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Automated (Software) Verification

Program and/or model

Alan M. Turing. 1936: “Undecidable”

Alan M. Turing. ”Checking a large routine” 1949

How can one check a routine in the sense of making sure that it is right?

The programmer should make a number of definite assertions which can be checked individually, and from which the correctness of the whole programme easily follows.
Automated Verification

Deductive Verification
• A user provides a program and a verification certificate
  – e.g., inductive invariant, pre- and post-conditions, function summaries, etc.
• A tool automatically checks validity of the certificate
  – this is not easy! (might even be undecidable)
• Verification is manual but machine certified

Algorithmic Verification
• A user provides a program and a desired specification
  – e.g., program never writes outside of allocated memory
• A tool automatically checks validity of the specification
  – and generates a verification certificate if the program is correct
  – and generates a counterexample if the program is not correct
• Verification is completely automatic – “push-button”
Algorithmic Logic-Based Verification

Program + Spec

Verification Condition (in Logic)

Decision Procedure

- Yes
- No

Safety Properties

Constrained Horn Clauses

Spacer
Houdini's Death-Defying Mystery

Escape from a galvanized iron can filled with water and secured by massive locks.

Failure means a drowning death.
A Magician’s Guide to Solving Undecidable Problems

Develop a procedure $P$ for a decidable problem

Show that $P$ is a decision procedure for the problem
- e.g., model checking of finite-state systems

Choose one of
- Always terminate with some answer (over-approximation)
- Always make useful progress (under-approximation)

Extend procedure $P$ to procedure $Q$ that “solves” the undecidable problem
- Ensure that $Q$ is still a decision procedure whenever $P$ is
- Ensure that $Q$ either always terminates or makes progress
Outline

Lecture 1: Overview of SeaHorn and Algorithmic Logic-Based Verification

Lecture 2: Generating verification conditions for automated analysis

Lecture 3: IC3: Incremental Construction of Inductive Clauses for Indubitable Correctness

Lecture 4: Solving Constrained Horn Clauses over Linear Real Arithmetic

Extra slides: What about Machine Learning?
SeaHorn

A fully automated verification framework for LLVM-based languages.

http://seahorn.github.io
SeaHorn Usage

Example: in test.c, check that \textit{x is always greater than or equal to y}

```c
extern int nd();
extern void __VERIFIER_error() __attribute__((noreturn));
void assert (int cond) { if (!cond) __VERIFIER_error (); } 

int main()

int x,y;
  x=1; y=0;
while (nd ( ))
{
  x=x+y;
  y++;
}
assert (x>=y);
return 0;
```
SeaHorn at a glance

Publicly Available ([http://seahorn.github.io](http://seahorn.github.io)) state-of-the-art Software Model Checker

Industrial-strength front-end based on Clang and LLVM

Abstract Interpretation engine: Crab

SMT-based verification engine: Spacer

Bit-precise Bounded Model Checker and Symbolic Execution

Executable Counter-Examples

A framework for research and application of logic-based verification
SeaHorn Workflow

- Code Under Analysis (CUA)
- Property Spec
- Verification Environment
- Property Checker
- Verification Problem (VP)
- SeaHorn
- Good + Verification Certificate (Cert)
- Bad + Counterexample (CEX)
- TestGen
- Test harness (Test)
SeaHorn workflow components

Code Under Analysis (CUA)
- code being analyzed. Device driver, component, library, etc.

Verification Environment
- stubs for the environment with which CUA interacts
- e.g., libc, memcpy, malloc, OS system calls, user input, socket, file, ...

Property Checker
- static instrumentation of a program with a monitor that indicates when an error has happened
- similar to dynamic sanitizers, but can use verifier-specific API to perform symbolic actions
- property spec is specific to a property checker

Verification Problem
- a prepared instance of program with embedded assertions, potentially simplified by abstracting away irrelevant parts of execution

Test Gen
- generates a test harness that includes all stubs and stimuli to guide CUA to a property failure discovered by the verifier
Developing a Static Property Checker

A static property checker is similar to a dynamic checker
- e.g., clang sanitizer (address, thread, memory, etc.)

A significant development effort for each new property
- new specialized static analyses to rule out trivial cases
- different instrumentations have affect on performance

Developed by a domain expert
- understanding of verification techniques is useful (but not required)
- 3-6 month effort for a new property
  - but many things can be reused between similar properties
  - e.g., memory safety, null-dereference, taint checking, use-after-free, etc.

SeaHorn property checkers:
- memory safety (out of bound uses, null pointer)
  - ongoing work to improve scalability and usability
- taint analysis (being developed by Princeton, see CAV 2018)
Architecture of Seahorn

C/C++ → LLVM bitcode → Horn Clauses

Front-end
- Clang
- LLVM Opt:
  - SSA
  - DCE
  - Peephole
  - CFG Simplification
- Devirtualization and Exception Lowering
- Property Instr:
  - Buffer overflow
  - Null dereferences
- Slicing Assertions

Middle-end
- Heap Abstraction
- VC Generation
  - Precision:
    - Integers
    - Floating point
    - Pointers
    - Memory contents
- Array Abstraction

Back-end
- PDR/IC3-based Model checking
- Abstract Interp.
  - Intervals
  - DBMs
  - LDDs
- Template-based (Houdini)
- BMC bitvectors
DEMO
SeaHorn Memory Model

Block-based memory model
- each allocation (malloc/alloca/etc) creates a new object
- a pointer is a pair (id,off), called cell, where id is an object identifier and off is a positive numeric offset
- similar to the C memory model

Abstract Memory Model
- the number of allocation regions is finite
- allocation site is used as an object identifier
- custom pointer-analysis is used to approximate abstract points to graph

Pointer Analysis: Sea-DSA (SAS 2017)
- unification-based (like LLVM-DSA)
- context-, field-, and array-sensitive
Crab Abstract Interpretation Library

Crab – Cornucopia of Abstract Domains
- Numerical domains (intervals, zones, boxes)
- 3rd party domains (apron, elina)
- arrays, uninterpreted functions, null, pointer

Language independent core with plugins for LLVM bitcode
- fixed-point engine
- widening / narrowing strategies
- crab-llvm: integrates LLVM optimizations and analysis of LLVM bitcode

Support for inter-procedural analysis
- pre-, post-conditions, function summaries

Extensible, publicly available on GitHub, open C++ API
Precise Logic-based Program Verification

Low-Level Bounded Model Checking (BMC)
• decide whether a low level program/circuit has an execution of a given length that violates a safety property
• effective decision procedure via encoding to propositional SAT

High-Level (Word-Level) Bounded Model Checking
• decide whether a program has an execution of a given length that violates a safety property
• efficient decision procedure via encoding to SMT

What is an SMT-like equivalent for Safety Verification?
• Logic: SMT-Constrained Horn Clauses
• Decision Procedure: Spacer
  – extend IC3/PDR algorithms from Hardware Model Checking
Symbolic Reachability Problem

\( P = (X, \text{Init}, \text{Tr}, \text{Bad}) \)

\( P \) is UNSAFE if and only if there exists a number \( N \) s.t.

\[
\text{Init}(X_0) \land \left( \bigwedge_{i=0}^{N-1} \text{Tr}(X_i, X_{i+1}) \right) \land \text{Bad}(X_N) \not\Rightarrow \bot
\]

\( P \) is SAFE if and only if there exists a safe inductive invariant \( \text{Inv}(X) \) s.t.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Init} & \implies \text{Inv} \\
\text{Inv}(X) \land \text{Tr}(X, X') & \implies \text{Inv}(X')
\end{align*}
\]

\[ \text{Inv} \implies \neg \text{Bad} \]
Constrained Horn Clauses (CHCs)

A Constrained Horn Clause (CHC) is a FOL formula

\[ \forall V \cdot (\varphi \land p_1[X_1] \land \cdots \land p_n[X_n]) \rightarrow h[X] \]

where

- \( T \) is a background theory (e.g., Linear Arithmetic, Arrays, Bit-Vectors, or combinations of the above)
- \( V \) are variables, and \( X_i \) are terms over \( V \)
- \( \varphi \) is a constraint in the background theory \( T \)
- \( p_1, \ldots, p_n, h \) are n-ary predicates
- \( p_i[X] \) is an application of a predicate to first-order terms
CHC Satisfiability

A $\mathcal{T}$-model of a set of a CHCs $\Pi$ is an extension of the model $M$ of $\mathcal{T}$ with a first-order interpretation of each predicate $p_i$ that makes all clauses in $\Pi$ true in $M$.

A set of clauses is **satisfiable** if and only if it has a model

- This is the usual FOL satisfiability

A $\mathcal{T}$-solution of a set of CHCs $\Pi$ is a substitution $\sigma$ from predicates $p_i$ to $\mathcal{T}$-formulas such that $\Pi \sigma$ is $\mathcal{T}$-valid

In the context of program verification

- a program satisfies a property iff corresponding CHCs are satisfiable
- solutions are inductive invariants
- refutation proofs are counterexample traces
Program Verification with HORN(LIA)

```
z = x; i = 0;
assume (y > 0);
while (i < y) {
    z = z + 1;
    i = i + 1;
}
assert(z == x + y);
```

\[
\begin{align*}
z &= x \land i = 0 \land y > 0 & \Rightarrow & \quad \text{Inv}(x, y, z, i) \\
\text{Inv}(x, y, z, i) \land i < y \land z1 = z+1 \land i1 = i+1 & \Rightarrow & \quad \text{Inv}(x, y, z1, i1) \\
\text{Inv}(x, y, z, i) \land i \geq y \land z \neq x+y & \Rightarrow & \quad \text{false}
\end{align*}
\]
In SMT-LIB

(set-logic HORN)

;; Inv(x, y, z, i)
(declare-fun Inv ( Int Int Int Int) Bool)

(assert
(forall ( (A Int) (B Int) (C Int) (D Int))
  (=> (and (> B 0) (= C A) (= D 0))
       (Inv A B C D)))
)

(assert
(forall ( (A Int) (B Int) (C Int) (D Int) (C1 Int) (D1 Int) )
  (=>
     (and (Inv A B C D) (< D B) (= C1 (+ C 1)) (= D1 (+ D 1)))
     (Inv A B C1 D1))
)
)

(assert
(forall ( (A Int) (B Int) (C Int) (D Int))
  (=> (and (Inv A B C D) (> D B) (not (= C (+ A B))))
        false)
)
)

(check-sat)
(get-model)

$ z3 add-by-one.smt2

sat

(model
  (define-fun Inv ((x!0 Int) (x!1 Int) (x!2 Int) (x!3 Int)) Bool
    (and (<= (+ x!2 (* (- 1) x!0) (* (- 1) x!3)) 0)
         (<= (+ x!2 (* (- 1) x!0) (* (- 1) x!1)) 0)
         (<= (+ x!0 x!3 (* (- 1) x!2)) 0)))
)

Inv(x, y, z, i)

z = x + i

z <= x + y
Horn Clauses for Program Verification

De Angelis et al. Verifying Array Programs by Transforming Verification Conditions. VMCAI'14

Bjørner, Gurfinkel, McMillan, and Rybalchenko: Horn Clause Solvers for Program Verification
Horn Clauses for Concurrent / Distributed / Parameterized Systems

