Structure-aware computation of predicate abstraction

A. Cimatti, J. Dubrovin, T. Junttila, M. Roveri Fondazione Bruno Kessler, Trento, Italy Helsinki Institute of Technology, Finland

Predicate abstraction

- Concrete program C over states S
- Predicates Ψ_i induce partition over S
- Each partition is a state of the abstract program
- Transitions in abstract space
 - from as to as' iff
 c-transition from cs to cs',
 with cs in as, and cs' in as'



Predicate abstraction: symbolic view

- Concrete state as assignment to X variables
 - booleans, bit vectors, reals, integers, ...
- Concrete program as SMT formula CR(X, X')
- Abstract state as assignment to boolean variables P_i
- Predicates as SMT formulae $\Psi_i(X)$
- Abstraction function Abstr(X X' P P') as $\Lambda_i P_i \leftrightarrow \Psi_i(X)$
- Computing predicate abstraction:
 - Obtain a boolean representation for AR(P,P')
 - Amenable to symbolic model checking
- $\begin{aligned} \bullet \quad \mathsf{AR}(\mathsf{P},\mathsf{P}') &= \exists \; X \; X'.(\mathsf{CR}(\mathsf{X}, \, \mathsf{X}') \land \bigwedge_{i} \; \mathsf{P}_{i} \Leftrightarrow \Psi_{i}(\mathsf{X}) \\ & \land \bigwedge_{i} \; \mathsf{P}_{i}' \Leftrightarrow \Psi_{i}(\mathsf{X}') \;) \end{aligned}$



- Predicate Abstraction
 - at the core of many verification approaches
 often a bottleneck

Avoid Monolithic Computation



 $\Phi(X X' P P')$

Structure-aware predicate abstraction

- New procedure for predicate abstraction
- Exploits the available problem structure
- At the high level
 - structure of system being abstracted
 - modules, scope of variables, nature of transitions
- At the low level
 - structure of quantified formula
 - reduce scope of quantification

High level framework

- System structured in several components
- Asynchronously composed via interleaving
- Transitions:
 - local transitions
 - synchronizing transitions
 - timed transitions

Invariants: x in [10, 20] SMT: $10 \le x \& x \le 20$

Flow condition: der(x) in [1.1, 1.3] SMT: $x + 1.1 \cdot \delta \le x' \& x' \le x + 1.3 \cdot \delta$

Global: the same δ for all components!



Predicate abstraction procedure

- Ingredients
 - disjunctively partitioning the concrete program
 - inlining
 - clustering
 - blocking and restricting models
 - value sampling

Disjunctive Partitioning

- AR(P P') = ∃ X X'.(CR(X X') ∧ Abstr(X X' P P'))
- Present CR as disjunction of
 - $V_m V_l E_t(X X')$ local transitions
 - $-V_{m,m'} E_{\sigma}(X X')$ synchronizing transitions
 - $-V_1 E_{\delta}(X X')$ timed transitions
- Distribute Abstr(X X' P P') over disjuncts
- Push Quantification inside disjunction



Abstracting one transition

- During transitions, several components may not change
- In local transitions
 - only active process is modified
 - loc' = loc, x' = x, ...
- synchronizing transitions

 similarly, only active processes change
- timed transitions
 - discrete locations do not change
- Lots of potential for inlining

Rules for inlining

- $\exists X.(\beta \land (u=\alpha))$ rewrites to $\exists X.(\beta[u / \alpha])$ - where u in X, and not in α
- $\exists X.(\beta \land (q \leftrightarrow \alpha))$ rewrites to $(q \leftrightarrow \alpha) \land \exists X.(\beta[q / \alpha])$

– where α propositional, and q not in α

• $\exists X.(\beta \land (\gamma \leftrightarrow \alpha))$ rewrites to $\exists X.(\beta[\gamma \land \alpha]) \land (\gamma \leftrightarrow \alpha))$

– where α propositional but γ has vars in X

Practical Limitations

 Variable in one component may be referred to in flow conditions of other components

- this indirectly influences its behaviour.

 Predicates can introduce correlations that are not directly present in the original system

-e.g. (x + y < 10) connects x and y

Clustering

- $\exists X.(\Phi_1(X_1 P) \land \Phi_2(X_2 P) \land ... \land \Phi_n(X_n P))$
- Each variable in X occurs in at most one of the clusters X_i
- Each cluster can be dealt with independently
- Trade one big quantification for many (hopefully smaller) quantifications

 $(\exists X_1.\Phi_1(X_1 P)) \land (\exists X_2.\Phi_2(X_2 P)) \land \dots \land (\exists X_n.\Phi_n(X_n P))$

