Decidable Call by Need Computations in Term Rewriting (Extended Abstract)*

Irène Durand[1] and Aart Middeldorp[2†]

[1] Laboratoire Bordelais de Recherche en Informatique
Université de Bordeaux I
351 Cours de la Libération, 33405 Talence, France
Irene.Durand@labri.u-bordeaux.fr

[2] Institute of Information Sciences and Electronics
University of Tsukuba
Tsukuba 305, Japan
ami@score.is.tsukuba.ac.jp

Abstract

In this paper we study decidable approximations to call by need computations to normal and root-stable forms in term rewriting. We obtain uniform decidability proofs by making use of elementary tree automata techniques. Surprisingly, by avoiding complicated concepts like index and sequentiality we are able to cover much larger classes of term rewriting systems.

1 Introduction

The following theorem of [Huet and Lévy, 1991] forms the basis of all results on optimal normalizing reduction strategies for orthogonal term rewriting systems (TRSs): every reducible term contains a needed redex, i.e., a redex which is contracted in every rewrite sequence to normal form, and repeated contraction of needed redexes results in a normal form, if the term under consideration has a normal form. Unfortunately, needed redexes are not computable in general. Hence, in order to obtain a *computable* optimal reduction strategy, we are left to find (1) decidable approximations of neededness and (2) decidable properties of TRSs which ensure that every reducible term has a needed redex identified by (1). Starting with the seminal work of [Huet and Lévy, 1991] on strong sequentiality, these issues have been extensively investigated in the literature ([Klop and Middeldorp, 1991], [Toyama, 1992], [Oyamaguchi, 1993], [Jouannaud and Sadfi, 1995], [Nagaya *et al.*, 1995], [Comon, 1995], [Jacquemard, 1996]). In all these works Huet and Lévy's notions of index, ω-reduction, and sequentiality figure prominently.

*This is a slightly extended version of a paper that will appear in the Proceedings of the 14th International Conference on Automated Deduction, Townsville, Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence, 1997.

†The work reported in this paper was initiated in March 1995 when the second author was staying at the University of Bordeaux. The support of LaBRI and the hospitality of the "Programmation Symbolique" group headed by Robert Strandh are gratefully acknowledged.

We present an approach to decidable call by need computations to normal form in which issues (1) and (2) above are addressed directly. Besides facilitating understanding this enables us to cover much larger classes of TRSs. For instance, an easy consequence of our work is that every orthogonal right-ground TRS admits a computable call by need strategy whereas none of the sequentiality-based approaches cover all such TRSs. Our approach is based on the easy but fundamental observation that needed redexes are *uniform* but not *independent* of other redexes in the same term. Uniformity means that only the position of a redex in a term counts for determining neededness.

Inspired by [Comon, 1995], our decidability results heavily rely on tree automata techniques. However, by assigning a greater role to *ground tree transducers* we don't need to rely on the (difficult) connection between weak second-order monadic logic and tree automata, even when considering the shallow and growing approximations of [Comon, 1995], [Jacquemard, 1996].

In this paper we also study decidable call by need computations to root-stable form, the underlying theory of which is expounded in [Middeldorp, 1997]. This is more complicated because root-needed redexes, which are redexes that are contracted in every rewrite sequence to root-stable form, are not uniform.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. In the next section we recall the necessary background of term rewriting and tree automata. In Section 3 we present sufficient conditions for neededness in terms of approximations. Growing and shallow approximations are introduced in Section 4. In Section 5 we present our framework for decidable call by need computations to normal form. We also include a comparison with the sequentiality-based approach. Decidable approximations of root-neededness is the topic of Section 6 and in Section 7 we consider decidable call by need computations to root-stable form. Due to lack of space, we concentrate on decidability issues in these last two sections. Results on the relationships between the various classes of TRSs have been omitted. For the same reason we don't address the important issue of complexity in this paper. The main purpose of this paper is to get our framework to decidable call by need computations across.

2 Preliminaries

We assume familiarity with the basic notions of term rewriting (see e.g. [Klop, 1992], [Dershowitz and Jouannaud, 1990]). A rewrite rule $l \to r$ is a pair of terms such that the left-hand side l is not a variable. We find it convenient not to impose the usual restriction that variables which occur in the right-hand side r occur in l as well. A TRS over a signature $\mathcal{F}$ is a set $\mathcal{R}$ of rewrite rules between terms in $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F},\mathcal{V})$. Here $\mathcal{V}$ is a countably infinite set of variables. A ground term doesn't contain variables. A linear term doesn't contain multiple occurrences of the same variable. A redex is an instance of the left-hand side of a rewrite rule. The set of all ground redexes of a TRS $\mathcal{R}$ is denoted by $\mathsf{REDEX}_{\mathcal{R}}$. A normal form is a term without redexes. The set of all ground normal forms of $\mathcal{R}$ is denoted by $\mathsf{NF}_{\mathcal{R}}$. A term is root-stable if it cannot be rewritten to a redex. The set of all root-stable ground terms of $\mathcal{R}$ is denoted by $\mathsf{RS}_{\mathcal{R}}$. A TRS is left-linear (right-linear, linear) if the left-hand sides (right-hand sides, both left and right-hand sides) of its rewrite rules are linear terms. A TRS is right-ground (ground) if the right-hand sides (left and right-hand sides) of its rewrite rules are ground terms. A binary relation R on terms is called parallel if $C[s_1,\ldots,s_n]\ R\ C[t_1,\ldots,t_n]$ whenever $s_1\ R\ t_1$, ..., $s_n\ R\ t_n$, for all contexts C and terms $s_1,\ldots,s_n,t_1,\ldots,t_n$. The parallel closure $R^{\|}$ of a binary relation R on terms is the smallest parallel relation that contains R. The parallel closure of the rewrite relation $\to_{\mathcal{R}}$ of a TRS $\mathcal{R}$ is denoted by $\mathbin{\|}_{\mathcal{R}}$ rather than $\to_{\mathcal{R}}^{\|}$.

A redex Δ in a term t is needed if in every rewrite sequence from t to normal form a descendant of Δ is contracted. Let $A\colon s \to^* t$ be a rewrite sequence and Δ a redex in s. We write $\Delta \perp A$ if no descendant of Δ is contracted in A. So a redex Δ in a term s is needed if and only if t is not a normal form whenever $A\colon s \to^* t$ with $\Delta \perp A$. Lemma 3.1 below gives an equivalent definition of neededness that doesn't depend on the notion of descendant.

Orthogonality

A left-linear TRS without critical pairs and whose rewrite rules satisfy the additional restriction that variables which occur in the right-hand side occur also in the left-hand side is called orthogonal. The following theorem of [Huet and Lévy, 1991] forms the basis of all results on optimal normalizing reduction strategies for orthogonal TRSs.

Theorem 2.1 *Let $\mathcal{R}$ be an orthogonal TRS.*
(1) *Every reducible term contains a needed redex.*
(2) *Repeated contraction of needed redexes results in a normal form, if the term under consideration has a normal form.*
□

[Middeldorp, 1997] generalized the above result to rewrite sequences to root-stable form. A redex Δ in a term t is root-needed if in every rewrite sequence from t to root-stable form a descendant of Δ is contracted. In [Middeldorp, 1997] it is argued that root-neededness is the proper generalization of neededness when it comes to optimal infinitary normalization.

Theorem 2.2 *Let $\mathcal{R}$ be an orthogonal TRS.*
(1) *Every non-root-stable term contains a root-needed redex.*
(2) *Repeated contraction of root-needed redexes results in a root-stable form, if the term under consideration has a root-stable reduct.*
□

Tree Automata

A *tree automaton* is a quadruple $\mathcal{A} = (\mathcal{F}, Q, Q_f, \Delta)$ consisting of a finite signature $\mathcal{F}$, a finite set Q of *states*, disjoint from $\mathcal{F}$, a subset $Q_f \subseteq Q$ of *final* states, and a set of *transition rules* Δ. Every transition rule has one of the following two forms:

- $f(q_1, \ldots, q_n) \to q$ with $f \in \mathcal{F}$ and $q_1, \ldots, q_n, q \in Q$, or
- $q \to q'$ with $q, q' \in Q$.

Transition rules of the second form are called *ϵ-rules*. Note that a tree automaton $\mathcal{A} = (\mathcal{F}, Q, Q_f, \Delta)$ is simply a finite ground TRS $(\mathcal{F} \cup Q, \Delta)$ whose rewrite rules have a special shape, together with a subset Q_f of Q. The induced rewrite relation on $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F} \cup Q)$ will be denoted by $\to_{\mathcal{A}}$. We say that a term $t \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F})$ is *accepted* by $\mathcal{A}$ if $t \to_{\mathcal{A}}^* q$ for some $q \in Q_f$. The set of all such terms is denoted by $L(\mathcal{A})$. A subset $L \subseteq \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F})$ is called *recognizable* if there exists a tree automaton $\mathcal{A} = (\mathcal{F}, Q, Q_f, \Delta)$ such that $L = L(\mathcal{A})$. It is well-known that every recognizable language is accepted by a *deterministic* tree automaton. A deterministic automaton has neither ϵ-rules nor different rules with the same left-hand side. In this paper we make use of the following properties.

Lemma 2.3
(1) *The set $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F})$ is recognizable.*

(2) *The intersection* $L_1 \cap L_2$ *of recognizable subsets* $L_1, L_2 \subseteq \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F})$ *are recognizable.*
(3) *The difference* $L_1 \setminus L_2$ *of recognizable subsets* $L_1, L_2 \subseteq \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F})$ *is recognizable.*
(4) *The complement* L^c *of a recognizable subset* $L \subseteq \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F})$ *is recognizable.*
□

Part (4) of the above lemma is a direct consequence of parts (1) and (3).