For assertions $R_1, \ldots, R_N$ over $V$ and $E_1, \ldots, E_N$ over $V, V'$,

CM1: $\text{init}(V) \rightarrow R_i(V)$
CM2: $R_i(V) \land \rho_i(V, V') \rightarrow R_i(V')$
CM3: $(\forall i \in \{1, \ldots, N\}) (R_i(V) \land \rho_i(V, V')) \rightarrow E_i(V, V')$
CM4: $R_i(V) \land E_i(V', V') \land \rho_{k_i}(V', V') \rightarrow R_i(V')$
CM5: $R_1(V) \land \cdots \land R_N(V) \land \text{error}(V) \rightarrow \text{false}$

multi-threaded program $P$ is safe

Rybalchenko et al. Synthesizing Software Verifiers from Proof Rules. PLDI'12

Hojjat et al. Horn Clauses for Communicating Timed Systems. HCVS'14

Gurfinkel et al. SMT-Based Verification of Parameterized Systems. FSE 2016

Hoenicke et al. Thread Modularity at Many Levels. POPL'17
Spacer: Solving SMT-constrained CHC

Spacer: a solver for SMT-constrained Horn Clauses

• now the default (and only) CHC solver in Z3
  – https://github.com/Z3Prover/z3
  – dev branch at https://github.com/agurfinkel/z3

Supported SMT-Theories

• Linear Real and Integer Arithmetic
• Quantifier-free theory of arrays
• Universally quantified theory of arrays + arithmetic
• Best-effort support for many other SMT-theories
  – data-structures, bit-vectors, non-linear arithmetic

Support for Non-Linear CHC

• for procedure summaries in inter-procedural verification conditions
• for compositional reasoning: abstraction, assume-guarantee, thread modular, etc.
Logic-based Algorithmic Verification

- Simulink
- C/C++
- Java
- CPR
- concurrent/distributed systems
- Lustre
- T2
- Zustre
- SeaHorn
- CoCoSim
- T2
- Spacer
- Termination for C
VERIFICATION CONDITIONS FOR PROGRAMS
Relationship between CHC and Verification

A program satisfies a property iff corresponding CHCs are satisfiable
- satisfiability-preserving transformations == safety preserving

Models for CHC correspond to verification certificates
- inductive invariants and procedure summaries

Unsatisfiability (or derivation of FALSE) corresponds to counterexample
- the resolution derivation (a path or a tree) is the counterexample

CAVEAT: In SeaHorn the terminology is reversed
- SAT means there exists a counterexample – a BMC at some depth is SAT
- UNSAT means the program is safe – BMC at all depths are UNSAT
Weakest Liberal Pre-Condition

Validity of Hoare triples is reduced to FOL validity by applying a predicate transformer.

Dijkstra’s weakest liberal pre-condition calculus [Dijkstra’75]

\[ \text{wlp} (P, \text{Post}) \]

weakest pre-condition ensuring that executing \( P \) ends in \( \text{Post} \)

\[
\{\text{Pre}\} \, P \, \{\text{Post}\} \text{ is valid IFF } \text{Pre} \Rightarrow \text{wlp} (P, \text{Post})
\]
A Simple Programming Language

\[
\text{Prog} ::= \text{def Main}(x) \{ \text{body}_M \}, \ldots, \text{def P}(x) \{ \text{body}_P \}
\]

\[
\text{body} ::= \text{stmt} (; \text{stmt})^*
\]

\[
\text{stmt} ::= x = E | \text{assert} (E) | \text{assume} (E) | \\
\quad \text{while } E \text{ do } S | y = P(E) | \\
\quad L: \text{stmt} | \text{goto} L \quad \text{(optional)}
\]

\[
E ::= \text{expression over program variables}
\]
Horn Clauses by Weakest Liberal Precondition

Prog ::= def Main(x) { body_M }, ..., def P(x) { body_P }

wlp (x=E, Q) = let x=E in Q
wlp (assert(E), Q) = E ∧ Q
wlp (assume(E), Q) = E ⇒ Q
wlp (while E do S, Q) = I(w) ∧
∀w. ((I(w) ∧ E) ⇒ wlp (S, I(w))) ∧ ((I(w) ∧ ¬E) ⇒ Q))
wlp (y = P(E), Q) = p_pre(E) ∧ (∀r. p(E, r) ⇒ Q[r/y])

ToHorn (def P(x) {S}) = wlp (x0=x; assume(p_pre(x)); S, p(x0, ret))
ToHorn (Prog) = wlp (Main(), true) ∧ ∀{P ∈ Prog}. ToHorn (P)
Example of a WLP Horn Encoding

\{Pre: \ y \geq 0\}
\begin{align*}
x_o &= x; \\
y_o &= y; \\
\text{while } y > 0 \text{ do} \\
&\quad x = x+1; \\
&\quad y = y-1;
\end{align*}
\{Post: x=x_o+y_o\}

C1: I(x,y,x,y) \leftarrow y \geq 0.
C2: I(x+1,y-1,x_o,y_o) \leftarrow I(x,y,x_o,y_o), \ y > 0.
C3: false \leftarrow I(x,y,x_o,y_o), \ y \leq 0, \ x \neq x_o+y_o

\{y \geq 0\} \ P \{x = x_{old}+y_{old}\} \text{ is valid IFF the } C_1 \land C_2 \land C_3 \text{ is satisfiable}
Control Flow Graph

A CFG is a graph of basic blocks
- edges represent different control flow

A CFG corresponds to a program syntax
- where statements are restricted to the form

\[ L_i : S ; \text{goto} \ L_j \]

and \( S \) is control-free (i.e., assignments and procedure calls)
Dual WLP

Dual weakest liberal pre-condition

\[ \text{dual-wlp} (P, \text{Post}) = \neg \text{wlp} (P, \neg \text{Post}) \]

\( s \in \text{dual-wlp} (P, \text{Post}) \) IFF there exists an execution of \( P \) that starts in \( s \) and ends in \( \text{Post} \)

\text{dual-wlp} (P, \text{Post}) \) is the weakest condition ensuring that an execution of \( P \) can reach a state in \( \text{Post} \)
Examples of dual-wlp

\[ \text{dual-wlp}(\text{assume}(E, Q)) = \neg \text{wl}(\text{assume}(E, \neg Q)) = \neg (E \Rightarrow \neg Q) = E \land Q \]

\[ \text{dual-wlp}(x := x+y; y := y+1, x=x' \land y=y') = y+1=y' \land x+y=x' \]

\[ \text{wl}(x := x + y, \neg(y+1=y \land x=x')) \quad \text{wl}(y:=y+1, \neg(x=x' \land y=y')) \]

\[ = \text{let } x = x+y \text{ in } \neg (y+1=y' \land x=x') \quad = \text{let } y = y+1 \text{ in } \neg(y=y' \land x=x') \]

\[ = \neg (y+1=y' \land x+y=x') \quad = \neg (y+1=y \land x=x') \]
Horn Clauses by Dual WLP

Assumptions

- each procedure is represented by a control flow graph
  - i.e., statements of the form $l_i : S ; \text{goto } l_j$, where $S$ is loop-free
- program is unsafe iff the last statement of `Main()` is reachable
  - i.e., no explicit assertions. All assertions are top-level.

For each procedure $P(x)$, create predicates

- $l(w)$ for each label (i.e., basic block)
  - $p_{en}(x_\theta, x)$ for entry location of procedure $p()$
  - $p_{ex}(x_\theta, r)$ for exit location of procedure $p()$
- $p(x, r)$ for each procedure $P(x):r$
Horn Clauses by Dual WLP

The verification condition is a conjunction of clauses:

\[ p_{en}(x_0, x) \leftarrow x_0 = x \]

\[ l_j(x_0, w') \leftarrow l_i(x_0, w) \land \neg \text{wlp} (S, \neg (w = w')) \]

- for each statement \( l_i : S; \text{goto} \ l_j \)

\[ p(x_0, r) \leftarrow p_{ex}(x_0, r) \]

\[ \text{false} \leftarrow \text{Main}_{\text{ex}}(x, \text{ret}) \]
Example Horn Encoding

int \( x = 1 \);
int \( y = 0 \);
while (*) {
    \( x = x + y \);
    \( y = y + 1 \);
}
assert(\( x \geq y \));

\( l_0 : \)
\( x = 1 \)
\( y = 0 \)

\( l_1 : b_1 = \text{nondet()} \)

\( l_2 : \)
\( x = x + y \)
\( y = y + 1 \)

\( l_3 : \)
\( b_2 = x \geq y \)

\( l_4 : \)

\( l_{\text{err}} : \)

\( p_0. \)
\( p_1(x, y) \leftarrow \)
\( p_0, x = 1, y = 0. \)
\( p_2(x, y) \leftarrow p_1(x, y). \)
\( p_3(x, y) \leftarrow p_1(x, y). \)
\( p_1(x', y') \leftarrow \)
\( p_2(x, y), \)
\( x' = x + y, \)
\( y' = y + 1. \)
\( p_4 \leftarrow (x \geq y), p_3(x, y). \)
\( p_{\text{err}} \leftarrow (x < y), p_3(x, y). \)
\( p_4 \leftarrow p_4. \)
\( \bot \leftarrow p_{\text{err}}. \)
From CFG to Cut Point Graph

A *Cut Point Graph* hides (summarizes) fragments of a control flow graph by (summary) edges.

Vertices (called, *cut points*) correspond to *some* basic blocks.

An edge between cut-points *c* and *d* summarizes all finite (loop-free) executions from *c* to *d* that do not pass through any other cut-points.
Cut Point Graph Example

 CFG

 CPG
From CFG to Cut Point Graph

A *Cut Point Graph* hides (summarizes) fragments of a control flow graph by (summary) edges.

Cut Point Graph preserves reachability of (not-summarized) control location.

Summarizing loops is undecidable! (Halting program)

A *cutset summary* summarizes all location except for a *cycle cutset* of a CFG. Computing minimal cutset summary is NP-hard (minimal feedback vertex set).

