CS 5110/6110 – Software Verification | Spring 2018 Jan-22

#### Lecture 4 First-Order Theories

Zvonimir Rakamarić University of Utah

slides acknowledgements: Zohar Manna

#### Announcements

- Graded homework 1
- Points lost due to incomplete/unreliable implementations
  - Budget time for thorough testing
- Many solutions do not follow the prescribed input/output specification
  - Program input: An integer n > 0 entered as a command line argument..."
  - Program output is also well-specified
  - I did not deduct points for this

#### Last Time

- First-order logic
  - Syntax and semantics
  - Quantifiers
  - Undecidable

Proving validity with semantic argument method

### This Time

- First-order theories
- Reading: Chapter 3

#### **First-Order Theories**

- Software manipulates structures
  - Numbers, arrays, lists, bitvectors,...
- Software (and hardware) verification
  - Reasoning about such structures
- First-order theories
  - Formalize structures to enable reasoning about them
  - Validity is sometimes decidable

#### Definition

#### • First-order theory *T* defined by:

- Signature  $\Sigma_T$  set of constant, function, and predicate symbols
  - Have no meaning
- Axioms  $A_T$  set of closed (no free variables)  $\Sigma_T$  –formulae
  - $\blacktriangleright$  Provide meaning for symbols of  $\Sigma_{\mathcal{T}}$

# $\Sigma_{\mathcal{T}}$ -formula

#### • $\Sigma_{T}$ -formula is a formula constructed of:

- Constants, functions, and predicate symbols from  $\Sigma_{T}$
- Variables, logical connectives, and quantifiers

#### **T-interpretation**

Interpretation *I* is *T*-interpretation if it satisfies all axioms A<sub>T</sub> of *T*:

 $I \vDash A$  for every  $A \in A_T$ 

#### Satisfiability and Validity

- $\Sigma_T$ -formula *F* is satisfiable in theory *T*(*T*-satisfiable) if there is a *T*-interpretation *I* that satisfies *F*
- $\Sigma_T$ -formula *F* is valid in theory *T*(*T*-valid,  $T \models F$ ) if every *T*-interpretation *I* satisfies *F* 
  - Theory T consists of all closed T-valid formulae
- Two  $\Sigma_T$ -formulae  $F_1$  and  $F_2$  are equivalent in T(*T*-equivalent) if  $T \vDash F_1 \leftrightarrow F_2$

# Fragment of a Theory

- Fragment of theory T is a syntactically restricted subset of formulae of the theory
- Example:
  - Quantifier-free fragment of theory T is the set of formulae without quantifiers that are valid in T
- Often decidable fragments for undecidable theories

#### Decidability

- Theory *T* is decidable if *T*-validity is decidable for every Σ<sub>T</sub>-formula *F*
  - There is an algorithm that always terminates with "yes" if F is T-valid, and "no" if F is T-invalid
- Fragment of *T* is decidable if *T*-validity is decidable for every Σ<sub>T</sub>-formula *F* in the fragment

# **Common First-Order Theories**

- Theory of equality
- Peano arithmetic
- Presburger arithmetic
- Linear integer arithmetic
- Reals
- Rationals
- Arrays
- Recursive data structures
- Bitvectors

# Theory of Equality $T_E$

Signature

$$\Sigma_E: \{=, a, b, c, \dots, f, g, h, \dots, p, q, r, \dots\}$$

consists of:

- a binary predicate "=" interpreted using provided axioms
- constant, function, and predicate symbols

### Axioms of $T_E$

- 1.  $\forall x. x = x$ (reflexivity)2.  $\forall x, y. x = y \rightarrow y = x$ (symmetry)3.  $\forall x, y, z. x = y \land y = z \rightarrow x = z$ (transitivity)4. for each positive into p and p any function symbol f
- 4. for each positive int. n and n-ary function symbol *f*,

$$\forall x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_n. \ (\bigwedge_{i=1}^n x_i = y_i) \to f(x_1, \dots, x_n) = f(y_1, \dots, y_n)$$
  
(function congruence)

5. for each positive int. n and n-ary predicate symbol p,

$$\forall x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_n. \ (\bigwedge_{i=1}^n x_i = y_i) \to (p(x_1, \dots, x_n) \leftrightarrow p(y_1, \dots, y_n))$$
  
