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## $\mathbf{S C}^{\mathbf{2}}$ (link to EU Project)

## Satisfiability Checking and Symbolic Computation

Bridging Two Communities to Solve Real Problems

## SUMMARY

The use of advanced methods to solve practical and industrially relevant problems by computers has a long history. Symbolic Computation is concerned with the algorithmic determination of exact solutions to complex mathematical problems; and more recent developments in the area of Satisfiability Checking are starting to tackle similar problems but with different algorithmic and technological solutions.

Though both communities have made remarkable progress in the last decades, they need to be further strengthened to tackle practical problems of ever increasing size and complexity. Their separate tools (computer algebra systems and SMT solvers) are urgently needed to address prevailing problems having a direct effect on our society. For example, Satisfiability Checking is an essential backend for assuring the security and the safety of computer systems. In various scientific areas, Symbolic Computation is able to deal with large mathematical problems far beyond the scope of pencil and paper solutions.

Currently the two communities are largely disjoint and unaware of the achievements of one another, despite there being strong reasons for them to discuss and collaborate, since they share many central interests. However, up to now, researchers from these two communities rarely interact, and also their tools lack common, mutual interfaces for unifying their strengths. Bridges between the communities in the form of common platforms and road-maps are necessary to initiate an exchange, and to support and direct their interaction. These are the main objectives of this CSA. We will initiate a wide range of activities to bring the two communities together, identify common challenges, propose joint standards, offer global events and bilateral visits, and so on. Besides the partners in our EU Project, these people have expressed an interest in these activities.

We believe that these activities will initiate cross-fertilization of both fields and bring mutual benefits. Combining the knowledge, experience and the technologies in these communities will enable the developmont of radically improved software tools.

On February 28th, 2016, the European Commission anounced an intention to fund ourbirst project: the SC-square
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## Satisfiability modulo theories

$\varphi$ is from an existentially quantified first-order logic
■ Fully automated solving
■ Our focus: nonlinear integer arithmetic

- Example:

$$
\exists x, y \cdot y \geq \frac{x^{2}-2}{2} \wedge y \leq \frac{x}{2} \quad \text { hybr } \quad \substack{\text { Theory } \\ \text { of tybrid } \\ \text { ofsems } \\ \text { intormatik } 2}
$$

## Fundamental idea: SAT vs. Theory
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Fundamental idea: use a solver for $\mathbb{R}$ on problems from $\mathbb{Z}$

- Theory solver searches a solution for $C=\left\{c_{1}, \ldots, c_{k}\right\}$
- If no solution exists: return unsat
- If solution is integral: return sat
- If solution is fractional: return unknown and generate a lemma

What kind of lemma?
■ Must be a tautology in the theory
■ Excludes only non-integral solutions
■ $x \rightarrow \alpha_{x}:\left(c_{1} \wedge \ldots \wedge c_{k}\right) \Rightarrow\left(x \leq\left\lfloor\alpha_{x}\right\rfloor \vee x \geq\left\lceil\alpha_{x}\right\rceil\right)$
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## Branch-and-Bound - Example

## Example: $y \geq x^{2} / 2-1 \wedge y \leq x / 2$



- Generate solution $x=-1, y=-\frac{1}{2}$


## Branch-and-Bound - Example

## Example: $y \geq x^{2} / 2-1 \wedge y \leq x / 2$



- Generate solution $x=-1, y=-\frac{1}{2}$
- Not integral, generate $\left(c_{1} \wedge c_{2}\right) \Rightarrow(y \leq-1 \vee y \geq 0)$
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## Example: $y \geq x^{2} / 2-1 \wedge y \leq x / 2$



- Generate solution $x=-1, y=-\frac{1}{2}$

■ Not integral, generate $\left(c_{1} \wedge c_{2}\right) \Rightarrow(y \leq-1 \vee y \geq 0)$
■ Pass lemma to SAT solver which selects one part
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## Example: $y \geq x^{2} / 2-1 \wedge y \leq x / 2$



- Generate solution $x=0, y=0$
- Integral, return sat
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## Solution strategy for Nonlinear Arithmetic

- Eliminate one variable at a time
- Separate solution space into satisfiability equivalent regions

■ Check a single representative for each region

Open questions:
■ How to generate roots and samples for 1-dimensional case?

- How to create $k$-dimensional points from $(k-1)$-dimensional points?

