

Unsatisfiability of Nonlinear Constraints:

An Algebraic Approach

Ashish Tiwari

Tiwari@csl.sri.com

Computer Science Laboratory

SRI International

Menlo Park CA 94025

<http://www.csl.sri.com/~tiwari>

Problem

Given a set of nonlinear equations and inequalities:

$$p = 0, \quad p \in P$$

$$q > 0, \quad q \in Q$$

$$r \geq 0, \quad r \in R$$

where $P, Q, R \subset \mathbb{Q}[\vec{x}]$ are sets of polynomials over \vec{x}

Is the above set satisfiable over the reals?

Motivation

Model of bacterial resistance to antibiotic Tetracycline:

$$d[TetR]/dt = f_1 - k_d[TetR] - k_+[Tc][TetR] + k_-[TetRTc]$$

$$d[TetRTc]/dt = k_+[Tc][TetR] - k_-[TetRTc] - k_d[TetRTc]$$

$$d[Tc]/dt = k_i([Tc]^0 - [Tc]) - \frac{k_p[Tc][TetA]}{k_+[Tc][TetR]} - k_+[Tc][TetR] + k_-[TetRTc] - k_d[Tc]$$

$$d[TetA]/dt = f_2 - k_d[TetA]$$

If C denotes the constraint that $d\vec{x}/dt|_{\langle [TetR]_0, [TetRTc]_0, [Tc]_0, [TetA]_0 \rangle} = 0$, one proof obligation for model simplification is:

$$C \Rightarrow 10k_+[Tc]_0[TetR]_0 < k_p[Tc]_0[TetA]_0$$

Other Applications: control, robotics, solving games, static analysis, hybrid systems, ...

Known Results

- The full FO theory of reals is decidable [Tarski48]
Nonelementary decision procedure, impractical
- Double-exponential time decision procedure [Collins74, MonkSolovay74]
- Exponential space lower bound
- Collin's algorithm based on “cylindrical algebraic decomposition” has been improved over the years and implemented in QEPCAD.
In practice, could fail on $p > 0 \wedge p < 0$.

Need a practical method to decide nonlinear constraints

Not necessarily a decision procedure

Goal for this work

To develop a **procedure** for testing unsatisfiability of nonlinear constraints that

- detects inconsistency of “easy” instances efficiently
- admits a simple description using logical inference rules
- is incremental
- generates small unsatisfiable core

Example: consider

$$p > 0 \wedge q_1 > 0 \wedge q_2 > 0 \wedge \dots \wedge q_n > 0 \wedge p < 0$$

We present a **sound** and **refutationally complete** procedure

But we use its **sound**, **terminating**, and **incomplete** variant

Approach

- Introduce **slack variables** s.t. all inequality constraints are of the form $v > 0$, or $w \geq 0$

$$\begin{array}{l} P = 0, \quad Q > 0, \quad R \geq 0 \quad \mapsto \\ \underline{P = 0}, \quad \underline{Q - \vec{v} = 0}, \quad \underline{R - \vec{w} = 0}, \quad \vec{v} > 0, \quad \vec{w} \geq 0 \end{array}$$

- **Search** for a polynomial p s.t.

$$\begin{array}{l} \underline{P = 0} \quad \Rightarrow \quad p = 0 \\ \vec{v} > 0, \quad \vec{w} \geq 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad p > 0 \end{array}$$

- To search for p , compute the **Gröbner basis** for P using different possible orderings (pivot)

Note the parallel to Simplex

Example

Let $I = \{v_1 > 0, v_2 > 0, v_3 > 0\}$.

$$v_1 + v_2 - 1 = 0, v_1 v_3 + v_2 - v_3 - 2 = 0$$

$$v_1 + v_2 - 1 = 0, (1 - v_2)v_3 + v_2 - v_3 - 2 = 0$$

$$v_1 + v_2 - 1 = 0, v_2 v_3 - v_2 + 2 = 0$$

$$v_1 + v_2 - 1 = 0, v_2 v_3 - v_2 + 2 = 0, v_2 v_3 - v_4 = 0$$

$$v_1 + v_2 - 1 = 0, -v_2 + v_4 + 2 = 0, v_2 v_3 - v_4 = 0$$

$$v_1 + v_4 + 1 = 0, -v_2 + v_4 + 2 = 0, v_2 v_3 - v_4 = 0$$

\perp

The polynomial $v_1 + v_4 + 1$ is the required witness to the unsatisfiability of the constraints.

Positivstellensatz

What guarantees the existence of such a witness?

