The theorem proving method DPLL($\Gamma+\mathcal{T}$)

A new style of reasoning

Maria Paola Bonacina

Dipartimento di Informatica
Università degli Studi di Verona
Verona, Italy, EU

Workshop on Automated Deduction and its Applications (ADAM)
Department of Computer Science, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, New Mexico, USA
(Extended version based also on a talk given the same month at the Department of Computer Science, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Illinois, USA)

June 2013

Automated reasoning

Computer programs that (help to) check whether formulæ follow from other formulæ: *theorem proving* and *model building*

Connections and applications

- Artificial intelligence
- Symbolic computation
- Computational logic
- Mathematics
- Education
- Analysis, verification, synthesis of programs

Analysis, verification, synthesis of programs

- Software is everywhere
- Needed: *Reliability*, *Compatibility*
- Difficult goals: Software may be
    - Artful
    - Complex
    - Huge
    - Varied
    - Old (and undocumented)
    - Less standardized than hardware

Automated reasoning offers tools that

- Prove verification conditions
- Prove synthesis conditions
- Refine abstractions
- Generate test cases

Problem statement

- Determine *validity (unsatisfiability)* or *invalidity (satisfiability)* of first-order formulæ

  generated by SW verification tools (verifying compiler, static analyzer, test generator, synthesizer, model checker)
- Modulo *background theories* (some arithmetic is a must)
- With *quantifiers* for expressivity: write
  - invariants about loops, heaps, data structures ...
  - axioms of *application-specific theories* without decision procedure (*type systems*)
- Emphasis on *automation*: prover called by other tools

Shape of problem

- Background theory $\mathcal{T}$
  - $\mathcal{T} = \bigcup_{i=1}^{n} \mathcal{T}_i$ (linear arithmetic, data structures)
- Set of formulæ: $\mathcal{R} \cup P$
  - $\mathcal{R}$: set of *non-ground* clauses without $\mathcal{T}$-symbols
  - P: large ground formula (set of ground clauses) typically with $\mathcal{T}$-symbols
- Determine whether $\mathcal{R} \cup P$ is *satisfiable* modulo $\mathcal{T}$ (Equivalently: determine whether $\mathcal{T} \cup \mathcal{R} \cup P$ is *satisfiable*)

Some key state-of-the-art reasoning methods

- Davis-Putnam-Logemann-Loveland (DPLL) procedure for SAT
- $\mathcal{T}_i$-solvers: *Satisfiability procedures* for the $\mathcal{T}_i$'s
- DPLL($\mathcal{T}$)-based SMT-solver: *Decision procedure* for $\mathcal{T}$ with combination by *equality sharing* of the $\mathcal{T}_i$-sat procedures
- First-order engine Γ to handle $\mathcal{R}$ (additional theory): Resolution+Rewriting+Superposition: *Superposition-based*

How to combine their strengths?

- DPLL: SAT-problems; large non-Horn clauses
- Theory solvers: e.g., ground equality, linear arithmetic
- DPLL($\mathcal{T}$)-based SMT-solver: efficient, scalable, integrated theory reasoning
- Superposition-based inference system Γ:
  - FOL$+=$ clauses with *universally quantified variables* (*automated* instantiation)
  - Sat-procedure for several theories of data structures (e.g., lists, arrays, records)

Superposition-based inference system Γ

- Generic, FOL$+=$, axiomatized theories
- Deduce clauses from clauses (*expansion*)
- Remove redundant clauses (*contraction*)
- Well-founded *ordering* $\succ$ on terms and literals to restrict expansion and define contraction
- Semi-decision procedure:
  empty clause (contradiction) generated, return *unsat*
- No backtracking

Ordering-based inferences

Ordering $\succ$ on terms and literals to

- restrict *expansion inferences*
- define *contraction inferences*

Complete Simplification Ordering:

- *stable*: if $s \succ t$ then $s\sigma \succ t\sigma$
- *monotone*: if $s \succ t$ then $l[s] \succ l[t]$
- *subterm property*: $l[t] \succeq t$
- *total* on ground terms and literals

Inference system Γ

State of derivation: set of clauses F

- Expansion rules:
  - *Resolution*: resolve maximal complementary literals
  - *Paramodulation/Superposition*: resolution with equality built-in: superpose maximal side of maximal equation into maximal literal/side
- Contraction rules:
  - *Simplification*: by well-founded rewriting
  - *Subsumption*: eliminate less general clauses

Superposition-based satisfiability procedures

- *Termination* results by analysis of inferences:
  Γ is $\mathcal{R}$-satisfiability procedure
- Covered theories include: *lists*, *arrays* and *records* with or without extensionality, *recursive data structures*