■ How to make sure, that $(k-1)$-dimensional samples properly separate $k$-dimensional regions?
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## Example: $y \geq x^{2} / 2-1 \wedge y \leq x / 2$



Satisfying solution: $x=-1, y=\frac{x^{2}-2}{2}=-\frac{1}{2}$

## Virtual Substitution and B\&B

■ If no solution exists: return unsat $y \geq x^{2} / 2-1 \wedge y \leq x / 2$
■ Otherwise follow path upwards

$\frac{x^{2}-2}{2}$
$\uparrow$
true $\wedge \frac{x^{2}-2}{2} \leq \frac{x}{2}$
$\uparrow$
$-1$
$\uparrow$
true
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## Virtual Substitution and B\&B

- If no solution exists: return unsat

$$
y \geq x^{2} / 2-1 \wedge y \leq x / 2
$$

■ Otherwise follow path upwards

- $x=-1$ : integral
- $y=\frac{x^{2}-2}{2}=-\frac{1}{2}$ : fractional

$\frac{x^{2}-2}{2}$
$\uparrow$
true $\wedge \frac{x^{2}-2}{2} \leq \frac{x}{2}$

$-1$

true


## Virtual Substitution and B\&B

- If no solution exists: return unsat

$$
\begin{gathered}
y \geq x^{2} / 2-1 \wedge y \leq x / 2 \\
\uparrow \\
\frac{x^{2}-2}{2} \\
\text { true } \wedge \frac{x^{2}-2}{2} \leq \frac{x}{2} \\
\uparrow \\
-1 \\
\uparrow \\
\text { true }
\end{gathered}
$$

■ Otherwise follow path upwards

- $x=-1$ : integral
- $y=\frac{x^{2}-2}{2}=-\frac{1}{2}$ : fractional
- Generate $(y \leq-1 \vee y \geq 0)$
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## Projection

Given $P_{k} \subset \mathbb{Q}\left[x_{1}, \ldots, x_{k}\right]$ construct $P_{k-1} \subset \mathbb{Q}\left[x_{1}, \ldots, x_{k-1}\right]$ such that:
$\xi_{1}, \ldots, \xi_{k}$ is a root of $P_{k} \Rightarrow \xi_{1}, \ldots, \xi_{k-1}$ is a root of $P_{k-1}$

## Lifting

Given $P_{k}$ and $\xi_{1}, \ldots, \xi_{k-1}$, we can obtain all roots of $P_{k}$ by

- substituting all $\xi_{i}$ and
- calculating univariate roots of $P_{k}\left[x_{i} / \xi_{i}\right]$.
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## Example: $y \geq x^{2} / 2-1 \wedge y \leq x / 2$

$$
P_{2}:\left\{y-\frac{x^{2}}{2}-1, y-\frac{x}{2}\right\}
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\downarrow
$$
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## Cylindrical Algebraic Decomposition

## Example: $y \geq x^{2} / 2-1 \wedge y \leq x / 2$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& P_{2}:\left\{y-\frac{x^{2}}{2}-1, y-\frac{x}{2}\right\} \quad \begin{array}{l}
y-\frac{3}{2}, y+\frac{1}{2} \\
\downarrow \\
P_{1}:\left\{x^{2}-x-2, x^{2}-2, x\right\} \\
\operatorname{roots}\left(\left\{x^{2}-x-2, x^{2}-2, x\right\}\right)
\end{array}
\end{aligned}
$$
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## Cylindrical Algebraic Decomposition

## Example: $y \geq x^{2} / 2-1 \wedge y \leq x / 2$

Satisfying solution: $x=-1, y=-\frac{1}{2}$
Note: intermediate samples were skipped
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## Cylindrical Algebraic Decomposition and B\&B

Some heuristics (that worked for us)

- Try to select integers
- Select integers from the middle of interval
- Continue lifting to avoid splitting on unsat samples
- Do not lift multiple integers from a single interval
- Be careful with more involved backtracking schemes
- Different lemmas if multiple assignments are rational:
- Smallest variable
- Largest variable
- Activity-based
$\rightarrow$ does not matter


## What about existing tools?

■ Linearization [Borralleras ${ }^{+}$2009]
Approximation and incremental refinement by an LIA formula

## What about existing tools?

■ Linearization [Borralleras ${ }^{+}$2009]
Approximation and incremental refinement by an LIA formula
■ Interval Constraint Propagation (iSAT3[scheibler+ 2013], raSAT [Van Kanh $^{+}$2014])
Use bounds on variables to shrink solution space

## What about existing tools?

■ Linearization [Borralleras ${ }^{+}$2009]
Approximation and incremental refinement by an LIA formula
■ Interval Constraint Propagation (iSAT3[scheibler+ 2013], raSAT [Van Kanh $^{+}$2014])
Use bounds on variables to shrink solution space
■ Bit-blasting (AProVE[Gies ${ }^{+}$2014], CVC4 $_{[B a r r e t t}{ }^{+}$2011], Z3 [de Moura 2012] )
Encode integers as vectors of boolean variables

