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Problem: How to wire the components to synthesize a desired system?
## Concrete Examples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Desired System $F_{\text{spec}}$</th>
<th>Components $f_i$'s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sort an array</td>
<td>comparators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>compute $\frac{x+y}{2}$</td>
<td>modulo arithmetic ops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>find rightmost one</td>
<td>bitwise ops, arithmetic ops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>compute $x^{243}$</td>
<td>multiplication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accept $\omega$-regular language</td>
<td>Buchi automata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>safe hybrid system</td>
<td>multiple operating modes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>geometry construction</td>
<td>ruler-compass steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deobfuscated code</td>
<td>parts of obfuscated code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verification proof</td>
<td>verification inference rules</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question:** $\exists C : \forall x : F_{\text{spec}}(x) = C(f_1, f_2, \ldots)(x)$
Synthesis Problem Classes

“This is difficult”

“This is ill posed”

“This is too general to be solvable”

\[ \exists C : \forall x : F_{\text{spec}}(x) = C(f_1, f_2, \ldots)(x) \]

Parameters that define the synthesis problem:

- composition operator \( C \)
- class of specifications \( F_{\text{spec}} \)
- class of component specifications \( f_i \)

Fixing the synthesis problem:

fix these parameters, fix representation of \( F_{\text{spec}}, f_i \)
Bounded Synthesis

The synthesis problem is still hard

We make it feasible by replacing the unbounded quantifier, $\exists C$, by a bounded quantifier

$$\exists C : \forall x : F_{\text{spec}}(x) = C(f_1, f_2, \ldots)(x)$$

$\Downarrow$

$$\exists c : \forall x : F_{\text{spec}}(x) = c(f_1, f_2, f_3)(x), c \text{ in some finite set}$$

This bounded synthesis problem is solved by deciding the $\exists \forall$ formula
Bounded synthesis version:

- fix length of program
- fix upper bound on number of each component

\[
\exists P : \forall x : F_{\text{spec}}(x) = P(x), \quad P \text{ a straight-line program composing } f_i \text{'s}
\]

\[
\downarrow
\]

\[
\exists \pi : \forall x : F_{\text{spec}}(x) = f_{\pi(1)}(f_{\pi(2)}(f_{\pi(3)}(x)))
\]

---

**Straight-Line Program Synthesis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>composition operator</th>
<th>function composition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>components</td>
<td>primitive functions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>system</td>
<td>complex function</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Example: Straight-Line Program Synthesis

Specification: Evaluate polynomial $a \times h^2 + b \times h + c$

Budget: two multiplication and two addition operators

Finite search space

Synthesized Program:

1. $o_1 := a \times h$;
2. $o_2 := o_1 + b$;
3. $o_3 := o_2 \times h$;
4. return $o_3 + c$;

Correctness: $(a \times h + b) \times h + c = a \times h^2 + b \times h + c$
**Example: Straight-Line Program Synthesis**

**Specification:** Turn-off rightmost contiguous 1 bits

Example: 010101100 \(\rightarrow\) 010100000

**Budget:** two addition and at most four bitwise Boolean operators

**Finite search space:** Also need some constants

**Synthesized Program:**

1. \(o_1 := x + (-1);\)
2. \(o_2 := o_1|x;\)
3. \(o_3 := o_2 + 1;\)
4. return \(o_3 & x;\)

**Correctness on sample input:**

010101100 \(\leftrightarrow\) 010101011 \(\leftrightarrow\) 010101111 \(\leftrightarrow\) 010110000 \(\leftrightarrow\) 010100000

MSR, Redmond
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Loop-free Program Synthesis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>composition operator</th>
<th>function composition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>components</td>
<td>primitive functions, if-then-else</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>system</td>
<td>complex function</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bounded synthesis version:

- fix length of program
- fix upper bound on number of each component including if-then-else

\[
\exists P : \forall x : F_{\text{spec}}(x) = P(x), \quad P \text{ a straight-line program composing } f_i \text{'s}
\]

\[
\downarrow
\]

\[
\exists \pi : \forall x : F_{\text{spec}}(x) = f_{\pi(\epsilon)}(f_{\pi(1)}(f_{\pi(11)}(x_1), f_{\pi(12)}(x_2, x_1)))
\]
Example: Loop-free Program Synthesis

Specification: Obfuscated code

Example: We are given

\[
\text{if (} h(x) \text{)} \\
\quad \text{if } (x \times (x+1) \mod 2 == 1) \ y := f(x) \text{ else } y := g(x) \\
\text{else } y := f(g(x))
\]

Components Budget: \(f, g, h, \text{if-then-else}\)

Synthesized Program:

\[
o := g(x); \\
\text{if } (h(x)) \ y := o; \text{ else } y := f(o);
\]

Correctness: Equivalence of two loop-free programs
Existence of a program $\pi$ such that for all $x$:

$$F_{spec}(x) = f_\pi(\epsilon)(f_\pi(1)(f_\pi(11)(x_1), f_\pi(12)(x_2, x_1)))$$

Enumerate all possible programs and check

Enumerate all permutations $\pi$ and check

Checking if a synthesized program is the desired program is a verification problem

**Bounded Synthesis** := iteratively perform verification

But we can learn from failures ...
How to solve $\exists u : \forall x : \phi$ formulas?