A reasonable compromise is to summarize everything but heads of loops. (Polynomial-time computable).
Single Static Assignment

SSA == every value has a unique assignment (a \textit{definition})
A procedure is in SSA form if every variable has exactly one definition

SSA form is used by many compilers
- explicit def-use chains
- simplifies optimizations and improves analyses

PHI-function are necessary to maintain unique definitions in branching control flow

\[ x = \text{PHI} \left( v_0:bb_0, \ldots, v_n:bb_n \right) \]  
\text{(phi-assignment)}

“\( x \) gets \( v_i \) if previously executed block was \( bb_i \)”
Single Static Assignment: An Example

```c
int x, y, n;
x = 0;
while (x < N) {
    if (y > 0)
        x = x + y;
    else
        x = x - y;
y = -1 * y;
}
```

0: goto 1
1: `x_0 = PHI(0:0, x_3:5);
y_0 = PHI(y:0, y_1:5);
if (x_0 < N) goto 2 else goto 6`
2: if (y_0 > 0) goto 3 else goto 4
3: `x_1 = x_0 + y_0;` goto 5
4: `x_2 = x_0 - y_0;` goto 5
5: `x_3 = PHI(x_1:3, x_2:4);
y_1 = -1 * y_0;` goto 1
6: val:bb
Large Step Encoding

Problem: Generate a compact verification condition for a loop-free block of code

0: goto 1
1: x₀ = PHI(0:0, x₃:5);
   y₀ = PHI(y:0, y₁:5);
   if (x₀ < N) goto 2 else goto 6
2: if (y₀ > 0) goto 3 else goto 4
3: x₁ = x₀ + y₀; goto 5
4: x₂ = x₀ - y₀; goto 5
5: x₃ = PHI(x₁:3, x₂:4);
   y₁ = -1 * y₀;
   goto 1
6:
Large Step Encoding: Extract all Actions

\[ x_1 = x_0 + y_0 \]
\[ x_2 = x_0 - y_0 \]
\[ y_1 = -1 \times y_0 \]

1: \[ x_0 = \text{PHI}(0:0, \ x_3:5); \]
\[ y_0 = \text{PHI}(y:0, \ y_1:5); \]
\[ \text{if} \ (x_0 < N) \ \text{goto} \ 2 \ \text{else} \ \text{goto} \ 6 \]

2: \[ \text{if} \ (y_0 > 0) \ \text{goto} \ 3 \ \text{else} \ \text{goto} \ 4 \]

3: \[ x_1 = x_0 + y_0 \] \text{goto} \ 5

4: \[ x_2 = x_0 - y_0 \] \text{goto} \ 5

5: \[ x_3 = \text{PHI}(x_1:3, \ x_2:4); \]
\[ y_1 = -1 \times y_0; \]
\[ \text{goto} \ 1 \]
Example: Encode Control Flow

\[
\begin{align*}
x_1 &= x_0 + y_0 \\
x_2 &= x_0 - y_0 \\
y_1 &= -1 \times y_0 \\
B_2 &\rightarrow x_0 < N \\
B_3 &\rightarrow B_2 \land y_0 > 0 \\
B_4 &\rightarrow B_2 \land y_0 \leq 0 \\
B_5 &\rightarrow (B_3 \land x_3=x_1) \lor (B_4 \land x_3=x_2) \\
B_5 \land x'_0=x_3 \land y'_0=y_1
\end{align*}
\]

1: \( x_0 = \text{PHI}(0:0, x_{3:5}) \);
   \( y_0 = \text{PHI}(y:0, y_{1:5}) \);
   if (\( x_0 < N \)) goto 2 else goto 6

2: if (\( y_0 > 0 \)) goto 3 else goto 4

3: \( x_1 = x_0 + y_0 \); goto 5

4: \( x_2 = x_0 - y_0 \); goto 5

5: \( x_3 = \text{PHI}(x_{1:3}, x_{2:4}) \);
   \( y_1 = -1 \times y_0 \);
   goto 1

\( p_1(x'_0, y'_0) \leftarrow p_1(x_0, y_0), \phi. \)
Summary

Convert body of each procedure into SSA

For each procedure, compute a Cut Point Graph (CPG)

For each edge \((s, t)\) in CPG use dual-wlp to construct the constraint for an execution to flow from \(s\) to \(t\)

Procedure summary is determined by constraints at the exit point of a procedure
Mixed Semantics

PROGRAM TRANSFORMATION
Deeply nested assertions
Deeply nested assertions

Counter-examples are long
Hard to determine (from main) what is relevant
Mixed Semantics

Stack-free program semantics combining:

- operational (or small-step) semantics
  - i.e., usual execution semantics
- natural (or big-step) semantics: function summary [Sharir-Pnueli 81]
  - \((\sigma, \sigma') \in \|f\|\) iff the execution of \(f\) on input state \(\sigma\) terminates and results in state \(\sigma'\)
- some execution steps are big, some are small

Non-deterministic executions of function calls

- update top activation record using function summary, or
- enter function body, forgetting history records (i.e., no return!)

Preserves reachability and non-termination

**Theorem:** Let \(K\) be the operational semantics, \(K^m\) the stack-free semantics, and \(L\) a program location. Then,

\[
K \models EF (pc=L) \iff K^m \models EF (pc=L) \quad \text{and} \quad K \models EG (pc\neq L) \iff K^m \models EG (pc\neq L)
\]
```python
def main():
    x = nd();
    x = x+1;
    while(x>=0):
        x = f(x);
        if(x<0):
            Error;
    END;

def f(int y):
    if(y>=10):
        y = y+1;
        y = f(y);
    else if(y>0):
        y = y+1;
    y = y-1
    y ;

Summary of f(y)
(1<=y<=9 ∧ y' = y) ∨
y<=0 ∧ y' = y-1
```

void main() {
    p1(); p2();
    assert(c1);
}
void p1() {
    p2();
    assert(c2);
}
void p2() {
    assert(c3);
}

void main() {
    if(nd()) p1(); else goto p1;
    if(nd()) p2(); else goto p2;
    assert(c1);
    assume(false);
    p1: if (nd) p2(); else goto p2;
    assume(!c2);
    assert(false);
    p2: assume(!c3);
    assert(false);
    void p1() {p2(); assume(c2);}
    void p2() {assume(c3);}

Mixed Semantics: Summary

Every procedure is inlined at most once

- in the worst case, doubles the size of the program
- can be restricted to only inline functions that directly or indirectly call `error()` function

Easy to implement at compiler level

- create “failing” and “passing” versions of each function
- reduce “passing” functions to returning paths
- in `main()`, introduce new basic block `bb.F` for every failing function `F()`, and call `failing.F` in `bb.F`
- inline all failing calls
- replace every call to `F` to non-deterministic jump to `bb.F` or call to passing `F`

Increases context-sensitivity of context-insensitive analyses

- context of failing paths is explicit in `main` (because of inlining)
- enables / improves many traditional analyses
IC3

Incremental Construction of Inductive Clauses for Indubitable Correctness
A Magician’s Guide to Solving Undecidable Problems

Develop a procedure $P$ for a decidable problem

Show that $P$ is a decision procedure for the problem
  • e.g., model checking of finite-state systems

Choose one of
  • Always terminate with some answer (over-approximation)
  • Always make useful progress (under-approximation)

Extend procedure $P$ to procedure $Q$ that “solves” the undecidable problem
  • Ensure that $Q$ is still a decision procedure whenever $P$ is
  • Ensure that $Q$ either always terminates or makes progress
Symbolic Reachability Problem

\[ P = (X, \text{Init}, \mathcal{T}r; \text{Bad}) \]

\( P \) is UNSAFE if and only if there exists a number \( N \) s.t.

\[ \text{Init}(X_0) \land \left( \bigwedge_{i=0}^{N-1} \mathcal{T}r(X_i, X_{i+1}) \right) \land \text{Bad}(X_N) \not\Rightarrow \bot \]

\( P \) is SAFE if and only if there exists a safe inductive invariant \( \text{Inv} \) s.t.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Init} & \Rightarrow \text{Inv} \\
\text{Inv}(X) \land \mathcal{T}r(X, X') & \Rightarrow \text{Inv}(X') \\
\text{Inv} & \Rightarrow \neg \text{Bad}
\end{align*}
\]
Inductive Invariants

System S is safe iff there exists an inductive invariant $\text{Inv}$:

- **Initiation:** $\text{Initial} \subseteq \text{Inv}$
- **Safety:** $\text{Inv} \cap \text{Bad} = \emptyset$
- **Consecution:** $\text{TR}($Inv$) \subseteq \text{Inv}$ i.e., if $s \in \text{Inv}$ and $s \xrightarrow{\cdot} t$ then $t \in \text{Inv}$
Inductive Invariants

System S is safe iff there exists an inductive invariant $\text{Inv}$:

- **Initiation:** $\text{Initial} \subseteq \text{Inv}$
- **Safety:** $\text{Inv} \cap \text{Bad} = \emptyset$
- **Consecution:** $\text{TR}(\text{Inv}) \subseteq \text{Inv}$
  
i.e., if $s \in \text{Inv}$ and $s \xrightarrow{\cdot} t$
  
then $t \in \text{Inv}$

System S is safe if $\text{Reach} \cap \text{Bad} = \emptyset$
IC3

IC3 = Incremental Construction of Inductive Clauses for Indubitable Correctness

The Goal: Find an Inductive Invariant stronger than P

• Recall: F is an inductive invariant stronger than P if
  – INIT => F
  – F ∨ T => F’
  – F => P

by learning relatively inductive facts (incrementally)

In a property directed manner

• Also called “Property Directed Reachability” (PDR)
IC3 Basics

Iteratively compute Over-Approximated Reachability Sequence (OARS) \(<F_0, F_1, ..., F_{k+1}>\) s.t.

- \(F_0 = \text{INIT}\)
- \(F_i \Rightarrow F_{i+1}\) monotone: \(F_i \subseteq F_{i+1}\)
- \(F_i \land T \Rightarrow F'_{i+1}\) inductive: simulates one forward step
- \(F_i \Rightarrow P\) safe: \(p\) is an invariant up to \(k+1\)

\(F_i\) - CNF formula given as a set of clauses

\(F_i\) over-approximates \(R_i\)

- If \(F_{i+1} \Rightarrow F_i\) then fixpoint: \(F_i\) is an inductive invariant
OARS (aka Inductive Trace)

If $F_{k+1} \equiv F_k$ then $F_k$ is an inductive invariant
IC3 Basics (cont.)

c is inductive relative to F if

- \( \text{INIT} \Rightarrow c \)
- \( F \land c \land T \Rightarrow c' \)

Notation:

- cube \( s \): conjunction of literals
  - \( \neg v_1 \land v_2 \land \neg v_3 \) - Represents a state
- \( s \) is a cube \(\Rightarrow \neg s \) is a clause (DeMorgan)
IC3 - Initialization

Check satisfiability of the two formulas:

- \( \text{INIT} \land \neg P \)
- \( \text{INIT} \land T \land \neg P' \)

If at least one is satisfiable: cex found

If both are unsatisfiable then:

- \( \text{INIT} \Rightarrow P \)
- \( \text{INIT} \land T \Rightarrow P' \)

Therefore

- \( F_0 = \text{INIT}, F_1 = P \)
- \(<F_0, F_1>\) is an OARS

OARS:

- \( F_0 = \text{INIT} \)
- \( F_i \Rightarrow F_{i+1} \)
- \( F_i \land T \Rightarrow F'_{i+1} \)
- \( F_i \Rightarrow P \)
IC3 - Iteration

Our OARS contains $F_0$ and $F_1$

Initialize $F_2$ to $P$

- If $P$ is an inductive invariant – done! 😊
- Otherwise: $F_1 \land T \nRightarrow F'_2$

$\Rightarrow F_1$ should be strengthened

OARS:

- $F_0 = \text{INIT}$
- $F_i \Rightarrow F_{i+1}$
- $F_i \land T \Rightarrow F'_{i+1}$
- $F_i \Rightarrow P$
IC3 - Iteration

If P is not an inductive invariant

• $F_1 \land T \land \neg P'$ is satisfiable
  
  $-(F \land T \land \neg P')$ sat IFF $(F \land T \Rightarrow P')$ not valid

• From the satisfying assignment get a state $s$ that can reach a bad state

OARS:

- $F_0 = \text{INIT}$
- $F_i \Rightarrow F_{i+1}$
- $F_i \land T \Rightarrow F_{i+1}'$
- $F_i \Rightarrow P$
IC3 - Iteration

Is s reachable in one transition from the previous set?

