

Formal Methods in Software Engineering

Satisfiability Modulo Theories — Spring 2025

Konstantin Chukharev

§1 First-Order Theories

Motivation

Consider the signature $\Sigma = \langle \Sigma^S, \Sigma^F \rangle$ for a fragment of number theory:

- $\Sigma^S = \{\text{Nat}\}$, $\Sigma^F = \{0, 1, +, <\}$
- $\text{rank}(0) = \text{rank}(1) = \langle \text{Nat} \rangle$
- $\text{rank}(+) = \langle \text{Nat}, \text{Nat}, \text{Nat} \rangle$
- $\text{rank}(<) = \langle \text{Nat}, \text{Nat}, \text{Bool} \rangle$

1. Consider the Σ -sentence: $\forall x : \text{Nat}. \neg(x < x)$

- Is it *valid*, that is, true under *all* interpretations?
- No, e.g., if we interpret $<$ as *equals* or *divides*.

2. Consider the Σ -sentence: $\neg \exists x : \text{Nat}. (x < 0)$

- Is it *valid*?
- No, e.g., if we interpret Nat as the set of *all* integers.

3. Consider the Σ -sentence: $\forall x : \text{Nat}. \forall y : \text{Nat}. \forall z : \text{Nat}. (x < y) \wedge (y < z) \rightarrow (x < z)$

- Is it *valid*?
- No, e.g., if we interpret $<$ as the *successor* relation.

Motivation [2]

In practice, we often *do not care* about satisfiability or validity in *general*, but rather with respect to a *limited class* of interpretations.

A practical reason:

- When reasoning in a particular application domain, we typically have *specific* data types/structures in mind (e.g., integers, strings, lists, arrays, finite sets, ...).
- More generally, we are typically *not* interested in *arbitrary* interpretations, but rather in *specific* ones.

Theories formalize this domain-specific reasoning: we talk about satisfiability and validity *with respect to a theory* or “*modulo a theory*”.

A computational reason:

- The validity problem for FOL is *undecidable* in general.
- However, the validity problem for many *restricted* theories, is *decidable*.

First-Order Theories

Hereinafter, we assume that we have an infinite set of variables X .

Definition 1 (Theory): A first-order *theory* \mathcal{T} is a pair¹ $\langle \Sigma, M \rangle$, where

- $\Sigma = \langle \Sigma^S, \Sigma^F \rangle$ is a first-order signature,
- M is a class² of Σ -interpretations over X that is *closed under variable re-assignment*.

Definition 2: M is *closed under variable re-assignment* if every Σ -interpretation that differs from one in M in the way it interprets the variables in X is also in M .

A theory limits the interpretations of Σ -formulas to those from M .

¹Here, we use **bold** style for M to denote that it is *not a single* model, but a *collection* of them.

²*Class* is a generalization of a set.

Theory Examples

Example: Theory of Real Arithmetic $\mathcal{T}_{\text{RA}} = \langle \Sigma_{\text{RA}}, \mathcal{M}_{\text{RA}} \rangle$:

- $\Sigma_{\text{RA}}^S = \{\text{Real}\}$
- $\Sigma_{\text{RA}}^F = \{+, -, \times, \leq\} \cup \{q \mid q \text{ is a decimal numeral}\}$
- All $\mathcal{I} \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{RA}}$ interpret `Real` as the set of *real numbers* \mathbb{R} , each q as the *decimal number* that it denotes, and the function symbols in the usual way.

Example: Theory of Ternary Strings $\mathcal{T}_{\text{TS}} = \langle \Sigma_{\text{TS}}, \mathcal{M}_{\text{TS}} \rangle$:

- $\Sigma_{\text{TS}}^S = \{\text{String}\}$
- $\Sigma_{\text{TS}}^F = \{\cdot, <\} \cup \{a, b, c\}$
- All $\mathcal{I} \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{TS}}$ interpret `String` as the set $\{a, b, c\}^*$ of all finite strings over the characters $\{a, b, c\}$, symbol \cdot as string concatenation (e.g., $a \cdot b = ab$), and $<$ as lexicographic order.

\mathcal{T} -interpretations

Definition 3 (Reduct): Let Σ and Ω be two signatures over variables X , where $\Omega \supseteq \Sigma$, that is, $\Omega^S \supseteq \Sigma^S$ and $\Omega^F \supseteq \Sigma^F$.

Let \mathcal{J} be an Ω -interpretation over X .

The *reduct* \mathcal{J}^Σ of \mathcal{J} to Σ is a Σ -interpretation obtained from \mathcal{J} by restricting it to the symbols in Σ .

Definition 4 (\mathcal{T} -interpretation): Given a theory $\mathcal{T} = \langle \Sigma, \mathcal{M} \rangle$, a *\mathcal{T} -interpretation* is any Ω -interpretation \mathcal{J} for some signature $\Omega \supseteq \Sigma$ such that $\mathcal{J}^\Sigma \in \mathcal{M}$.

Note: This definition allows us to consider the satisfiability in a theory $\mathcal{T} = \langle \Sigma, \mathcal{M} \rangle$ of formulas that contain sorts or function symbols not in Σ . These symbols are usually called *uninterpreted* (in \mathcal{T}).

\mathcal{T} -interpretations [2]

Example: Consider again the theory of real arithmetic $\mathcal{T}_{\text{RA}} = \langle \Sigma_{\text{RA}}, \mathcal{M}_{\text{RA}} \rangle$.

All $\mathcal{J} \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{RA}}$ interpret `Real` as \mathbb{R} and function symbols as usual.

Which of the following interpretations are \mathcal{T}_{RA} -interpretations?

1. $\text{Real}^{\mathcal{J}_1} = \mathbb{Q}$, symbols in Σ_{RA}^F interpreted as usual. ✗
2. $\text{Real}^{\mathcal{J}_2} = \mathbb{R}$, symbols in Σ_{RA}^F interpreted as usual, and $\text{String}^{\mathcal{J}_2} = \{0.5, 1.3\}$. ✓
3. $\text{Real}^{\mathcal{J}_3} = \mathbb{R}$, symbols in Σ_{RA}^F interpreted as usual, and $\log^{\mathcal{J}_3}$ is the successor function. ✓

\mathcal{T} -satisfiability, \mathcal{T} -entailment, \mathcal{T} -validity

Definition 5 (\mathcal{T} -satisfiability): A Σ -formula α is *satisfiable in \mathcal{T}* , or *\mathcal{T} -satisfiable*, if it is satisfied by *some* \mathcal{T} -interpretation \mathcal{I} .

Definition 6 (\mathcal{T} -entailment): A set Γ of formulas *\mathcal{T} -entails* a formula α , if every \mathcal{T} -interpretation that satisfies all formulas in Γ also satisfies α .

Definition 7 (\mathcal{T} -validity): A formula α is *\mathcal{T} -valid*, if it is satisfied by *all* \mathcal{T} -interpretations.

Note: A formula α is *\mathcal{T} -valid* iff $\emptyset \models \alpha$.

Example: Which of the following Σ_{RA} -formulas is satisfiable or valid in \mathcal{T}_{RA} ?

1. $(x_0 + x_1 \leq 0.5) \wedge (x_0 - x_1 \leq 2)$
2. $\forall x_0. (x_0 + x_1 \leq 1.7) \rightarrow (x_1 \leq 1.7 - x_0)$
3. $\forall x_0. \forall x_1. (x_0 + x_1 \leq 1)$

satisfiable, falsifiable
satisfiable, valid
unsatisfiable, falsifiable

FOL vs Theory

For every signature Σ , entailment and validity in “pure” FOL can be seen as entailment and validity in the theory $\mathcal{T}_{\text{FOL}} = \langle \Sigma, M_{\text{FOL}} \rangle$ where M_{FOL} is the class of *all possible* Σ -interpretations.

