

Satisfiability Checking

Fourier-Motzkin Variable Elimination

Prof. Dr. Erika Ábrahám

RWTH Aachen University
Informatik 2
LuFG Theory of Hybrid Systems

WS 16/17

The Xmas problem

There are three types of Xmas presents Santa Claus can make.

- Santa Claus wants to reduce the overhead by making only two types.
- He needs at least 100 presents.
- He needs at least 5 of either type 1 or type 2.
- He needs at least 10 of the third type.
- Each present of type 1, 2, and 3 need 1, 2, resp. 5 minutes to make.
- Santa Claus is late, and he has only 3 hours left.
- Each present of type 1, 2, and 3 costs 3, 2, resp. 1 EUR.
- He has 300 EUR for presents in total.

$$\begin{aligned}(p_1 = 0 \vee p_2 = 0 \vee p_3 = 0) \wedge p_1 + p_2 + p_3 \geq 100 \wedge \\ (p_1 \geq 5 \vee p_2 \geq 5) \wedge p_3 \geq 10 \wedge p_1 + 2p_2 + 5p_3 \leq 180 \wedge \\ 3p_1 + 2p_2 + p_3 \leq 300\end{aligned}$$

Quantifier-free linear real arithmetic (QFLRA)

Linear real arithmetic is the first-order theory with signature $\{0, 1, +, <\}$ and the domain being the reals \mathbb{R} .

Syntax of linear real arithmetic

Terms:	$t ::=$	0		1		x		$t + t$
Constraints:	$c ::=$	$t < t$						
Formulas:	$\varphi ::=$	c		$\neg \varphi$		$\varphi \wedge \varphi$		$\exists x. \varphi$

where x is a variable.

- Syntactic sugar for constraints: $t_1 \leq t_2$, $t_1 = t_2$, $t_1 \neq t_2$.
- The semantics is standard.
- Linear real arithmetic is also called **linear real algebra**.
- We consider the **satisfiability problem for the quantifier-free fragment QFLRA** (equivalently, we consider the existential fragment, i.e., no negation of expressions containing quantifiers).

Linear real arithmetic: Eliminating equations

Reminder: In the SMT-solving context, we need a decision procedure for **sets** of linear real arithmetic constraints (equations and inequations).

- Assume that the i th constraint is an equation containing a variable x_j with a non-zero coefficient $a_{ij} \neq 0$:

$$\sum_{k=1}^n a_{ik} \cdot x_k = b_i \quad (a_{i,k}, b_i: \text{integer/rational constants}, x_k: \text{variables})$$

$$\Rightarrow a_{ij} \cdot x_j = b_i - \sum_{k \in \{1, \dots, j-1, j+1, \dots, n\}} a_{ik} \cdot x_k$$

$$\Rightarrow x_j = \frac{b_i}{a_{ij}} - \sum_{k \in \{1, \dots, j-1, j+1, \dots, n\}} \frac{a_{ik}}{a_{ij}} \cdot x_k := \beta_j$$

- Replace x_j by β_j in all constraints.
- This **substitutiton** leads to an equisatisfiable problem in $n - 1$ variables.

Linear arithmetic over the reals

- Goal: decide satisfiability of
conjunctions of linear inequalities over the reals

$$\bigwedge_{1 \leq i \leq m} \sum_{1 \leq j \leq n} a_{ij} x_j \leq b_i$$

- Input in matrix form: $A\bar{x} \leq \bar{b}$

m constraints

$$\begin{pmatrix} a_{11} & a_{12} & \cdots & \cdots & a_{1n} \\ a_{21} & a_{22} & \ddots & & \vdots \\ \vdots & & & \ddots & \vdots \\ a_{m1} & a_{m2} & \cdots & \cdots & a_{mn} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ \vdots \\ \vdots \\ x_n \end{pmatrix} \leq \begin{pmatrix} b_1 \\ \vdots \\ \vdots \\ b_m \end{pmatrix}$$

n variables

- Earliest method for solving **linear inequality systems**:
discovered in 1826 by Fourier, re-discovered by Motzkin in 1936
- Basic idea of **variable elimination**:
 - Pick a variable and eliminate it, yielding an equisatisfiable formula that does not refer to the eliminated variable any more.
 - Continue until all variables are eliminated.
- **Fourier-Motzkin**: Put requirements on the **lower an upper bounds** on the variable we want to eliminate.

Variable bounds

- For a variable x_n , we can partition the constraints according to the coefficient a_{in} :
 - $a_{in} > 0$: upper bound β_i on x_n
 - $a_{in} < 0$: lower bound β_i on x_n

$$\sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} \cdot x_j \leq b_i$$

$$\Rightarrow a_{in} \cdot x_n \leq b_i - \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} a_{ij} \cdot x_j$$

$$(a) \quad a_{in} \geq 0 \quad x_n \leq \frac{b_i}{a_{in}} - \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \frac{a_{ij}}{a_{in}} \cdot x_j =: \beta_i \quad \text{upper bound}$$

$$(b) \quad a_{in} \leq 0 \quad x_n \geq \frac{b_i}{a_{in}} - \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \frac{a_{ij}}{a_{in}} \cdot x_j =: \beta_u \quad \text{lower bound}$$

Example for upper and lower bounds

	Category for x_1 ?
(1) $x_1 - x_2 \leq 0$	Upper bound
(2) $x_1 - x_3 \leq 0$	Upper bound
(3) $-x_1 + x_2 + 2x_3 \leq 0$	Lower bound
(4) $-x_3 \leq -1$	No bound

Eliminating unbounded variables

- Iteratively remove variables that are not bounded in both ways (and all the constraints that use them).
- The new problem has a solution iff the old problem has one!

$$\begin{array}{l} \cancel{8x \geq 7y} \\ \cancel{x \geq 3} \\ y \geq z \\ z \geq 10 \\ 20 \geq z \end{array} \quad \longrightarrow \quad \begin{array}{l} \cancel{y \geq z} \\ z \geq 10 \\ 20 \geq z \end{array} \quad \longrightarrow \quad \begin{array}{l} z \geq 10 \\ 20 \geq z \end{array}$$

- For each pair of a lower bound β_l and an upper bound β_u , we have

$$\beta_l \leq x_n \leq \beta_u$$

- For each such pair, add the constraint

$$\beta_l \leq \beta_u$$

Fourier-Motzkin: Example

(1)	$x_1 - x_2 \leq 0$		Category for x_1 ?
(2)	$x_1 - x_3 \leq 0$		Upper bound
(3)	$x_1 + x_2 + 2x_3 \leq 0$		Upper bound
(4)	$-x_3 \leq -1$		Lower bound
<hr/>			Lower bound
(5)	$2x_3 \leq 0$	(from 1,3)	eliminate x_1
(6)	$x_2 + x_3 \leq 0$	(from 2,3)	Upper bound
<hr/>			Upper bound
(7)	$1 \leq 0$	(from 4,5)	we eliminate x_3

→ **Contradiction** (the system is UNSAT)

- Worst-case complexity:

$$m \rightarrow m^2 \rightarrow (m^2)^2 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow m^{2^n}$$

- Heavy!

- The bottleneck: case-splitting