kotek, M. Simkus, H. Veith, and F. Zuleger. Shape and content: Incorporating domain knowledge into shape analysis. *CoRR*, abs/1312.6624. To appear in iFM 2014.
9. W. Charatonik and P. Witkowski. Two-variable logic with counting and trees. In *LICS*, pages 73–82, 2013.
10. Chan Le Duc, Myriam Lamolle, and Olivier Curé. A decision procedure for shoiq with transitive closure of roles. In *International Semantic Web Conference (1)*, pages 264–279, 2013.
11. L. Georgieva and P. Maier. Description logics for shape analysis. In *SEFM*, pages 321–330. IEEE, 2005.
12. G. De Giacomo and M. Lenzerini. Concept language with number restrictions and fixpoints, and its relationship with mu-calculus. In *ECAI*, pages 411–415, 1994.
13. Y. Kazakov, U. Sattler, and E. Zolin. How many legs do i have? non-simple roles in number restrictions revisited. In *LPAR*, volume 4790 of *LNCS*, pages 303–317. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2007.
14. W3C OWL Working Group. *OWL 2 Web Ontology Language: Document Overview*. W3C Recommendation, 27.10.09. Available at <http://www.w3.org/TR/owl2-overview/>.
15. I. Pratt-Hartmann. Complexity of the two-variable fragment with counting quantifiers. *Journal of Logic, Language and Information*, 14(3):369–395, 2005.
16. J. C. Reynolds. Separation Logic: A logic for shared mutable data structures. In *LICS*, pages 55–74, Washington, DC, USA, 2002. IEEE Computer Society.
17. K. Schild. A correspondence theory for terminological logics: Preliminary report. In *IJCAI*, pages 466–471, 1991.
18. K. Schild. Terminological cycles and the propositional  $\mu$ -calculus. In *KR*, pages 509–520. Morgan Kaufmann, 1994.
19. M. Schmidt-Schauß and G. Smolka. Attributive concept descriptions with complements. *Artif. Intell.*, 48(1):1–26, 1991.
20. Lutz Schröder and Dirk Pattinson. How many toes do i have? parthood and number restrictions in description logics. In *KR*, pages 307–317, 2008.
21. R. Shearer, B. Motik, and I. Horrocks. Hermit: A highly-efficient owl reasoner. In *OWLED*, volume 432, 2008.
22. E. Sirin, B. Parsia, B. Cuenca Grau, A. Kalyanpur, and Y. Katz. Pellet: A practical owl-dl reasoner. *J. Web Sem.*, 5(2):51–53, 2007.
23. S. Tobies. Complexity results and practical algorithms for logics in knowledge representation. *CoRR*, cs.LO/0106031, 2001.
24. D. Tsarkov and I. Horrocks. Fact++ description logic reasoner: System description. In *Automated reasoning*, pages 292–297. Springer, 2006.

## A $\mathcal{ALCQIO}_b$ and first order logic

$\mathcal{ALCQIO}_b$  has a fairly standard reduction to the two-variable fragment of first order logic with counting  $C^2$  (see e.g. [6])

**Definition 12.** Let  $tr : \mathcal{ALCQIO}_b \rightarrow C^2$  be given as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
tr_z(C) &= C(z) && C \text{ is an atomic concept} \\
tr_{z,\bar{z}}(r) &= r(z, \bar{z}) && r \text{ is an atomic role} \\
tr_z(C \sqcap D) &= tr_z(C) \wedge tr_z(D) \\
tr_z(C \sqcup D) &= tr_z(C) \vee tr_z(D) \\
tr_z(\neg C) &= \neg tr_z(C) \\
tr_{z,\bar{z}}(r^-) &= tr_{\bar{z},z}(r) \\
tr_z(\exists r.C) &= \exists y.tr_{z,\bar{z}}(r) \wedge tr_{\bar{z}}(C) \\
tr_z(\exists^{\leq n} r.C) &= \exists^{\leq n} y.tr_{z,\bar{z}}(r) \wedge tr_{\bar{z}}(C) \\
tr_z(\exists^{\geq n} r.C) &= \exists^{\geq n} y.tr_{z,\bar{z}}(r) \wedge tr_{\bar{z}}(C) \\
\\ 
tr(C \sqsubseteq D) &= \forall x.tr_x(C) \rightarrow tr_x(D) \\
tr(\varphi \wedge \psi) &= tr(\varphi) \wedge tr(\psi) \\
tr(\neg \varphi) &= \neg tr(\varphi)
\end{aligned}$$