- **backward search:** Check $F_0 \land T \land s'$
- **If satisfiable,** s is reachable from $F_0$ : CEX
- **Otherwise,** block s, i.e. remove it from $F_1$

$$\neg F_1 = F_1 \land \neg s$$
IC3 - Iteration

Iterate this process until $F_1 \land T \land \neg P'$ becomes unsatisfiable

• $F_1 \land T \Rightarrow P'$ holds
• $<F_0, F_1, F_2>$ is an OARS
IC3 - Iteration

New iteration, initialize $F_3$ to $P$, check $F_2 \land T \land \neg P'$

- If satisfiable, get $s$ that can reach $\neg P$
- Now check if $s$ can be reached from $F_1$ by $F_1 \land T \land s'$
- If it can be reached, get $t$ and try to block it
IC3 - Iteration

To block t, check $F_0 \land T \land t'$

- If satisfiable, a CEX
- If not, t is blocked, get a “new” $t^*$ by $F_1 \land T \land s'$ and try to block $t^*$
IC3 - Iteration

When $F_1 \land T \land s'$ becomes unsatisfiable

- $s$ is blocked, get a “new” $s^*$ by $F_2 \land T \land \neg P'$ and try to block $s^*$

......You get the picture 😊
General Iteration

If \( s_k \) is reachable (in \( k \) steps): counterexample

If \( s_k \) is unreachable: strengthen \( F_k \) to exclude \( s_k \)

\[
\begin{align*}
F_{k-1} &:= F_{k-1} \land \neg s_{k-1} \\
F_k &:= F_k \land \neg s_k \\
F_{k+1} &= P
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\text{SAT}(F_k \land T \land \neg P') ?
\]

\[
\text{SAT}(F_{k-1} \land T \land s_k') ?
\]
General Iteration

Until $F_k \land T \land \neg P'$ is unsatisfiable, i.e. $F_k \land T \implies P'$

$\Rightarrow$ We have an OARS again. Check fixpoint and increase $k$
IC3 - Iteration

Given an OARS \(<F_0, F_1, ..., F_k>\), set \(F_{k+1} = P\)

Apply a backward search

1. Find predecessor \(s_k\) in \(F_k\) that can reach a bad state
   \[ F_k \land T \not\Rightarrow P' \quad \text{(}F_k \land T \land \neg P' \text{ is sat)}\]
2. If none exists, move to next iteration (check fixpoint first)
3. If exists, try to find a predecessor \(s_{k-1}\) to \(s_k\) in \(F_{k-1}\)
   \[ F_{k-1} \land T \not\Rightarrow \neg s_k' \quad \text{(}F_{k-1} \land T \land s_k' \text{ is sat)}\]
4. If none exists, remove \(s_k\) from \(F_k\) and go back to 3
   \[ F_k := F_k \land \neg s_k \]
5. Otherwise: Recur on \((s_{k-1}, F_{k-1})\)
   \[ \text{We call} \ (s_{k-1}, k-1) \ \text{a “proof obligation” / “counterexample to induction”} \]

If we reach INIT, a CEX exists
That Simple?

Looks simple

• But this “simple” does NOT work

Simple = State Enumeration

• Too many states...

Does IC3 enumerate states?

• No – removing more than one state at a time
• But, yes (when IC3 doesn’t perform well)
Generalization of a blocked state

s in $F_k$ can reach a bad state in one transition (or more)

But $F_{k-1} \land T \Rightarrow \neg s'$ holds

- Therefore, $s$ is not reachable in $k$ transitions
- $F_k := F_k \land \neg s$

We want to generalize this fact

- $s$ is a single state
- Goal: learn a stronger fact
  - Find a set of states, unreachable from $F_{k-1}$ in one step
Generalization

We know $F_{k-1} \land T \Rightarrow \neg s'$
And, $\neg s$ is a clause

Generalization:
Find a sub-clause $c \subseteq \neg s$ s.t.
$F_{k-1} \land T \Rightarrow c'$ and INIT $\Rightarrow c$

- Sub clause means less literals
- Less literals implies less satisfying assignments
  - $(a \lor b)$ vs. $(a \lor b \lor c)$
- $c \Rightarrow \neg s$ i.e. c is a stronger fact

$F_k := F_k \land c$
- More states are removed from $F_k$, making it stronger/more precise (closer to $R_k$)
Generalization

How do we find a sub-clause $c \subseteq \neg s$ s.t. $F_{k-1} \land T \Rightarrow c'$?

Trial and Error

- Try to remove literals from $\neg s$ while $F_{k-1} \land T \land \neg c'$ and $\text{INIT} \land \neg c'$ remain unsatisfiable

Use the UnSAT Core

- $(\text{INIT'} \lor (F_{k-1} \land T)) \land s'$ is unsatisfiable
- Conflict clauses can also be used

$F_{k-1} \land T \land s'$ is UNSAT

Desired:
$c \implies \neg s$

$F_{k-1} \land T \land \neg c'$ is UNSAT

Looks familiar?
Observation 1

Assume a state \( s \) in \( F_k \) can reach a bad state in a number of transitions

- **Important Fact:** \( s \) is **not** in \( F_{k-1} \) (!!)
  - If \( s \) was in \( F_{k-1} \) we would have found it in an earlier iteration

- Therefore: \( F_{k-1} \Rightarrow \neg s \)
Observation 1

Assume a state $s$ in $F_k$ can reach a bad state in a number of transitions

Therefore: $F_{k-1} \Rightarrow \neg s$

Assume $F_{k-1} \land T \Rightarrow \neg s'$ holds

• It’s blocking time...

So, this is equivalent to

$F_{k-1} \land \neg s \land T \Rightarrow \neg s'$

Further $INIT \Rightarrow \neg s$

– Otherwise, CEX!
  
  (INIT $\not\Rightarrow \neg s$ IFF $s$ is in INIT)

• This looks familiar!

  – $\neg s$ is inductive relative to $F_{k-1}$
Inductive Generalization

We now know that ¬s is inductive relative to F_{k-1}

And, ¬s is a clause

**Inductive Generalization:**
Find sub-clause c ⊆ ¬s s.t.

\[ F_{k-1} \land c \land T \Rightarrow c' \] (and INIT ⇒ c)

- Stronger inductive fact

\[ F_k := F_k \land c \]

- It may be the case that \( F_{k-1} \land T \Rightarrow F_k \) no longer holds
  - Why?
Inductive Generalization

\( F_{k-1} \land c \land T \Rightarrow c' \) and \( \text{INIT} \Rightarrow c \) hold

\( F_k := F_k \land c \)

c is also inductive relative to \( F_{k-1}, F_{k-2}, \ldots, F_0 \)

- Add \( c \) to all of these sets
- For every \( i \leq k \): \( F_i^* = F_i \land c \)

\( F_i^* \land T \Rightarrow F_{i+1}^* \) holds for every \( i < k \)
Observation 2

Assume state $s$ in $F_i$ can reach a bad state in a number of transitions

$s$ is also in $F_j$ for $j > i$ \quad (F_i => F_j)

• a longer CEX may exist
• $s$ may not be reachable in $i$ steps, but it may be reachable in $j$ steps

If $s$ is blocked in $F_i$, it must be blocked in $F_j$ for $j > i$

• Otherwise, a CEX exists
Push Forward
Push Forward

Suppose $s$ is removed from $F_i$

- by conjoining a sub-clause $c$
- $F_i := F_i \land c$

$c$ is a clause learnt at level $i$

try to push $c$ forward for $j > i$

- If $F_j \land c \land T \Rightarrow c'$ holds
  - $c$ is inductive in level $j$
  - $F_{j+1} := F_{j+1} \land c$
- Else: $s$ was not blocked at level $j > i$
  - Add a proof obligation $(s,j)$
  - If $s$ is reachable from INIT in $j$ steps, CEX!
Generalizing Predecessor

Suppose $s_{k-1}$ is a predecessor obtained by $F_{k-1} \land T \land s'_k$

- New proof obligation

Try to generalize $s_{k-1}$ to a set of states (cube m) such that

$$m \implies \exists V'. F_{k-1} \land T \land s'_k$$

- Drop a literal from $s_{k-1}$ and use ternary simulation to check whether $F_{k-1} \land T \land s'_k$ evaluates to true under current assignment
Recursive Blocking Stage in IC3

// Find a counterexample, or strengthen the inductive trace
// s.t. $F_N \Rightarrow \neg s$ holds

IC3_recBlockCube(s, N)
    Add(Q, (s, N))
    while \text{\neg Empty}(Q) do
        (s, k) \leftarrow \text{Pop}(Q)
        if (k = 0) return "Counterexample"
        if ($F_k \Rightarrow \neg s$) continue
        if ($F_{k-1} \land Tr \land s'$) is SAT
            $t \leftarrow$ generalized predecessor of $s$
            Add(Q, (t, k-1))
            Add(Q, (s, k))
        else
            $\neg t \leftarrow$ generalize $\neg s$ by inductive generalization (to level $m \geq k$)
            add $\neg t$ to $F_m$
        if (m<N) Add(Q, (s, m+1))
Pushing stage in IC3

// Push each clause to the highest possible frame up to N
IC3_Push()
    for k = 1 .. N-1 do
        for c ∈ F_k \ F_{k+1} do
            if (F_k ∧ Tr ⇒ c')
                add c to F_{k+1}
        if (F_k = F_{k+1})
            return "Proof" // F_k is a safe inductive invariant
IC3 – Key Ingredients

Backward Search
• Find a state \( s \) that can reach a bad state in a number of steps
• [lifting: generalize \( s \) to a set of states]
• \( s \) may not be reachable (over-approximations)

Block a State
• Do it efficiently, block more than \( s \)
  – Generalization / Inductive generalization

Push Forward
• An inductive fact at frame \( i \), may also be inductive at higher frames
• If not, a longer CEX may be found
SOLVING CONSTRAINED HORN CLAUSES
Constrained Horn Clauses (CHC)

A Constrained Horn Clause (CHC) is a FOL formula

$$\forall V \cdot (\varphi \land p_1[X_1] \land \cdots \land p_n[X_n]) \rightarrow h[X]$$

where

- $\mathcal{T}$ is a background theory (e.g., Linear Arithmetic, Arrays, Bit-Vectors, or combinations of the above)
- $V$ are variables, and $X_i$ are terms over $V$
- $\varphi$ is a constraint in the background theory $\mathcal{T}$
- $p_1, \ldots, p_n, h$ are $n$-ary predicates
- $p_i[X]$ is an application of a predicate to first-order terms
CHC Notation and Terminology

Rule

\[ h[X] \leftarrow p_1[X_1], \ldots, p_n[X_n], \phi. \]

Query

false \leftarrow p_1[X_1], \ldots, p_n[X_n], \phi.

Fact

h[X] \leftarrow \phi.

Linear CHC

h[X] \leftarrow p[X_1], \phi.

Non-Linear CHC

\[ h[X] \leftarrow p_1[X_1], \ldots, p_n[X_n], \phi. \]

for \( n > 1 \)
CHC Satisfiability

A $\mathcal{T}$-model of a set of a CHCs $\Pi$ is an extension of the model $M$ of $\mathcal{T}$ with a first-order interpretation of each predicate $p_i$ that makes all clauses in $\Pi$ true in $M$.

