### Decision Procedures and Verification

#### Martin Blicha

Charles University

16.4.2018

Theory of Linear Arithmetic

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 のへぐ

## Theory of linear arithmetic

quantifier-free conjunctive fragment

### Definition

A quantifier-free formula in the language of the theory of linear arithmetic is defined by the following grammar:

fla : fla ∧ fla | atom
atom : sum op sum
op : = | ≤ | <
sum : term | sum + term
term : identifier | constant | constant identifier</pre>

where identifiers are variables defined over single ininite domain.

### Domains

- Reals (LRA)
- Integers (LIA)
- $x > 0 \land x < 1$ 
  - Satisfiable in LRA, unsatisfiable in LIA
- Deciding satisfiability of conjunction of linear constraints over reals is polynomial, while it is NP-complete over integers.

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

Algorithms for solving linear constraints

- ► General Simplex (R)
- Fourier-Motzkin variable elimination (R)

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへぐ

- Branch-and-bound (I)
- Omega test (I)

## Simplex algorithm

- Proposed by Dantzig in 1947.
- Optimizes an objective function given a set of linear constraints.
  - linear program (LP)
- Worst-case exponential, but efficient in practice.
  - Polynomial algorithms exist, e.g. *ellipsoid* method.
- Traverses vertices of a convex polytope defined by the constraints.

## General simplex

- Input are constraints of the following form:
  - Equalities  $a_1x_1 + \cdots + a_nx_n = 0$
  - ► Lower and upper bounds on the variables l<sub>i</sub> ≤ x<sub>i</sub> ≤ u<sub>i</sub>, where l<sub>i</sub> and u<sub>i</sub> are constants.
    - Bounds are optional
- This form is called general form
- ► Transformation of any linear constraint L ⋈ R (with ⋈∈ {=, ≤, ≥}) to general form:
  - ► Move every term with variable from R to L to obtain L' ⋈ b where b is a constant.
  - ► Introduce new variable  $s_i$ . Add constraints  $L' s_i = 0$  and  $s_i \bowtie b$
  - Replace equalities with two inequalities (both  $\leq$  and  $\geq$ )
- Original and transformed problem are equisatisfiable
- New variables are called *additional* or *slack* variables, the variables in the original constrains are referred to as *problem* variables.

### General simplex - problem representation

- ▶ With n problem and m additional variables, the problem is represented as m × (n + m)-matrix A, together with bounds on the variables.
- ► The decision problem can be written as Av = 0 and ∧<sub>i</sub> l<sub>i</sub> ≤ s<sub>i</sub> ≤ u<sub>i</sub>, with v a vector of problem and additional variables.
- ► The submatrix corresponding to columns of additional variables is a diagonal matrix with -1 on the diagonal.
  - There is always such submatrix during the run of the algorithm.
- Variables of the columns of this diagonal matrix are *basic* (also *dependent*) variables. The others are nonbasic variables.
- ► *Tableau* is a representation of **A** as *m* × *n* matrix (**A** without the diagonal submatrix) with rows labeled by basic variables and columns labeled by nonbasic variables.

General simplex - the algorithm (1)

Data structures:

- Set of basic variables B
- Set of nonbasic variables  ${\cal N}$
- Tableau
- Assignment  $\alpha : \mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{N} \to \mathbb{Q}$
- Initially: Additional variables are basic, program variables are nonbasic, assignment assigns 0 to all variables.
- Algorithm maintains two invariants:
  - 1.  $\mathbf{A}\alpha(\mathbf{v}) = \mathbf{0}$  (**v** is the vector of all variables)
  - 2. The values of the nonbasic variables are within their bounds:  $\forall v_j \in \mathcal{N}. l_j \leq \alpha(v_j) \leq u_j.$

General simplex - the algorithm (2)

#### $\label{eq:algorithm} \textbf{Algorithm} \quad \textbf{General-Simplex}$

- 1. Transform input to general form  $\mathbf{Av} = 0$  and  $\bigwedge_i l_i \leq s_i \leq u_i$ .
- 2. Initialize the data structures.
- 3. Determine a fixed order on the variables.
- 4. If no basic variable violates its bounds, return SAT. Otherwise take the first basic variable *v<sub>i</sub>* violating its bounds.
- 5. Find the first suitable nonbasic variable  $v_j$  for pivoting with  $v_i$ . If there is no such variable, return UNSAT.