(predicate congruence)

# Decidability of $T_E$

- Bad news
  - $T_E$  is undecidable
- Good news
  - Quantifier-free fragment of  $T_E$  is decidable
  - Very efficient algorithms



#### $x=y \land y=z \rightarrow g(f(x),y)=g(f(z),x)$

#### Arithmetic: Natural Numbers and Integers

Natural numbers  $\mathbb{N} = \{0, 1, 2, ...\}$ Integers  $\mathbb{Z} = \{..., -2, -1, 0, 1, 2, ...\}$ 

Three theories:

- Peano arithmetic  $T_{PA}$ 
  - Natural numbers with addition (+), multiplication (\*), equality (=)
- Presburger arithmetic  $T_N$ 
  - Natural numbers with addition (+), equality (=)
- Theory of integers  $T_{\mathbb{Z}}$ 
  - Integers with addition (+), subtraction (-), comparison (>), equality (=), multiplication by constants

Peano Arithmetic  $T_{PA}$ 

 $\Sigma_{PA}$ : {0,1,+,\*,=}

- $T_{PA}$ -satisfiability and  $T_{PA}$ -validity are undecidable
  - Restrict the theory more

# Presburger Arithmetic $T_N$

 $\Sigma_{\mathbb{N}}$ : {0,1,+,=} no multiplication!

Axioms:

- 1. equality axioms for =
- 2. ∀*x*. ¬(*x*+1=0)
- 3.  $\forall x, y$ .  $x+1=y+1 \rightarrow x=y$
- 4.  $F[0] \land (\forall x.F[x] \rightarrow F[x+1]) \rightarrow \forall x.F[x]$  (induction)
- 5.  $\forall x. x + 0 = x$
- 6.  $\forall x, y. x+(y+1)=(x+y)+1$

*x*] (induction) (plus zero)

(successor)

(zero)

(plus successor)

### Decidability of $T_{\mathbb{N}}$

#### • $T_{N}$ -satisfiability and $T_{N}$ -validity are decidable

### Theory of Integers $T_{\mathbb{Z}}$

$$\Sigma_{\mathbb{Z}}: \{\dots, -2, -1, 0, 1, 2, \dots, -3^*, -2^*, 2^*, 3^*, \dots, +, -, =, >\}$$
 where

• ...,-2,-1,0,1,2,... are constants

...,-3\*,-2\*,2\*,3\*,... are unary functions
 (intended meaning: 2\*x is x+x, -3\*x is -x-x-x)

+,-,>,= have the usual meaning

*T*<sub>N</sub> and *T*<sub>Z</sub> have the same expressiveness
 Every Σ<sub>Z</sub>-formula can be reduced to Σ<sub>N</sub>-formula
 Every Σ<sub>N</sub>-formula can be reduced to Σ<sub>Z</sub>-formula

#### Example of $T_{\mathbb{Z}}$ to $T_{\mathbb{N}}$ Reduction

Consider  $\Sigma_{\mathbb{Z}}$ -formula  $F_0: \forall w, x. \exists y, z. x + 2^*y - z - 13 > -3^*w + 5$ 

Introduce two variables  $v_p$  and  $v_n$  (range over natural numbers) for each variable v (range over integers) in  $F_0$ :

$$F_{1}: \forall w_{p}, w_{n}, x_{p}, x_{n}. \exists y_{p}, y_{n}, z_{p}, z_{n}.$$
  
$$(x_{p}-x_{n}) + 2^{*}(y_{p}-y_{n}) - (z_{p}-z_{n}) - 13 > -3^{*}(w_{p}-w_{n}) + 5$$

Eliminate - by moving to the other side of >:

$$F_{2}: \forall w_{p}, w_{n}, x_{p}, x_{n}. \exists y_{p}, y_{n}, z_{p}, z_{n}.$$
  
$$x_{p} + 2^{*}y_{p} + z_{n} + 3^{*}w_{p} > x_{n} + 2^{*}y_{n} + z_{p} + 13 + 3^{*}w_{n} + 5$$

### Example of $T_{\mathbb{Z}}$ to $T_{\mathbb{N}}$ Reduction cont.

Eliminate \* and >:

•  $F_3$  is a  $\Sigma_N$ -formula equisatisfiable to  $F_0$ 

### Example of $T_{\mathbb{N}}$ to $T_{\mathbb{Z}}$ Reduction

Consider  $\Sigma_{\mathbb{N}}$ -formula  $F: \forall x. \exists y. x=y+1$ 

*F* is equisatisfiable to  $\Sigma_{\mathbb{Z}}$ -formula  $\forall x. \ x > -1 \rightarrow \exists y. \ y > -1 \land x = y + 1$ 

Decidability of  $T_{\mathbb{Z}}$ 

•  $T_{\mathbb{Z}}$ -satisfiability and  $T_{\mathbb{Z}}$ -validity are decidable



#### $x > z \land y >= 0 \rightarrow x + y > z$

Theory of Reals  $T_{\mathbb{R}}$  and Rationals  $T_{\mathbb{Q}}$  $\Sigma_{\mathbb{R}} : \{0, 1, +, -, *, =, \}$  with multiplication

$$\Sigma_{\mathbb{Q}}$$
: {0, 1, +, -, =, }

without multiplication

# Decidability of $T_{\mathbb{R}}$ and $T_{\mathbb{Q}}$

- Both are decidable
  - High time complexity
- Quantifier-free fragment of  $T_{\mathbb{Q}}$  is efficiently decidable

# Theory of Arrays $T_A$

- $\Sigma_A$ : {*select*, *store*, =} where
  - select(a,i) is a binary function:
    - read array a at index i
  - store(a, i, v) is a ternary function:
    - write value v to index i of array a

### Axioms of $T_A$

- 1.  $\forall a, i, j. i = j \rightarrow select(a, i) = select(a, j)$ (array congruence)
- 2.  $\forall a, v, i, j. i = j \rightarrow select(store(a, i, v), j) = v$ (select-store 1)
- 3.  $\forall a, v, i, j. i \neq j \rightarrow select(store(a, i, v), j) = select(a, j)$ (select-store 2)

# Note about $T_A$

- Equality (=) is only defined for array elements...
  - Example:

 $select(a,i)=e \rightarrow \forall j. select(store(a,i,e),j)=select(a,j)$ is  $T_A$ -valid

- …and not for whole arrays
  - Example:

```
select(a,i)=e \rightarrow store(a,i,e)=a
is not T_A-valid
```

# Decidability of $T_A$

- ► T<sub>A</sub> is undecidable
- Quantifier-free fragment of  $T_A$  is decidable

# Theory of Arrays with Extensionality $T_A^{=}$

Signature and axioms of  $T_A^{=}$  are the same as  $T_A$ , with one additional axiom:

 $\forall a, b. \ (\forall i. select(a, i) = select(b, i)) \leftrightarrow a = b$ 

(extensionality)

►  $T_A^{=}$ -valid example select(a,i)=e  $\rightarrow$  store(a,i,e)=a

# Decidability of $T_A^{=}$

- $T_A^{=}$  is undecidable
- Quantifier-free fragment of  $T_A^{=}$  is decidable

### Summary of Decidability Results

Theory		Quantifiers Decidable	QFF Decidable
$T_E$	Equality	NO	YES
$T_{PA}$	Peano Arithmetic	NO	NO
$T_{\mathbb{N}}$	Presburger Arithmetic	YES	YES
$T_{\mathbb{Z}}$	Linear Integer Arithmetic	YES	YES
$T_{\mathbb{R}}$	Real Arithmetic	YES	YES
$T_{\mathbb{Q}}$	Linear Rationals	YES	YES
$T_{A}$	Arrays	NO	YES

# Summary of Complexity Results

	Theory	Quantifiers	QF Conjunctive
PL	Propositional Logic	NP-complete	O(n)
$T_E$	Equality	—	$O(n \log n)$
$T_{\mathbb{N}}$	Presburger Arithmetic	O(2^2^2^(kn))	NP-complete
$T_{\mathbb{Z}}$	Linear Integer Arithmetic	O(2^2^2^(kn))	NP-complete
$\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{R}}$	<b>Real Arithmetic</b>	O(2^2^(kn))	O(2^2^(kn))
${\mathcal T}_{\mathbb Q}$	Linear Rationals	O(2^2^(kn))	PTIME
$T_A$	Arrays	_	NP-complete

n – input formula size; k – some positive integer



#### Z3 examples