A set of clauses is **satisfiable** if and only if it has a model.

- This is the usual FOL satisfiability

A $\mathcal{T}$-solution of a set of CHCs $\Pi$ is a substitution $\sigma$ from predicates $p_i$ to $\mathcal{T}$-formulas such that $\Pi \sigma$ is $\mathcal{T}$-valid.

In the context of program verification:

- a program satisfies a property iff corresponding CHCs are satisfiable
- solutions are inductive invariants
- refutation proofs are counterexample traces
Procedures for Solving CHC(T)

Predicate abstraction by lifting Model Checking to HORN
- QARMC, Eldarica, ...

Maximal Inductive Subset from a finite Candidate space (Houdini)
- TACAS’18: hoice, FreqHorn

Machine Learning
- PLDI’18: sample, ML to guess predicates, DT to guess combinations

Abstract Interpretation (Poly, intervals, boxes, arrays...)
- Approximate least model by an abstract domain (SeaHorn, ...)

Interpolation-based Model Checking
- Duality, QARMC, ...

SMT-based Unbounded Model Checking (IC3/PDR)
- Spacer, Implicit Predicate Abstraction
Linear CHC Satisfiability

Satisfiability of a set of linear CHCs is reducible to satisfiability of THREE clauses of the form

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Init}(X) &\rightarrow P(X) \\
P(X) \land Tr(X, X') &\rightarrow P(X') \\
P(X) &\rightarrow \neg Bad(X)
\end{align*}
\]

where, \( X' = \{x' \mid x \in X \} \), \( P \) a fresh predicate, and \( \text{Init}, Bad, \) and \( Tr \) are constraints.

**Proof:**

add extra arguments to distinguish between predicates

\[
\begin{align*}
Q(y) \land \phi &\rightarrow W(y, z) \\
\hline
P(\text{id}='Q', y) \land \phi &\rightarrow P(\text{id}='W', y, z)
\end{align*}
\]
IC3, PDR, and Friends (1)

IC3: A SAT-based Hardware Model Checker

- Incremental Construction of Inductive Clauses for Indubitble Correctness
- A. Bradley: SAT-Based Model Checking without Unrolling. VMCAI 2011

PDR: Explained and extended the implementation

- Property Directed Reachability
- N. Eén, A. Mishchenko, R. K. Brayton: Efficient implementation of property directed reachability. FMCAD 2011

PDR with Predicate Abstraction (easy extension of IC3/PDR to SMT)

IC3, PDR, and Friends (2)

GPDR: Non-Linear CHC with Arithmetic constraints
- Generalized Property Directed Reachability
- K. Hoder and N. Bjørner: Generalized Property Directed Reachability. SAT 2012

SPACER: Non-Linear CHC with Arithmetic
- fixes an incompleteness issue in GPDR and extends it with under-approximate summaries
- A. Komuravelli, A. Gurfinkel, S. Chaki: SMT-Based Model Checking for Recursive Programs. CAV 2014

PolyPDR: Convex models for Linear CHC
- simulating Numeric Abstract Interpretation with PDR
- N. Bjørner and A. Gurfinkel: Property Directed Polyhedral Abstraction. VMCAI 2015

ArrayPDR: CHC with constraints over Arithmetic + Arrays
- Required to model heap manipulating programs
IC3, PDR, and Friends (3)

Quip: Forward Reachable States + Conjectures
- Use both forward and backward reachability information
- A. Gurfinkel and A. Ivrii: Pushing to the Top. FMCAD 2015

Avy: Interpolation with IC3
- Use SAT-solver for blocking, IC3 for pushing
- Y. Vizel, A. Gurfinkel: Interpolating Property Directed Reachability. CAV 2014

uPDR: Constraints in EPR fragment of FOL
- Universally quantified inductive invariants (or their absence)

Quic3: Universally quantified invariants for LIA + Arrays
- Extending Spacer with quantified reasoning
- A. Gurfinkel, S. Shoham, Y. Vizel: Quantifiers on Demand. ATVA 2018
Spacer: Solving SMT-constrained CHC

Spacer: a solver for SMT-constrained Horn Clauses

- now the default (and only) CHC solver in Z3
  - https://github.com/Z3Prover/z3
  - dev branch at https://github.com/agurfinkel/z3

Supported SMT-Theories

- Linear Real and Integer Arithmetic
- Quantifier-free theory of arrays
- Universally quantified theory of arrays + arithmetic
- Best-effort support for many other SMT-theories
  - data-structures, bit-vectors, non-linear arithmetic

Support for Non-Linear CHC

- for procedure summaries in inter-procedural verification conditions
- for compositional reasoning: abstraction, assume-guarantee, thread modular, etc.
Program Verification with HORN(LIA)

\[ z = x; \ i = 0; \]
\[ \text{assume} \ (y > 0); \]
\[ \text{while} \ (i < y) \{ \]
\[ \quad z = z + 1; \]
\[ \quad i = i + 1; \]
\[ \} \]
\[ \text{assert}(z == x + y); \]

\[ z = x \& i = 0 \& y > 0 \Rightarrow \text{Inv}(x, y, z, i) \]
\[ \text{Inv}(x, y, z, i) \& i < y \& z1=\text{z+1} \& i1=i+1 \Rightarrow \text{Inv}(x, y, z1, i1) \]
\[ \text{Inv}(x, y, z, i) \& i >= y \& z != x+y \Rightarrow \text{false} \]
In SMT-LIB

(set-logic HORN)

;; Inv(x, y, z, i)
(declare-fun Inv ( Int Int Int Int) Bool)

(assert
(forall ( (A Int) (B Int) (C Int) (D Int))
   (=> (and (> B 0) (= C A) (= D 0))
        (Inv A B C D)))
)

(assert
(forall ( (A Int) (B Int) (C Int) (D Int) (C1 Int) (D1 Int) )
   (=>
    (and (Inv A B C D) (< D B) (= C1 (+ C 1)) (= D1 (+ D 1)))
    (Inv A B C1 D1))
)
)

(assert
(forall ( (A Int) (B Int) (C Int) (D Int))
   (=> (and (Inv A B C D) (> D B) (not (= C (+ A B))))
        false
    )
)
)

(check-sat)
(get-model)
**IC3/PDR In Pictures: MkSafe**

**Predecessor**

find $M$ s.t. $M \models F_i \land Tr \land m'$

find $m$ s.t. $(M \models m) \land (m \implies \exists V' \cdot Tr \land m')$

**NewLemma**

find $\ell$ s.t. $(F_i \land Tr \implies \ell') \land (\ell \implies \neg m)$
IC3/PDR in Pictures: Push

Algorithm Invariants

\[ F_i \rightarrow \neg \text{Bad} \quad \text{Init} \rightarrow F_i \]
\[ F_i \rightarrow F_{i+1} \quad F_i \land Tr \rightarrow F_{i+1} \]

SMT-query: \[ \vdash \ell \land F_i \land Tr \implies \ell' \]
IC3/PDR: Solving Linear (Propositional) CHC

Unreachable and Reachable
• terminate the algorithm when a solution is found

Unfold
• increase search bound by 1

Candidate
• choose a bad state in the last frame

Decide
• extend a cex (backward) consistent with the current frame
• choose an assignment $s$ s.t. $(s \land F_i \land Tr \land cex')$ is SAT

Conflict
• construct a lemma to explain why cex cannot be extended
• Find a clause $L$ s.t. $L \Rightarrow \neg\text{cex}$, $\text{Init} \Rightarrow L$, and $L \land F_i \land Tr \Rightarrow L'$

Induction
• propagate a lemma as far into the future as possible
  (optionally) strengthen by dropping literals
From Propositional PDR to Solving CHC

Theories with infinitely many models

- infinitely many satisfying assignments
- can’t simply enumerate (when computing predecessor)
- can’t block one assignment at a time (when blocking)

Non-Linear Horn Clauses

- multiple predecessors (when computing predecessors)

The problem is undecidable in general, but we want an algorithm that makes progress

- doesn’t get stuck in a decidable sub-problem
- guaranteed to find a counterexample (if it exists)
IC3/PDR: Solving Linear (Propositional) CHC

Unreachable and Reachable
• terminate the algorithm when a solution is found

Unfold
• increase search bound by 1

Candidate
• choose a bad state in the last frame

Decide
• extend a cex (backward) consistent with the current frame
• choose an assignment $s$ s.t. $(s \land R_i \land T_r \land cex')$ is SAT

Conflict
• construct a lemma to explain why cex cannot be extended
• Find a clause $L$ s.t. $L \Rightarrow \neg cex$, $Init \Rightarrow L$, and $L \land R_i \land T_r \Rightarrow L'$

Induction
• propagate a lemma as far into the future as possible
  (optionally) strengthen by dropping literals
\[(\left( F_i \land Tr \right) \lor \text{Init}^{'}) \Rightarrow \varphi' \]

\[\varphi' \Rightarrow \neg c'\]

Looking for $\phi'$

ARITHMETIC CONFLICT
Craig Interpolation Theorem

**Theorem** (Craig 1957)
Let A and B be two First Order (FO) formulae such that $A \Rightarrow \neg B$, then there exists a FO formula $I$, denoted $\text{ITP}(A, B)$, such that

$$A \Rightarrow I \quad I \Rightarrow \neg B \quad \Sigma(I) \in \Sigma(A) \cap \Sigma(B)$$

A Craig interpolant $\text{ITP}(A, B)$ can be effectively constructed from a resolution proof of unsatisfiability of $A \land B$

In Model Checking, Craig Interpolation Theorem is used to safely over-approximate the set of (finitely) reachable states
Examples of Craig Interpolation for Theories

Boolean logic

\[ A = (\neg b \land (\neg a \lor b \lor c) \land a) \quad B = (\neg a \lor \neg c) \]

\[ ITP(A, B) = a \land c \]

Equality with Uninterpreted Functions (EUF)

\[ A = (f(a) = b \land p(f(a))) \quad B = (b = c \land \neg p(c)) \]

\[ ITP(A, B) = p(b) \]

Linear Real Arithmetic (LRA)

\[ A = (z + x + y > 10 \land z < 5) \quad B = (x < -5 \land y < -3) \]

\[ ITP(A, B) = x + y > 5 \]
Useful properties of existing interpolation algorithms [CGS10] [HB12]

- $I \in \text{ITP (A, B)}$ then $\neg I \in \text{ITP (B, A)}$
- If $A$ is syntactically convex (a monomial), then $I$ is convex
- If $B$ is syntactically convex, then $I$ is co-convex (a clause)
- If $A$ and $B$ are syntactically convex, then $I$ is a half-space

$A = \mathcal{F}(R_i)$
Arithmetic Conflict

Notation: $\mathcal{F}(A) = (A(X) \land Tr) \lor \text{Init}(X')$.

Conflict For $0 \leq i < N$, given a counterexample $\langle P, i + 1 \rangle \in Q$ s.t. $\mathcal{F}(F_i) \land P'$ is unsatisfiable, add $P^{\uparrow} = \text{ITP}(\mathcal{F}(F_i), P')$ to $F_j$ for $j \leq i + 1$.