Lemma 2.4 *Let* $L \subseteq \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F})$ *be recognizable.*
(1) *Given a term* $t \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F})$*, it is decidable whether* $t \in L$*.*
(2) *It is decidable whether* L *is empty.*
□

The following well-known result connects tree automata with TRSs.

Lemma 2.5 *Let* $\mathcal{R}$ *be a finite left-linear TRS. The sets* $\mathsf{REDEX}_\mathcal{R}$ *and* $\mathsf{NF}_\mathcal{R}$ *are recognizable.* □

Table 1: The tree automata $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$.

a	$\to$	$*$	a	$\to$	a	$f(\mathsf{g}(*),\mathsf{a})$	$\to$	!	$f(!,*)$	$\to$	!
b	$\to$	$*$	b	$\to$	b	$h(\mathsf{a})$	$\to$	!	$f(*,!)$	$\to$	!
$f(*,*)$	$\to$	$*$	$g(*)$	$\to$	$\mathsf{g}(*)$	$h(\mathsf{f}(*,\mathsf{b}))$	$\to$	!	$g(!)$	$\to$	!
$g(*)$	$\to$	$*$	$f(*,\mathsf{b})$	$\to$	$\mathsf{f}(*,\mathsf{b})$				$h(!)$	$\to$	!
$h(*)$	$\to$	$*$									

Consider for instance a TRS $\mathcal{R}$ with left-hand sides $f(g(x),a)$, $h(a)$, and $h(f(x,b))$. The left column of Table 1 shows the transition rules of a tree automaton $\mathcal{A}$ such that $L(\mathcal{A}) = \mathsf{REDEX}_\mathcal{R}$. Here $*$, a, b, $\mathsf{g}(*)$, $\mathsf{f}(*,\mathsf{b})$, and ! are states with ! the only final state. State $*$ accepts all ground terms. The purpose of the second group of transition rules is to recognize all ground instances of proper non-variable subterms of the left-hand sides of $\mathcal{R}$. So in state a only the term a is accepted, whereas in state $\mathsf{f}(*,\mathsf{b})$ all ground terms of the form $f(t,b)$ are accepted. The third group of transition rules corresponds to the left-hand sides of $\mathcal{R}$. Note that $\mathcal{A}$ is non-deterministic. By adding to $\mathcal{A}$ the transition rules in the right column of Table 1 we obtain a tree automaton $\mathcal{B}$ that accepts the set of reducible ground terms. Since $L(\mathcal{B})^c = \mathsf{NF}_\mathcal{R}$, a tree automaton accepting $\mathsf{NF}_\mathcal{R}$ is obtained by taking the complement of $\mathcal{B}$.

A *ground tree transducer* (GTT for short) is a pair $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B})$ of tree automata over the same signature $\mathcal{F}$. Let $s,t \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F})$. We say that the pair (s,t) is *accepted* by $\mathcal{G}$ if $s \to_\mathcal{A}^* \cdot \,{}_\mathcal{B}^*\!\leftarrow t$. The set of all such pairs is denoted by $L(\mathcal{G})$. Observe that $L(\mathcal{G})$ is a binary relation on $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F})$. A binary relation on ground terms is called *recognizable* if there exists a GTT that accepts it. Every recognizable relation is parallel. GTTs were introduced by [Dauchet and Tison, 1985] in order to prove that confluence is a decidable property of ground TRSs. In this paper we make use of the following closure properties. Parts (2) and (3) can be proved by adding appropriate ϵ-rules only. Part (3) is from [Coquidé and Gilleron, 1990].

Lemma 2.6 *Let* R *be a recognizable relation on* $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F})$*.*
(1) *The inverse* R^{-1} *of* R *is recognizable.*
(2) *The transitive closure* R^+ *of* R *is recognizable.*

(3) *If L is a recognizable subset of $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F})$ then $R[L] = \{s \mid s\ R\ t$ for some $t \in L\}$ is recognizable.*

□

In the literature $R[L]$ often denotes the different set $\{t \mid s\ R\ t$ for some $s \in L\}$. We find our choice more convenient.

We would like to emphasize that there are many other notions of recognizability in the literature besides the two introduced in this subsection. In this paper a subset of terms is recognizable if it is accepted by a tree automaton and a binary relation on terms is recognizable if it is accepted by a GTT. (In [Dauchet *et al.*, 1990] recognizable relations are called *GTT-relations*.)

Weak Second-Order Monadic Logic

The material in this subsection is only used in Section 7. We assume familiarity with WSkS, the weak second-order monadic logic with k successors. See [Thomas, 1990, Section 11] for a discussion of WS2S.

Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a finite signature. Let k be the maximal arity of function symbols in $\mathcal{F}$ and let n be the cardinality of $\mathcal{F}$. A term $t \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F})$ is represented in WSkS using $n+1$ set variables X and X_f for every $f \in \mathcal{F}$. In the following we write $\vec{X}$ for the sequence X, X_f for $f \in \mathcal{F}$. The WSkS formula $\mathsf{term}(\vec{X})$:

$$X = \bigcup_{f\in\mathcal{F}} X_f \wedge \bigwedge_{f\in\mathcal{F}} \forall x \in X_f \left[\bigwedge_{i=1}^{\mathsf{arity}(f)} x{\cdot}i \in X \wedge \bigwedge_{i=\mathsf{arity}(f)+1}^{k} x{\cdot}i \notin X \right] \wedge \bigwedge_{f\neq g\in\mathcal{F}} X_f \cap X_g = \varnothing \wedge \forall x \in X\, \forall y < x\ [y \in X]$$

expresses that $\vec{X}$ encodes a term in $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F})$. If $\mathsf{term}(\vec{T})$ holds for the sequence $\vec{T}$ of sets of positions then we define $t_{\vec{T}}$ to be the term in $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F})$ uniquely determined by $\mathcal{P}\mathsf{os}(t) = T$ and $\mathsf{root}(t_{|p}) = f$ if $p \in T_f$, for all $p \in T$. A subset L of $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F})$ is called WSkS *definable* if there exists a WSkS formula ϕ with free variables $\vec{X}$ such that $L = \{t_{\vec{T}} \mid \mathsf{term}(\vec{T}) \wedge \phi(\vec{T})\}$.

Theorem 2.7 ([Doner, 1970], [Thatcher and Wright, 1968]) *A set $L \subseteq \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F})$ is WSkS definable if and only if it is recognizable.* □

3 Decidable Approximations of Neededness

In the remaining part of the paper we are dealing with finite TRSs only. Moreover, we consider rewriting on ground terms only. So we assume that the set of ground terms is non-empty. This requirement entails no loss of generality. It is undecidable whether a redex in a term is needed with respect to a given (orthogonal) TRS. In this section we present decidable sufficient conditions for a redex to be needed.

Let $\mathcal{R}$ be a TRS over a signature $\mathcal{F}$. Throughout this and the next two sections we assume the existence of a constant $\bullet$ not appearing in $\mathcal{F}$ and we view $\mathcal{R}$ as a TRS over the extended signature $\mathcal{F}_\bullet = \mathcal{F} \cup \{\bullet\}$. So $\mathsf{NF}_\mathcal{R}$ consists of all terms in $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F}_\bullet)$ that are in normal form. Let $\mathcal{R}_\bullet$ be the TRS $\mathcal{R} \cup \{\bullet \to \bullet\}$. Note that $\mathsf{NF}_{\mathcal{R}_\bullet}$ coincides with $\mathsf{NF}_\mathcal{R} \cap \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F})$. The following easy lemma gives an alternative definition of neededness, not depending on the notion of descendant.

Lemma 3.1 *Let $\mathcal{R}$ be an orthogonal TRS over a signature $\mathcal{F}$. Redex Δ in term $C[\Delta] \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F})$ is needed if and only if there is no term $t \in \mathsf{NF}_{\mathcal{R}_\bullet}$ such that $C[\bullet] \to_{\mathcal{R}}^* t$.*

Proof.

$\Rightarrow$ Suppose there is a term $t \in \mathsf{NF}_{\mathcal{R}_\bullet}$ such that $C[\bullet] \to_{\mathcal{R}}^* t$. Replacing every occurrence of $\bullet$ by Δ yields a sequence $A{:}C[\Delta] \to_{\mathcal{R}}^* t$ with $\Delta \perp A$. Hence Δ is not needed.

$\Leftarrow$ Conversely, if Δ is not needed then there exists a rewrite sequence $A{:}C[\Delta] \to_{\mathcal{R}}^* t$ with $t \in \mathsf{NF}_{\mathcal{R}_\bullet}$ and $\Delta \perp A$. Replacing every descendant of Δ in A by $\bullet$ yields a sequence $C[\bullet] \to_{\mathcal{R}}^* t$. (Here we use orthogonality. Note that because t is a normal form there are no descendants of Δ in t left.)

□

Note that Lemma 3.1 implies that needed redexes are *uniform*, which means that only the position of a redex in a term is important for determining neededness. So if redex Δ in term $C[\Delta]$ is needed then so is redex Δ' in $C[\Delta']$.

Because the relation $\to_{\mathcal{R}}^*$ is in general not computable, neededness is undecidable. In order to obtain decidable sufficient conditions, the idea is now to approximate $\to_{\mathcal{R}}^*$ by $\to_{\mathcal{S}}^*$ for some suitable TRS $\mathcal{S}$ such that it is decidable whether a term has an $\mathcal{S}$-reduct in $\mathsf{NF}_{\mathcal{R}_\bullet}$.