**Lemma 13.** *For every  $\varphi \in \mathcal{ALCQIO}_b$ ,  $\varphi$  and  $tr(\varphi)$  agree on the truth value of all  $\tau$ -structures.*

## B From $\mathcal{ALCQIO}_b$ to $\mathcal{ALCQIO}$

Here we show the reduction from satisfiability in  $\mathcal{ALCQIO}_b$  to satisfiability in  $\mathcal{ALCQIO}$ .

**Lemma 14.** *Let  $\tau$  be a vocabulary and  $\varphi \in \mathcal{ALCQIO}_b(\tau)$ . There exist a vocabulary  $\sigma \supseteq \tau$  and  $\psi \in \mathcal{ALCQIO}(\sigma)$  such that  $\varphi$  is satisfiable iff  $\psi$  is satisfiable, and the size of  $\psi$  is linear in the size of  $\varphi$ . More precisely:*

1. *If  $\mathcal{M}$  is a  $\tau$ -structure satisfying  $\varphi$ , then there exists an extension  $\mathcal{N}$  of  $\mathcal{M}$  such that  $\mathcal{N} \models \psi$ .  $\mathcal{N}$  has the same universe as  $\mathcal{M}$  and agrees with  $\mathcal{M}$  on the interpretation of the symbols in  $\tau$ .*
2. *If  $\mathcal{N}$  is a  $\sigma$ -structure satisfying  $\psi$ , then the substructure of  $\mathcal{N}$  which corresponds to  $\tau$  satisfies  $\varphi$ .*

*Proof.* We prove the claim by induction on the construction of formulae in  $\mathcal{ALCQIO}_b$ . The claim we prove is slightly augmented as follows:

- We assume without loss of generality that  $\varphi$  is given in negation normal form (NNF).
- $\psi$  will not contain any negations.

We may assume without loss of generality that if  $\varphi$  is satisfiable, then it is satisfiable by a structure of size strictly larger than 1.

**Base** If  $\varphi = C \sqsubseteq D$ , then  $C \sqsubseteq D \in \mathcal{ALCQIO}$  and  $\sigma = \tau$ .

**Closure** Let  $\varphi_1, \varphi_2 \in \mathcal{ALCQIO}_b(\tau)$  in NNF,  $\sigma_1, \sigma_2 \supseteq \tau$  be vocabularies,  $\psi_1 \in \mathcal{ALCQIO}(\sigma_1)$  and  $\psi_2 \in \mathcal{ALCQIO}(\sigma_2)$  as guaranteed. Without loss of generality,  $(\sigma_1 \setminus \tau) \cap (\sigma_2 \setminus \tau) = \emptyset$ .

1.  $\varphi = \varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2$ : Let  $\psi = \psi_1 \wedge \psi_2$  and  $\sigma = \sigma_1 \cup \sigma_2$ .

2.  $\varphi = \neg\varphi_1$ : By the assumption that that  $\varphi$  is in NNF,  $\varphi_1$  is of the form  $(C \sqsubseteq D)$ . Let  $o$  be a fresh nominal which does not occur in  $\sigma_1$ . Let  $\sigma = \sigma_1 \cup \{o\}$ . Let  $\psi = (o \sqsubseteq C) \wedge (D \sqsubseteq \neg o)$ .
3.  $\varphi = \varphi_1 \vee \varphi_2$ . Let  $r$  be a fresh role and  $o_1, o_2, o_X, o_Y$  be fresh nominals.