Counterexample is blocked using Craig Interpolation

• summarizes the reason why the counterexample cannot be extended

Generalization is not inductive

• weaker than IC3/PDR

• inductive generalization for arithmetic is still an open problem
Computing Interpolants for IC3/PDR

Much simpler than general interpolation problem for $A \land B$

- $B$ is always a conjunction of literals
- $A$ is dynamically split into DNF by the SMT solver
- DPLL(T) proofs do not introduce new literals

Interpolation algorithm is reduced to analyzing all theory lemmas in a DPLL(T) proof produced by the solver

- every theory-lemma that mixes $B$-pure literals with other literals is interpolated to produce a single literal in the final solution
- interpolation is restricted to clauses of the form $(\land B_i \Rightarrow \lor A_j)$

Interpolating (UNSAT) Cores

- improve interpolation algorithms and definitions to the specific case of PDR
- classical interpolation focuses on eliminating non-shared literals
- in PDR, the focus is on finding good generalizations
Farkas Lemma

Let $M = t_1 \geq b_1 \land \ldots \land t_n \geq b_n$, where $t_i$ are linear terms and $b_i$ are constants

$M$ is unsatisfiable iff $0 \geq 1$ is derivable from $M$ by resolution

$M$ is unsatisfiable iff $M \vdash 0 \geq 1$

- e.g., $x + y > 10, -x > 5, -y > 3 \vdash (x+y-x-y) > (10 + 5 + 3) \vdash 0 > 18$

$M$ is unsatisfiable iff there exist Farkas coefficients $g_1, \ldots, g_n$ such that

- $g_i \geq 0$
- $g_1 \times t_1 + \ldots + g_n \times t_n = 0$
- $g_1 \times b_1 + \ldots + g_n \times b_n \geq 1$
Frakas Lemma Example

\[ z + x + y > 10 \times 1 \]
\[ -z > -5 \times 1 \]
\[ -x > 5 \times 1 \]
\[ -y > 3 \times 1 \]

\[ 0 > 13 \]

\[ \{ \]
\[ x + y > 5 \]
\[ \} \]

\[ \{ \]
\[ x + y < -8 \]
\[ \} \]

Interpolants
Interpolation for Linear Real Arithmetic

Let $M = A \land B$ be UNSAT, where

- $A = t_1 \geq b_1 \land \ldots \land t_i \geq b_i$, and
- $B = t_{i+1} \geq b_i \land \ldots \land t_n \geq b_n$

Let $g_1, \ldots, g_n$ be the Farkas coefficients witnessing UNSAT

Then

- $g_1 \times (t_1 \geq b_1) + \ldots + g_i \times (t_i \geq b_i)$ is an interpolant between $A$ and $B$
- $g_{i+1} \times (t_{i+1} \geq b_i) + \ldots + g_n \times (t_n \geq b_n)$ is an interpolant between $B$ and $A$
- $g_1 \times t_1 + \ldots + g_i \times t_i = -(g_{i+1} \times t_{i+1} + \ldots + g_n \times t_n)$
- $\neg(g_{i+1} \times (t_{i+1} \geq b_i) + \ldots + g_n \times (t_n \geq b_n))$ is an interpolant between $A$ and $B$
Program Verification with HORN(LIA)

\[
\begin{align*}
z &= x; i = 0; \\
\text{assume } (y > 0); \\
\text{while } (i < y) \{ \\
& \quad z = z + 1; \\
& \quad i = i + 1; \\
\} \\
\text{assert}(z = x + y);
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
z &= x \& i = 0 \& y > 0 \\
\text{Inv}(x, y, z, i) \& i < y \& z1=z+1 \& i1=i+1 \\
\text{Inv}(x, y, z, i) \& i \geq y \& z \neq x+y \\
\text{IS SAT?}
\end{align*}
\]
Lemma Generation Example

Transition Relation

\[ x = x_0 \land z = z_0 + 1 \land i = i_0 + 1 \land y > i_0 \]

Pob

\[ i \geq y \land x + y > z \]

Farkas explanation for unsat

\[ x_0 + y_0 \leq z_0, \ x \leq x_0, \ z_0 < z, \ i \leq i_0 + 1 \]

\[ x + i \leq z \]

\[ i \geq y, \ x + y > z \]

false

Learn lemma:

\[ x + i \leq z \]
\[ s \subseteq \text{pre}(c) \]

\[ \equiv s \Rightarrow \exists X'. Tr \land c' \]

Computing a predecessor \( s \) of a counterexample \( c \)

**ARITHMETIC DECIDE**
Model Based Projection

**Definition:** Let \( \phi \) be a formula, \( U \) a set of variables, and \( M \) a model of \( \phi \). Then \( \psi = \text{MBP} (U, M, \phi) \) is a Model Based Projection of \( U, M \) and \( \phi \) iff

1. \( \psi \) is a monomial
2. \( \text{Vars}(\psi) \subseteq \text{Vars}(\phi) \setminus U \)
3. \( M \models \psi \)
4. \( \psi \Rightarrow \exists U . \phi \)

Model Based Projection under-approximates existential quantifier elimination relative to a given model (i.e., satisfying assignment)
Expensive to find a quantifier-free 

\[ \psi(y) \equiv \exists x \cdot \varphi(x, y) \]

1. Find model M of \( \varphi(x, y) \)

2. Compute a partition containing M
Loos-Weispfenning Quantifier Elimination

$\phi$ is LRA formula in Negation Normal Form

$E$ is set of $x=t$ atoms, $U$ set of $x < t$ atoms, and $L$ set of $s < x$ atoms

There are no other occurrences of $x$ in $\phi[x]$

$$\exists x. \varphi[x] \equiv \varphi[\infty] \lor \bigvee_{x=t \in E} \varphi[t] \lor \bigvee_{x < t \in U} \varphi[t - \epsilon]$$

where

$$(x < t')[t - \epsilon] \equiv t \leq t' \quad (s < x)[t - \epsilon] \equiv s < t \quad (x = e)[t - \epsilon] \equiv false$$

The case of lower bounds is dual

• using $-\infty$ and $t+\epsilon$
Fourier–Motzkin Quantifier Elimination

\[ \exists x \cdot \bigwedge_i s_i < x \land \bigwedge_j x < t_j \]

\[ = \bigwedge_i \bigwedge_j \text{resolve}(s_i < x, x < t_j, x) \]

\[ = \bigwedge_i \bigwedge_j s_i < t_j \]

Quadratic increase in the formula size per each eliminated variable
Quantifier Elimination with Assumptions

\[
\left( \bigwedge_{j \neq 0} t_0 \leq t_j \right) \land \exists x \cdot \bigwedge_i s_i < x \land \bigwedge_j x < t_j
\]

\[
= \left( \bigwedge_{j \neq 0} t_0 \leq t_j \right) \land \bigwedge_i \text{resolve}(s_i < x, x < t_0, x)
\]

\[
= \left( \bigwedge_{j \neq 0} t_0 \leq t_j \right) \land \bigwedge_i s_i < t_0
\]

Quantifier elimination is simplified by a choice of a minimal upper bound

- For each choice of minimal upper bound, no increase in term size
- Dually, can use largest lower bound

How to chose an the assumptions?!

- MBP == use the order chosen by the model
MBP for Linear Rational Arithmetic

Compute a **single** disjunct from LW-QE that includes the model

- Use the Model to uniquely pick a substitution term for $x$

\[
Mbp_x(M, x = s \wedge L) = L[x \leftarrow s]
\]

\[
Mbp_x(M, x \neq s \wedge L) = Mbp_x(M, s < x \wedge L) \text{ if } M(x) > M(s)
\]

\[
Mbp_x(M, x \neq s \wedge L) = Mbp_x(M, -s < -x \wedge L) \text{ if } M(x) < M(s)
\]

\[
Mbp_x(M, \bigwedge_i s_i < x \wedge \bigwedge_j x < t_j) = \bigwedge_i s_i < t_0 \wedge \bigwedge_j t_0 \leq t_j \text{ where } M(t_0) \leq M(t_i), \forall i
\]

MBP techniques have been developed for

- Linear Rational Arithmetic, Linear Integer Arithmetic
- Theories of Arrays, and Recursive Data Types
Arithmetic Decide

Notation: $\mathcal{F}(A) = (A(X) \land Tr(X, X') \lor Init(X')).$

Decide If $\langle P, i + 1 \rangle \in Q$ and there is a model $m(X, X')$ s.t. $m \models \mathcal{F}(F_i) \land P'$, add $\langle P_{\downarrow}, i \rangle$ to $Q$, where $P_{\downarrow} = \text{MBP}(X', m, \mathcal{F}(F_i) \land P').$

Compute a predecessor using Model Based Projection

To ensure progress, Decide must be finite

- finitely many possible predecessors when all other arguments are fixed

Alternatively

- Completeness can follow from an interaction of Decide and Conflict
  - but requires more rules to propagate implicants backward (as in PDR) and forward (as in Spacer and Quip)
PolyPDR: Solving CHC(LRA)

Unreachable and Reachable
- terminate the algorithm when a solution is found

Unfold
- increase search bound by 1

Candidate
- choose a bad state in the last frame

Decide
- extend a cex (backward) consistent with the current frame
- find a model $\mathbf{M}$ of $s$ s.t. $(F_i \land Tr \land cex')$, and let $s = \text{MBP}(X', F_i \land Tr \land cex')$

Conflict
- construct a lemma to explain why cex cannot be extended
- Find an interpolant $L$ s.t. $L \Rightarrow \neg cex$, $\text{Init} \Rightarrow L$, and $F_i \land Tr \Rightarrow L'$

Induction
- propagate a lemma as far into the future as possible
  (optionally) strengthen by dropping literals
Non-Linear CHC Satisfiability

Satisfiability of a set of arbitrary (i.e., linear or non-linear) CHCs is reducible to satisfiability of THREE (3) clauses of the form

\[ Init(X) \rightarrow P(X) \]

\[ P(X) \land P(X^o) \land Tr(X, X^o, X') \rightarrow P(X') \]

\[ P(X) \rightarrow \neg Bad(X) \]

where, \( X' = \{x' \mid x \in X\} \), \( X^o = \{x^o \mid x \in X\} \), \( P \) a fresh predicate, and \( Init, Bad, \) and \( Tr \) are constraints.
Generalized GPDR

**Input:** A safety problem \(<Init(X), Tr(X, X^o, X'), Bad(X)>\).

**Output:** Unreachable or Reachable

**Data:** A cex queue \(Q\), where a cex \(<c_0, \ldots, c_k>\) is a tuple, each \(c_j = \langle m, i>\), \(m\) is a cube over state variables, and \(i \in \mathbb{N}\). A level \(N\).

- A trace \(F_0, F_1, \ldots\)

**Notation:** \(\mathcal{F}(A, B) = Init(X') \lor (A(X) \land B(X^o) \land Tr), and \(\mathcal{F}(A) = \mathcal{F}(A, A)\)

**Initially:** \(Q = \emptyset, N = 0, F_0 = Init, \forall i > 0 \cdot F_i = \emptyset\)

**Require:** \(Init \land \neg Bad\)

repeat

**Unreachable** If there is an \(i < N\) s.t. \(F_i \subseteq F_{i+1}\) return Unreachable.

**Reachable** if exists \(t \in Q\) s.t. for all \(<c, i>\) \(\in t\), \(i = 0\), return Reachable.

**Unfold** If \(F_N \rightarrow \neg Bad\), then set \(N \leftarrow N + 1\) and \(Q \leftarrow \emptyset\).

**Candidate** If for some \(m\), \(m \rightarrow F_N \land Bad\), then add \(<\langle m, N>\>\) to \(Q\).

**Decide** If there is a \(t \in Q\), with \(c = \langle m, i + 1>\) \(\in t\), \(m_0 \rightarrow m\), \(l_0 \land m_0^o \land m_1'\) is satisfiable, and \(l_0 \land m_0^o \land m_1'\rightarrow F_i \land F_i^o \land Tr \land m'\) then add \(\hat{t}\) to \(Q\), where \(\hat{t} = t\) with \(c\) replaced by two tuples \(<l_0, i>\), and \(<m_0, i>\).