Definition 3.2 Let $\mathcal{R}$ and $\mathcal{S}$ be TRSs over the same signature. We say that $\mathcal{S}$ *approximates* $\mathcal{R}$ if $\to_{\mathcal{R}}^* \subseteq \to_{\mathcal{S}}^*$ and $\mathsf{NF}_{\mathcal{R}} = \mathsf{NF}_{\mathcal{S}}$.

Definition 3.3 Let $\mathcal{R}$ be a TRS over a signature $\mathcal{F}$. We say that redex Δ in $C[\Delta] \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F})$ is *$\mathcal{R}$-needed* if there is no term $t \in \mathsf{NF}_{\mathcal{R}_\bullet}$ such that $C[\bullet] \to_{\mathcal{R}}^* t$.

So for every orthogonal TRS $\mathcal{R}$, a redex is needed if and only if it is $\mathcal{R}$-needed. The following lemma is immediate from the definitions.

Lemma 3.4 *Let $\mathcal{R}$ be a TRS and let $\mathcal{S}$ be an approximation of $\mathcal{R}$. Every $\mathcal{S}$-needed redex is $\mathcal{R}$-needed.* □

In the literature four approximations have been studied. These approximations have the same left-hand sides as the original TRS $\mathcal{R}$, hence the second requirement in the definition of approximation is trivially satisfied, but differ in the way they treat the right-hand sides of the rewrite rules of $\mathcal{R}$. In this section we introduce the two simplest approximations. The other two are dealt with in the next section.

Definition 3.5 Let $\mathcal{R}$ be a TRS. The TRS $\mathcal{R}_{\mathrm{s}}$ is obtained from $\mathcal{R}$ by replacing the right-hand side of every rewrite rule by a variable that does not occur in the corresponding left-hand side.

The idea of approximating a TRS by ignoring the right-hand sides of its rewrite rules is due to [Huet and Lévy, 1991]. Our $\mathcal{R}_{\mathrm{s}}$-needed redexes coincide with their *strongly needed* redexes. A better approximation is obtained by preserving the *n*on-*v*ariable parts of the right-hand sides of the rewrite rules.

Definition 3.6 Let $\mathcal{R}$ be a TRS. The TRS $\mathcal{R}_{\mathrm{nv}}$ is obtained from $\mathcal{R}$ by replacing the variables in the right-hand sides of the rewrite rules by pairwise distinct variables that do not occur in the corresponding left-hand sides.

The idea of approximating a TRS by ignoring the variables in the right-hand sides of the rewrite rules is due to [Oyamaguchi, 1993]. Note that $\mathcal{R}_{\rm nv} = \mathcal{R}$ whenever $\mathcal{R}$ is right-ground. Hence for every orthogonal right-ground TRS $\mathcal{R}$, a redex is needed if and only if it is $\mathcal{R}_{\rm nv}$-needed.

In the remainder of this section we show that it is decidable whether a redex in a term is $\mathcal{S}$-needed for every left-linear TRS $\mathcal{R}$ and $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{R}_{\rm s}$ or $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{R}_{\rm nv}$.

Definition 3.7 Let $\mathcal{R}$ be a TRS over a signature $\mathcal{F}$. The set of all terms $C[\bullet] \in \mathsf{M}_\bullet$ such that there is no term $t \in \mathsf{NF}_{\mathcal{R}_\bullet}$ with $C[\bullet] \to_{\mathcal{R}}^* t$ is denoted by $\mathcal{R}$-NEEDED. Here $\mathsf{M}_\bullet$ consists of all terms in $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F}_\bullet)$ that contain exactly one occurrence of $\bullet$.

So redex Δ in $C[\Delta] \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F})$ is $\mathcal{R}$-needed if and only if $C[\bullet] \in \mathcal{R}$-$\mathsf{NEEDED}$. The following result presents a sufficient condition for the decidability of $\mathcal{R}$-neededness.

Theorem 3.8 *Let $\mathcal{R}$ be a TRS. If $(\to_{\mathcal{R}}^*)[\mathsf{NF}_{\mathcal{R}_\bullet}]$ is recognizable then $\mathcal{R}$-NEEDED is recognizable.*

Proof. We have $\mathcal{R}$-$\mathsf{NEEDED} = (\to_{\mathcal{R}}^*)[\mathsf{NF}_{\mathcal{R}_\bullet}]^c \cap \mathsf{M}_\bullet$. The set $\mathsf{M}_\bullet$ is easily shown to be recognizable. Hence the recognizability of $\mathcal{R}$-NEEDED follows from Lemma 2.3. □

Next we show that for the two approximations defined above, the premise of the above theorem is satisfied, hence $\mathcal{R}_{\rm s}$-neededness and $\mathcal{R}_{\rm nv}$-neededness are decidable.

Lemma 3.9 *Let $\mathcal{R}$ be a left-linear TRS. The relations $\to_{\mathcal{R}_{\rm s}}^*$ and $\to_{\mathcal{R}_{\rm nv}}^*$ are recognizable.*

Proof. Because recognizable relations are closed under transitive closure (Lemma 2.6(2)) and $\between^+ = \to^*$, it suffices to show that $\between_{\mathcal{R}_{\rm s}}$ and $\between_{\mathcal{R}_{\rm nv}}$ are recognizable. First we show the recognizability of $\between_{\mathcal{R}_{\rm nv}}$. Let $\mathcal{R}_{\rm nv} = \{l_i \to r_i \mid 1 \leqslant i \leqslant n\}$. Define the GTT $\mathcal{G}_{\rm nv}$ as the pair of tree automata $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ that accept in state i all instances of l_i and r_i, respectively. Moreover, we may assume that the two tree automata share no other states. Hence $L(\mathcal{G}_{\rm nv}) = \between_{\mathcal{R}_{\rm nv}}$. The recognizability of $\between_{\mathcal{R}_{\rm s}}$ is obtained by replacing $\mathcal{B}$ by the tree automaton $\mathcal{C}$ that accepts in state i all ground terms. □

Table 2 shows the tree automata $\mathcal{A}$, $\mathcal{B}$, and $\mathcal{C}$ used in the proof of the above lemma for the following TRS $\mathcal{R}$:

$$\begin{array}{lrcl} 1\colon & f(g(x),a) & \to & f(h(h(x)),x) \\ 2\colon & h(a) & \to & h(b) \\ 3\colon & h(f(x,b)) & \to & x \end{array}$$

The underlinings are to ensure that only states $\mathsf{1}$, $\mathsf{2}$, and $\mathsf{3}$ are shared between $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ ($\mathcal{C}$).

Lemma 3.10 *Let $\mathcal{R}$ be a left-linear TRS. The set $(\to_{\mathcal{S}}^*)[\mathsf{NF}_{\mathcal{S}_\bullet}]$ is recognizable for $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{R}_{\rm s}$ and $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{R}_{\rm nv}$.*

Proof. Since $\mathsf{NF}_{\mathcal{S}_\bullet} = \mathsf{NF}_{\mathcal{R}_\bullet}$ is recognizable by Lemma 2.5, the recognizability of $(\to_{\mathcal{S}}^*)[\mathsf{NF}_{\mathcal{S}_\bullet}]$ is a consequence of Lemmata 2.6 and 3.9. □

Hence the following corollary is a consequence of the first part of Lemma 2.4.

Corollary 3.11 *Let $\mathcal{R}$ be a left-linear TRS over a signature $\mathcal{F}$. It is decidable whether a redex in a term in $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F})$ is $\mathcal{S}$-needed for $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{R}_{\rm s}$ and $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{R}_{\rm nv}$.* □

In particular, needed redexes are computable in orthogonal right-ground TRSs.

Table 2: The tree automata $\mathcal{A}$, $\mathcal{B}$, and $\mathcal{C}$.

$a \to *$	$a \to \underline{*}$	$a \to \underline{*}$
$b \to *$	$b \to \underline{*}$	$b \to \underline{*}$
$f(*,*) \to *$	$f(\underline{*},\underline{*}) \to \underline{*}$	$f(\underline{*},\underline{*}) \to \underline{*}$
$g(*) \to *$	$g(\underline{*}) \to \underline{*}$	$g(\underline{*}) \to \underline{*}$
$h(*) \to *$	$h(\underline{*}) \to \underline{*}$	$h(\underline{*}) \to \underline{*}$
$\bullet \to *$	$\bullet \to \underline{*}$	$\bullet \to \underline{*}$
$a \to \mathsf{a}$	$b \to \underline{\mathsf{b}}$	
$b \to \mathsf{b}$	$h(\underline{*}) \to \underline{\mathsf{h}(*)}$	
$g(*) \to \mathsf{g}(*)$	$h(\underline{\mathsf{h}(*)}) \to \underline{\mathsf{h}(\mathsf{h}(*))}$	
$f(*,\mathsf{b}) \to \mathsf{f}(*,\mathsf{b})$		
$f(\mathsf{g}(*),\mathsf{a}) \to 1$	$f(\underline{\mathsf{h}(\mathsf{h}(*))},\underline{*}) \to 1$	$\underline{*} \to 1$
$h(\mathsf{a}) \to 2$	$h(\underline{\mathsf{b}}) \to 2$	$\underline{*} \to 2$
$h(\mathsf{f}(*,\mathsf{b})) \to 3$	$\underline{*} \to 3$	$\underline{*} \to 3$

4 Shallow and Growing Approximations

In this section we introduce the other two approximations that have been studied in the literature. The definitions below differ in a non-essential way from the corresponding ones in [Comon, 1995] and [Jacquemard, 1996].