- Pure first-order logic = reasoning over *all* possible interpretations.
- Reasoning modulo a theory = *restricting* interpretations with some domain constraints.
- Theories make automated reasoning *feasible* in many domains.

Axiomatization

Definition 8 (Axiomatic theory): A first-order *axiomatic theory* \mathcal{T} is defined by a signature Σ and a set \mathcal{A} of Σ -sentences, or *axioms*.

Definition 9 (\mathcal{T} -validity in axiomatic theory): An Ω -formula α is *valid* in an axiomatic theory \mathcal{T} if it is entailed by the axioms of \mathcal{T} , that is, every Ω -interpretation \mathcal{I} that satisfies \mathcal{A} also satisfies α .

Note: Axiomatic theories are a *special case* of the general definition (via \mathbf{M}) of theories.

- Given an axiomatic theory \mathcal{T}' defined by Σ and \mathcal{A} , we can define a theory $\mathcal{T} = \langle \Sigma, \mathbf{M} \rangle$ where \mathbf{M} is the class of all Σ -interpretations that satisfy all axioms in \mathcal{A} .
- It is not hard to show that a formula α is valid in \mathcal{T} *iff* it is valid in \mathcal{T}' .

Note: Not all theories are first-order axiomatizable.

Non-Axiomatizable Theories

Note: Not all theories are first-order axiomatizable.

Example: Consider the theory \mathcal{T}_{Nat} of the natural numbers, with signature Σ with $\Sigma^S = \{\text{Nat}\}$, $\Sigma^F = \{0, S, +, <\}$, and $M = \{\mathcal{I}\}$ where $\text{Nat}^{\mathcal{I}} = \mathbb{N}$ and Σ^F is interpreted as usual.

Any set of axioms (for example, *Peano axioms*) for this theory is satisfied by *non-standard models*, e.g., interpretations \mathcal{I}' where $\text{Nat}^{\mathcal{I}'}$ includes other chains of elements besides the natural numbers.

However, these models *falsify* formulas that are *valid* in \mathcal{T}_{Nat} .

For example, “every number is either zero or a successor”: $\forall x. (x \doteq 0) \vee \exists y. (x \doteq S(y))$.

- **true** in the *standard* model, i.e. $\text{Nat}^{\mathcal{I}} = \mathbb{N} = \{0, 1 := S(0), 2 := S(1), \dots\}$.
- **false** in *non-standard* models, e.g., $\text{Nat}^{\mathcal{I}'} = \{0, 1, 2, \dots\} \cup \{\omega, \omega + 1, \dots\}$
 - ▶ Intuitively, ω is “an infinite element”.
 - ▶ The successor function still applies: $S(\omega) = \omega + 1$, $S(\omega + 1) = \omega + 2$, etc.
 - ▶ Even the addition and multiplication still works: $\omega + 3 = S(S(S(\omega)))$, $\omega \times 2 = \omega + \omega$.
 - ▶ But ω is larger than all standard numbers: $\omega > 0, \omega > 1, \dots$

Peano Arithmetic

Definition 10: *Peano arithmetic* \mathcal{T}_{PA} , or *first-order arithmetic*, is the axiomatic theory of natural numbers with signature $\Sigma_{\text{PA}}^F = \{0, S, +, \times, =\}$ and *Peano axioms*:

1. $\forall x. (S(x) \neq 0)$ (zero)
2. $\forall x. \forall y. (S(x) = S(y)) \rightarrow (x = y)$ (successor)
3. $F[0] \wedge (\forall x. F[x] \rightarrow F[x + 1]) \rightarrow \forall x. F[x]$ (induction)
4. $\forall x. (x + 0 = x)$ (plus zero)
5. $\forall x. \forall y. (x + S(y) = S(x + y))$ (plus successor)
6. $\forall x. (x \times 0 = 0)$ (times zero)
7. $\forall x. \forall y. (x \times S(y) = (x \times y) + x)$ (times successor)

Axiom (induction) is the *induction axiom schema*. It stands for an *infinite* set of axioms, one for each Σ_{PA} -formula F with one free variable. The notation $F[\alpha]$ means that F contains α as a sub-formula.

The *intended interpretation* (*standard models*) of \mathcal{T}_{PA} have the domain \mathbb{N} and the usual interpretations of the function symbols as $0_{\mathbb{N}}$, $S_{\mathbb{N}}$, $+_{\mathbb{N}}$, and $\times_{\mathbb{N}}$.

Presburger Arithmetic

Note: Satisfiability and validity in $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{P}_A}$ is undecidable. Therefore, we need a more restricted theory of arithmetic that does not include multiplication.

Definition 11: *Presburger arithmetic* $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{N}}$ is the axiomatic theory of natural numbers with signature $\Sigma_{\mathbb{N}}^F = \{0, S, +, =\}$ and the *subset* of *Peano axioms*:

1. $\forall x. (S(x) \neq 0)$ (zero)
2. $\forall x. \forall y. (S(x) = S(y)) \rightarrow (x = y)$ (successor)
3. $F[0] \wedge (\forall x. F[x] \rightarrow F[x + 1]) \rightarrow \forall x. F[x]$ (induction)
4. $\forall x. (x + 0 = x)$ (plus zero)
5. $\forall x. \forall y. (x + S(y) = S(x + y))$ (plus successor)

Note: Presburger arithmetic is decidable.

Completeness of Theories

Definition 12: A Σ -theory \mathcal{T} is *complete* if for every Σ -sentence α , either α or $\neg\alpha$ is valid in \mathcal{T} .

Note: In a complete Σ -theory, every Σ -sentence is either valid or unsatisfiable.

Example: Any theory $\mathcal{T} = \langle \Sigma, M \rangle$ where all interpretations in M only differ in how they interpret the variables (e.g., \mathcal{T}_{RA}) is *complete*.

Example: The axiomatic (mono-sorted) theory of *monoids* with $\Sigma^F = \{ \cdot, \varepsilon \}$ and axioms

$$\forall x. \forall y. \forall z. (x \cdot y) \cdot z \doteq x \cdot (y \cdot z) \quad \forall x. (x \cdot \varepsilon \doteq x) \quad \forall x. (\varepsilon \cdot x \doteq x)$$

is *incomplete*. For example, the sentence $\forall x. \forall y. (x \cdot y \doteq y \cdot x)$ is *true* in some monoids (e.g. the addition of integers *is* commutative) but *false* in others (e.g. the concatenation of strings *is not* commutative).

Completeness of Theories [2]

Example: The axiomatic (mono-sorted) theory of *dense linear orders without endpoints* with $\Sigma^F = \{<\}$ and the following axioms is *complete*.

$$\forall x. \forall y. (x < y) \rightarrow \exists z. ((x < z) \wedge (z < y)) \quad (\text{dense})$$

$$\forall x. \forall y. ((x < y) \vee (y < x) \vee (x = y)) \quad (\text{linear})$$

$$\forall x. \neg(x < x) \quad \forall x. \forall y. \forall z. ((x < y) \wedge (y < z) \rightarrow (x < z)) \quad (\text{orders})$$

$$\forall x. \exists y. (y < x) \quad \forall x. \exists y. (x < y) \quad (\text{without endpoints})$$

Decidability

Recall that a set A is *decidable* if there exists a *terminating* procedure that, given an input element a , returns (after *finite* time) either “yes” if $a \in A$ or “no” if $a \notin A$.

