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  • Practical applications of SAT
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But first …
  • A brief Q&A session for Homework 1
  • Live SAT solving (or, partial assignment of students to project teams)
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Bounded Model Checking. First presented at FMCAD’98. In an unusual move, the Chairs included an extra talk on BMC. A 1999 paper describes its application at Motorola to verify a PowerPC processor.
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Bounded Model Checking (BMC) & Configuration Management
Bounded Model Checking (in general)

Given a system and a property, BMC checks if the property is satisfied by all executions of the system with $\leq k$ steps, on all inputs of size $\leq n$. 
Given a system and a property, BMC checks if the property is satisfied by all executions of the system with $\leq k$ steps, on all inputs of size $\leq n$.

We will focus on safety properties (i.e., making sure a bad state, such as an assertion violation, is not reached).
Bounded Model Checking (in general)

Testing: checks a few executions of arbitrary size

BMC: checks all executions of size $\leq k$

Verification: checks all executions of every size

low confidence        high confidence
low human labor       high human labor
BMC by example

```c
int daysToYear(int days) {
    int year = 1980;
    while (days > 365) {
        if (isLeapYear(year)) {
            if (days > 366) {
                days -= 366;
                year += 1;
            }
        } else {
            days -= 365;
            year += 1;
        }
    }
    return year;
}
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The Zune Bug: on December 31, 2008, all first generation Zune players from Microsoft became unresponsive because of this code. What’s wrong?
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```c
int daysToYear(int days) {
    int year = 1980;
    while (days > 365) {
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            if (days > 366) {
                days -= 366;
                year += 1;
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    return year;
}
```

Infinite loop triggered on the last day of every leap year.
A desired safety property: the value of the days variable decreases in every loop iteration.
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- Unwind all loops $k$ times (e.g., $k=1$), and add an unwinding assertion after each.
```c
int daysToYear(int days) {
    int year = 1980;
    if (days > 365) {
        int oldDays = days;
        if (isLeapYear(year)) {
            if (days > 366) {
                days -= 366;
                year += 1;
            }
        } else {
            days -= 365;
            year += 1;
        }
        assert days < oldDays;
        assert days <= 365;
    }
    return year;
}
```

- Unwind all loops $k$ times (e.g., $k=1$), and add an unwinding assertion after each.
- If a CEX violates a program assertion, we have found a buggy behavior of length $\leq k$. 

BMC step 1 of 4: finitize loops & inline calls
int daysToYear(int days) {
    int year = 1980;
    if (days > 365) {
        int oldDays = days;
        if (isLeapYear(year)) {
            if (days > 366) {
                days -= 366;
                year += 1;
            }
        } else {
            days -= 365;
            year += 1;
        }
        assert days < oldDays;
        assert days <= 365;
    }
    return year;
}
int daysToYear(int days) {
    int year = 1980;
    if (days > 365) {
        int oldDays = days;
        if (isLeapYear(year)) {
            if (days > 366) {
                days -= 366;
                year += 1;
            }
        } else {
            days -= 365;
            year += 1;
        }
        assert days < oldDays;
        assert days <= 365;
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    return year;
}
int daysToYear(int days) {  
    int year = 1980;
    if (days > 365) {  
        int oldDays = days;
        if (isLeapYear(year)) {  
            if (days > 366) {  
                days -= 366;
                year += 1;
            }  
        } else {  
            days -= 365;
            year += 1;
        }  
        assert days < oldDays;
    }  
    assert days <= 365;
}  
return year;

Assume call to isLeapYear is inlined (replaced with the procedure body). We’ll keep it for readability.
BMC step 2 of 4: eliminate side effects

```c
int daysToYear(int days) {
    int year = 1980;
    if (days > 365) {
        int oldDays = days;
        if (isLeapYear(year)) {
            if (days > 366) {
                days -= 366;
                year += 1;
            }
        } else {
            days -= 365;
            year += 1;
        }
        assert days < oldDays;
        assert days <= 365;
    }
    return year;
}
```
BMC step 2 of 4: eliminate side effects

```c
int days;
int year = 1980;
if (days > 365) {
    int oldDays = days;
    if (isLeapYear(year)) {
        if (days > 366) {
            days = days - 366;
            year = year + 1;
        }
    } else {
        days = days - 365;
        year = year + 1;
    }
    assert days < oldDays;
    assert days <= 365;
}
return year;
```

Convert to Static Single Assignment (SSA) form:

- Replace each assignment to a variable v with a definition of a fresh variable v
- Change uses of variables so that they refer to the correct definition (version).
- Make conditional dependences explicit with gated φ nodes.
BMC step 2 of 4: eliminate side effects

```c
int days0;
int year0 = 1980;
if (days0 > 365) {
    int oldDays0 = days0;
    if (isLeapYear(year0)) {
        if (days0 > 366) {
            days1 = days0 - 366;
            year1 = year0 + 1;
        }
    } else {
        days3 = days0 - 365;
        year3 = year0 + 1;
    }
    assert days4 < oldDays0;
    assert days4 <= 365;
} return year4;
```

Convert to Static Single Assignment (SSA) form:

- Replace each assignment to a variable `v` with a definition of a fresh variable `vi`.
- Change uses of variables so that they refer to the correct definition (version).
-
BMC step 2 of 4: eliminate side effects

```java
int days0;
int year0 = 1980;
boolean g0 = (days0 > 365);
int oldDays0 = days0;
boolean g1 = isLeapYear(year0);
boolean g2 = days0 > 366;
days1 = days0 - 366;
year1 = year0 + 1;
days2 = \phi(g1 && g2, days1, days0)
year2 = \phi(g1 && g2, year1, year0)
days3 = days0 - 365;
year3 = year0 + 1;
days4 = \phi(g1, days2, days3)
year4 = \phi(g1, year2, year3)
assert days4 < oldDays0;
assert days4 <= 365;
return year4;
```

Convert to Static Single Assignment (SSA) form:

- Replace each assignment to a variable \( v \) with a definition of a fresh variable \( v_i \).
- Change uses of variables so that they refer to the correct definition (version).
- Make conditional dependences explicit with gated \( \phi \) nodes.
BMC step 2 of 4: eliminate side effects

```java
int days0;
int year0 = 1980;
if (days0 > 365) {
    int oldDays0 = days0;
    if (isLeapYear(year0)) {
        if (days0 > 366) {
            days1 = days0 - 366;
            year1 = year0 + 1;
        }
    } else {
        days3 = days0 - 365;
        year3 = year0 + 1;
    }
} assert days4 < oldDays0;
assert days4 <= 365;
return year4;
```

```java
int days0;
int year0 = 1980;
boolean g0 = (days0 > 365);
int oldDays0 = days0;
boolean g1 = isLeapYear(year0);
boolean g2 = days0 > 366;
days1 = days0 - 366;
year1 = year0 + 1;
days2 = φ(g1 && g2, days1, days0);
year2 = φ(g1 && g2, year1, year0);
days3 = days0 - 365;
year3 = year0 + 1;
days4 = φ(g1, days2, days3);
year4 = φ(g1, year2, year3);
assert days4 < oldDays0;
assert days4 <= 365;
return year4;
```
BMC step 3 of 4: convert into equations

```java
int days0;
int year0 = 1980;
boolean g0 = (days0 > 365);
int oldDays0 = days0;
boolean g1 = isLeapYear(year0);
boolean g2 = days0 > 366;
days1 = days0 - 366;
year1 = year0 + 1;
days2 = φ(g1 && g2, days1, days0)
year2 = φ(g1 && g2, year1, year0)
days3 = days0 - 365;
year3 = year0 + 1;
days4 = φ(g1, days2, days3)
year4 = φ(g1, year2, year3)
assert days4 < oldDays0;
assert days4 <= 365;
return year4;
```
A solution to these equations is a sound counterexample: an interpretation for all logical variables that satisfies the program semantics (for up to k unwindings) but violates at least one of the assertions.
BMC step 4 of 4: convert into CNF

\[ year_1 = year_0 + 1 \]
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BMC step 4 of 4: convert into CNF

\[ \text{year}_1 = \text{year}_0 + 1 \]
int daysToYear(int days) {
    int year = 1980;
    while (days > 365) {
        int oldDays = days;
        if (isLeapYear(year)) {
            if (days > 366) {
                days -= 366;
                year += 1;
            }
        } else {
            days -= 365;
            year += 1;
        }
        assert days < oldDays;
    }
    return year;
}
Bounded Model Checking (BMC) & Configuration Management
Configuration Management

Given a configuration, consisting of a set of components, their dependencies, and conflicts:

• Decide if a new component can be added to the configuration.

• Add the component while optimizing some linear function.