Definition 4.1 A TRS $\mathcal{R}$ is called *shallow* if for every rewrite rule $l \to r \in \mathcal{R}$ the variables in $\mathcal{V}\mathsf{ar}(l) \cap \mathcal{V}\mathsf{ar}(r)$ occur at depth 1 in l and at depth 0 or 1 in r. (The depth of a subterm occurrence is the length of its position.) We define $\mathcal{R}_{\mathrm{sh}}$ as any right-linear shallow TRS that is obtained from $\mathcal{R}$ by replacing variables in the right-hand sides of the rewrite rules by variables that do not occur in the corresponding left-hand sides.

Definition 4.2 A TRS $\mathcal{R}$ is called *growing* if for every rewrite rule $l \to r \in \mathcal{R}$ the variables in $\mathcal{V}\mathsf{ar}(l) \cap \mathcal{V}\mathsf{ar}(r)$ occur at depth 1 in l. We define $\mathcal{R}_{\mathrm{g}}$ as any right-linear growing TRS that is obtained from $\mathcal{R}$ by replacing variables in the right-hand sides of the rewrite rules by variables that do not occur in the corresponding left-hand sides.

Clearly every right-ground TRS is shallow and every shallow TRS is growing. The reverse implications do not hold.

Note that due to the right-linearity requirement $\mathcal{R}_{\mathrm{sh}}$ and $\mathcal{R}_{\mathrm{g}}$ are not uniquely determined, even if we insist on replacing only variables that violate the restrictions imposed on shallow and growing TRSs. For instance, for $\mathcal{R} = \{f(x) \to g(x,x)\}$ we can take either one of $\mathcal{R}_1 = \{f(x) \to g(y,x)\}$, $\mathcal{R}_2 = \{f(x) \to g(x,y)\}$, and $\mathcal{R}_3 = \{f(x) \to g(y,z)\}$ as $\mathcal{R}_{\mathrm{sh}}$ (and $\mathcal{R}_{\mathrm{g}}$). Clearly $\mathcal{R}_1$ and $\mathcal{R}_2$ are better approximations of $\mathcal{R}$ than $\mathcal{R}_3$, but neither of $\mathcal{R}_1$, $\mathcal{R}_2$ approximates the other. All results stated below hold for any $\mathcal{R}_{\mathrm{sh}}$ and $\mathcal{R}_{\mathrm{g}}$, provided of course we stick to our choices within a single 'environment'.

The proof of Lemma 3.10 doesn't extend to $\mathcal{R}_{\mathrm{sh}}$ and $\mathcal{R}_{\mathrm{g}}$ because the relations $\to^*_{\mathcal{R}_{\mathrm{sh}}}$ and $\to^*_{\mathcal{R}_{\mathrm{g}}}$ need not be recognizable. The following result is due to [Comon, 1995] for $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{R}_{\mathrm{sh}}$ and [Jacquemard, 1996] for $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{R}_{\mathrm{g}}$.

Theorem 4.3 ([Comon, 1995], [Jacquemard, 1996]) *Let $\mathcal{R}$ be a left-linear TRS. The set of terms that have a normal form with respect to $\mathcal{S}$ is recognizable for $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{R}_{\rm sh}$ and $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{R}_{\rm g}$.* □

The proof of Theorem 4.3 (in [Comon, 1995] and [Jacquemard, 1996]) doesn't rely on the connection between weak second-order monadic logic and recognizability (i.e., Theorem 2.7), but is considerably more complicated than the proof of Lemma 3.9.

Lemma 4.4 *Let $\mathcal{R}$ be a left-linear TRS. The set $(\to_{\mathcal{S}}^*)[\mathsf{NF}_{\mathcal{S}_\bullet}]$ is recognizable for $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{R}_{\rm sh}$ and $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{R}_{\rm g}$.*
Proof. From $\to_{\mathcal{S}}^* = \to_{\mathcal{S}_\bullet}^*$ it follows that $(\to_{\mathcal{S}}^*)[\mathsf{NF}_{\mathcal{S}_\bullet}]$ coincides with the set of terms that have a normal form with respect to the TRS $\mathcal{S}_\bullet$. Since $(\mathcal{R}_{\rm sh})_\bullet = (\mathcal{R}_\bullet)_{\rm sh}$ and $(\mathcal{R}_{\rm g})_\bullet = (\mathcal{R}_\bullet)_{\rm g}$, the desired result follows from Theorem 4.3. □

Corollary 4.5 *Let $\mathcal{R}$ be a left-linear TRS over a signature $\mathcal{F}$. It is decidable whether a redex in a term in $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F})$ is $\mathcal{S}$-needed for $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{R}_{\rm sh}$ and $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{R}_{\rm g}$.* □

It is easy to see that $\mathcal{R}_{\rm s}$-needed redexes in a term are always outermost. The same is true for $\mathcal{R}_{\rm nv}$-needed redexes in terms that have a normal form. However, $\mathcal{R}_{\rm sh}$-needed and $\mathcal{R}_{\rm g}$-needed redexes in normalizing terms need not be outermost. For instance, the TRS

$$\begin{array}{rcl} f(x) & \to & g(x) \\ a & \to & b \end{array}$$

is shallow and hence $\mathcal{R}_{\rm sh} = \mathcal{R}_{\rm g} = \mathcal{R}$. Innermost redex a in the term $f(a)$ is $\mathcal{R}$-needed because there is no term $t \in \mathsf{NF}_{\mathcal{R}_\bullet}$ such that $f(\bullet) \to_{\mathcal{R}}^* t$. Note that a is not $\mathcal{R}_{\rm nv}$-needed as $f(\bullet) \to_{\mathcal{R}_{\rm nv}} g(b)$ with $g(b) \in \mathsf{NF}_{\mathcal{R}_\bullet}$.

5 Call by Need Computations to Normal Form

A TRS $\mathcal{R}$ admits decidable call by need computations to normal form if it has an approximation $\mathcal{S}$ such that $\mathcal{S}$-needed redexes are computable and every term not in normal form has an $\mathcal{S}$-needed redex. This motivates the following definitions.

Definition 5.1 An *approximation mapping* is a mapping α from TRSs to TRSs with the property that $\alpha(\mathcal{R})$ approximates $\mathcal{R}$, for every TRS $\mathcal{R}$. In the following we write $\mathcal{R}_\alpha$ instead of $\alpha(\mathcal{R})$. We define a partial order $\leqslant$ on approximation mappings as follows: $\alpha \leqslant \beta$ if and only if $\mathcal{R}_\beta$ approximates $\mathcal{R}_\alpha$, for every TRS $\mathcal{R}$. Note that the identity mapping is the minimum element of this partial order.

The mapping s that assigns to every TRS $\mathcal{R}$ the TRS $\mathcal{R}_{\rm s}$ is an approximation mapping. In the same fashion, Definitions 3.6, 4.1, and 4.2 define approximation mappings nv, sh, and g. We have $\mathrm{g} \leqslant \mathrm{sh} \leqslant \mathrm{nv} \leqslant \mathrm{s}$.

Definition 5.2 Let α be an approximation mapping. The class of TRSs $\mathcal{R}$ such that every reducible term in $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F})$ has an $\mathcal{R}_\alpha$-needed redex is denoted by $\mathsf{CBN\text{-}NF}_\alpha$. Here $\mathcal{F}$ denotes the signature of $\mathcal{R}$.

Lemma 5.3 *Let $\mathcal{R}$ be an orthogonal TRS.*
(1) *If $\mathcal{R}$ is right-ground then $\mathcal{R} \in \mathsf{CBN\text{-}NF}_{\rm nv}$.*
(2) *If $\mathcal{R}$ is right-linear and shallow then $\mathcal{R} \in \mathsf{CBN\text{-}NF}_{\rm sh}$.*
(3) *If $\mathcal{R}$ is right-linear and growing then $\mathcal{R} \in \mathsf{CBN\text{-}NF}_{\rm g}$.*

Proof. According to Theorem 2.1 and the remark following Definition 3.3 every reducible term contains an $\mathcal{R}$-needed redex. If $\mathcal{R}$ is right-ground then $\mathcal{R} = \mathcal{R}_{\mathrm{nv}}$ and thus $\mathcal{R} \in \mathsf{CBN\text{-}NF}_{\mathrm{nv}}$. If $\mathcal{R}$ is right-linear and shallow then $\mathcal{R} = \mathcal{R}_{\mathrm{sh}}$ and thus $\mathcal{R} \in \mathsf{CBN\text{-}NF}_{\mathrm{sh}}$. If $\mathcal{R}$ is right-linear and growing then $\mathcal{R} = \mathcal{R}_{\mathrm{g}}$ and thus $\mathcal{R} \in \mathsf{CBN\text{-}NF}_{\mathrm{g}}$. □

The next lemma is an easy consequence of Lemma 3.4.

Lemma 5.4 *Let α and β be approximation mappings. If $\alpha \leqslant \beta$ then $\mathsf{CBN\text{-}NF}_{\beta} \subseteq \mathsf{CBN\text{-}NF}_{\alpha}$.* □

In this section we prove that membership of $\mathsf{CBN\text{-}NF}_{\alpha}$ for $\alpha \in \{\mathrm{s}, \mathrm{nv}, \mathrm{sh}, \mathrm{g}\}$ is decidable for left-linear TRSs. The proof is a straightforward consequence of the following result.