A1 Counter-example guided iterative solver

A2 Distinguishing input solver
   - Applies even when $\phi$ not fully known

A3 Numerical solver
A1: Solving $\exists \forall \phi$

Counter-example guided iterative procedure for solving $\exists \vec{u} : \forall \vec{x} : \phi(\vec{u}, \vec{x})$

1. Guess $\vec{u}_0$ for $\vec{u}$

2. (Verification) Check if

$$\forall \vec{x} : \phi(\vec{u}_0, \vec{x})$$

3. If true, then return $\vec{u}_0$

4. Get counterexample $\vec{x}_0$, add it to $X$

5. (Finite Synthesis) Find new $\vec{u}_0$ such that

$$\exists \vec{u}_0 : \bigwedge_{\vec{x}_0 \in X} \phi(\vec{u}_0, \vec{x}_0)$$

6. Go to Step 2
A1: Counter-example Guided Iterative ∃∀ Solving

Needs a backend quantifier-free solver
That can return counterexamples
We use an SMT solver

The structure of $\phi$, and additional knowledge about what $\phi$ encodes, is used optimize the above procedure to expedite convergence

Related Work: Sketch, Aha

Reference: Synthesis of loop-free programs, PLDI 2011
A2: Distinguishing Input Solver

Solving $\exists \vec{u} : \forall \vec{x} : \phi(\vec{u}, \vec{x})$

1. $X :=$ some finite set of choices for $\vec{x}$

2. Find two programs that work for $X$, but differ on some $\vec{x}_0$

   $\exists \vec{u}_1, \vec{u}_2, \vec{x}_0 : (\bigwedge_{\vec{x} \in X} (\phi(\vec{u}_1, \vec{x}) \land \phi(\vec{u}_2, \vec{x}))) \land (\phi(\vec{u}_1, \vec{x}_0) \not\Leftrightarrow \phi(\vec{u}_2, \vec{x}_0))$

3. If satisfiable, we add $\vec{x}_0$ to $X$ and go to (2)

4. If unsatisfiable, then find one program that works for $X$

   $\exists \vec{u}_1 : \bigwedge_{\vec{x} \in X} \phi(\vec{u}_1, \vec{x})$

5. If satisfiable, return $\vec{u}_1$

6. Otherwise, return “not synthesizable”

MSR, Redmond
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A2: Properties of the A2 Solver

The second algorithm for solving $\exists \vec{u} : \forall \vec{x} : \phi(\vec{u}, \vec{x})$

- Does not need the full specification of the desired program
- We only need the knowledge of the specification on the set $X$
- Does not perform the verification step

An interactive implementation of A2:

1. Tool asks user for the expected output on input $\vec{x}_0$
2. Tool synthesizes internally two programs that work correctly for $X := \{\vec{x}_0\}$, but differ on input $\vec{x}_1$
3. Tool asks user for the expected output on input $\vec{x}_1$
4. Add $\vec{x}_1$ to $X$ and repeat
A third algorithm for solving $\exists \vec{u} : \forall \vec{x} : \phi(\vec{u}, \vec{x})$

1. Find finite set $X$ of input-output pairs of the specification
2. Synthesize program that works for finite set $X$
3. Verify the synthesized program on randomly sampled inputs

We solved Step (2) using an SMT solver previously

We can avoid the SMT solver and instead

1. hierarchical program synthesis: first synthesize high-level components
2. enumerate composition of high-level components guided by goal
Example: Synthesis Without Symbolic Reasoning

**Specification:** Construct a triangle, given its base, a base angle and sum of the other two sides.

**Components:** Ruler compass constructions

**Formal specification:** Given points $p_1, p_2$ and numbers $a, r$, find point $p$

\[
\begin{align*}
\phi_{pre} & := r > \text{length}(p_1, p_2) \\
\phi_{post} & := \text{Angle}(p, p_1, p_2) = a \land \text{length}(p, p_1) + \text{length}(p, p_2) = r
\end{align*}
\]