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_{prep} = & (o_X \sqsubseteq \neg o_Y) \wedge (o_1 \sqsubseteq \neg o_2) \wedge (o_X \sqcup o_Y \equiv o_1 \sqcup o_2) \wedge \\ & (\exists r.o_X \equiv \top) \wedge (\exists r.o_Y \equiv \perp) \end{aligned}$$

For a structure  $\mathcal{M}$  with universe  $M$ ,  $\mathcal{M} \models \psi_{prep}$  iff

- (a)  $o_X^{\mathcal{M}} \neq o_Y^{\mathcal{M}}$
- (b)  $o_1^{\mathcal{M}} \neq o_2^{\mathcal{M}}$
- (c)  $o_1^{\mathcal{M}} = o_X^{\mathcal{M}}$  and  $o_2^{\mathcal{M}} = o_Y^{\mathcal{M}}$ , or  $o_1^{\mathcal{M}} = o_Y^{\mathcal{M}}$  and  $o_2^{\mathcal{M}} = o_X^{\mathcal{M}}$ .
- (d)  $(\exists r.o_1)^{\mathcal{M}} = M$  and  $(\exists r.o_2)^{\mathcal{M}} = \perp$ , or  $(\exists r.o_1)^{\mathcal{M}} = \perp$  and  $(\exists r.o_2)^{\mathcal{M}} = M$ .

For  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ , let  $\theta_i$  be the formula obtained from  $\varphi_i$  by replacing every atomic formula  $C \sqsubseteq D$  with  $C \sqcap \exists r.o_i \sqsubseteq D \sqcap \exists r.o_i$ . Let  $\sigma = \sigma_1 \cup \sigma_2 \cup \{r, o_1, o_2, o_X, o_Y\}$ . Let  $\psi = \psi_{prep} \wedge \theta_1 \wedge \theta_2$ . The desired property follows directly from the claim:

*Claim.* Let  $\mathcal{N}$  be a  $\sigma$ -structure such that  $\mathcal{N} \models \psi_{prep}$ , and let  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{N}}$  be the substructure of  $\mathcal{N}$  which corresponds to  $\tau$ .

- (a) If  $(\exists r.o_1)^{\mathcal{N}} = M$ , then  $\mathcal{N} \models \psi$  iff  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{N}} \models \varphi_1$ .
- (b) If  $(\exists r.o_1)^{\mathcal{N}} = \emptyset$ , then  $\mathcal{N} \models \psi$  iff  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{N}} \models \varphi_2$ .