Blocking and Restricting Models

- When computing $\Phi_{B}(P) \vee \exists X.\Phi(XP)$
- Replace $\exists X.\Phi(XP)$ with $\exists X.(\neg \Phi_B(P) \land \Phi(XP))$
- Rationale
 - boolean reasoning cheaper than SMT reasoning
 - models in Φ_B have already been visited
 - force exploration to other models within $\neg \Phi_B$
- When computing
 - $\Phi_{B0}(P) \land \exists X_1.\Phi_1(X_1 P) \land \exists X_2.\Phi_2(X_2 P) \land \dots \land \exists X_n. \Phi_n(X_n P)$
- We can use previously computed conjuncts to prune quantification
 - ∃X₁.(Φ₁(X₁ P) ∧ ¬Φ_{B0}(P))
 - ∃X₂.(Φ₂(X₂ P) ∧ ¬Φ_{B01}(P))
 - − $\exists X_3.(Φ_3(X_3 P) \land ¬Φ_{B012}(P))$
- Restrict to models still worth exploration

Variable Sampling

- "Quasi clustering": a single w prevents clustering
 ∃ X.(Φ₁(w X₁ P) ∧ Φ₂(w X₂ P) ∧ ... ∧ Φ_n(w X_n P))
- Pick one value c for w, replace, and cluster $-\exists X \cdot w \cdot (\Phi_{1,w/c}(X_1 P) \land \Phi_{2,w/c}(X_2 P) \land \dots \land \Phi_{n,w/c}(X_n P))$
- Result: underapproximation $\Phi_{w/c}(P)$
 - computed one cofactor with respect to w = c
 - we have to cover the case $w\neq c$
 - $\exists X.(w \neq c \land \Phi_1(w X_1 P) \land \Phi_2(w X_2 P) \land \dots \land \Phi_n(w X_n P))$
- The process can be iterated
 - need to block already covered models
 - need to find a suitable sequence of instantiations

Sampling-driven quantification

SamplingAllSMT(Phi, X, W) {

res := False;

(sat, mu) := SMTSolve(Phi);

while sat do

c := PickValue(mu, W);

new := AllSMT(not res and Phi[W / c]);

res := res or new;

(sat, mu) := SMTSolve(Phi and not res);

end while

return res;

Implementation

- Extended NuSMV
 - empowered with SMT functionalities
 - types: reals, integers, bit-vectors, ...
- MathSAT SMT solver used as backend
- High level simplifications
 - network of automata
 - python script to generate disjunctive partitioned representation
- Low level simplifications as rewriter over quantified formulae
- Abstraction based on AllSMT version of MathSAT

Experimental Set up

- Two classes of problems
 - from HyTech distribution
 - randomly generated networks of automata
- Compared Algorithms
 - mono
 - + partitioning
 - + clustering
 - -+v-sampling

Results on Hytech models

				computation time (s)				sampling	
Model	$ \vec{P} $	$ \vec{V} $	disj	monol.	partit.	clust.	sampl.	clu	sam
active	34	5	27	54.626	18.847	2.410	0.937	5	1
active-trace	34	7	27	51.781	22.171	2.473	0.952	5	1
audio	30	6	15	13.826	4.547	0.448	0.442	2	2
audio-timing	29	7	15	10.910	3.915	0.947	0.690	2	6
billiard-timed	25	3	5	0.910	0.732	0.732	1.044	2	13
dist-controller	8	7	12	0.320	0.232	0.195	0.147	5	1
grc-ver	24	5	11	33.068	19.599	10.421	0.455	4	8
new-grc	22	5	11	38.649	17.840	7.395	0.383	4	7
railroad	16	3	8	0.170	0.140	0.131	0.112	2	5
reactor-clock	19	4	5	0.181	0.133	0.069	0.050	2	2
reactor-rect	17	4	5	0.132	0.112	0.051	0.045	2	2

Results on Random LHA's



Structure-aware abstraction

Related Work

- Imprecise techniques
 - Cartesian Abstraction
- Boolean Quantification
 - BDD-based
 - SAT-based
- Monolithic SMT-based predicate abstraction
 - AIISMT [CAV06]
 - BDD + SMT [FMCAD07]
- Software model checking: BLAST, SATABS
 - Partitioning transition by transition in CFG
 - Forward image computations by inlining unmodified variables
- Avoid abstraction computation
 - Directly compute abstract violations [FM09]
 - No need for AllSMT functionality

Conclusions

- A structure-aware procedure for the exact computation of predicate abstraction
- Exploit high level structure
 - transition partitioning
 - variable scope
- Exploit low level structure
 - formula quantification, clustering
 - value sampling
- Significant speed-ups

Future Work

- Comprehensive comparison with other methods
 - Experiment with BDD-based abstraction
- Measure impact on CEGAR loop
- Application to post-image computation
 Reachability in abstract space
- Full incrementality