**Conflict** If there is a \(t \in Q\) with \(c = \langle m, i + 1>\) \(\in t\), s.t. \(\mathcal{F}(F_i) \land m'\) is unsatisfiable. Then, add \(\varphi = Itp(\mathcal{F}(F_i), m')\) to \(F_j\), for all \(0 \leq j \leq i + 1\).

**Leaf** If there is \(t \in Q\) with \(c = \langle m, i>\) \(\in t\), \(0 < i < N\) and \(\mathcal{F}(F_{i-1}) \land m'\) is unsatisfiable, then add \(\hat{t}\) to \(Q\), where \(\hat{t}\) is \(t\) with \(c\) replaced by \(<m, i + 1>\).

**Induction** For \(0 \leq i < N\) and a clause \((\varphi \lor \psi) \in F_i\), if \(\varphi \not\in F_{i+1}\), \(\mathcal{F}(\phi \land F_i) \rightarrow \phi'\), then add \(\varphi\) to \(F_j\), for all \(j \leq i + 1\).

until \(\infty\);
Counterexamples to non-linear CHC

A set $S$ of CHC is unsatisfiable iff $S$ can derive FALSE

- we call such a derivation a counterexample

For linear CHC, the counterexample is a path

For non-linear CHC, the counterexample is a tree
GPDR Search Space

In Decide, one POB in the frontier is chosen and its two children are expanded.
GPDR: Splitting predecessors

Consider a clause

\[ P(x) \land P(y) \land x > y \land z = x + y \implies P(z) \]

How to compute a predecessor for a proof obligation \( z > 0 \)

Predecessor over the constraint is:

\[ \exists z \cdot x > y \land z = x + y \land z > 0 \]
\[ = x > y \land x + y > 0 \]

Need to create two separate proof obligation

- one for \( P(x) \) and one for \( P(y) \)
- gpdr solution: split by substituting values from the model (incomplete)
GPDR: Deciding predecessors

**Decide** If there is a $t \in Q$, with $c = \langle m, i + 1 \rangle \in t$, $m_1 \rightarrow m$, $l_0 \land m_0^o \land m_1'$ is satisfiable, and $l_0 \land m_0^o \land m_1' \rightarrow F_i \land F_i^o \land Tr \land m'$ then add $\hat{t}$ to $Q$, where $\hat{t} = t$ with $c$ replaced by two tuples $\langle l_0, i \rangle$, and $\langle m_0, i \rangle$.

Compute two predecessors at each application of **GPDR/Decide**

Can explore both predecessors in parallel

- e.g., BFS or DFS exploration order

Number of predecessors is unbounded

- incomplete even for finite problem (i.e., non-recursive CHC)

No caching/summarization of previous decisions

- worst-case exponential for Boolean Push-Down Systems
**Input:** A safety problem \(\langle \text{Init}(X), \text{Tr}(X, X^0, X'), \text{Bad}(X) \rangle\).

**Output:** *Unreachable* or *Reachable*

**Data:** A cex queue \(Q\), where a cex \(c \in Q\) is a pair \(\langle m, i \rangle\), \(m\) is a cube over state variables, and \(i \in \mathbb{N}\). A set of reachable states \(\text{REACH}\). A trace \(F_0, F_1, \ldots\)

**Notation:** \(\mathcal{F}(A, B) = \text{Init}(X') \lor (A(X) \land B(X^0) \land \text{Tr})\), and \(\mathcal{F}(A) = \mathcal{F}(A, A)\)

**Initially:** \(Q = \emptyset, N = 0, F_0 = \text{Init}, \forall i > 0 \cdot F_i = \emptyset, \text{REACH} = \text{Init}\)

**Require:** \(\text{Init} \to \neg \text{Bad}^\ast\)

repeat

**Unreachable** If there is an \(i < N\) s.t. \(F_i \subseteq F_{i+1}\) return *Unreachable*.

**Reachable** If \(\text{REACH} \land \text{Bad}^\ast\) is satisfiable, return *Reachable*.

**Unfold** If \(F_N \to \neg \text{Bad}^\ast\), then set \(N \leftarrow N + 1\) and \(Q \leftarrow \emptyset\).

**Candidate** If for some \(m, m \to F_N \land \text{Bad}^\ast\), then add \(\langle m, N \rangle\) to \(Q\).

**Successor** If there is \(\langle m, i + 1 \rangle \in Q\) and a model \(M M \models \psi\), where \(\psi = \mathcal{F}(\neg \text{REACH}) \land m'\). Then, add \(s\) to \(\text{REACH}\), where \(s' \in \text{MBP}(\{X, X^0\}, \psi)\).

**DecideMust** If there is \(\langle m, i + 1 \rangle \in Q\) and a model \(M M \models \psi\), where \(\psi = \mathcal{F}(F_i, \neg \text{REACH}) \land m'\). Then, add \(s\) to \(Q\), where \(s' \in \text{MBP}(\{X^0, X'\}, \psi)\).

**DecideMay** If there is \(\langle m, i + 1 \rangle \in Q\) and a model \(M M \models \psi\), where \(\psi = \mathcal{F}(F_i) \land m'\). Then, add \(s\) to \(Q\), where \(s^0 \in \text{MBP}(\{X, X'\}, \psi)\).

**Conflict** If there is an \(\langle m, i + 1 \rangle \in Q\), s.t. \(\mathcal{F}(F_i) \land m'\) is unsatisfiable. Then, add \(\varphi = \text{ITP}(\mathcal{F}(F_i), m')\) to \(F_j\), for all \(0 \leq j \leq i + 1\).

**Leaf** If \(\langle m, i \rangle \in Q\), \(0 < i < N\) and \(\mathcal{F}(F_{i-1}) \land m'\) is unsatisfiable, then add \(\langle m, i + 1 \rangle\) to \(Q\).

**Induction** For \(0 \leq i < N\) and a clause \((\varphi \lor \psi) \in F_i\), if \(\varphi \notin F_{i+1}\), \(\mathcal{F}(\varphi \land F_i) \to \varphi'\), then add \(\varphi\) to \(F_j\), for all \(j \leq i + 1\).

until \(\infty\);
In Decide, unfold the derivation tree in a fixed depth-first order

- use MBP to decide on counterexamples

**Successor**: Learn new facts (reachable states) on the way up

- use MBP to propagate facts bottom up
Successor Rule: Computing Reachable States

**Successor** If there is \( \langle m, i + 1 \rangle \in Q \) and a model \( M M \models \psi \), where 
\[
\psi = \mathcal{F}(\bigvee \text{REACH}) \land m'.
\]
Then, add \( s \) to REACH, where 
\[
s' \in \text{MBP}(\{X, X^o\}, \psi).
\]

Computing new reachable states by under-approximating forward image using MBP
- since MBP is finite, guarantee to exhaust all reachable states

Second use of MBP
- orthogonal to the use of MBP in Decide
- can allow REACH to contain auxiliary variables, but this might explode

For Boolean CHC, the number of reachable states is bounded
- complexity is polynomial in the number of states
- same as reachability in Push Down Systems
Decide Rule: Must and May refinement

**DecideMust** If there is \( \langle m, i + 1 \rangle \in Q \), and a model \( M M \models \psi \), where
\[
\psi = \mathcal{F}(F_i) \lor \text{REACH} \land m'.
\]
Then, add \( s \) to \( Q \), where \( s \in \text{MBP}(\{X^o, X'\}, \psi) \).

**DecideMay** If there is \( \langle m, i + 1 \rangle \in Q \) and a model \( M M \models \psi \), where
\[
\psi = \mathcal{F}(F_i) \land m'.
\]
Then, add \( s \) to \( Q \), where \( s^o \in \text{MBP}(\{X, X'\}, \psi) \).

**DecideMust**
- use computed summary (REACH) to skip over a call site

**DecideMay**
- use over-approximation of a calling context to guess an approximation of the call-site
- the call-site either refutes the approximation (Conflict) or refines it with a witness (Successor)
CHC-COMP: CHC Solving Competition

First edition on July 13, 2018 at HVCS@FLOC

Constrained Horn Clauses (CHC) is a fragment of First Order Logic (FOL) that is sufficiently expressive to describe many verification, inference, and synthesis problems including inductive invariant inference, model checking of safety properties, inference of procedure summaries, regression verification, and sequential equivalence. The CHC competition (CHC-COMP) will compare state-of-the-art tools for CHC solving with respect to performance and effectiveness on a set of publicly available benchmarks. The winners among participating solvers are recognized by measuring the number of correctly solved benchmarks as well as the runtime.

Web: https://chc-comp.github.io/
Gitter: https://gitter.im/chc-comp/Lobby
GitHub: https://github.com/chc-comp
CHC VIA MACHINE LEARNING
Cormac Flanagan, K. Rustan M. Leino: Houdini, an Annotation Assistant for ESC/Java. FME 2001: 500-517
Program Verification by Houdini

- **Inductive Invariant**
  - **Lemma1**
  - **Lemma2**
  - **Lemma3**

- Safe?
  - Yes
  - No

- **guess new lemmas**

- **tail call 132 @ _VERIFIER_nondet:**
  - iccp eq 132 %40, 0
  - %40, label xbb7.1.1, label xbb9.1
  - .1:1
  - 1 - tail call 132 @ _VERIFIER_nondet_
  - iccp eq 132 %41, 0
  - %41, label xbb9.1, 1, label xbb3.1
  - .1:1
  - systemActive.0 = phi 132 [ 1, %bb3.1]
  - iccp eq 132 %43, 1
  - %43, label xbb3.1.14.1.1, label xbb1.114.1.1
  - sgt %132 %waterlevel1.1, 0
  - add %132 %waterlevel1.1, -1
  - waterlevel1.3 = select 11 %44, 132 %45
  - label xbb1.114.1.1
Finding an Inductive Invariant

Discovering an inductive invariants involves two steps

**Step 1**: find a candidate inductive invariant $\text{Inv}$

**Step 2**: check whether $\text{Inv}$ is an inductive invariant

Invariant Inference is the process of automating both of these phases
Finding an Inductive Invariant

Two popular approaches to invariant inference:

Machine Learning based Invariant Synthesis (MLIS)
- referred to as a Black-Box approach

SAT-based Model Checking (SAT-MC)
- e.g. IC3: Aaron R. Bradley: SAT-Based Model Checking without Unrolling. VMCAI 2011: 70-87
- referred to as a White-Box approach
Our Goal

Study the Relationship between SAT-MC and MLIS

Or, is there a difference between White-Box and Black-Box?
Our Goal

Study the Relationship between SAT-MC and MLIS

Or, is there a difference between White-Box and Black-Box?

