

Tuesday 8th October, 2019

“Synthesize program safety spec by learning from membership”?

Let $X = \{x_1, \dots, x_i\}$ be the named program variables. Let $N = \{n_1, \dots, n_i\}$ be the numeric variables of finite domain. Let atomic predicates involving x_i, x_j, n_i be of the form $x_i \leq x_j \mid x_i \leq n_i \mid n_i \leq x_i$. Let B representing a set of safety-violating program states be a formula of atomic predicates involving X, N . The safety problem is to check $SAT(B)$.

Let B be not explicitly known. Suppose an honest oracle O that answers membership query is given; this can be a human teacher who knows if some certain state $B(X_k, N_k)$ realized by concrete valuations of X_k, N_k is undesirable but at the same time cannot give a full account of B . (Impossible?)

The goal is to check $SAT(B)$ by learning the specification of B from O .

Thing 1. *Can we know if $SAT(B)$ can be answered efficiently? (Property Testing)*

If so, can we learn B efficiently in such a way that allows $SAT(B)$ be checked efficiently? (Learnability)

For example, can we test if B can be represented in horn, and, if so, what is it in horn?

If not, can we answer $SAT(B)$ without knowing B ? Perhaps by synthesizing a “good enough” hypothesis H such that $SAT(H)$ can be answered efficiently and that (Approximation) $\|B - H\| \leq \epsilon$ or (Overapproximation) $H \rightarrow B$?

Thing 2 (Property Testing). *What are the characterizing properties of the concept class E such that $SAT(e)$ can be checked efficiently for all $e \in E$? Can these properties be checked efficiently?*

If such E cannot exist, what are the “useful” classes E_1, \dots, E_n that can cover “most” practical cases?

For example, what are the properties of the class of horns H , maybe in terms of their Fourier spectrum? And how to check if $B \in H$ efficiently?

Thing 3 (Learnability). *If we know there is an representation of B with which $SAT(B)$ can be answered efficiently, how to learn that representation efficiently?*