Theorem 5.5 *Let $\mathcal{R}$ be a left-linear TRS such that $\mathcal{R}$-NEEDED is recognizable. The set of terms that have an $\mathcal{R}$-needed redex is recognizable.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be the signature of $\mathcal{R}$. Define the relation $\mathsf{mark}^{\bullet}_{\mathcal{R}}$ on $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F}_{\bullet})$ as the parallel closure of $\{(\Delta, \bullet) \mid \Delta \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F}) \text{ is a redex}\}$. The set of terms that have an $\mathcal{R}$-needed redex coincides with $\mathsf{mark}^{\bullet}_{\mathcal{R}}[\mathcal{R}\text{-NEEDED}] \cap \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F})$. If we can show that the relation $\mathsf{mark}^{\bullet}_{\mathcal{R}}$ is recognizable then the result follows from Lemmata 2.3 and 2.6. Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a tree automaton with a unique final state ! that accepts $\mathsf{REDEX}_{\mathcal{R}} \cap \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F})$ and let $\mathcal{B}$ be the tree automaton whose single transition rule is $\bullet \to !$. It is not difficult to see that the GTT $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ accepts $\mathsf{mark}^{\bullet}_{\mathcal{R}}$. □

Theorem 5.6 *Let $\mathcal{R}$ be a left-linear TRS and let α be an approximation mapping such that $\mathcal{R}_{\alpha}$-NEEDED is recognizable. It is decidable whether $\mathcal{R} \in \mathsf{CBN\text{-}NF}_{\alpha}$.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be the signature of $\mathcal{R}$. The TRS $\mathcal{R}$ belongs to $\mathsf{CBN\text{-}NF}_{\alpha}$ if and only if the set

$$A = (\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F}) \setminus \mathsf{NF}_{\mathcal{R}}) \setminus \{t \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F}) \mid t \text{ has an } \mathcal{R}_{\alpha}\text{-needed redex}\}$$

is empty. Because A is recognizable due to Theorem 5.5 and Lemmata 2.3 and 2.5, emptiness of A is decidable by the second part of Lemma 2.4. □

Corollary 5.7 *Let $\mathcal{R}$ be a left-linear TRS and let $\alpha \in \{\mathrm{s}, \mathrm{nv}, \mathrm{sh}, \mathrm{g}\}$. It is decidable whether $\mathcal{R} \in \mathsf{CBN\text{-}NF}_{\alpha}$.* □

It shouldn't come as a surprise that a better approximation covers a larger class of TRSs. This is expressed formally in the next lemma.

Lemma 5.8 *We have $\mathsf{CBN\text{-}NF}_{\mathrm{s}} \subset \mathsf{CBN\text{-}NF}_{\mathrm{nv}} \subset \mathsf{CBN\text{-}NF}_{\mathrm{sh}} \subset \mathsf{CBN\text{-}NF}_{\mathrm{g}}$, even when these classes are restricted to orthogonal TRSs.*

Proof. According to Lemma 5.4, $\mathsf{CBN\text{-}NF}_{\mathrm{s}} \subseteq \mathsf{CBN\text{-}NF}_{\mathrm{nv}} \subseteq \mathsf{CBN\text{-}NF}_{\mathrm{sh}} \subseteq \mathsf{CBN\text{-}NF}_{\mathrm{g}}$. Consider the orthogonal TRSs

$\mathcal{R}_1$			$\mathcal{R}_2$			$\mathcal{R}_3$		
$f(a,b,x)$	$\to$	a	$f(a,b,x)$	$\to$	a	$f(a,b,x)$	$\to$	a
$f(b,x,a)$	$\to$	b	$f(b,x,a)$	$\to$	b	$f(b,x,a)$	$\to$	b
$f(x,a,b)$	$\to$	c	$f(x,a,b)$	$\to$	x	$f(x,a,b)$	$\to$	$g(g(x))$
						$g(x)$	$\to$	x

According to Lemma 5.3 $\mathcal{R}_1 \in \mathsf{CBN\text{-}NF}_{\mathrm{nv}}$, $\mathcal{R}_2 \in \mathsf{CBN\text{-}NF}_{\mathrm{sh}}$, and $\mathcal{R}_3 \in \mathsf{CBN\text{-}NF}_{\mathrm{g}}$. So it remains to show that $\mathcal{R}_1 \notin \mathsf{CBN\text{-}NF}_{\mathrm{s}}$, $\mathcal{R}_2 \notin \mathsf{CBN\text{-}NF}_{\mathrm{nv}}$, and $\mathcal{R}_3 \notin \mathsf{CBN\text{-}NF}_{\mathrm{sh}}$. We have

$$
\begin{array}{lcl}
(\mathcal{R}_1)_{\mathrm{s}} & & \\
f(a,b,x) & \to & y \\
f(b,x,a) & \to & y \\
f(x,a,b) & \to & y
\end{array}
\qquad
\begin{array}{lcl}
(\mathcal{R}_2)_{\mathrm{nv}} & & \\
f(a,b,x) & \to & a \\
f(b,x,a) & \to & b \\
f(x,a,b) & \to & y
\end{array}
\qquad
\begin{array}{lcl}
(\mathcal{R}_3)_{\mathrm{sh}} & & \\
f(a,b,x) & \to & a \\
f(b,x,a) & \to & b \\
f(x,a,b) & \to & g(g(y)) \\
g(x) & \to & x
\end{array}
$$

Let Δ be the redex $f(a,a,b)$. The following rewrite sequences in $(\mathcal{R}_1)_{\mathrm{s}}$ show that none of the redexes in $f(\Delta,\Delta,\Delta)$ is $(\mathcal{R}_1)_{\mathrm{s}}$-needed:

$$
\begin{array}{lcllcllcl}
f(\bullet,\Delta,\Delta) & \to & f(\bullet,a,\Delta) & \to & f(\bullet,a,b) & \to & a \\
f(\Delta,\bullet,\Delta) & \to & f(b,\bullet,\Delta) & \to & f(b,\bullet,a) & \to & a \\
f(\Delta,\Delta,\bullet) & \to & f(a,\Delta,\bullet) & \to & f(a,b,\bullet) & \to & a
\end{array}
$$

Hence $\mathcal{R}_1 \notin \mathsf{CBN\text{-}NF}_{\mathrm{s}}$. In $(\mathcal{R}_2)_{\mathrm{nv}}$ we have $\Delta \to t$ for every term t and thus

$$
\begin{array}{lcllcllcl}
f(\bullet,\Delta,\Delta) & \to & f(\bullet,a,\Delta) & \to & f(\bullet,a,b) & \to & a \\
f(\Delta,\bullet,\Delta) & \to & f(b,\bullet,\Delta) & \to & f(b,\bullet,a) & \to & b \\
f(\Delta,\Delta,\bullet) & \to & f(a,\Delta,\bullet) & \to & f(a,b,\bullet) & \to & a
\end{array}
$$

Consequently, $\mathcal{R}_2 \notin \mathsf{CBN\text{-}NF}_{\mathrm{nv}}$. Finally, in $(\mathcal{R}_3)_{\mathrm{sh}}$ we have $\Delta \to g(g(t)) \to g(t) \to t$ for every term t. Hence

$$
\begin{array}{lcllcllcllcl}
f(\bullet,\Delta,\Delta) & \to^* & f(\bullet,a,\Delta) & \to^* & f(\bullet,a,b) & \to & g(g(a)) & \to & g(a) & \to & a \\
f(\Delta,\bullet,\Delta) & \to^* & f(b,\bullet,\Delta) & \to^* & f(b,\bullet,a) & \to & b \\
f(\Delta,\Delta,\bullet) & \to^* & f(a,\Delta,\bullet) & \to^* & f(a,b,\bullet) & \to & a
\end{array}
$$

and therefore $\mathcal{R}_3 \notin \mathsf{CBN\text{-}NF}_{\mathrm{g}}$. □

It can be shown that $\mathsf{CBN\text{-}NF}_{\mathrm{s}}$ coincides with the class of strongly sequential TRSs introduced by [Huet and Lévy, 1991]. However, $\mathsf{CBN\text{-}NF}_{\mathrm{nv}}$ properly includes the class of NV-sequential TRSs introduced by [Oyamaguchi, 1993] as well as the extension to NVNF-sequential TRSs considered by [Nagaya *et al.*, 1995]. For instance, the TRS $\mathcal{R}_1$ defined in the above proof is neither NV-sequential nor NVNF-sequential (because the term $f(\Omega,\Omega,\Omega)$ doesn't have an index). Figure 1 shows the relationship between several classes of TRSs that admit decidable call by need computations to normal form. Areas (1), (2), (3), and (4) consist of all NV, NVNF, shallow ([Comon, 1995]), and growing ([Jacquemard, 1996]) sequential TRSs, respectively. Note that $\mathsf{CBN\text{-}NF}_{\mathrm{sh}}$ and $\mathsf{CBN\text{-}NF}_{\mathrm{g}}$ properly include the classes of shallow and growing sequential TRSs.

Why do we get more powerful results with so little effort? The deeper reason is that needed redexes are not *independent* of other redexes in the same term. Consider for instance the redexes $\Delta_1 = f(a,b,a)$ and $\Delta_2 = f(b,a,b)$ with respect to the TRS $\mathcal{R}_1$ in the proof of Lemma 5.8. An arbitrary redex Δ is needed in the term $f(\Delta_1,\Delta_1,\Delta)$ but not in the term $f(\Delta_1,\Delta_2,\Delta)$. The non-independence of needed redexes implies that if all (outermost) redexes in a term are replaced by a new constant Ω, which happens in the traditional approach to decidable approximations to call by need based on the notions of index and sequentiality, essential information for determining needed redexes is lost. Only when considering the approximation mapping s the use of Ω entails no loss of generality because in $\mathcal{R}_{\mathrm{s}}$ redexes reduce to all possible terms. This is the reason why $\mathsf{CBN\text{-}NF}_{\mathrm{s}}$ coincides with the class of strongly sequential TRSs.