Definition 13: A theory $\mathcal{T} = \langle \Sigma, M \rangle$ is *decidable* if the set of all \mathcal{T} -valid Σ -formulas is decidable.

Definition 14: A *fragment* of \mathcal{T} is a *syntactically-restricted subset* of \mathcal{T} -valid Σ -formulas.

Example: The *quantifier-free* fragment of \mathcal{T} is the set of all \mathcal{T} -valid Σ -formulas *without quantifiers*.

Example: The *linear* fragment of \mathcal{T}_{RA} is the set of all \mathcal{T} -valid Σ_{RA} -formulas *without multiplication* (\times).

Axiomatizability

Definition 15: A theory $\mathcal{T} = \langle \Sigma, M \rangle$ is *recursively axiomatizable* if M is the class of all interpretations satisfying a *decidable set* of first-order axioms \mathcal{A} .

Theorem 1 (Lemma): Every recursively axiomatizable theory \mathcal{T} admits a procedure $E_{\mathcal{T}}$ that *enumerates* all \mathcal{T} -valid formulas.

Theorem 2: For every *complete* and *recursively axiomatizable* theory \mathcal{T} , validity in \mathcal{T} is decidable.

Proof: Given a formula α , use $E_{\mathcal{T}}$ to enumerate all valid formulas. Since \mathcal{T} is complete, either α or $\neg\alpha$ will eventually (after *finite* time) be produced by $E_{\mathcal{T}}$. □

§2 Introduction to SMT

Common Theories in SMT

Satisfiability Modulo Theories (SMT) traditionally focuses on theories with *decidable quantifier-free fragments*.

SMT is concerned with (un)satisfiability, but recall that a formula α is \mathcal{T} -*valid* iff $\neg\alpha$ is \mathcal{T} -*unsatisfiable*.

Checking the (un)satisfiability of quantifier-free formulas in main background theories *efficiently* has a large number of applications in:

- hardware and software verification
- model checking
- symbolic execution
- compiler validation
- type checking
- planning and scheduling
- software synthesis
- cyber-security
- verifiable machine learning
- analysis of biological systems

Further, we are going to study:

- A few of those *theories* and their *decision procedures*.
- *Proof systems* to reason *modulo theories* automatically.

From Quantifier-Free Formulas to Conjunctions of Literals


Theorem 3: The satisfiability of *quantifier-free* formulas in a theory \mathcal{T} is *decidable* iff the satisfiability in \mathcal{T} of *conjunctions of literals* is decidable.

Here, *literal* is an atom or its negation. For example: $(a \doteq b)$, $\neg(a + 1 < b)$, $(f(b) \doteq g(f(a)))$.

Proof: A quantifier-free formula can be transformed into disjunctive normal form (DNF), and its satisfiability reduces to checking satisfiability of conjunctions of literals. Conversely, a conjunction of literals is a special case of a quantifier-free formula. Thus, the two satisfiability problems are equivalent. \square

Theory Solvers

Definition 16 (\mathcal{T} -solver): A *theory solver*, or \mathcal{T} -*solver*, is a specialized decision procedure for the satisfiability of conjunctions of literals in a theory \mathcal{T} .



Theory of Uninterpreted Functions

Definition 17: Given a signature Σ , the most general theory consists of the class of *all* Σ -interpretations. In fact, this is a *family* of theories parameterized by the signature Σ .

It is known as the theory of *equality with uninterpreted functions* \mathcal{T}_{EUF} , or the *empty theory*, since it contains no *sentences*.

Example: $(a \doteq b) \wedge (f(a) \doteq b) \wedge \neg(g(a) \doteq g(f(a)))$ Is this formula satisfiable in \mathcal{T}_{EUF} ?

Both validity and satisfiability are undecidable in \mathcal{T}_{EUF} .

- Validity in \mathcal{T}_{EUF} is *semi-decidable* — this is just a validity in FOL.
- Since a formula α is \mathcal{T} -satisfiable iff $\neg\alpha$ is not \mathcal{T} -valid, \mathcal{T}_{EUF} -satisfiability is *co-recognizable*.

However, the satisfiability of *conjunctions of \mathcal{T}_{EUF} -literals* is *decidable*, in polynomial time, using the *congruence closure* algorithm.

Theory of Real Arithmetic

Definition 18: The theory of *real arithmetic* \mathcal{T}_{RA} is a theory of inequalities over the real numbers.

- $\Sigma^S = \{\text{Real}\}$
- $\Sigma^F = \{+, -, \times, <\} \cup \{q \mid q \text{ is a decimal numeral}\}$
- \mathcal{M} is the class of interpretations that interpret Real as the set of *real numbers* \mathbb{R} , and the function symbols in the usual way.

Satisfiability in the full \mathcal{T}_{RA} is *decidable* (in worst-case doubly-exponential time).

Restricted fragments of \mathcal{T}_{RA} can be decided more efficiently.

Example: Quantifier-free linear real arithmetic (QF_LRA) is the theory of *linear* inequalities over the reals, where \times can only be used in the form of *multiplication by constants* (decimal numerals).

The satisfiability of conjunctions of literals in QF_LRA is *decidable* in *polynomial time*.

Theory of Integer Arithmetic

Definition 19: The theory of *integer arithmetic* \mathcal{T}_{IA} is a theory of inequalities over the integers.

- $\Sigma^S = \{\text{Int}\}$
- $\Sigma^F = \{+, -, \times, <\} \cup \{n \mid n \text{ is an integer numeral}\}$
- \mathcal{M} is the class of interpretations that interpret Int as the set of *integers* \mathbb{Z} , and the function symbols in the usual way.

Satisfiability in \mathcal{T}_{IA} is *not even semi-decidable*!

Satisfiability of quantifier-free Σ -formulas in \mathcal{T}_{IA} is *undecidable* as well.

Linear integer arithmetic (LIA, also known as *Presburger arithmetic*) is decidable, but not efficiently (in worst-case triply-exponential time). Its quantifier-free fragment (QF_LIA) is NP-complete.

Theory of Arrays with Extensionality

Definition 20: The theory of *arrays* \mathcal{T}_{AX} is useful for modelling RAM or array data structures.

- $\Sigma^S = \{A, I, E\}$ (arrays, indices, elements)
- $\Sigma^F = \{\text{read}, \text{write}\}$, where $\text{rank}(\text{read}) = \langle A, I, E \rangle$ and $\text{rank}(\text{write}) = \langle A, I, E, A \rangle$

Let a be a variable of sort A , variable i of sort I , and variable v of sort E .

- $\text{read}(a, i)$ denotes the value stored in array a at index i .
- $\text{write}(a, i, v)$ denotes the array that stores value v at index i and is otherwise identical to a .

Example: $\text{read}(\text{write}(a, i, v), i) \doteq_E v$

- Is this formula *intuitively* valid/satisfiable/unsatisfiable in \mathcal{T}_A ?

Example: $\forall i. (\text{read}(a, i) \doteq_E \text{read}(a', i)) \rightarrow (a \doteq_A a')$

- Is this formula *intuitively* valid/satisfiable/unsatisfiable in \mathcal{T}_A ?

Theory of Arrays with Extensionality [2]

Definition 21: The theory of arrays $\mathcal{T}_{\text{AX}} = \langle \Sigma, M \rangle$ is finitely axiomatizable.