DPLL and DPLL($\mathcal{T}$)

- Propositional logic, ground problems in built-in theories
- Build candidate model M
- Decision procedure:
  model found: return *sat*;
  failure: return *unsat*
- Backtracking

DPLL with CDCL

State of derivation: $M \parallel F$

- *Decide*: add a literal to M
- *UnitPropagate*: add a literal that follows from M and F
- *Conflict*: detect that M falsifies a clause in F: conflict clause
- *Explain*: resolution on conflict clause
- *Learn*: add resolvent
- *Backjump*: undoes at least one decision and jumps as far as possible

DPLL($\mathcal{T}$)

State of derivation: $M \parallel F$

- $\mathcal{T}$*-Propagate*: add to M an L that is $\mathcal{T}$-consequence of M
- $\mathcal{T}$*-Conflict*: detect that $L_1, \ldots, L_n$ in M are $\mathcal{T}$-inconsistent

Theory combination by equality sharing

- Disjoint theories
- Stably infinite
- $\mathcal{T}_i$-sat procedures
- Capable to generate entailed (disjunctions of) equalities between shared constants

Model-based theory combination

- If $\mathcal{T}_i$-solver builds $\mathcal{T}_i$-model
- *PropagateEq*: add to M a ground $s \simeq t$ true in $\mathcal{T}_i$-model

Union of theories in superposition

- If Γ terminates on $\mathcal{R}_i$-sat problems, it terminates on $\mathcal{R}$-sat problems for $\mathcal{R} = \bigcup_{i=1}^{n} \mathcal{R}_i$, if $\mathcal{R}_i$'s *disjoint* and *variable-inactive*
- Variable-inactivity: no superposition from variables (no maximal literal $t \simeq x$ where $x \notin Var(t)$)
- Inferences across theories: *superpositions from shared constants*
- Variable inactivity implies stable infiniteness: Γ reveals lack of stable infiniteness by generating a *cardinality constraint* (not variable-inactive)

DPLL($\Gamma+\mathcal{T}$): integrate Γ in DPLL($\mathcal{T}$)

- **Idea**: literals in M can be premises of Γ-inferences
- Stored as *hypotheses* in inferred clause
- *Hypothetical clause*: $(L_1 \wedge \ldots \wedge L_n) \triangleright (L'_1 \vee \ldots L'_m)$ interpreted as $\neg L_1 \vee \ldots \vee \neg L_n \vee L'_1 \vee \ldots \vee L'_m$
- Inferred clauses inherit hypotheses from premises

DPLL($\Gamma+\mathcal{T}$) inferences

State of derivation: $M \parallel F$

- *Expansion*: take as pemises *non-ground* clauses from F and $\mathcal{R}$-literals (unit clauses) from M and add result to F
- *Backjump*: remove hypothetical clauses depending on undone assignments
- *Contraction*: as above + *scope level* to prevent situation where clause is deleted, but clauses that make it redundant are gone because of backjumping

DPLL($\Gamma+\mathcal{T}$): expansion inferences

- *Deduce*: Γ-rule γ (e.g., superposition) using *non-ground* clauses $\{H_1 \triangleright C_1, \ldots, H_m \triangleright C_m\}$ in F and ground $\mathcal{R}$-literals $\{L_{m+1}, \ldots, L_n\}$ in M

$$M \,\|\, F \quad \Longrightarrow \quad M \,\|\, F, H \triangleright C$$

  where $H = H_1 \cup \ldots \cup H_m \cup \{L_{m+1}, \ldots, L_n\}$
  and γ infers C from $\{C_1, \ldots, C_m, L_{m+1}, \ldots, L_n\}$
- Only $\mathcal{R}$-literals: Γ-inferences ignore $\mathcal{T}$-literals
- Take ground unit $\mathcal{R}$-clauses from M as *PropagateEq* puts them there

DPLL($\Gamma+\mathcal{T}$): contraction inferences

- Single premise $H \triangleright C$: apply to C (e.g., *tautology deletion*)
- Multiple premises (e.g., *subsumption*, *simplification*): prevent situation where clause is deleted, but clauses that make it redundant are gone because of backjumping
- *Scope level*:
  - $level(L)$ in $M\ L\ M'$: number of decided literals in $M\ L$
  - $level(H) = max\{level(L) \mid L \in H\}$ and 0 for $\emptyset$