Figure 1: Comparison.

6 Decidable Approximations of Root-Neededness

In the remainder of this paper we generalize the results of the preceding sections to call by need computations to root-stable forms. The first problem we face is to find a definition of root-needed redex that doesn't depend on the notion of descendant. This is less trivial than it seems, because the obvious adaptation

> redex Δ in term $C[\Delta] \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F})$ is root-needed if and only if there is no term $t \in \mathsf{RS}_{\mathcal{R}_\bullet}$ such that $C[\bullet] \to_{\mathcal{R}}^* t$

of Lemma 3.1 doesn't work. For instance, redex a in the term $f(a)$ is root-needed with respect to the TRS

$$\begin{array}{rcl} a & \to & b \\ f(b) & \to & c \end{array}$$

but $f(\bullet)$ is root-stable with respect to $\mathcal{R}_\bullet$. On the other hand, redex $f(b)$ in the term $f(f(b))$ is not root-needed as $f(f(b))$ is root-stable. This shows that root-needed redexes, unlike needed redexes, are not uniform: root-neededness of a redex doesn't depend only on its position in a term. Hence when trying to determine whether a redex Δ is root-needed we cannot simply replace it by $\bullet$. Instead, we mark the root symbol of Δ.

Definition 6.1 Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a signature. Let $\mathcal{F}_\circ = \mathcal{F} \cup \{f_\circ \mid f \in \mathcal{F}\}$ where every $f_\circ$ has the same arity as f. Let $\mathcal{R}$ be a TRS over the signature $\mathcal{F}$. Let $\Delta \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F})$ be a redex. We write Δ° for the term that is obtained from Δ by marking its root symbol, i.e., if $\Delta = f(t_1, \ldots, t_n)$ then $\Delta^\circ = f_\circ(t_1, \ldots, t_n)$. We call Δ° a *marked redex*. The mapping from $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F}_\circ)$ to $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F})$ that simply erases all marks is denoted by erase, so $\mathsf{erase}(f(t_1, \ldots, t_n)) = \mathsf{erase}(f_\circ(t_1, \ldots, t_n)) = f(\mathsf{erase}(t_1), \ldots, \mathsf{erase}(t_n))$.

The marking of redexes serves a double purpose. On the one hand, it tells us which redex we want to test for root-neededness. On the other hand, marked redexes are not redexes—simply because there are no marks in the (left-hand sides of the) rewrite rules—so if we rewrite a term that contains a marked redex, the marked redex is never contracted.

Lemma 6.2 *Let $\mathcal{R}$ be an orthogonal TRS over a signature $\mathcal{F}$. Redex Δ in term $C[\Delta] \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F})$ is root-needed if and only if there is no term t such that $C[\Delta^\circ] \to_{\mathcal{R}}^* t$ and $\mathsf{erase}(t) \in \mathsf{RS}_{\mathcal{R}}$.*

Proof.

$\Rightarrow$ Suppose there is a term t such that $C[\Delta^\circ] \to_{\mathcal{R}}^* t$ and $\mathsf{erase}(t) \in \mathsf{RS}_{\mathcal{R}}$. Erasing all marks yields a sequence $A{:}C[\Delta] = \mathsf{erase}(C[\Delta^\circ]) \to_{\mathcal{R}}^* \mathsf{erase}(t)$ with $\Delta \perp A$. Hence Δ is not root-needed.

$\Leftarrow$ Suppose Δ is not root-needed. So there exists a rewrite sequence $A{:}C[\Delta] \to_{\mathcal{R}}^* t$ with t root-stable and $\Delta \perp A$. Marking every descendant of Δ in A yields a sequence $C[\Delta^\circ] \to_{\mathcal{R}}^* t'$ with $\mathsf{erase}(t') = t \in \mathsf{RS}_{\mathcal{R}}$.

□

Actually, we can do without the relation erase because for orthogonal TRSs $\mathcal{R}$ it is not difficult to prove that $\{t \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F}_\circ) \mid \mathsf{erase}(t) \in \mathsf{RS}_{\mathcal{R}}\}$ coincides with $\mathsf{RS}_{\mathcal{R}_\circ}$ where $\mathcal{R}_\circ$ denotes the TRS $\mathcal{R} \cup \{l^\circ \to r \mid l \to r \in \mathcal{R}\}$. Hence redex Δ in term $C[\Delta] \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F})$ is root-needed if and only if there is no term $t \in \mathsf{RS}_{\mathcal{R}_\circ}$ such that $C[\Delta^\circ] \to_{\mathcal{R}}^* t$.

Besides the non-computability of $\to_{\mathcal{R}}^*$ we face the additional problem that root-stability is in general not computable. So in order to arrive at decidable approximations of root-neededness, we approximate $\mathcal{R}$ by TRSs $\mathcal{S}_1$ and $\mathcal{S}_2$ such that it is decidable whether a term has an $\mathcal{S}_1$-reduct in $\mathsf{RS}_{(\mathcal{S}_2)_\circ}$.

Definition 6.3 Let $\mathcal{S}_1$ and $\mathcal{S}_2$ be TRSs over the same signature $\mathcal{F}$. We say that redex Δ in $C[\Delta] \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F})$ is $(\mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2)$-*root-needed* if there is no term $t \in \mathsf{RS}_{(\mathcal{S}_2)_\circ}$ such that $C[\Delta^\circ] \to_{\mathcal{S}_1}^* t$. We abbreviate $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{S})$-root-needed to $\mathcal{S}$-root-needed.

Our $\mathcal{R}_{\mathrm{s}}$-root-needed redexes coincide with the *strongly root-needed* redexes defined in [Kennaway, 1995].

Lemma 6.4 *Let $\mathcal{R}_1$ and $\mathcal{R}_2$ be TRSs over the same signature with approximations $\mathcal{S}_1$ and $\mathcal{S}_2$. Every $(\mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{R}_2)$-root-needed redex is $(\mathcal{R}_1, \mathcal{S}_2)$-root-needed.*

Proof. First we show that $\mathsf{RS}_{(\mathcal{S}_2)_\circ} \subseteq \mathsf{RS}_{(\mathcal{R}_2)_\circ}$. If $t \notin \mathsf{RS}_{(\mathcal{R}_2)_\circ}$ then there exists an $(\mathcal{R}_2)_\circ$-redex Δ such that $t \to_{(\mathcal{R}_2)_\circ}^* \Delta$. Because $\mathcal{S}_2$ approximates $\mathcal{R}_2$ we have $\to_{\mathcal{R}_2}^* \subseteq \to_{\mathcal{S}_2}^*$ and $\mathsf{NF}_{\mathcal{R}_2} = \mathsf{NF}_{\mathcal{S}_2}$. The latter implies $\mathsf{NF}_{(\mathcal{R}_2)_\circ} = \mathsf{NF}_{(\mathcal{S}_2)_\circ}$ and thus $(\mathcal{R}_2)_\circ$ and $(\mathcal{S}_2)_\circ$ have the same redexes. Hence $t \to_{(\mathcal{S}_2)_\circ}^* \Delta$ with Δ an $(\mathcal{S}_2)_\circ$-redex and therefore $t \notin \mathsf{RS}_{(\mathcal{S}_2)_\circ}$. Combining the inclusion $\mathsf{RS}_{(\mathcal{S}_2)_\circ} \subseteq \mathsf{RS}_{(\mathcal{R}_2)_\circ}$ with $\to_{\mathcal{R}_1}^* \subseteq \to_{\mathcal{S}_1}^*$ immediately yields the desired result. □

It should be noted that, for an approximation $\mathcal{S}$ of $\mathcal{R}$, $\mathcal{S}$-root-needed redexes need not be $\mathcal{R}$-root-needed. Consider for instance the orthogonal TRS $\mathcal{R}$:

$$\begin{array}{rcl} a & \to & b \\ f(c) & \to & c \end{array}$$

The term $f(a)$ is root-stable, hence its redex a is not root-needed. Nevertheless, redex a is $\mathcal{R}_{\mathrm{s}}$-needed because the only term t such that $f(a_\circ) \to_{\mathcal{R}_{\mathrm{s}}}^* t$ is $f(a_\circ)$ itself and $f(a_\circ) \notin \mathsf{RS}_{(\mathcal{R}_{\mathrm{s}})_\circ}$ because we have $f(a_\circ) \to f(c)$ in the TRS $(\mathcal{R}_{\mathrm{s}})_\circ$:

$$\begin{array}{rcl@{\qquad}rcl} a & \to & x & a_\circ & \to & x \\ f(c) & \to & x & f_\circ(c) & \to & x \end{array}$$

So not every strongly root-needed redex is root-needed, contradicting Theorem 16 in [Kennaway, 1995].

Definition 6.5 Let $\mathcal{R}$ and $\mathcal{S}$ be TRSs over the same signature $\mathcal{F}$. The set of all terms $C[\Delta^\circ] \in \mathsf{M}^\circ_\mathcal{R}$ such that there is no term $t \in \mathsf{RS}_{\mathcal{S}_\circ}$ with $C[\Delta^\circ] \to^*_\mathcal{R} t$ is denoted by $(\mathcal{R},\mathcal{S})$-ROOT-NEEDED. Here $\mathsf{M}^\circ_\mathcal{R} = \{C[\Delta^\circ] \mid C[\Delta] \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F})$ and Δ is an $\mathcal{R}$-redex$\}$ consists of all terms that contain exactly one marked redex.