M is the class of interpretations that satisfy the following axioms:

1. $\forall a. \forall i. \forall v. (\text{read}(\text{write}(a, i, v), i) \doteq_{\text{E}} v)$
2. $\forall a. \forall i. \forall j. \forall v. \neg(i \doteq_{\text{I}} j) \rightarrow (\text{read}(\text{write}(a, i, v), j) \doteq_{\text{E}} \text{read}(a, j))$
3. $\forall a. \forall b. (\forall i. (\text{read}(a, i) \doteq_{\text{E}} \text{read}(b, i))) \rightarrow (a \doteq_{\text{A}} b)$

Note: The last axiom is called *extensionality* axiom. It states that two arrays are equal if they have the same values at all indices. It can be omitted to obtain a theory of arrays *without extensionality* \mathcal{T}_{A} .

Validity and satisfiability in \mathcal{T}_{AX} is *undecidable*.

There are several *decidable fragments* of \mathcal{T}_{A} .

Survey of Decidability and Complexity

Theory	Description	Full	QF	Full complexity	QFC complexity
PL	Propositional Logic	—	yes	NP-complete	$\Theta(n)$
\mathcal{T}_{EUF}	Equality	no	yes	undecidable	$\mathcal{O}(n \log n)$
\mathcal{T}_{PA}	Peano Arithmetic	no	no	undecidable	undecidable
$\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{N}}$	Presburger Arithmetic	yes	yes	$\Omega(2^{2^n}), \mathcal{O}(2^{2^{kn}})$	NP-complete
$\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{Z}}$	Linear Integers (LIA)	yes	yes	$\Omega(2^{2^n}), \mathcal{O}(2^{2^{kn}})$	NP-complete
$\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{R}}$	Reals	yes	yes	$\mathcal{O}(2^{2^{kn}})$	$\mathcal{O}(2^{2^{kn}})$
$\mathcal{T}_{\mathbb{Q}}$	Linear Rationals	yes	yes	$\Omega(2^n), \mathcal{O}(2^{2^{kn}})$	PTIME
\mathcal{T}_{RDS}	Recursive Data Structures	no	yes	undecidable	$\mathcal{O}(n \log n)$
$\mathcal{T}_{\text{ARDS}}$	Acyclic RDS	yes	yes	not elementary recursive	$\Theta(n)$
\mathcal{T}_{A}	Arrays	no	yes	undecidable	NP-complete
\mathcal{T}_{AX}	Arrays with Extensionality	no	yes	undecidable	NP-complete

Survey of Decidability and Complexity [2]

Legend for the table:

- “**Full**” denotes the decidability of a complete theory *with* quantifiers.
- “**QF**” denotes the decidability of a *quantifier-free* theory.
- “**Full complexity**” denotes the complexity of the satisfiability in a complete theory *with quantifiers*.
- “**QFC complexity**” denotes the complexity of the satisfiability in a *quantifier-free conjunctive* fragment.
- For complexities, n is the size of the input formula, k is some positive integer.
- “*Not elementary recursive*” means the runtime cannot be bounded by a fixed-height stack of exponentials.

§3 Difference Logic

Difference Logic

Definition 22: *Difference logic* (DL) is a fragment of linear integer arithmetic consisting of conjunctions of literals of the very restricted form:

$$x - y \bowtie c$$

where x and y are integer variables, c is a numeral, and $\bowtie \in \{=, <, \leq, >, \geq\}$.

A solver for difference logic consists of three steps:

1. Literals normalization.
2. Conversion to a graph.
3. Cycle detection.

Decision Procedure for DL

Step 1: Rewrite each literal using \leq by applying the following rules:

1. $(x - y = c) \longrightarrow (x - y \leq c) \wedge (x - y \geq c)$
2. $(x - y \geq c) \longrightarrow (y - x \leq -c)$
3. $(x - y > c) \longrightarrow (y - x < -c)$
4. $(x - y < c) \longrightarrow (x - y \leq c - 1)$

Step 2: Construct a weighted directed graph G with a vertex for each variable and an edge $x \xrightarrow{c} y$ for each literal $(x - y \leq c)$.

Step 3: Check for *negative cycles* in G .

- Use, for example, the Bellman-Ford algorithm.
- If G contains a negative cycle, the set of literals is *inconsistent* (UNSAT).
- Otherwise, the set of literals is *consistent* (SAT).

Difference Logic Example


Consider the following set of difference logic literals:

$$(x - y = 5) \wedge (z - y \geq 2) \wedge (z - x > 2) \wedge (w - x = 2) \wedge (z - w < 0)$$

Normalize the literals:

- $(x - y = 5) \implies (x - y \leq 5) \wedge (y - x \leq -5)$
- $(z - y \geq 2) \implies (y - z \leq -2)$
- $(z - x > 2) \implies (x - z \leq -3)$
- $(w - x = 2) \implies (w - x \leq 2) \wedge (x - w \leq -2)$
- $(z - w < 0) \implies (z - w \leq -1)$

UNSAT because of the negative cycle: $x \xrightarrow{-3} z \xrightarrow{-1} w \xrightarrow{2} x$.



§4 Equality

Theory of Equality with Uninterpreted Functions

Definition 23: The theory of equality with uninterpreted functions \mathcal{T}_{EUF} is defined by the signature $\Sigma^F = \{\dot{=}, f, g, h, \dots\}$ (*interpreted* equality and *uninterpreted* functions) and the following axioms:

1. $\forall x. x \dot{=} x$ (reflexivity)
2. $\forall x. \forall y. (x \dot{=} y) \rightarrow (y \dot{=} x)$ (symmetry)
3. $\forall x. \forall y. \forall z. (x \dot{=} y) \wedge (y \dot{=} z) \rightarrow (x \dot{=} z)$ (transitivity)
4. $\forall x. \forall y. (x = y) \rightarrow (f(x) \dot{=} f(y))$ (function congruence)

Flattening

Definition 24: A literal is *flat* if it is of the form:

- $x \doteq y$
- $\neg(x \doteq y)$
- $x \doteq f(z)$

where x and y are variables, f is a function symbol, and z is a tuple of 0 or more variables.

Note: Any set of literals can be converted to an equisatisfiable set of *flat* literals by introducing *new* variables and equating non-equational atoms to *true*.

Example: Consider the set of literals: $\{x + y > 0, y \doteq f(g(z))\}$.

We can convert it to an equisatisfiable set of flat literals by introducing fresh variables v_i :

$$\{ v_1 \doteq v_2 > v_3, \quad v_1 \doteq \text{true}, \quad v_2 \doteq x + y, \quad v_3 \doteq 0, \quad y \doteq f(v_4), \quad v_4 \doteq g(z) \}$$

Hereinafter, we will assume that all literals are *flat*.

Notation and Assumptions

- We abbreviate $\neg(s \doteq t)$ with $s \not\doteq t$.
- For tuples $\mathbf{u} = \langle u_1, \dots, u_n \rangle$ and $\mathbf{v} = \langle v_1, \dots, v_n \rangle$, we abbreviate $(u_1 \doteq v_1) \wedge \dots \wedge (u_n \doteq v_n)$ with $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{v}$.
- Γ is used to refer to the “current” proof state in rule premises.
- $\Gamma, s \doteq t$ is an abbreviation for $\Gamma \cup \{s \doteq t\}$.
- If applying a rule R does not change Γ , then R *is not applicable* to Γ , that is, Γ is *irreducible* w.r.t. R .

Satisfiability Proof System for QF_UF

Let QF_UF be the quantifier-free fragment of FOL over some signature Σ .

Below is a simple *satisfiability proof system* R_{UF} for QF_UF:

REFL $\frac{x \text{ occurs in } \Gamma}{\Gamma := \Gamma, x \doteq x}$	CONG $\frac{x \doteq f(u) \in \Gamma \quad y \doteq f(v) \in \Gamma \quad u = v \in \Gamma}{\Gamma := \Gamma, x \doteq y}$
SYMM $\frac{x \not\doteq y \in \Gamma}{\Gamma := \Gamma, y \doteq x}$	CONTR $\frac{x \doteq y \in \Gamma \quad x \not\doteq y \in \Gamma}{\text{UNSAT}}$
TRANS $\frac{x \not\doteq y \in \Gamma \quad y \doteq z \in \Gamma}{\Gamma := \Gamma, x \doteq z}$	SAT $\frac{\text{No other rules apply}}{\text{SAT}}$

Is R_{UF} *sound*?