- 6. Update  $\alpha$  so that  $v_i$  satisfies its bounds. Perform the pivot operation on  $v_i$  and  $v_j$ .
- 7. Go to step 4.

## General simplex - pivoting

- Pivot operation (or pivoting) = update of the tableau corresponding to swapping one basic and one nonbasic variable.
- Given a basic variable v<sub>i</sub> and nonbasic variable v<sub>j</sub>, the coefficient a<sub>ij</sub> is the pivot element. The column of x<sub>j</sub> is the pivot column, the row of x<sub>i</sub> is the pivot row.
- Steps:
  - 1. Solve row *i* for  $x_j$
  - 2. For all rows  $l \neq i$ , eliminate  $x_j$  by using the equality for  $x_j$  obtained from row *i*.
- Fixed ordering of variables ensures that no set of basic variables is ever repeated and hence guarantees termination.
  - Bland's rule

### General simplex - final notes

- Strict inequalities:
  - Set of constraints containing strict inequalities  $\{s_1 > 0, \ldots s_n > 0 \text{ is satisfiable iff there exists a rational number } \delta > 0$  such that the same set of constraints with replaced inequalities  $s_1 \ge \delta, \ldots s_n \ge \delta$  is satisfiable.
- DPLL(T) setting:
  - Addition of a constraint:
    - 1. If it is a bound on nonbasic variable, update  $\alpha$  to restore the second invariant.

- 2. Run GENERAL-SIMPLEX from step 4.
- Removal of a constraint: Disable a bound on the corresponding variable.
- $\blacktriangleright$  For backtracking, only  $\alpha$  needs to be updated, the tableau need not change.

# Branch and bound method (1)

- Developed for solving integer linear programs as optimization problems.
  - Here modified version for deciding feasibility.
- Idea:
  - Solve *relaxed* problem
  - If satisfiable but satisfying assignment is not integral, add constraints forbidding this non-integer assignment but preserving all potential integral ones.

#### Relaxed problem

Given an integer linear system S, its relaxation is S without the integrality requirement (i.e., the variables are not required to be integer).

If relaxed problem is unsatisfiable, so is the original problem.

# Branch and Bound method (2)

- Assume the existence of a procedure LP<sub>feasible</sub> which receives an linear system and returns satisfying assignment or UNSAT of no satisfying assignment exists.
  - ► Easy modification of GENERAL-SIMPLEX
- 1: **procedure** SEARCH-INTEGRAL-SOLUTION(*S*)

2: 
$$res = LP_{feasible}(relaxed(S)))$$

- 3: **if** res == UNSAT then return
- 4: **if** res is integral **then exit**(SAT)
- 5: Select a variable v with a nonintegral value r
- 6: SEARCH-INTEGRAL-SOLUTION( $S \cup (v \leq \lfloor r \rfloor)$ )
- 7: SEARCH-INTEGRAL-SOLUTION( $S \cup (v \ge \lceil r \rceil)$ )
- 8:  $\triangleright$  No integer solution in this branch
- 9: procedure FEASIBILITY-BRANCH-AND-BOUND(S)
- 10: SEARCH-INTEGRAL-SOLUTION(S)
- 11: **return**(UNSAT)

### Completeness of Branch and Bound

- ► As presented, FEASIBILITY-BRANCH-AND-BOUND is not complete.
  - I ≤ 3x − 3y ≤ 2 has no integer solution but unbounded real solutions.

Completeness can be achieved using the *small-model* property.

- A bound on each variable can be computed such that if a solution exists, there also exists one within these bounds.
- If added explicitly as constraints, it makes Branch and Bound complete.