Theorem 6.6 *Let $\mathcal{R}$ and $\mathcal{S}$ be TRSs over the same signature $\mathcal{F}$. If $(\to^*_\mathcal{R})[\mathsf{RS}_{\mathcal{S}_\circ}]$ is recognizable and $\mathcal{R}$ left-linear then $(\mathcal{R},\mathcal{S})$-ROOT-NEEDED is recognizable.*

Proof. We have $(\mathcal{R},\mathcal{S})$-ROOT-NEEDED $= (\to^*_\mathcal{R})[\mathsf{RS}_{\mathcal{S}_\circ}]^c \cap \mathsf{M}^\circ_\mathcal{R}$. We show that $\mathsf{M}^\circ_\mathcal{R}$ is recognizable. Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a tree automaton that accepts $\mathsf{REDEX}_\mathcal{R} \cap \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F})$ such that $\mathcal{A}$ has a unique final state !, a state $*$ in which all terms in $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F})$ are accepted, and for every left-hand side $f(l_1,\ldots,l_n)$ of a rewrite rule in $\mathcal{R}$ a single transition rule of the form $f(q_1,\ldots,q_n) \to$!. We transform $\mathcal{A}$ into a tree automaton $\mathcal{B}$ by changing the latter transition rules to $f_\circ(q_1,\ldots,q_n) \to$! and adding all transition rules of the form $f(*,\ldots,!,\ldots,*) \to$! with $f \in \mathcal{F}$. It is not difficult to see that $\mathcal{B}$ accepts $\mathsf{M}^\circ_\mathcal{R}$. Hence the desired result follows from Lemma 2.3(2,4). □

Table 3: A tree automaton that accepts $\mathsf{M}^\circ_\mathcal{R}$.

a	$\to$	$*$	a	$\to$	a
b	$\to$	$*$	b	$\to$	b
$f(*,*)$	$\to$	$*$	$g(*)$	$\to$	$\mathsf{g}(*)$
$g(*)$	$\to$	$*$	$f(*,\mathsf{b})$	$\to$	$\mathsf{f}(*,\mathsf{b})$
$h(*)$	$\to$	$*$			
			$g(!)$	$\to$	!
$f_\circ(\mathsf{g}(*),\mathsf{a})$	$\to$	!	$h(!)$	$\to$	!
$h_\circ(\mathsf{a})$	$\to$	!	$f(!,*)$	$\to$	!
$h_\circ(\mathsf{f}(*,\mathsf{b}))$	$\to$	!	$f(*,!)$	$\to$	!

For the example TRS $\mathcal{R}$ on page a tree automaton that accepts $\mathsf{M}^\circ_\mathcal{R}$ is presented in Table 3. In the remainder of this section we show that the first premise of Theorem 6.6 is satisfied for the four approximations defined in the preceding two sections. For shallow and growing approximations we make use of the following extension of Theorem 4.3.

Theorem 6.7 *Let $\mathcal{R}$ be a left-linear TRS over a signature $\mathcal{F}$ and let $L \subseteq \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F})$ be recognizable. The set $(\to_\mathcal{S})^*[L]$ is recognizable for $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{R}_{\mathrm{sh}}$ and $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{R}_{\mathrm{g}}$.*

Proof. Similar to the proof of [Comon, 1995, Lemma 4.20] and [Jacquemard, 1996, Theorem 5]. The only difference is to start the constructions in those two papers with a tree automaton that accepts L instead of a tree automaton that accepts $\mathsf{NF}_\mathcal{R}$. □

Lemma 6.8 *Let $\mathcal{R}$ be a left-linear TRS and let $\alpha \in \{\mathrm{s},\mathrm{nv},\mathrm{sh},\mathrm{g}\}$. The set $\mathsf{RS}_{(\mathcal{R}_\alpha)_\circ}$ is recognizable.*

Proof. We have $\mathsf{RS}_{(\mathcal{R}_\alpha)_\circ} = (\to^*_{(\mathcal{R}_\alpha)_\circ})[\mathsf{REDEX}_{(\mathcal{R}_\alpha)_\circ}]^c$. Since $(\mathcal{R}_\alpha)_\circ$ is left-linear, $\mathsf{REDEX}_{(\mathcal{R}_\alpha)_\circ}$ is recognizable according to Lemma 2.5. It is easy to see that $(\mathcal{R}_\alpha)_\circ = (\mathcal{R}_\circ)_\alpha$ for $\alpha \in \{\mathrm{s},\mathrm{nv},\mathrm{sh},\mathrm{g}\}$. So for $\alpha \in \{\mathrm{s},\mathrm{nv}\}$ the relation $\to^*_{(\mathcal{R}_\alpha)_\circ}$ is recognizable by Lemma 3.9 and thus the recognizability of $\mathsf{RS}_{(\mathcal{R}_\alpha)_\circ}$ is consequence of Lemmata 2.6(3) and 2.3(4). For $\alpha \in \{\mathrm{sh},\mathrm{g}\}$ we use Theorem 6.7 and Lemma 2.3(4) to obtain the same result. □

Lemma 6.9 *Let $\mathcal{R}$ be a left-linear TRS. The set $(\to^*_{\mathcal{R}_\alpha})[\mathsf{RS}_{(\mathcal{R}_\beta)_\circ}]$ is recognizable for $\alpha,\beta \in \{\mathrm{s},\mathrm{nv},\mathrm{sh},\mathrm{g}\}$.*

Proof. Similar to the second half of the proof of Lemma 6.8. □

Corollary 6.10 *Let $\mathcal{R}$ be a left-linear TRS over a signature $\mathcal{F}$. It is decidable whether a redex in a term in $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F})$ is $(\mathcal{R}_\alpha, \mathcal{R}_\beta)$-root-needed for $\alpha, \beta \in \{\mathrm{s}, \mathrm{nv}, \mathrm{sh}, \mathrm{g}\}$.* □

7 Call by Need Computations to Root-Stable Form

Definition 7.1 Let α and β be approximation mappings. The class of TRSs $\mathcal{R}$ such that every non-$\mathcal{R}_\beta$-root-stable term in $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F})$ has an $(\mathcal{R}_\alpha, \mathcal{R}_\beta)$-root-needed redex is denoted by $\mathsf{CBN\text{-}RS}_{\alpha,\beta}$. Here $\mathcal{F}$ denotes the signature of $\mathcal{R}$.

It can be shown that $\mathsf{CBN\text{-}RS}_{\mathrm{s},\mathrm{s}}$ coincides with the class of strongly root-sequential TRSs introduced by [Kennaway, 1995].

The following result corresponds to Theorem 5.5. The proof, however, is more difficult because the parallel closure of $\{(\Delta, \Delta^\circ) \mid \Delta \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F}) \text{ is a redex}\}$ is not recognizable since the size of redexes is unbounded and in GTTs one can only transfer a finite amount of information between the two sides. We overcome this problem by resorting to weak second-order monadic logic.

Theorem 7.2 *Let $\mathcal{R}$ and $\mathcal{S}$ be TRSs such that $(\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{S})$-ROOT-NEEDED is recognizable. The set of terms that have an $(\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{S})$-root-needed redex is recognizable.*

Proof. Let $\phi(\vec{X})$ be the definition of $(\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{S})$-ROOT-NEEDED in WS$k$S, whose existence is guaranteed by Theorem 2.7. The set of terms that have an $(\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{S})$-root-needed redex is defined by the following WSkS formula:

$$\overbrace{\bigwedge_{f \in \mathcal{F}_\circ \setminus \mathcal{F}} X_f = \varnothing}^{(1)} \;\wedge\; \exists \vec{Y} \Bigg[\overbrace{X = Y \;\wedge\; \bigwedge_{f \in \mathcal{F}} X_f = Y_f \cup Y_{f_\circ}}^{(2)} \;\wedge\; \overbrace{\phi(\vec{Y})}^{(3)} \Bigg].$$

Part (1) ensures that the term t encoded by $\vec{X}$ contains no marks, part (2) ensures that $\mathsf{erase}(t') = t$ for the term t' encoded by $\vec{Y}$, and part (3) ensures that t' belongs to $(\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{S})$-ROOT-NEEDED. Hence the result follows from Theorem 2.7. □

Theorem 7.3 *Let $\mathcal{R}$ be a TRS and let α and β be approximation mapping such that $\mathsf{RS}_{\mathcal{R}_\beta}$ and $(\mathcal{R}_\alpha, \mathcal{R}_\beta)$-ROOT-NEEDED are recognizable. It is decidable whether $\mathcal{R} \in \mathsf{CBN\text{-}RS}_{\alpha,\beta}$.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be the signature of $\mathcal{R}$. The TRS $\mathcal{R}$ belongs to $\mathsf{CBN\text{-}RS}_{\alpha,\beta}$ if and only if the set

$$A = (\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F}) \setminus \mathsf{RS}_{\mathcal{R}_\beta}) \setminus \{t \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F}) \mid t \text{ has an } (\mathcal{R}_\alpha, \mathcal{R}_\beta)\text{-root-needed redex}\}$$

is empty. Because A is recognizable due to Theorem 7.2 and Lemma 2.3(1,3), emptiness of A is decidable by the second part of Lemma 2.4. □

In the remainder of this section we show that for the approximation mappings s and nv we don't need weak second-order monadic logic to conclude the decidability of membership of $\mathsf{CBN\text{-}RS}_{\alpha,\beta}$ for *orthogonal* TRSs. The reason is that $(\mathcal{R}_\alpha, \mathcal{R}_\beta)$-root-needed redexes for $\alpha, \beta \in \{\mathrm{s}, \mathrm{nv}\}$ and orthogonal $\mathcal{R}$ satisfy the partial uniformity result expressed in Theorem 7.5 below.