Is R_{UF} *terminating*?

Example Derivation in R_{UF}

REFL $\frac{x \text{ occurs in } \Gamma}{\Gamma := \Gamma, x \doteq x}$	TRANS $\frac{x \not\doteq y \in \Gamma \quad y \doteq z \in \Gamma}{\Gamma := \Gamma, x \doteq z}$	CONTR $\frac{x \doteq y \in \Gamma \quad x \not\doteq y \in \Gamma}{\text{UNSAT}}$
SYMM $\frac{x \not\doteq y \in \Gamma}{\Gamma := \Gamma, y \doteq x}$	CONG $\frac{x \doteq f(u) \in \Gamma \quad y \doteq f(v) \in \Gamma \quad u = v \in \Gamma}{\Gamma := \Gamma, x \doteq y}$	SAT $\frac{\text{No other rules apply}}{\text{SAT}}$

Example: Determine the satisfiability of the following set of literals: $a \doteq f(f(a))$, $a \doteq f(f(f(a)))$, $g(a, f(a)) \not\doteq g(f(a), a)$. Flatten the literals and construct the following proof:

$a \doteq f(a_1), a_1 \doteq f(a), a \doteq f(a_2), a_2 \doteq f(a_1), a_3 \not\doteq a_4, a_3 \doteq g(a, a_1), a_4 \doteq g(a_1, a)$	REFL
$a_1 \doteq a_1$	CONG applied to $a \doteq f(a_1), a_2 \doteq f(a_1), a_1 \doteq a_1$
$a \doteq a_2$	CONG applied to $a_1 \doteq f(a), a \doteq f(a_2), a \doteq a_2$
$a_1 \doteq a$	SYMM
$a \doteq a_1$	CONG applied to $a_3 \doteq g(a, a_1), a_4 \doteq g(a_1, a), a \doteq a_1, a_1 \doteq a$
$a_3 \doteq a_4$	CONTR applied to $a_3 \doteq a_4, a_3 \not\doteq a_4$
UNSAT	

Soundness of R_{UF}

Theorem 4 (Refutation soundness): A literal set Γ_0 is unsatisfiable if R_{UF} derives UNSAT from it.

Proof: All rules except SAT are satisfiability-preserving.

If a derivation from Γ_0 ends with UNSAT, then Γ_0 must be unsatisfiable. □

Theorem 5 (Solution soundness): A literal set Γ_0 is satisfiable if R_{UF} derives SAT from it.

Proof: Let Γ be a proof state to which SAT applies. From Γ , we can construct an interpretation \mathcal{J} that satisfies Γ_0 . Let $s \sim t$ iff $(s \doteq t) \in \Gamma$. One can show that \sim is an equivalence relation.

Let the domain of \mathcal{J} be the equivalence classes E_1, \dots, E_k of \sim .

- For every variable or a constant t , let $t^{\mathcal{J}} = E_i$ if $t \in E_i$ for some i . Otherwise, let $t^{\mathcal{J}} = E_1$.
- For every unary function symbol f , and equivalence class E_i , let $f^{\mathcal{J}}$ be such that $f^{\mathcal{J}}(E_i) = E_j$ if $f(t) \in E_j$ for some $t \in E_i$. Otherwise, let $f^{\mathcal{J}}(E_i) = E_1$. Define $f^{\mathcal{J}}$ for non-unary f similarly.

We can show that $\mathcal{J} \models \Gamma$. This means that \mathcal{J} models Γ_0 as well since $\Gamma_0 \subseteq \Gamma$. □

Termination in R_{UF}

Theorem 6: Every derivation strategy for R_{UF} terminates.

Proof: R_{UF} adds to the current state Γ only equalities between variables of Γ_0 .

So, at some point it will run out of new equalities to add.

□

Completeness of R_{UF}

Theorem 7 (Refutation completeness): Every derivation strategy applied to an unsatisfiable state Γ_0 ends with UNSAT.

Proof: Let Γ_0 be an unsatisfiable state. Suppose there was a derivation from Γ_0 that did not end with UNSAT. Then, by the termination theorem, it would have to end with SAT. But then R_{UF} would be not be solution sound. \square

Theorem 8 (Solution completeness): Every derivation strategy applied to a satisfiable state Γ_0 ends with SAT.

Proof: Let Γ_0 be a satisfiable state. Suppose there was a derivation from Γ_0 that did not end with SAT. Then, by the termination theorem, it would have to end with UNSAT. But then R_{UF} would be not be refutation sound. \square

§5 Arrays

Theory of Arrays

Definition 25: The theory of *arrays* \mathcal{T}_{AX} is defined by the signature $\Sigma^S = \{A, I, E\}$ (arrays, indices, elements), $\Sigma^F = \{\text{read}, \text{write}\}$ and the following axioms:

1. $\forall a. \forall i. \forall v. (\text{read}(\text{write}(a, i, v), i) \doteq_E v)$
2. $\forall a. \forall i. \forall j. \forall v. \neg(i \doteq_I j) \rightarrow (\text{read}(\text{write}(a, i, v), j) \doteq_E \text{read}(a, j))$
3. $\forall a. \forall b. (\forall i. (\text{read}(a, i) \doteq_E \text{read}(b, i))) \rightarrow (a \doteq_A b)$

Example

```
void ReadBlock(int data[], int x, int len) {  
    int i = 0;  
    int next = data[0];  
    for (; i < next && i < len; i = i + 1) {  
        if (data[i] == x)  
            break;  
        else  
            Process(data[i]);  
    }  
    assert(i < len);  
}
```

One pass through this code can be translated into the following \mathcal{T}_A formula:

$$(i \doteq 0) \wedge (\text{next} \doteq \text{read}(\text{data}, 0)) \wedge (i < \text{next}) \wedge \\ \wedge (i < \text{len}) \wedge (\text{read}(\text{data}, i) \doteq x) \wedge \neg(i < \text{len})$$

Satisfiability Proof System for QF_AX

The satisfiability proof system R_{AX} for \mathcal{T}_{AX} *extends* the proof system R_{UF} for \mathcal{T}_{UF} with the following rules:

$$\begin{array}{c} \mathbf{RINTRO1} \frac{b \doteq \text{write}(a, i, v) \in \Gamma}{\Gamma := \Gamma, v \doteq \text{read}(b, i)} \\ \\ \mathbf{RINTRO2} \frac{b \doteq \text{write}(a, i, v) \in \Gamma \quad u \doteq \text{read}(x, j) \in \Gamma \quad x \in \{a, b\}}{\Gamma := \Gamma, i \doteq j \quad \Gamma := \Gamma, i \neq j, u \doteq \text{read}(a, j), u \doteq \text{read}(b, j)} \\ \\ \mathbf{EXT} \frac{a \neq b \in \Gamma \quad a \text{ and } b \text{ are arrays}}{\Gamma := \Gamma, u \neq v, u \doteq \text{read}(a, k), v \doteq \text{read}(b, k)} \end{array}$$

- **RINTRO1**: After writing v at index i , the reading at the same index i gives us back the value v .
- **RINTRO2**: After writing v in a at index i , the reading from a or b at index j *splits* in two cases: (1) i equals j , (2) a and b have the same value u at position j .
- **EXT**: If two arrays a and b are distinct, they must differ at some index k .