• If the component cannot be added, find way to add it by removing as few conflicting components from the current configuration as possible.
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To install a, CNF constraints are:

- a depends on b, c, z.
- z already installed.
- c needs f or g.
Deciding if a component can be installed

Conflict: \(d\) and \(e\) cannot both be installed.

To install \(a\), CNF constraints are:
\[
(\neg a \lor b) \land (\neg a \lor c) \land (\neg a \lor z) \land
\]

\(z\) already installed.

\(a\) depends on \(b, c, z\).

\(c\) needs \(f\) or \(g\).
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To install a, CNF constraints are:

\[(\neg a \lor b) \land (\neg a \lor c) \land (\neg a \lor z) \land (\neg b \lor d) \land \]

Conflict: d and e cannot both be installed.
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\[(\neg a \lor b) \land (\neg a \lor c) \land (\neg a \lor z) \land
(\neg b \lor d) \land
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Deciding if a component can be installed

To install a, CNF constraints are:

\( (\neg a \lor b) \land (\neg a \lor c) \land (\neg a \lor z) \land (\neg b \lor d) \land (\neg c \lor d \lor e) \land (\neg c \lor f \lor g) \land (\neg d \lor \neg e) \land a \land z \)

Conflict: d and e cannot both be installed.
Optimal installation
Assume $f$ and $g$ are 5MB and 2MB each, and all other components are 1MB. To install $a$, while minimizing total size, pseudo-boolean constraints are:

Pseudo-boolean solvers accept a linear function to minimize, in addition to a (weighted) CNF.
Assume f and g are 5MB and 2MB each, and all other components are 1MB. To install a, while minimizing total size, pseudo-boolean constraints are:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{min} & \quad c_1 x_1 + \ldots + c_n x_n \\
 a_1 x_1 + \ldots + a_1 x_n \geq b_1 \\
 \vdots \\
 a_k x_1 + \ldots + a_k x_n \geq b_k
\end{align*}
\]
Assume f and g are 5MB and 2MB each, and all other components are 1MB. To install a, while minimizing total size, pseudo-boolean constraints are:

\[
\min a + b + c + d + e + 5f + 2g + y
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\min c_1x_1 + \ldots + c_nx_n \\
a_1x_1 + \ldots + a_nx_n \geq b_1 \\
\ldots \\
a_kx_1 + \ldots + a_kx_n \geq b_k
\end{align*}
\]
Assume f and g are 5MB and 2MB each, and all other components are 1MB. To install a, while minimizing total size, pseudo-boolean constraints are:

\[
\min a + b + c + d + e + 5f + 2g + y \\
(-a + b \geq 0) \land (-a + c \geq 0) \land (-a + z \geq 0) \land \\
(-b + d \geq 0) \land \\
(-c + d + e \geq 0) \land (-c + f + g \geq 0) \land \\
(-d + -e \geq -1) \land \\
(a \geq 1) \land (z \geq 1)
\]
Installation in the presence of conflicts
Installation in the presence of conflicts

a cannot be installed because it requires b, which requires d, which conflicts with e.
Installation in the presence of conflicts

To install a, while minimizing the number of removed components, Partial MaxSAT constraints are:

**hard:** \((-a \lor b) \land (-a \lor c) \land (-a \lor z) \land (-b \lor d) \land (-c \lor d \lor e) \land (-c \lor f \lor g) \land (-d \lor -e) \land a\)

**soft:** \(e \land z\)

Partial MaxSAT solver takes as input a set of **hard** clauses and a set of **soft** clauses, and it produces an assignment that satisfies all hard clauses and the greatest number of soft clauses.
Installation in the presence of conflicts

To install a, while minimizing the number of removed components, Partial MaxSAT constraints are:

**hard:** \((\neg a \lor b) \land (\neg a \lor c) \land (\neg a \lor z) \land (\neg b \lor d) \land (\neg c \lor d \lor e) \land (\neg c \lor f \lor g) \land (\neg d \lor \neg e) \land a\)

**soft:** \(e \land z\)

Partial MaxSAT solver takes as input a set of hard clauses and a set of soft clauses, and it produces an assignment that satisfies all hard clauses and the greatest number of soft clauses.
Summary

Today

• SAT solvers have been used successfully in many applications & domains
• But reducing problems to SAT is a lot like programming in assembly …
• We need higher-level logics!

Next lecture

• On to richer logics: introduction to Satisfiability Modulo Theories (SMT)