Definition 7.4 Let $\mathcal{R}$ be a TRS over a signature $\mathcal{F}$. Two redexes $\Delta_1, \Delta_2 \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F})$ are called *pattern equal*, denoted by $\Delta_1 \approx \Delta_2$, if they have the same redex pattern, i.e., they are redexes with respect to the same rewrite rule. The relation $\mathsf{mark}^\circ_{\mathcal{R}}$ on $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F}_\circ)$ is defined as the parallel closure of $\{(\Delta_1, \Delta_2^\circ) \mid \Delta_1, \Delta_2 \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F}) \text{ are pattern equal redexes}\}$.

Theorem 7.5 *Let $\mathcal{R}$ be an orthogonal TRS. If redex Δ_1 in $C[\Delta_1]$ is $(\mathcal{R}_\alpha, \mathcal{R}_\beta)$-root-needed with $\alpha, \beta \in \{\mathrm{s}, \mathrm{nv}\}$ then so is redex Δ_2 in $C[\Delta_2]$, for any $\Delta_2 \approx \Delta_1$.* □

Orthogonality is essential in Theorem 7.5. Consider for instance the pattern equal redexes $f(g(a))$ and $f(g(b))$ with respect to the left-linear TRS $\mathcal{R}$:

$$\begin{array}{rcl} f(g(x)) & \to & f(a) \\ g(b) & \to & a \end{array}$$

Redex $f(g(a))$ is $(\mathcal{R}_\alpha, \mathcal{R}_\beta)$-root-needed for all $\alpha, \beta \in \{\mathrm{s}, \mathrm{nv}\}$ because $f_\circ(g(a))$ is an $\mathcal{R}_\alpha$-normal form that is not $(\mathcal{R}_\beta)_\circ$-root-stable. However, redex $f(g(b))$ is not $(\mathcal{R}_\alpha, \mathcal{R}_\beta)$-root-needed since $f_\circ(g(b)) \to_{\mathcal{R}_\alpha} f_\circ(a)$ and $f_\circ(a)$ is $(\mathcal{R}_\beta)_\circ$-root-stable.

Lemma 7.6 *Let $\mathcal{R}$ be a left-linear TRS. The relation $\mathsf{mark}^\circ_\mathcal{R}$ is recognizable.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be the signature of $\mathcal{R} = \{l_i \to r_i \mid 1 \leqslant i \leqslant n\}$. Define the GTT $\mathcal{G}$ as $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ where $\mathcal{A}$ is a tree automaton without ϵ-rules that accepts in state i all instances in $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F})$ of l_i and $\mathcal{B}$ is obtained from $\mathcal{A}$ by changing every transition rule of the form $f(q_1, \ldots, q_n) \to \mathsf{i}$ to $f_\circ(q_1, \ldots, q_n) \to \mathsf{i}$, followed by a renaming of all states different from $\mathsf{1}, \ldots, \mathsf{n}$. It is not difficult to see that $\mathcal{G}$ accepts $\mathsf{mark}^\circ_\mathcal{R}$. □

For the example TRS $\mathcal{R}$ on page a GTT that accepts $\mathsf{mark}^\circ_\mathcal{R}$ is presented in Table 4.

Table 4: A GTT that accepts $\mathsf{mark}^\circ_\mathcal{R}$.

a	$\to$	$*$	a	$\to$	$\underline{*}$
b	$\to$	$*$	b	$\to$	$\underline{*}$
$f(*,*)$	$\to$	$*$	$f(\underline{*},\underline{*})$	$\to$	$\underline{*}$
$g(*)$	$\to$	$*$	$g(\underline{*})$	$\to$	$\underline{*}$
$h(*)$	$\to$	$*$	$h(\underline{*})$	$\to$	$\underline{*}$
a	$\to$	a	a	$\to$	$\underline{\mathsf{a}}$
b	$\to$	b	b	$\to$	$\underline{\mathsf{b}}$
$g(*)$	$\to$	$\mathsf{g}(*)$	$g(\underline{*})$	$\to$	$\underline{\mathsf{g}(*)}$
$f(*,\mathsf{b})$	$\to$	$\mathsf{f}(*,\mathsf{b})$	$f(\underline{*},\underline{\mathsf{b}})$	$\to$	$\underline{\mathsf{f}(*,\mathsf{b})}$
$f(\mathsf{g}(*),\mathsf{a})$	$\to$	$\mathsf{1}$	$f_\circ(\underline{\mathsf{g}(*)},\underline{\mathsf{a}})$	$\to$	$\mathsf{1}$
$h(\mathsf{a})$	$\to$	$\mathsf{2}$	$h_\circ(\underline{\mathsf{a}})$	$\to$	$\mathsf{2}$
$h(\mathsf{f}(*,\mathsf{b}))$	$\to$	$\mathsf{3}$	$h_\circ(\underline{\mathsf{f}(*,\mathsf{b})})$	$\to$	$\mathsf{3}$

Let $\mathcal{R}$ be an orthogonal TRS over a signature $\mathcal{F}$. Using the preceding results we give a simple proof of the recognizability of $\{t \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F}) \mid t \text{ has an } (\mathcal{R}_\alpha, \mathcal{R}_\beta)\text{-root-needed redex}\}$ for $\alpha, \beta \in \{\mathrm{s}, \mathrm{nv}\}$. Because of Theorem 7.5 the above set coincides with

$$\mathsf{mark}^\circ_\mathcal{R}[(\mathcal{R}_\alpha, \mathcal{R}_\beta)\text{-}\mathsf{ROOT\text{-}NEEDED}] \cap \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F})$$

and this latter set is recognizable due to Lemmata 7.6, 2.6(3), and 2.3(1,2).

References

[Comon, 1995] H. Comon. Sequentiality, second-order monadic logic and tree automata. In *Proceedings of the 10th IEEE Annual Symposium on Logic in Computer Science*, pages 508–517, 1995.

[Coquidé and Gilleron, 1990] J.L. Coquidé and R. Gilleron. Proofs and reachability problem for ground rewrite systems. In *Proceedings of the 6th International Meeting of Young Computer Scientists*, volume 464 of *LNCS*, pages 120–129, 1990.

[Dauchet and Tison, 1985] M. Dauchet and S. Tison. Decidability of confluence for ground term rewriting systems. In *Proceedings of the 1st International Conference on Fundamentals of Computation Theory*, volume 199 of *LNCS*, pages 80–89, 1985.

[Dauchet *et al.*, 1990] M. Dauchet, T. Heuillard, P. Lescanne, and S. Tison. Decidability of the confluence of finite ground term rewriting systems and of other related term rewriting systems. *Information and Computation*, 88:187–201, 1990.

[Dershowitz and Jouannaud, 1990] N. Dershowitz and J.-P. Jouannaud. Rewrite systems. In *Handbook of Theoretical Computer Science*, volume B, pages 243–320. Elsevier, 1990.

[Doner, 1970] J. Doner. Tree acceptors and some of their applications. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 4:406–451, 1970.

[Huet and Lévy, 1991] G. Huet and J.-J. Lévy. Computations in orthogonal rewriting systems, i and ii. In *Computational Logic, Essays in Honor of Alan Robinson*, pages 396–443. The MIT Press, 1991.

[Jacquemard, 1996] F. Jacquemard. Decidable approximations of term rewriting systems. In *Proceedings of the 7th International Conference on Rewriting Techniques and Applications*, volume 1103 of *LNCS*, pages 362–376, 1996.

[Jouannaud and Sadfi, 1995] J.-P. Jouannaud and W. Sadfi. Strong sequentiality of left-linear overlapping rewrite systems. In *Proceedings of the 4th Workshop on Conditional Term Rewriting Systems*, volume 968 of *LNCS*, pages 235–246, 1995.

[Kennaway, 1995] J.R. Kennaway. A conflict between call-by-need computation and parallelism. In *Proceedings of the 4th Workshop on Conditional Term Rewriting Systems*, volume 968 of *LNCS*, pages 247–261, 1995.

[Klop and Middeldorp, 1991] J.W. Klop and A. Middeldorp. Sequentiality in orthogonal term rewriting systems. *Journal of Symbolic Computation*, 12:161–195, 1991.

[Klop, 1992] J.W. Klop. Term rewriting systems. In *Handbook of Logic in Computer Science, Vol. 2*, pages 1–116. Oxford University Press, 1992.

[Middeldorp, 1997] A. Middeldorp. Call by need computations to root-stable form. In *Proceedings of the 24th Annual ACM Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages*, pages 94–105, 1997.

[Nagaya *et al.*, 1995] T. Nagaya, M. Sakai, and Y. Toyama. Nvnf-sequentiality of left-linear term rewriting systems. In *Proceeding of the RIMS Workshop on Theory and Applications of Rewriting Systems*, pages 109–117, 1995.

[Oyamaguchi, 1993] M. Oyamaguchi. Nv-sequentiality: A decidable condition for call-by-need computations in term rewriting systems. *SIAM Journal on Computation*, 22:114–135, 1993.

[Thatcher and Wright, 1968] J.W. Thatcher and J.B. Wright. Generalized finite automata theory with an application to a decision problem of second-order logic. *Mathematical Systems Theory*, 2:57–81, 1968.

[Thomas, 1990] W. Thomas. Automata on infinite objects. In *Handbook of Theoretical Computer Science, Vol. B*, pages 133–191. North-Holland, 1990.

[Toyama, 1992] Y. Toyama. Strong sequentiality of left-linear overlapping term rewriting systems. In *Proceedings of the 7th IEEE Annual Symposium on Logic in Computer Science*, pages 274–284, 1992.