*Proof.*

- (a) Let  $\mathcal{N}$  be a  $\sigma$ -structure such that  $(\exists r.o_1)^{\mathcal{N}} = M$ . For every atomic formula  $C \sqsubseteq D$  in  $\varphi_1$ ,  $(C \sqcap \exists r.o_1)^{\mathcal{N}} = C^{\mathcal{N}} \cap M = C^{\mathcal{N}}$  and  $(D \sqcap \exists r.o_1)^{\mathcal{N}} = D^{\mathcal{N}} \cap M = D^{\mathcal{N}}$ . Hence,  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{N}} \models C \sqsubseteq D$  iff  $\mathcal{N} \models C \sqcap \exists r.o_1 \sqsubseteq D \sqcap \exists r.o_1$ . By construction of  $\theta_1$ ,  $\mathcal{M} \models \varphi_1$  iff  $\mathcal{N} \models \theta_1$ .  
For every atomic formula  $C \sqsubseteq D$  in  $\varphi_2$ ,  $(C \sqcap \exists r.o_2)^{\mathcal{N}} = C^{\mathcal{N}} \cap \emptyset = \emptyset$  and  $(D \sqcap \exists r.o_2)^{\mathcal{N}} = D^{\mathcal{N}} \cap \emptyset = \emptyset$ . Hence,  $\mathcal{N} \models C \sqcap \exists r.o_2 \sqsubseteq D \sqcap \exists r.o_2$ . Since  $\theta_2$  is a negation free Boolean combination of atomic formulae,  $\mathcal{N} \models \theta_2$ .
- (b) This case is symmetric to the previous case. Let  $\mathcal{N}$  be a  $\sigma$ -structure such that  $(\exists r.o_1)^{\mathcal{N}} = \emptyset$ . Then  $(\exists r.o_2)^{\mathcal{N}} = M$ . For every atomic formula  $C \sqsubseteq D$  in  $\varphi_2$ ,  $(C \sqcap \exists r.o_2)^{\mathcal{N}} = C^{\mathcal{N}} \cap M = C^{\mathcal{N}}$  and  $(D \sqcap \exists r.o_2)^{\mathcal{N}} = D^{\mathcal{N}} \cap M = D^{\mathcal{N}}$ . Hence,  $\mathcal{M} \models C \sqsubseteq D$  iff  $\mathcal{N} \models C \sqcap \exists r.o_2 \sqsubseteq D \sqcap \exists r.o_2$ . By construction of  $\theta_2$ ,  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{N}} \models \varphi_2$  iff  $\mathcal{N} \models \theta_2$ .  
For every atomic formula  $C \sqsubseteq D$  in  $\varphi_1$ ,  $(C \sqcap \exists r.o_1)^{\mathcal{N}} = C^{\mathcal{N}} \cap \emptyset = \emptyset$  and  $(D \sqcap \exists r.o_1)^{\mathcal{N}} = D^{\mathcal{N}} \cap \emptyset = \emptyset$ . Hence,  $\mathcal{N} \models C \sqcap \exists r.o_1 \sqsubseteq D \sqcap \exists r.o_1$ . Since  $\theta_1$  is a negation free Boolean combination of atomic formulae,  $\mathcal{N} \models \theta_1$ .

## C Proof of Lemma 2

The proof of (1) proceeds by induction on the construction of the concepts, showing that  $C^{\mathcal{M}} = C^{\mathcal{M}_{\triangleright}}$  for all  $C \in \varphi$ . For ease of notation we write  $\mathcal{M}_1 = \mathcal{M}$  and  $\mathcal{M}_2 = \mathcal{M}_{\triangleright}$ .

1. If  $A \in \mathbf{N}_C$ , then  $A^{\mathcal{M}_1} = A^{\mathcal{M}_2}$  since none of the atomic concepts change between  $\mathcal{M}_1$  and  $\mathcal{M}_2$ .
2. If  $o \in \mathbf{N}_n$ , then similarly, there is no change.
3. If  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  are concepts satisfying the induction hypothesis, then  $C_1 \sqcap C_2$ ,  $C_1 \sqcup C_2$  and  $\neg C_1$  also satisfy the claim, e.g.,  $(C_1 \sqcap C_2)^{\mathcal{M}_1} = C_1^{\mathcal{M}_1} \cap C_2^{\mathcal{M}_1} = C_1^{\mathcal{M}_2} \cap C_2^{\mathcal{M}_2} = (C_1 \sqcap C_2)^{\mathcal{M}_2}$ .
4. For a role  $s$ , a concept  $C$  and a non-negative integer  $n$ , we consider the concepts  $\exists s.C$ ,  $\exists^{\leq n} s.C$ ,  $\exists s^-.C$  and  $\exists^{\leq n} s^-.C$ :
  - (a) If  $s \neq r$ , then  $(\exists s.C)^{\mathcal{M}_1} = (\exists s.C)^{\mathcal{M}_2}$  since  $s^{\mathcal{M}_1} = s^{\mathcal{M}_2}$  and by induction  $C^{\mathcal{M}_1} = C^{\mathcal{M}_2}$ . Similarly, this holds for  $\exists^{\leq n} s.C$ ,  $\exists s^-.C$  and  $\exists^{\leq n} s^-.C$ .
  - (b) If  $s = r$ :
    - $\exists r.C$  and  $\exists^{\leq n} s.C$ : We fix some  $i \in \{0, 1\}$ . We have  $a_i \in (\exists r.C)^{\mathcal{M}_1}$  iff  $a_{i-1} \in (\exists r.C)^{\mathcal{M}_1}$  (by  $\overline{tp}_{\mathcal{M}_1}^\varphi(a_0) = \overline{tp}_{\mathcal{M}_1}^\varphi(a_1)$ ) iff there is a  $b$  such that  $(a_{i-1}, b) \in r^{\mathcal{M}_1}$  and  $b \in C^{\mathcal{M}_1}$  iff there is a  $b$  such that  $(a_{i-1}, b) \in r^{\mathcal{M}_1}$  and  $b \in C^{\mathcal{M}_2}$  (by induction assumption) iff there is a  $b$  such that  $(a_i, b) \in r^{\mathcal{M}_2}$  and  $b \in C^{\mathcal{M}_2}$  (by the definition of the operation  $\triangleright$ ) iff  $a_i \in (\exists r.C)^{\mathcal{M}_2}$ . Since the only difference between  $\mathcal{M}_1$  and  $\mathcal{M}_2$  are the values of  $r^{\mathcal{M}_i}$  on  $a_0$  and  $a_1$ , we have  $(\exists r.C)^{\mathcal{M}_1} = (\exists r.C)^{\mathcal{M}_2}$  and  $(\exists^{\leq n} r.C)^{\mathcal{M}_1} = (\exists^{\leq n} r.C)^{\mathcal{M}_2}$ .
    - $\exists r^-.C$  and  $\exists^{\leq n} r^-.C$ : For every  $u \in M$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ , we define