Example Derivation in R_{AX}

$$\begin{array}{l}
 \mathbf{RINTRO1} \frac{b \doteq \text{write}(a, i, v) \in \Gamma}{\Gamma := \Gamma, v \doteq \text{read}(b, i)} \quad \mathbf{EXT} \frac{a \not\equiv b \in \Gamma \quad a \text{ and } b \text{ are arrays}}{\Gamma := \Gamma, u \not\equiv v, u \doteq \text{read}(a, k), v \doteq \text{read}(b, k)} \\
 \mathbf{RINTRO2} \frac{b \doteq \text{write}(a, i, v) \in \Gamma \quad u \doteq \text{read}(x, j) \in \Gamma \quad x \in \{a, b\}}{\Gamma := \Gamma, i \doteq j \quad \Gamma := \Gamma, i \not\equiv j, u \doteq \text{read}(a, j), u \doteq \text{read}(b, j)}
 \end{array}$$

Example: Determine the satisfiability of $\{\text{write}(a_1, i, \text{read}(a_1, i)) \doteq \text{write}(a_2, i, \text{read}(a_2, i)), a_1 \not\equiv a_2\}$.

First, flatten the literals:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \{\text{write}(a_1, i, \text{read}(a_1, i)) \doteq \text{write}(a_2, i, \text{read}(a_2, i))\} \longrightarrow \\
 & \longrightarrow \{a'_1 \doteq a'_2, a'_1 \doteq \text{write}(a_1, i, \text{read}(a_2, i)), a'_2 \doteq \text{write}(a_2, i, \text{read}(a_1, i)), a_1 \not\equiv a_2\} \longrightarrow \\
 & \longrightarrow \{a'_1 \doteq a'_2, a'_1 \doteq \text{write}(a_1, i, v_2), v_2 \doteq \text{read}(a_2, i), a'_2 \doteq \text{write}(a_2, i, v_1), v_1 \doteq \text{read}(a_1, i), a_1 \not\equiv a_2\}
 \end{aligned}$$

Example Derivation in R_{AX} [2]

1. $a'_1 \doteq a'_2, a'_1 \doteq \text{write}(a_1, i, v_2), v_2 \doteq \text{read}(a_2, i), a'_2 \doteq \text{write}(a_2, i, v_1), v_1 \doteq \text{read}(a_1, i), a_1 \not\doteq a_2$
2. (by REFL) $a_1 \doteq a_1$
3. (by REFL) $a_2 \doteq a_2$
4. (by EXT) $u_1 \not\doteq u_2, u_1 \doteq \text{read}(a_1, n), u_2 \doteq \text{read}(a_2, n)$
5. (by RINTRO2) split

-
6. $i \doteq n$
 7. (by CONG) $v_1 \doteq u_1$
 8. (by SYMM) $u_1 \doteq v_1$
 9. (by CONG) $v_2 \doteq u_2$
 10. (by RINTRO1) $v_2 \doteq \text{read}(a'_1, i)$
 11. (by RINTRO1) $v_1 \doteq \text{read}(a'_2, i)$
 12. (by REFL) $i \doteq i$
 13. (by CONG) $v_1 \doteq v_2$
 14. (by TRANS) $u_1 \doteq u_2$
 15. (by CONTR) UNSAT

-
6. $i \not\doteq n, u_1 \doteq \text{read}(a'_1, n)$
 7. (by RINTRO2) split

-
8. $i \doteq n$
 9. (by CONTR) UNSAT

-
8. $i \not\doteq n, u_2 \doteq \text{read}(a'_2, n)$
 9. (by RELF) $n \doteq n$
 10. (by CONG) $u_1 \doteq u_2$
 11. (by CONTR) UNSAT

§6 *Arithmetic*

Theory of Real Arithmetic

Definition 26: The theory of *real arithmetic* \mathcal{T}_{RA} is defined by the signature $\Sigma_{\text{RA}}^S = \{\text{Real}\}$, $\Sigma_{\text{RA}}^F = \{+, -, \times, \leq\} \cup \{q \mid q \text{ is a decimal numeral}\}$ and the class of interpretations \mathcal{M}_{RA} that interpret Real as the set of *real numbers* \mathbb{R} , and the function symbols in the usual way.

Quantifier-free linear real arithmetic (QF_LRA) is the theory of *linear inequalities* over the reals, where \times can only be used in the form of *multiplication by constants (decimal numerals)*.

Linear Programming

Definition 27: A *linear program* (LP) consists of:

1. An $m \times n$ matrix \mathbf{A} , the *constraint matrix*.
2. An m -dimensional vector \mathbf{b} .
3. An n -dimensional vector \mathbf{c} , the *objective function*.

Let \mathbf{x} be a vector of n variables.

Goal: Find a solution \mathbf{x} that *maximizes* $\mathbf{c}^T \mathbf{x}$ subject to the linear constraints $\mathbf{Ax} \leq \mathbf{b}$ (and³ $\mathbf{x} \geq \mathbf{0}$).

Note: All **bold**-styled symbols denote *vectors* or *matrices*, e.g., \mathbf{x} , \mathbf{A} , $\mathbf{0}$.

³The constraint $\mathbf{x} \geq \mathbf{0}$ is introduced when LP is expressed in *standard form*, explained later in these slides.

Example and Terminology

Example: Maximize $2x_2 - x_1$ subject to:

$$x_1 + x_2 \leq 3$$

$$2x_1 - x_2 \leq -5$$

Here, $\mathbf{x} = \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{bmatrix}$, $\mathbf{A} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 2 & -1 \end{bmatrix}$, $\mathbf{b} = \begin{bmatrix} 3 \\ -5 \end{bmatrix}$, $\mathbf{c} = \begin{bmatrix} -1 \\ 2 \end{bmatrix}$.

Find \mathbf{x} that maximizes $\mathbf{c}^T \mathbf{x}$ subject to $\mathbf{Ax} \leq \mathbf{b}$.

Definition 28: An assignment of \mathbf{x} is a *feasible solution* if it satisfies $\mathbf{Ax} \leq \mathbf{b}$.

- Is $\mathbf{x} = \langle 0, 0 \rangle$ a feasible solution? ✗
- Is $\mathbf{x} = \langle -2, 1 \rangle$ a feasible solution? ✓

Definition 29: For a given assignment \mathbf{x} , the value $\mathbf{c}^T \mathbf{x}$ is the *objective value*, or *cost*, of \mathbf{x} .

- What is the objective value of $\mathbf{x} = \langle -2, 1 \rangle$?

Example and Terminology [2]

Definition 30: An *optimal solution* is a feasible solution with a *maximal* objective value among all feasible solutions.

Definition 31: If a linear program has no feasible solutions, it is *infeasible*.

Definition 32: The linear program is *unbounded* if the objective value of the optimal solution is ∞ .

Geometric Interpretation

Definition 33: A *polytope* is a generalization of 3-dimensional polyhedra to higher dimensions.

Definition 34: A polytope P is *convex* if every point on the line segment connecting any two points in P is also within P .

Formally, for all $a, b \in \mathbb{R}^n \cap P$, and for all $\lambda \in [0; 1]$, it holds that $\lambda a + (1 - \lambda)b \in P$.


Note: For an $m \times n$ constraint matrix A , the set of points $P = \{x \mid Ax \leq b\}$ forms a *convex polytope* in n -dimensional space.

LP goal: find a point x *inside the polytope* that maximizes $c^T x$ for a given c .

Note: LP is *infeasible* iff the polytope is *empty*.

Note: LP is *unbounded* iff the polytope is *open* in the direction of the objective function.