• Study two state-of-the-art algorithms: ICE and IC3
• In other words: can we describe IC3 as an instance of ICE?
Reachability Analysis

\[ R_n = \text{post}(R_{n-1}, Tr) \]

\[ R_1 = \text{post}(\text{INIT}, Tr) \]

\[ R_2 = \text{post}(R_1, Tr) \]
Reachability Analysis

Computing states reachable from a set of states $S$ using the post operator

$$\begin{cases} post^0(S) = S \\ post^{i+1} = post^i(S) \cup \{t \mid s \in S \land (s, t) \in Tr\} \end{cases}$$

Computing states reaching a set of states $S$ using the pre operator

$$\begin{cases} pre^0(S) = S \\ pre^{i+1} = pre^i(S) \cup \{t \mid s \in S \land (t, s) \in Tr\} \end{cases}$$

Transitive closure is denoted by $post^*$ and $pre^*$
SAT-based Model Checking

Search for a counterexample for a specific length

If a counterexample does not exist, generalize the bounded proof into a candidate \( Inv \)

Check if \( Inv \) is a safe inductive invariant

Referred to as White-Box: Rely on a close interaction between the main algorithm and the decision procedure used
SMT-based Model Checking

Generalizing from bounded proofs

1. **A counterexample of length N exists?**
   - Yes
   - No + bounded proof

2. **No, N := N + 1**
   - YES

3. **Is a safe inductive invariant?**
   - SMT

4. **Generalize proof**
   - SMT

5. **T, N = 0**
Machine Learning-based Invariant Synthesis

MLIS consists of two entities: Teacher and Learner

Learner comes up with a candidate $Inv$

- Agnostic of the transition system
- Using machine learning techniques

Learner asks the Teacher if $Inv$ is a safe inductive invariant

If not, Teacher replies with a witness: positive or negative

- Aware of the transition system

Referred to as Black-Box
Machine Learning-based Invariant Synthesis

Teacher

Learner

candidate

$Inv$

YES

NO

a witness $s$
Machine Learning-based Invariant Synthesis

Teacher

Learner

aware of Tr

candidate \( Inv \)

not aware of Tr

a witness

YES

NO
ICE: MLIS Framework

(Garg et al. CAV 2014)

Given a transition system $T=(\text{INIT}, \text{Tr}, \text{Bad})$ and a candidate $\text{Inv}$ generated by the Learner

When the Teacher determines $\text{Inv}$ is not a safe inductive invariant, a witness is returned:

- E-example: $s \in \text{post}^*(\text{INIT})$ but $s \notin \text{Inv}$
- C-example: $s \in \text{pre}^*(\text{Bad})$ and $s \in \text{Inv}$
- I-example: $(s,t) \in T$ such that $s \in \text{Inv}$ but $t \notin \text{Inv}$

Given a set of states $S$, the triple $(E, C, I)$ is an ICE state

- $E \subseteq S$, $C \subseteq S$, $I \subseteq S \times S$

A set $J \subseteq S$ is consistent with ICE state iff

- $E \subseteq J$ and $J \cap C = \emptyset$
- for $(s,t) \in I$, if $s \in J$ then $t \in J$
Input: A transition system $T = (\mathcal{V}, \text{Init}, \text{Tr}, \text{Bad})$

$Q \leftarrow \emptyset$ \texttt{LEARNER}(\texttt{T}) ; \texttt{TEACHER}(\texttt{T})$

repeat

\begin{align*}
J &\leftarrow \texttt{LEARNER.SYN\text{CANDIDATE}}(Q); \\
\varepsilon &\leftarrow \texttt{TEACHER.IS\text{IND}}(J); \\
\text{if } \varepsilon = \bot \text{ then return } \text{SAFE}; \\
Q &\leftarrow Q \cup \{\varepsilon\};
\end{align*}

until $\infty$;
ICE

(Garg et al. CAV 2014)

Input: A transition system $T = (V, A)$

\[ Q \leftarrow \emptyset \]

LEARNER($T$) ; TEACHER($T$);

repeat

\[ J \leftarrow \text{LEARNER.SYN\_CANDIDATE}(Q); \]

\[ \varepsilon \leftarrow \text{TEACHER.IS\_IND}(J); \]

if $\varepsilon = \bot$ then return SAFE;

\[ Q \leftarrow Q \cup \{\varepsilon\}; \]

until $\infty$;

The Learner is passive - has no control over the Teacher

No requirement for incrementality

J must be consistent with Q
PDR/IC3 – SAT Queries

Trace \([F_0, \ldots, F_N]\), and \(Q \subseteq \text{pre}^*(\text{Bad})\), a state \(s \in Q \cap F_{i+1}\)

Strengthening

- \((F_i \land \neg s) \land T \land s'\)
- is \((F_i \land \neg s) \land T \rightarrow \neg s'\) valid?

If this is satisfiable then there exists a state \(t\) in \(F_i\) that can reach \(\text{Bad}\)

- This looks like a C-example

In order to "fix" \(F_i\) \(t\) must be removed

Now check

- \((F_{i-1} \land \neg t) \land T \land t'\)
PDR/IC3 – SAT Queries

Trace \([F_0, \ldots, F_N]\), try to push a lemma \(c \in F_i\) to \(F_{i+1}\)

Pushing

- \((F_i \land c) \land T \land \neg c'\)
- is \((F_i \land c) \land T \rightarrow c'\) valid?

If this is satisfiable then there exists a pair \((s, t) \in T\) s.t. \(s \in F_i\) and \(t \notin F_{i+1}\)

- It looks like an I-example
  - Also, can be either an E- or C-example

In order to “fix” \(F_i\), either \(s\) is removed from \(F_i\) or \(t\) is added to it

- Strengthening vs Weakening
The Problem

IC3 reasons about relative induction

F is inductive relative to G when:

- \( \text{INIT} \to F \), and
- \( G(V) \land F(V) \land T(V,V') \to F(V') \)

But, in ICE, the Learner (Teacher) asks (answers) about induction

and, the Learner in ICE is passive

- cannot control the Teacher in any way
- No guarantee for incrementality
Input: A transition system $T = (\mathcal{V}, \text{Init}, \text{Tr}, \text{Bad})$

$q \leftarrow \emptyset$

\text{Learner}(T) \ ; \ \text{Teacher}(T) ;$

repeat

$(f, g) \leftarrow \text{Learner}.\text{SyncAndAndBase}(q);$  
\[ \varepsilon \leftarrow \text{Teacher}.\text{IsRelInd}(f, g); \]
if $\varepsilon = \perp \land g = \text{true}$ then return $\text{SAFE};$

$q \leftarrow q \cup \{\varepsilon\};$

until $\infty;$

G allows the Learner to have some control over the Teacher

When G is true it is a regular inductive check
RICE – ICE + Relative Induction

The Teacher in RICE reacts to queries about relative induction

The Learner can “manipulate” the Teacher using relative induction

RICE is a generalization of ICE where the Learner is an active learning algorithm
RICE – ICE + Relative Induction

The Teacher in RICE reacts to queries about relative induction

Is F inductive relative to G?

If not, a witness is returned:

• E-example: \( s \in \text{post}^*(\text{INIT}) \) but \( s \notin F \)
• C-example: \( s \in \text{pre}^*(\text{Bad}) \) and \( s \in F \)
• I-example: \( (s,t) \in T \) such that \( s \in F \land G \) but \( t \notin F \)
IC3 AS AN INSTANCE OF RICE
IC3 Learner

The IC3 Learner is active and incremental

Maintains the following:

- a trace \([F_0, ..., F_N]\) of candidates
- RICE state \(Q=(E, C, I)\)

The Learner must be consistent with the RICE state

E-examples and C-examples may exist when F is inductive relative to G

- The Teacher may return an E-example or C-example when F is inductive relative to G
IC3 Learner - Strengthening

Strengthening:
- a C-example $s$ in $F_i$
- $(F_i \land \neg s \land \neg C(Q)) \land T \land (s \lor C(Q))'$

- **E-example:** a cex exists
- **C-example:** add to $Q$
- **I-example:** treat like C-example

INIT $\rightarrow F$, and
$G(V) \land F(V) \land T(V,V') \rightarrow F(V')$
IC3 Learner - Pushing

Pushing:

- a lemma $c$ in $F_i$
- $(F_i \land c \land \neg C(Q) \land F_{i+1}) \land T \land (\neg c \lor C(Q) \lor \neg F_{i+1})'$

*E-example:* do not push and add to $Q$

*C-example:* do not push and add to $Q$

*I-example:* do not push and add to $Q$

INIT $\rightarrow F$, and

$G(V) \land F(V) \land T(V,V') \rightarrow F(V')$
IC3 Learner - Pushing

Pushing:
• a lemma \( c \) in \( F_i \)
• \((F_i \land c \land \neg C(Q) \land F_{i+1}) \land T \land (\neg c \lor C(Q) \lor \neg F_{i+1})'\)

\[\text{is } (c \land \neg C(Q) \land F_{i+1}) \text{ inductive relative to } F_i?\]

- **E-example:** do not push and add to \( Q \)
- **C-example:** do not push and add to \( Q \)
- **I-example:** do not push and add to \( Q \)

E- and C-examples may exist even when relative induction holds.
IC3 Teacher

Using a general Teacher, the described Learner computes a trace \([F_0, \ldots, F_N]\) such that

- \(\text{post}^*(\text{INIT}) \rightarrow F_i \rightarrow \neg\text{pre}^*(\text{Bad})\)

Generic Teacher is infeasible

- required to look arbitrary far into the future (for E-examples)
- required to look arbitrary far into the past (for C-examples)

Solution: add restrictions on E- and C-examples
IC3 Teacher

Is F inductive relative to G?

If not, a witness is returned:

- C-example: $s \in \text{pre}^m(\text{Bad})$ and $s \in F$
- I-example: $(s,t) \in T$ such that $s \in F \land G$ but $t \notin F$
- E-example: $s \in \text{post}^0(\text{INIT})$ but $s \notin F$

Claim: Using this IC3 Teacher and the IC3 Learner results in an algorithm that behaves like (simulates) IC3
What Can We Learn?

Can we lift the restriction that requires E-example to be in INIT only?

• Yes, a variant of IC3, called Quip, does that

There is no “real” weakening mechanism in IC3

• Future work...

Can we introduce other active Learners for MLIS?
Conclusions

An extension of ICE to RICE

• Taking ques from IC3: incrementality, active Learner
• Overcomes a deficiency in ICE

IC3 can benefit from (R)ICE

• Weakening, E-examples, ...
CHC-COMP: CHC Solving Competition

First edition on July 13, 2018 at HVCS@FLOC

Constrained Horn Clauses (CHC) is a fragment of First Order Logic (FOL) that is sufficiently expressive to describe many verification, inference, and synthesis problems including inductive invariant inference, model checking of safety properties, inference of procedure summaries, regression verification, and sequential equivalence. The CHC competition (CHC-COMP) will compare state-of-the-art tools for CHC solving with respect to performance and effectiveness on a set of publicly available benchmarks. The winners among participating solvers are recognized by measuring the number of correctly solved benchmarks as well as the runtime.

Web: https://chc-comp.github.io/
Gitter: https://gitter.im/chc-comp/Lobby
GitHub: https://github.com/chc-comp