$$S_i(u) = \left\{ v \mid (u, v) \in (r^-)^{\mathcal{M}_i} \text{ and } v \in C^{\mathcal{M}_i} \right\}$$

We fix some  $u \in M$ . We have  $v \in S_1(u)$  iff  $v \in S_2(u)$  for every  $v \notin \{a_0, a_1\}$ , using that  $(u, v) \in (r^-)^{\mathcal{M}_1}$  iff  $(u, v) \in (r^-)^{\mathcal{M}_2}$  and that by induction  $C^{\mathcal{M}_1} = C^{\mathcal{M}_2}$ . We now consider  $v \in \{a_0, a_1\}$ : We have  $a_i \in S_1(u)$  iff  $(a_i, u) \in r^{\mathcal{M}_1}$  and  $a_i \in C^{\mathcal{M}_1}$  iff  $(a_i, u) \in r^{\mathcal{M}_1}$  and  $a_{i-1} \in C^{\mathcal{M}_1}$  (because  $\overline{tp}_{\mathcal{M}_1}^\varphi(a_0) = \overline{tp}_{\mathcal{M}_1}^\varphi(a_1)$ ) iff  $(a_{i-1}, u) \in r^{\mathcal{M}_2}$  and  $a_{i-1} \in C^{\mathcal{M}_1}$  (by the definition of the operation  $\triangleright$ ) iff  $(a_{i-1}, u) \in r^{\mathcal{M}_2}$  and  $a_{i-1} \in C^{\mathcal{M}_2}$  (by induction assumption) iff  $a_{i-1} \in S_2(u)$ . So,  $|S_1(u)| = |S_2(u)|$ . Therefore,  $u \in (\exists r^-.C)^{\mathcal{M}_1}$  iff  $u \in (\exists r^-.C)^{\mathcal{M}_2}$  and  $u \in (\exists^{\leq n} r^-.C)^{\mathcal{M}_1}$  iff  $u \in (\exists^{\leq n} r^-.C)^{\mathcal{M}_2}$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ .

We turn to the two conclusions:

- (2) We get directly that for every  $u \in M$ ,  $\overline{tp}_{\mathcal{M}}^\varphi(u) = \overline{tp}_{\mathcal{M}_{\triangleright}}^\varphi(u)$ .
- (3) Follows using Lemma 1.