DPLL($\Gamma+\mathcal{T}$): contraction inferences

- Say we have $H \triangleright C$, $H_2 \triangleright C_2, \ldots, H_m \triangleright C_m$, and $L_{m+1}, \ldots, L_n$
- $C_2, \ldots, C_m, L_{m+1}, \ldots, L_n$ simplify C to C' or subsume it
- Let $H' = H_2 \cup \ldots \cup H_m \cup \{L_{m+1}, \ldots, L_n\}$
- Simplification: replace $H \triangleright C$ by $(H \cup H') \triangleright C'$
- Both simplification and subsumption:
  - if $\mathit{level}(H) \geq \mathit{level}(H')$: delete
  - if $\mathit{level}(H) < \mathit{level}(H')$: disable (re-enable when backjumping $\mathit{level}(H')$)

DPLL($\Gamma+\mathcal{T}$) as a transition system

- Search mode: State of derivation $M \parallel F$
  - M sequence of *assigned ground literals*: partial model
  - F set of *hypothetical clauses*
- Conflict resolution mode: State of derivation $M \parallel F \parallel C$
  - C ground conflict clause

Initial state: M empty, F is $\{\emptyset \triangleright C \mid C \in \mathcal{R} \cup P\}$

Completeness of DPLL($\Gamma+\mathcal{T}$)

- *Refutational completeness* of the inference system:
  - from that of Γ, DPLL($\mathcal{T}$) and equality sharing
  - made combinable by variable-inactivity
- *Fairness* of the search plan:
  - depth-first search fair only for ground SMT problems;
  - add *iterative deepening* on *inference depth*

DPLL($\Gamma+\mathcal{T}$): Summary

Use each engine for what is best at:

- DPLL($\mathcal{T}$) works on ground clauses
- Γ not involved with ground inferences and built-in theory
- Γ works on non-ground clauses and ground unit clauses taken from M: inferences guided by current partial model
- Γ works on $\mathcal{R}$-sat problem

How to get decision procedures?

- SW development: **false** conjectures due to mistakes in implementation or specification
- Need theorem prover that **terminates on satisfiable** inputs
- Not possible in general:
  - FOL is only semi-decidable
  - First-order formulæ of linear arithmetic with uninterpreted functions: not even semi-decidable

However we need less than a general solution.

Problematic axioms do occur in relevant inputs

Example:

1. $\neg(x \sqsubseteq y) \vee f(x) \sqsubseteq f(y)$ (*Monotonicity*)
2. $a \sqsubseteq b$ generates by resolution
3. $\{f^i(a) \sqsubseteq f^i(b)\}_{i \geq 0}$

E.g. $f(a) \sqsubseteq f(b)$ or $f^2(a) \sqsubseteq f^2(b)$ often suffice to show satisfiability

Idea: Allow speculative inferences

1. $\neg(x \sqsubseteq y) \vee f(x) \sqsubseteq f(y)$
2. $a \sqsubseteq b$
3. $a \sqsubseteq f(c)$
4. $\neg(a \sqsubseteq c)$

1. Add $f(x) \simeq x$
2. Rewrite $a \sqsubseteq f(c)$ into $a \sqsubseteq c$ and get $\Box$: backtrack!
3. Add $f(f(x)) \simeq x$
4. $a \sqsubseteq b$ yields only $f(a) \sqsubseteq f(b)$
5. $a \sqsubseteq f(c)$ yields only $f(a) \sqsubseteq c$
6. Terminate and detect satisfiability

Speculative inferences in DPLL($\Gamma+\mathcal{T}$)

- Speculative inference: add *arbitrary* clause C
- To induce termination on sat input
- What if it makes problem unsat?!
- Detect conflict and backjump:
  - Keep track by adding $\lceil C \rceil \triangleright C$
  - $\lceil C \rceil$: new propositional variable (a "name" for C)
  - Speculative inferences are *reversible*

Speculative inferences in DPLL($\Gamma+\mathcal{T}$)

State of derivation: $M \parallel F$

Inference rule:

- *SpeculativeIntro*: add $\lceil C \rceil \triangleright C$ to F and $\lceil C \rceil$ to M
- Rule *SpeculativeIntro* also bounded by iterative deepening

Example as done by system

1. $\neg(x \sqsubseteq y) \vee f(x) \sqsubseteq f(y)$
2. $a \sqsubseteq b$
3. $a \sqsubseteq f(c)$
4. $\neg(a \sqsubseteq c)$