**Construction:**

\[
\begin{align*}
L_1 & := \text{ConstructLineGivenAngleLine}(L, a) \\
C_1 & := \text{ConstructCircleGivenPointLength}(p_1, r) \\
(p_3, p_4) & := \text{LineCircleIntersection}(L_1, C_1) \\
L_2 & := \text{PerpendicularBisector2Points}(p_2, p_3) \\
p_5 & := \text{LineLineIntersection}(L_1, L_2)
\end{align*}
\]
Example: Geometry Construction Synthesis

**Step 1** find concrete input-output pair consistent with specification

\[ L = \text{Line}(\langle 81.62, 99.62 \rangle, \langle 99.62, 83.62 \rangle) \]

\[ r = 88.07 \]

\[ a = 0.81 \text{ radians} \]

Compute output for this input: \( p := \langle 131.72, 103.59 \rangle \)

**Step 2** Start enumerating partial programs built using an extended library

**Step 3** Evaluate if intermediate objects generated by the partial program are good and try other choices in Step (2) otherwise
Geometry Construction Synthesis

Evaluating effect of making search **goal directed**

![Points generated by goal-directed search](image1)

![Points generated by brute-force search](image2)

Points visited in a goal-directed search (left) and a brute-force search (right).
Geometry Construction Synthesis

- **Extended library** is forward search
  - Encodes knowledge / concept taught in class
- **Goal directness** is backward search
  - Corresponds to reasoning student expected to do
- Sample input-output points generated using **numerical** techniques
Switching Logic Synthesis

Given a multimodal dynamical system

Synthesize conditions for switching between modes such that some requirements are met
Example: Driving a Robot

The goal is to drive the robot starting from \( \text{Init} \) to \( \text{Reach} \) while remaining inside \( \text{Safe} \):

\[
\text{Init} := (x \in [-1, 1], y = 0, v_x = 0, v_y = 0)
\]

\[
\text{Reach} := (y \geq 10)
\]

\[
\text{Safe} := (|x| \leq 3)
\]

Using the 2 modes:

- **Mode 1**: Force applied in \((1, 1)\)-direction

\[
\frac{dx}{dt} = v_x, \quad \frac{dv_x}{dt} = 1 - v_x, \quad \frac{dy}{dt} = v_y, \quad \frac{dv_y}{dt} = 1 - v_y
\]

- **Mode 2**: Force applied in \((-1, 1)\)-direction

\[
\frac{dx}{dt} = v_x, \quad \frac{dv_x}{dt} = -1 - v_x, \quad \frac{dy}{dt} = v_y, \quad \frac{dv_y}{dt} = 1 - v_y
\]
We synthesize a non-deterministic controller: a set of different possible switchings that each satisfy the requirement $\text{Safe}\cup\text{Reach}$.

Two possible trajectories:

How to discover the correct switching logic?
Switching Logic Synthesis

\exists \text{switching conditions} : \forall \text{state variables} : \text{correctness}

We can again bound the search for switching conditions

But that is a bad solution

Need to go back to verification
Verification Techniques

1. Reachability-Based Verification
2. Abstraction-Based Verification
3. Certificate-Based Verification

Key Observation: Verification = searching for right certificate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Witness/Certificate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stability</td>
<td>Lyapunov function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Inductive Invariant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liveness</td>
<td>Ranking function</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Certificate-Based Verification

Verifying property $P$ in system $S :=$

\[ \exists C : C \text{ is a certificate for } P \text{ in } S \]

Can do a **bounded** search for $C$

Also known as the **constraint-based approach**

Certificates for Synthesis Problem:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Witness/Certificate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td><strong>Controlled</strong> Inductive Invariant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stability</td>
<td><strong>Controlled</strong> Lyapunov function</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bounded Synthesis of Switching Logic

Given multimodal dynamical system, and property Safe:

- Guess templates for the certificate for controlled-safety
- Generate the $\exists a, b, \ldots : \forall x, y, \ldots : \phi$
- Solve the formula to get values for $a, b, \ldots$
\[ \exists u : \forall x : \phi \] solvers for the reals

We can use the same ideas as before

- **Symbolic Numeric Approach:**
  - Symbolic: A combination of QEPCAD, redlog, slfq to eliminate inner \( \forall \)
  - Numeric: Gradient descent to find \( u \) from resulting formula

- **Iterative learning:** Iteratively prune out \( u \) values based on simulations
Conclusion

- **Synthesis**: $\exists \forall$ solving
- **Bounded synthesis**: Make problem tractable by making $\exists$ a finite quantification
- **Component-based Synthesis**
- **Various approaches to solve $\exists \forall$ depending on application**
- **Switching logic synthesis**: search for **controlled certificates**