Note: The *optimal solution* for a bounded LP lies on a *vertex* of the polytope.



Satisfiability as Linear Programming

Our goal is to use LP to check the satisfiability of *sets of linear \mathcal{T}_{RA} -literals*.

Step 1: Convert equalities to inequalities.

- A linear \mathcal{T}_{RA} -equality can be written to have the form $\mathbf{a}^T \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{b}$.
- We rewrite this further as $\mathbf{a}^T \mathbf{x} \geq \mathbf{b}$ and $\mathbf{a}^T \mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{b}$.
- And finally to $-\mathbf{a}^T \mathbf{x} \leq -\mathbf{b}$ and $\mathbf{a}^T \mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{b}$.

Step 2: Handle inequalities.

- A \mathcal{T}_{RA} -literal of the form $\mathbf{a}^T \mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{b}$ is already in the desired form.
- A \mathcal{T}_{RA} -literal of the form $\neg(\mathbf{a}^T \mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{b})$ is transformed as follows:

$$\neg(\mathbf{a}^T \mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{b}) \longrightarrow (\mathbf{a}^T \mathbf{x} > \mathbf{b}) \longrightarrow (-\mathbf{a}^T \mathbf{x} < -\mathbf{b}) \longrightarrow (-\mathbf{a}^T \mathbf{x} + y \leq -\mathbf{b}), (y > 0)$$

where y is a fresh variable used for all negated inequalities.

Example: $\neg(2x_1 - x_2 \leq 3)$ rewrites to $-2x_1 + x_2 + y \leq -3, y > 0$

- If there are no negated inequalities, add the inequality $y \leq 1$, where y is a fresh variable.

Satisfiability as Linear Programming [2]

- In either case, we end up with a set of the form $\mathbf{a}^T \mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{b} \cup \{y > 0\}$

Step 3: Check the satisfiability of $\mathbf{a}^T \mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{b} \cup \{y > 0\}$.

Encode it as LP: maximize y subject to $\mathbf{a}^T \mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{b}$.

The final system is *satisfiable* iff the *optimal value* for y is *positive*.

Methods for Solving LP

- *Simplex* (Dantzig, 1947) — exponential time $\mathcal{O}(2^n)$
- *Ellipsoid* (Khachiyan, 1979) — polynomial time $\mathcal{O}(n^6)$
- *Projective* (Karmarkar, 1984) — polynomial time $\mathcal{O}(n^{3.5})$
- And many more tricky algorithms approaching $\mathcal{O}(n^{2.5})$

Note: Although the Simplex method is the *oldest* and the *least efficient in theory*, it can be implemented to be *quite efficient in practice*. It remains the most popular and we will focus on it next.

Standard Form

Any LP can be transformed to *standard form*:

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{maximize } \sum_{j=1}^n c_j x_j \\ &\text{such that } \sum_{j=1}^m a_{ij} x_j \leq b_i \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, m \\ &\quad x_j \geq 0 \text{ for } j = 1, \dots, n \end{aligned}$$

Example: Next, we are going to use the following running example LP:

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{maximize } 5x_1 + 4x_2 + 3x_3 \\ &\text{such that } \begin{cases} 2x_1 + 3x_2 + x_3 \leq 5 \\ 4x_1 + x_2 + 2x_3 \leq 11 \\ 3x_1 + 4x_2 + 2x_3 \leq 8 \\ x_1, x_2, x_3 \geq 0 \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Slack Variables

- Observe the first inequality: $2x_1 + 3x_2 + x_3 \leq 5$
- Define a *new variable* to represent the *slack*:

$$x_4 = 5 - 2x_1 - 3x_2 - x_3, \quad x_4 \geq 0$$

- Do this for each constraint, so that everything becomes *equalities*.
- Define a new variable to represent the *objective value*: $z = 5x_1 + 4x_2 + 3x_3$

$$\max 5x_1 + 4x_2 + 3x_3$$

$$\text{s.t.} \begin{cases} 2x_1 + 3x_2 + x_3 \leq 5 \\ 4x_1 + x_2 + 2x_3 \leq 11 \\ 3x_1 + 4x_2 + 2x_3 \leq 8 \\ x_1, x_2, x_3 \geq 0 \end{cases}$$



$$\max z$$

$$\text{s.t.} \begin{cases} x_4 = 5 - 2x_1 - 3x_2 - x_3 \\ x_5 = 11 - 4x_1 - x_2 - 2x_3 \\ x_6 = 8 - 3x_1 - 4x_2 - 2x_3 \\ z = 5x_1 + 4x_2 + 3x_3 \\ x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, x_5, x_6 \geq 0 \end{cases}$$

Note: Optimal solution remains optimal for the new problem.

The Simplex Strategy

- Start with a feasible solution.
 - For our example, assign 0 to all variables.
 $x_1 \mapsto 0, x_2 \mapsto 0, x_3 \mapsto 0$
 - Assign the introduced variables their computed values.
 $x_4 \mapsto 5, x_5 \mapsto 11, x_6 \mapsto 8, z \mapsto 0$
- Iteratively improve the objective value.
 - Go from \mathbf{x} to \mathbf{x}' only if $z(\mathbf{x}) \leq z(\mathbf{x}')$.

What can we improve here?

One option is to make x_1 larger, leaving x_2 and x_3 unchanged:

- $x_1 = 1 \longrightarrow x_4 = 3, x_5 = 7, x_6 = 1, z = 5$ ✓
- $x_1 = 2 \longrightarrow x_4 = 1, x_5 = 3, x_6 = 2, z = 10$ ✓
- $x_1 = 3 \longrightarrow x_4 = -1, \dots$ ✗ *no longer feasible!*

$$\begin{cases} x_4 = 5 - 2x_1 - 3x_2 - x_3 \\ x_5 = 11 - 4x_1 - x_2 - 2x_3 \\ x_6 = 8 - 3x_1 - 4x_2 - 2x_3 \\ z = 5x_1 + 4x_2 + 3x_3 \end{cases}$$

The Simplex Strategy [2]

We can't increase x_1 *too much*. Let's increase it as much as possible, *without compromising feasibility*.

$$\begin{array}{l} x_1 \mapsto 0, x_2 \mapsto 0, x_3 \mapsto 0 \\ \left\{ \begin{array}{l} x_4 = 5 - 2x_1 - 3x_2 - x_3 \\ x_5 = 11 - 4x_1 - x_2 - 2x_3 \\ x_6 = 8 - 3x_1 - 4x_2 - 2x_3 \\ z = 5x_1 + 4x_2 + 3x_3 \end{array} \right. \end{array} \longrightarrow \left\{ \begin{array}{l} x_1 \leq \frac{5}{2} \\ x_1 \leq \frac{11}{4} \\ x_1 \leq \frac{8}{3} \end{array} \right.$$

Select the *tightest bound*, $x_1 \leq \frac{5}{2}$.

- New assignment: $x_1 \mapsto \frac{5}{2}, x_2 \mapsto x_3 \mapsto x_4 \mapsto 0, x_5 \mapsto 1, x_6 \mapsto \frac{1}{2}, z \mapsto \frac{25}{2}$
- This indeed improves the objective value z .

The Simplex Strategy [3]

Current assignment:

- $x_1 \mapsto \frac{5}{2}, x_2 \mapsto x_3 \mapsto x_4 \mapsto 0, x_5 \mapsto 1, x_6 \mapsto \frac{1}{2}, z \mapsto \frac{25}{2}$

How do we continue?

For the first iteration we had:

- A *feasible solution*.
- An *equation system* where the variables with positive values are expressed in terms of variables with 0 value.