### Cutting-planes

- Cutting-planes are constraints that are added to a system that remove only noninteger solutions.
- They improve the tightness of the relaxation, hence can make branch-and-bound faster
  - ► ⇒ branch-and-cut
- Gomory cuts
  - Can be generated from assignment returned by general Simplex method and current state of the tableau.

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

# Fourier-Motzkin Variable Elimination (1)

- Decides satisfiability of a conjunction of linear constraints.
- In practice not as efficient as Simplex method.
  - But competitive on small formulas.
- Used for eliminating existential quantifiers from quantified formulas of linear arithmetic.

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

 Eliminates variables from the system one by one while preserving satisfiability.

## Fourier-Motzkin Variable Elimination (2)

- 1. Eliminate all equalities from the system
  - Express one variable as a linear combination of others and substitute in all other constraints.
- 2. Repeatedly choose variable and remove it from the system by *projecting* its constraints onto the rest of the system.
- 3. Deciding satisfiability of a system with single variable is trivial.

## Projection of a variable (1)

- Assumptions:
  - x<sub>n</sub> is picked to be eliminated next
  - All constraints have the following form (with *i* ranging over constraints):

$$\sum_{j=1}^n a_{i,j} x_j \le b_i$$

► Gather all constraints containing x<sub>n</sub> with non-zero coefficient and use them to derive *bounds* on x<sub>n</sub>.

$$\flat \ \beta = \frac{b_i}{a_{i,n}} - \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \frac{a_{i,j}}{a_{i,n}} x_j$$

- If  $a_{i,n} > 0 \Rightarrow$  upper bound, if  $a_{i,n} < 0 \Rightarrow$  lower bound.
- If x<sub>n</sub> is not bounded both ways, i.e. it has only lower bounds or only upper bounds, the variable is unbounded.
- Unbounded variable can be removed from the system together with all constraints where it occurs.

# Projection of a variable (2)

- If a variable has both kind of bounds it is bounded.
- Enumerate pairs of lower and upper bounds derived in the previous step.
- For each pair of bounds β<sub>l</sub> ≤ x<sub>n</sub> ≤ β<sub>u</sub> the following constraint is added:

$$\beta_I \leq \beta_u$$

- ► This may simplify to constraint 0 ≤ b where b is a negative constant, which means the problem is *unsatisfiable*.
- Otherwise the constraints containing x<sub>n</sub> are removed and next variable to eliminate is picked.

Fourier-Motzkin Variable Elimination - final notes

- The algorithm can be naturally extended to handle strict inequalities.
  - If either lower or upper bound is strict, so is the resulting constraint.
- Complexity:
  - Increase in number of constraints in one step in worst case is from *m* to  $\frac{m^2}{4}$

• Overall increase in worst case is from *m* to  $\frac{m^{2^n}}{4^n}$ .

### Preprocessing

- Techniques to modify the input system of constraints independent of the decision procedure used.
- 1. Constraints of form  $\sum\limits_{j=0}^n a_j x_j \leq b$  are redundant if

$$\sum_{j|a_j>0}a_ju_j+\sum_{j|a_j<0}a_jl_j\leq b$$

2. Bounds on individual variables can be derived (and possibly tighten). If  $a_0 > 0$  then

$$x_0 \leq (b - \sum_{j \mid a_j > 0, j > 0} a_j l_j - \sum_{j \mid a_j < 0} a_j u_j) / a_0$$

and if  $a_0 < 0$  then

$$x_0 \ge (b - \sum_{j|a_j > 0} a_j l_j - \sum_{j|a_j < 0, j > 0} a_j u_j)/a_0$$

## Preprocessing for integers

- 1. Multiply all constraints to make all constants and coefficients integral.
- 2. Weak inequalities can be used instead of strong ones.

$$\sum_{i=1}^n a_i x_i < b \Rightarrow \sum_{i=1}^n a_i x_i \le b-1$$

(ロ)、(型)、(E)、(E)、 E) の(の)