

5.4 Recursion with Measure

5.4.1 The principle of measure induction. For every formula $\varphi[\bar{x}]$ and term $\mu[\bar{x}]$, the formula of *induction on \bar{x} with measure $\mu[\bar{x}]$* for φ is the following one:

$$\forall \bar{x} \left(\forall \bar{y} (\mu[\bar{y}] < \mu[\bar{x}] \rightarrow \varphi[\bar{y}]) \rightarrow \varphi[\bar{x}] \right) \rightarrow \forall \bar{x} \varphi[\bar{x}]. \quad (1)$$

We assume here that the variables \bar{y} are different from \bar{x} and that they do not occur freely in φ . The formula φ and the term μ may contain additional variables as parameters.

Note that for $\bar{x} \equiv x$ and $\mu[x] \equiv x$, the scheme of measure induction coincides with the scheme of complete induction.

5.4.2 Theorem *The principle of measure induction holds for each formula.*

Proof. The principle of measure induction 5.4.1(1) is reduced to mathematical induction as follows. Under the assumption that φ is μ -progressive:

$$\forall \bar{x} \left(\forall \bar{y} (\mu[\bar{y}] < \mu[\bar{x}] \rightarrow \varphi[\bar{y}]) \rightarrow \varphi[\bar{x}] \right), \quad (\dagger_1)$$

we first prove, by induction on n , the auxiliary property:

$$\forall \bar{z} (\mu[\bar{z}] < n \rightarrow \varphi[\bar{z}]). \quad (\dagger_2)$$

In the base case there is nothing to prove. In the induction step take any \bar{z} such that $\mu[\bar{z}] < n+1$ and consider two cases. If $\mu[\bar{z}] < n$ then we obtain $\varphi[\bar{z}]$ by IH. If $\mu[\bar{z}] = n$ then by instantiating of (\dagger_1) with $\bar{x} := \bar{z}$ we obtain

$$\forall \bar{y} (\mu[\bar{y}] < n \rightarrow \varphi[\bar{y}]) \rightarrow \varphi[\bar{z}].$$

Now we apply IH to get $\varphi[\bar{z}]$.

With the auxiliary property proved we obtain that $\varphi[\bar{x}]$ holds for every \bar{x} by instantiating of $\forall n (\dagger_2)$ with $n := \mu[\bar{x}] + 1$ and $\bar{z} := \bar{x}$. \square

5.4.3 Greatest common divisor. Consider the recursive definition of the greatest divisor function of the form

$$\begin{aligned} \text{gcd}(x, y) = & \mathbf{if } x \neq 0 \wedge y \neq 0 \mathbf{ then} \\ & \mathbf{case} \\ & \quad x < y \Rightarrow \text{gcd}(x, y \div x) \\ & \quad x = y \Rightarrow x \\ & \quad x > y \Rightarrow \text{gcd}(x \div y, y) \\ & \mathbf{end} \\ & \mathbf{else} \\ & \quad \max(x, y). \end{aligned}$$

The definition is an example of regular recursion where recursion goes down in the measure $\max(x, y)$. Its conditions of regularity

$$\begin{aligned} \vdash_{\mathcal{PA}} x \neq 0 \wedge y \neq 0 \wedge x < y &\rightarrow \max(x, y \dot{-} x) < \max(x, y) & (1) \\ \vdash_{\mathcal{PA}} x \neq 0 \wedge y \neq 0 \wedge x > y &\rightarrow \max(x \dot{-} y, y) < \max(x, y) \end{aligned}$$

follow from

$$\vdash_{\mathcal{PA}} a > b > 0 \rightarrow a \dot{-} b < a.$$

The idea of the algorithm is based on the observation that

$$\vdash_{\mathcal{PA}} x < y \wedge z \mid x \rightarrow z \mid y \leftrightarrow z \mid y \dot{-} x. \quad (2)$$

We claim that

$$\vdash_{\mathcal{PA}} x \neq 0 \vee y \neq 0 \rightarrow \gcd(x, y) \mid x \wedge \gcd(x, y) \mid y \quad (3)$$

$$\vdash_{\mathcal{PA}} (x \neq 0 \vee y \neq 0) \wedge z \mid x \wedge z \mid y \rightarrow z \leq \gcd(x, y). \quad (4)$$

Verification. (3): By measure induction on x, y with the measure $\max(x, y)$. Assume $x \neq 0 \vee y \neq 0$ and consider two cases. If $x = 0 \vee y = 0$ then clearly

$$x \neq 0 \wedge y = 0 \vee x = 0 \wedge y \neq 0.$$

If $x \neq 0 \wedge y = 0$ then the claim follows from 5.3.4(5)(1) because

$$\gcd(x, y) = \max(x, y) = x \wedge x \mid x \wedge x \mid 0.$$

The subcase $x = 0 \wedge y \neq 0$ is proved similarly. If $x \neq 0 \wedge y \neq 0$ then we consider three subcases. If $x < y$ then by (1) we have $\max(x, y \dot{-} x) < \max(x, y)$ and thus by IH applied to the pair $(x, y \dot{-} x)$ we obtain

$$\gcd(x, y \dot{-} x) \mid x \wedge \gcd(x, y \dot{-} x) \mid y \dot{-} x.$$

From definition

$$\gcd(x, y) \mid x \wedge \gcd(x, y) \mid y \dot{-} x.$$

From this and (2) we finally obtain

$$\gcd(x, y) \mid x \wedge \gcd(x, y) \mid y.$$

The subcase $x > y$ is proved similarly; the subcase $x = y$ follows from 5.3.4(1) and definition.

(4): By measure induction on x, y with the measure $\max(x, y)$. So assume that $x \neq 0 \vee y \neq 0$ holds and take any number z such that

$$z \mid x \wedge z \mid y.$$

We consider two cases. If $x = 0 \vee y = 0$ then

$$x \neq 0 \wedge y = 0 \vee x = 0 \wedge y \neq 0.$$

The desired bound $z \leq \gcd(x, y)$ follows from

$$\begin{aligned} x \neq 0 \wedge y = 0 \wedge z \mid x &\stackrel{5.3.4(13)}{\Rightarrow} z \leq x = \max(x, y) = \gcd(x, y) \\ x = 0 \wedge y \neq 0 \wedge z \mid y &\stackrel{5.3.4(13)}{\Rightarrow} z \leq y = \max(x, y) = \gcd(x, y). \end{aligned}$$

If $x \neq 0 \wedge y \neq 0$ then we consider three subcases. If $x < y$ then by (2) we have

$$z \mid x \wedge z \mid y \dot{-} x.$$

By (1) we have $\max(x, y \dot{-} x) < \max(x, y)$ and thus by IH applied to the pair $(x, y \dot{-} x)$ we obtain

$$z \leq \gcd(x, y \dot{-} x) = \gcd(x, y).$$

The subcase $x > y$ is proved similarly; the subcase $x = y$ follows from 5.3.4(13) and definition. \square