## Our approach

## Strategies
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\mathrm{RAT}_{\mathbb{Z}}: & M_{\text {SAT }} \rightarrow M_{\text {LRA }} \rightarrow M_{V S_{\mathbb{Z}}} \rightarrow M_{\mathrm{CAD}_{\mathbb{Z}}} \\
\operatorname{RAT}_{\text {blast }}: & M_{\text {IncWidth }} \rightarrow M_{\text {IntBlast }} \\
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■ RAT $_{\mathbb{Z}}$ : uses branch-and-bound approach as described
■ M MntBlast: used bit-blasting approach

- M MncWidth: creates and widens artificial bounds on all variables
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## Our approach

## Strategies

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\mathrm{RAT}_{\mathbb{Z}}: & M_{\text {SAT }} \rightarrow M_{\text {LRA }} \rightarrow M_{V S_{\mathbb{Z}}} \rightarrow M_{\mathrm{CAD}_{\mathbb{Z}}} \\
\operatorname{RAT}_{\text {blast }}: & M_{\text {IncWidth }} \rightarrow M_{\text {IntBlast }} \\
\operatorname{RAT}_{\text {blast.Z }}: & M_{\text {IncWidth }} \rightarrow M_{\text {IntBlast }} \rightarrow \operatorname{RAT}_{\mathbb{Z}}
\end{array}
$$

■ $\mathrm{RAT}_{\mathbb{Z}}$ : uses branch-and-bound approach as described
■ MIntBlast: used bit-blasting approach
■ M MncWidth: creates and widens artificial bounds on all variables
■ RAT $_{\text {blast.Z }}$ : uses $\mathrm{M}_{\text {IncWidth }}$ up to 4 bits and uses $\mathrm{RAT}_{\mathbb{Z}}$ afterwards

- Rationale: find small solutions fast, use $\mathrm{RAT}_{\mathbb{Z}}$ for large solutions


## Experimental results

| Bench Solver $\downarrow$ | $\mathrm{rk} \rightarrow$ | $\begin{array}{cc} \text { AProve }(8129) \\ \# \quad \text { time } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{cc} \text { Calypto }(138) \\ \# \quad \text { time } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{cc} \text { LEIPZIG } & (167) \\ \# & \text { time } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{cc} \text { CALYPTO }_{\infty} & (138) \\ \# & \text { time } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{lr} \text { all } & (8572) \\ \# & \text { time } \end{array}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\overline{\mathrm{RAT}}_{\mathbb{Z}}$ | sat unsat | $\begin{array}{r} 7283 \\ 73 \end{array}$ | $2294.8$ <br> 14.3 | $\begin{aligned} & 67 \\ & 52 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 71.2 \\ & 40.7 \end{aligned}$ | 9 0 | $\begin{aligned} & 260.4 \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 133 \\ \mathbf{3} \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 298.9 \\ & <0.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 7492 \\ 128 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2925.3 \\ & 55.1 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\overline{\mathrm{RAT}}$ blast | sat unsat | $\begin{array}{r} 8025 \\ 12 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 866.3 \\ & 0.4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 21 \\ 5 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 35.6 \\ & 0.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 156 \\ 0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 603.3 \\ & 0.0 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 87 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 16.0 \\ & 0.0 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 8289 \\ 17 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1521.2 \\ & 0.5 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| $\overline{\text { RAT }}$ blast. $^{\mathbb{Z}}$ | sat unsat | $\begin{array}{r} 8025 \\ 71 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{7 8 0 . 7} \\ & 42.6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 79 \\ & 46 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 122.3 \\ & 127.5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 156 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 511.5 \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 134 \\ 3 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 21.8 \\ & 0.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \hline \mathbf{8 3 9 4} \\ 120 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 1436.3 \\ & 170.2 \end{aligned}$ |
| Z3 | sat unsat | $\begin{gathered} 7992 \\ \mathbf{1 0 2} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 14695.5 \\ & \mathbf{5 9 5 . 9} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 78 \\ & \mathbf{5 7} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 19.1 \\ & 117.6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \hline 158 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 427.6 \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 126 \\ 3 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 57.3 \\ & 2.3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8354 \\ \mathbf{1 6 2} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 15199.5 \\ & \mathbf{7 1 5 . 8} \end{aligned}$ |
| AProVE | sat unsat | $\begin{array}{r} 8025 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7052.2 \\ & 0.0 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 74 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 559.1 \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 159 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 696.5 \\ & 0.0 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 127 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 685.2 \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 8385 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8993.0 \\ & 0.0 \end{aligned}$ |

■ Comparing against Z3 and AProVE:
■ Good on sat, lagging behind for unsat (preprocessing?)

- Very fast (we start with a smaller bit-width)

■ Comparing our strategies:

- $\mathrm{RAT}_{\mathbb{Z}}$ complements $\mathrm{RAT}_{\text {blast }}$ nicely on many examples
- $\mathrm{RAT}_{\mathbb{Z}}$ finds large solution fast in many cases
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