Does the current *equation system* satisfy this property? **No** ✗

$$\begin{cases} x_4 = 5 - 2x_1 - 3x_2 - x_3 \\ x_5 = 11 - 4x_1 - x_2 - 2x_3 \\ x_6 = 8 - 3x_1 - 4x_2 - 2x_3 \\ z = 5x_1 + 4x_2 + 3x_3 \end{cases}$$

The Simplex Strategy [4]

What should we change?

- Initially, x_1 was 0 and x_4 was positive.
- Now, x_1 is positive and x_4 is 0.

Isolate x_1 and *eliminate* it from right-hand-side:

$$\bullet \quad x_4 = 5 - 2x_1 - 3x_2 - x_3 \quad \longrightarrow \quad x_1 = \frac{5}{2} - \frac{3}{2}x_2 - \frac{1}{2}x_3 - \frac{1}{2}x_4$$

$$x_1 \mapsto \frac{5}{2}, x_2 \mapsto x_3 \mapsto x_4 \mapsto 0$$

$$\begin{cases} x_4 = 5 - 2x_1 - 3x_2 - x_3 \\ x_5 = 11 - 4x_1 - x_2 - 2x_3 \\ x_6 = 8 - 3x_1 - 4x_2 - 2x_3 \\ z = 5x_1 + 4x_2 + 3x_3 \end{cases}$$

$$\begin{cases} x_4 = 5 - 2x_1 - 3x_2 - x_3 \\ x_5 = 11 - 4x_1 - x_2 - 2x_3 \\ x_6 = 8 - 3x_1 - 4x_2 - 2x_3 \\ z = 5x_1 + 4x_2 + 3x_3 \end{cases}$$



$$\begin{cases} x_1 = \frac{5}{2} - \frac{3}{2}x_2 - \frac{1}{2}x_3 - \frac{1}{2}x_4 \\ x_5 = 1 + 5x_2 + \quad \quad \quad + 2x_4 \\ x_6 = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2}x_2 - \frac{1}{2}x_3 + \frac{3}{2}x_4 \\ z = \frac{25}{2} - \frac{7}{2}x_2 + \frac{1}{2}x_3 - \frac{5}{2}x_4 \end{cases}$$

The Simplex Strategy [5]

How can we improve z further?

- **Option 1:** decrease x_2 or x_4 , but we can't since $x_2, x_4 \geq 0$.
- **Option 2:** increase x_3 . *By how much?*

x_3 's bounds: $x_3 \leq 5, x_3 \leq \infty, x_3 \leq 1$.

We increase x_3 to its tightest bound 1.

- New assignment: $x_1 \mapsto 2, x_2 \mapsto 0, x_3 \mapsto 1, x_4 \mapsto 0, x_5 \mapsto 0, x_6 \mapsto 0$.
- This gives $z = 13$, which is again an improvement.

As before, we switch x_6 and x_3 , and *eliminate* x_3 from the right-hand-side:

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} x_1 = \frac{5}{2} - \frac{3}{2}x_2 - \frac{1}{2}x_3 - \frac{1}{2}x_4 \\ x_5 = 1 + 5x_2 + \quad \quad + 2x_4 \\ x_6 = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2}x_2 - \frac{1}{2}x_3 + \frac{3}{2}x_4 \\ z = \frac{25}{2} - \frac{7}{2}x_2 + \frac{1}{2}x_3 - \frac{5}{2}x_4 \end{array} \right. \longrightarrow \left\{ \begin{array}{l} x_1 = 2 - 2x_2 - 2x_4 + x_6 \\ x_5 = 1 + 5x_2 + 2x_4 \\ x_3 = 1 + x_2 + 3x_4 - 2x_6 \\ z = 13 - 3x_2 - x_4 - x_6 \end{array} \right.$$

$$x_1 \mapsto \frac{5}{2}, x_2 \mapsto 0, x_3 \mapsto 0, x_4 \mapsto 0$$

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} x_1 = \frac{5}{2} - \frac{3}{2}x_2 - \frac{1}{2}x_3 - \frac{1}{2}x_4 \\ x_5 = 1 + 5x_2 + \quad \quad + 2x_4 \\ x_6 = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2}x_2 - \frac{1}{2}x_3 + \frac{3}{2}x_4 \\ z = \frac{25}{2} - \frac{7}{2}x_2 + \frac{1}{2}x_3 - \frac{5}{2}x_4 \end{array} \right.$$

The Simplex Strategy [6]

Can we improve z again?

- No, because $x_2, x_4, x_6 \geq 0$, and all *appear with negative signs* in the objective function.

So, we are done, and the optimal value of z is 13.

The optimal solution is then $x_1 \mapsto 2, x_2 \mapsto 0, x_3 \mapsto 1$.

$$x_1 \mapsto 2, x_2 \mapsto 0, x_3 \mapsto 1,$$

$$x_4 \mapsto 0, x_6 \mapsto 0$$

$$\begin{cases} x_1 = 2 - 2x_2 - 2x_4 + x_6 \\ x_5 = 1 + 5x_2 + 2x_4 \\ x_3 = 1 + x_2 + 3x_4 - 2x_6 \\ z = 13 - 3x_2 - x_4 - x_6 \end{cases}$$

The Simplex Algorithm

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{maximize } \sum_{j=1}^n c_j x_j \\ &\text{such that } \sum_{j=1}^m a_{ij} x_j \leq b_i \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, m \\ &\quad x_j \geq 0 \text{ for } j = 1, \dots, n \end{aligned}$$

1. Introduce slack variables x_{n+1}, \dots, x_{n+m} .
2. Set $x_{n+i} = b_i - \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} x_j$ for $i = 1, \dots, m$.
3. Start with initial, *feasible* solution. (commonly, $x_1 \mapsto 0, \dots, x_n \mapsto 0$)
4. While some summands in the current objective function have *positive coefficients*, update the feasible solution to improve the objective value. Otherwise, stop.
5. Update the equations to *maintain the invariant* that all right-hand-side values have value 0.
6. Go to 4.

§7 CDCL(\mathcal{T})

CDCL(\mathcal{T}) Architecture

$$\text{CDCL}(\mathcal{T}) = \text{CDCL}(X) + \mathcal{T}\text{-solver}$$

CDCL(X):

- Very *similar to a SAT solver*, enumerates Boolean models.
- Not allowed: pure literal rule (and other SAT specific heuristics).
- Required: incremental addition of clauses.
- Desirable: partial model detection.


\mathcal{T} -solver:

- Checks the \mathcal{T} -satisfiability of conjunctions of literals.
- Computes *theory propagations*.
- Produces *explanations* of \mathcal{T} -unsatisfiability/propagation.
- Must be *incremental* and *backtrackable*.

Typical SMT Solver Architecture

SAT Solver:

- Only sees *Boolean skeleton* of a problem.
- Builds *partial model* by assigning truth values to literals
- Sends these literals to the core as *assertions*



Core:

- Sends each assertion to the appropriate theory
- Sends deduced literals to other theories/SAT solver
- Handles *theory combination*

Theory Solvers:

- Check \mathcal{T} -satisfiability of sets of theory literals
- Incremental
- Backtrackable
- Conflict generation
- Theory propagation

§8 Combining Theories

Motivation

TODO

TODO

- ☒ theory of arrays \mathcal{T}_A
- ☒ satisfiability proof system for \mathcal{T}_A
- ☒ example of derivation in R_{AX}
- ☐ soundness, termination, completeness of R_{AX}
- ☐ RDS solver
- ☐ Bit-vector solver
- ☐ String solver
- ☒ LRA
- ☒ Linear programming
- ☐ Simplex algorithm
- ☐ Combination of theories