1. Add $\lceil f(x) \simeq x \rceil \triangleright f(x) \simeq x$
2. Rewrite $a \sqsubseteq f(c)$ into $\lceil f(x) \simeq x \rceil \triangleright a \sqsubseteq c$
3. Generate $\lceil f(x) \simeq x \rceil \triangleright \square$; Backtrack, learn $\neg\lceil f(x) \simeq x \rceil$
4. Add $\lceil f(f(x)) \simeq x \rceil \triangleright f(f(x)) \simeq x$
5. $a \sqsubseteq b$ yields only $f(a) \sqsubseteq f(b)$
6. $a \sqsubseteq f(c)$ yields only $f(a) \sqsubseteq f(f(c))$
   rewritten to $\lceil f(f(x)) = x \rceil \triangleright f(a) \sqsubseteq c$
7. Terminate and detect satisfiability

Decision procedures with speculative inferences

To decide satisfiability modulo $\mathcal{T}$ of $\mathcal{R} \cup P$:

- Find sequence of "speculative axioms" U
- Show that there exists k s.t. k-bounded DPLL($\Gamma+\mathcal{T}$) is guaranteed to terminate
  - with *Unsat* if $\mathcal{R} \cup P$ is $\mathcal{T}$-unsat
  - in a state which is not stuck at k if $\mathcal{R} \cup P$ is $\mathcal{T}$-sat

Decision procedures

- $\mathcal{R}$ has single monadic function symbol f
- *Essentially finite*: if $\mathcal{R} \cup P$ is sat, has model where range of f is *finite*
- Such a model satisfies $f^j(x) \simeq f^k(x)$ for some $j \neq k$
- *SpeculativeIntro* adds "pseudo-axioms" $f^j(x) \simeq f^k(x)$, $j > k$
- Use $f^j(x) \simeq f^k(x)$ as rewrite rule to limit term depth
- Clause length limited by properties of Γ and $\mathcal{R}$
- Only finitely many clauses generated: termination without getting stuck

Situations where clause length is limited

Γ: Superposition, Resolution + negative selection, Simplification

Negative selection: only positive literals in positive clauses are active

- $\mathcal{R}$ is Horn
- $\mathcal{R}$ is *ground-preserving*: variables in positive literals appear also in negative literals;
  the only positive clauses are ground

Axiomatizations of type systems

$$
\begin{array}{rll}
\text{Reflexivity} & x \sqsubseteq x & (1) \\
\text{Transitivity} & \neg(x \sqsubseteq y) \vee \neg(y \sqsubseteq z) \vee x \sqsubseteq z & (2) \\
\text{Anti-Symmetry} & \neg(x \sqsubseteq y) \vee \neg(y \sqsubseteq x) \vee x \simeq y & (3) \\
\text{Monotonicity} & \neg(x \sqsubseteq y) \vee f(x) \sqsubseteq f(y) & (4) \\
\text{Tree-Property} & \neg(z \sqsubseteq x) \vee \neg(z \sqsubseteq y) \vee x \sqsubseteq y \vee y \sqsubseteq x & (5)
\end{array}
$$

Multiple inheritance: $\mathrm{MI} = \{(1), (2), (3), (4)\}$
Single inheritance: $\mathrm{SI} = \mathrm{MI} \cup \{(5)\}$

Concrete examples of decision procedures

DPLL($\Gamma+\mathcal{T}$) with *SpeculativeIntro* adding $f^j(x) \simeq f^k(x)$ for $j > k$ decides the satisfiability modulo $\mathcal{T}$ of problems

- $\mathrm{MI} \cup P$
- $\mathrm{SI} \cup P$
- $\mathrm{MI} \cup \mathrm{TR} \cup P$ and $\mathrm{SI} \cup \mathrm{TR} \cup P$

where $\mathrm{TR} = \{\neg(g(x) \simeq null),\ h(g(x)) \simeq x\}$ has only infinite models!

Current and future work

- Beyond stable infiniteness: detecting lack of finite models
- More decision procedures by speculative intro
- Proof ordering based characterization
- A general framework for model-driven deduction

References

- M. P. Bonacina, C. A. Lynch and L. de Moura. On deciding satisfiability by theorem proving with speculative inferences. *Journal of Automated Reasoning*, 47(2):161–189, August 2011.
- A. Armando, M. P. Bonacina, S. Ranise and S. Schulz. New results on rewrite-based satisfiability procedures. *ACM Transactions on Computational Logic*, 10(1):129–179, January 2009.
- M. P. Bonacina and M. Echenim. On variable-inactivity and polynomial $\mathcal{T}$-satisfiability procedures. *Journal of Logic and Computation*, 18(1):77–96, February 2008.
- M. P. Bonacina, S. Ghilardi, E. Nicolini, S. Ranise and D. Zucchelli. Decidability and undecidability results for Nelson-Oppen and rewrite-based decision procedures. *Proc. of the 3rd IJCAR*, Springer, LNAI 4130, 513–527, 2006.