The constraint

$$\{p = 0 : p \in P\} \cup \{q \geq 0 : q \in Q\} \cup \{r \neq 0 : r \in R\}$$

is unsatisfiable (over the reals) iff

there exist polynomials p , q , and r such that

$$p \in \text{Ideal}(P)$$

$$\{\sum_i p_i q_i : p_i \in P\}$$

$$q \in \text{Cone}[Q]$$

$$\{\sum_i c_i^+ q_1 q_2 \dots q_k : q_i \in Q\}$$

$$r \in [R]$$

$$\{r_1 r_2 \dots r_k : r_i \in R\}$$

$$p + q + r^2 \equiv 0$$

Positivstellensatz Corollary

The constraint

$$\{p = 0 : p \in P\} \cup \{v > 0 : v \in \vec{v}\} \cup \{w \geq 0 : w \in \vec{w}\}$$

is unsatisfiable iff

$\exists p'$ such that

$$p' \in \text{Ideal}(P) \cap \text{Cone}[\vec{v}, \vec{w}]$$

and there is at least one monomial $c\mu$ in p' such that $c > 0$ and $\mu \in [\vec{v}]$.

How to find p' ?

Finding p'

We know $p' \in \text{Ideal}(P)$.

If p' is “small-enough” in the ordering \succ , then p' will appear explicitly in the Gröbner basis for P constructed using \succ .

Example: $P = \{w_1 - 2w_3 + 2, w_2 + 2w_3 - 1\}$ and $I = \{w_1 \geq 0, w_2 \geq 0\}$.

If $w_1 \succ w_2 \succ w_3$, then $GB_{\succ}(P) = P$.

If we make $w_3 \succ w_1$ and $w_3 \succ w_2$ in the ordering, then

$$GB_{\succ}(P) = \{2w_3 - w_1 - 2, \underline{w_2 + w_1 + 1}\}.$$

For linear polynomials, this is pivoting, but what is its analogue for nonlinear systems ?

Finding p' : Nonlinear Issues

It is **not** always possible to change \succ to get witness $p' \in GB_{\succ}(P)$.

- **Problem 1:**

$$P_1 = \{v + w_1 - 1, w_1w_2 - w_1 + 1\}$$

Need $w_1 \succ w_1w_2$ to “get” $v + w_1w_2$ in $GB(P_1)$.

- **Problem 2:**

$$P_2 = \{w_1^2 - 2w_1w_2 + w_2^2 + 1\}$$

Need $w_1, w_2 \succ (w_1 - w_2)^2$ to “get” the witness $(w_1 - w_2)^2 + 1$ in $GB(P_2)$.

Main Idea: Introduce new definitions and get flexibility in choosing \succ

Add $w_1w_2 - w_3$ to P_1 and have $w_1 \succ w_3$.

Add $(w_1 - w_2)^2 - w_3$ to P_2 and have $w_1, w_2 \succ w_3$.

Example: Revisited

Let $I = \{v_1 > 0, v_2 > 0, v_3 > 0\}$.

$$v_1 + v_2 - 1 = 0, v_1 v_3 + v_2 - v_3 - 2 = 0$$

$$v_1 + v_2 - 1 = 0, (1 - v_2)v_3 + v_2 - v_3 - 2 = 0$$

$$v_1 + v_2 - 1 = 0, v_2 v_3 - v_2 + 2 = 0$$

$$v_1 + v_2 - 1 = 0, v_2 v_3 - v_2 + 2 = 0, v_2 v_3 - v_4 = 0$$

$$v_1 + v_2 - 1 = 0, -v_2 + v_4 + 2 = 0, v_2 v_3 - v_4 = 0$$

$$v_1 + v_4 + 1 = 0, -v_2 + v_4 + 2 = 0, v_2 v_3 - v_4 = 0$$

⊥

The polynomial $v_1 + v_4 + 1$ is the required witness to the unsatisfiability of the constraints.

Inference Rules

GB:	$\frac{(V, P)}{(V, GB(P))}$	
Extend1:	$\frac{(V, P' = P \cup \{\mu_0 + p\})}{(V \cup \{w'\}, P' \cup \{\mu_0 - w'\})}$	if $\mu_0 \in [V_{\geq 0}]$, $w' \in V_{\geq 0}^{new}$
Extend2:	$\frac{(V, P)}{(V \cup \{x'\}, P \cup \{\nu_0 + \alpha\nu_1 - x'\})}$	if $\langle \nu_0, \nu_1 \rangle$ occurs in P , $x' \in V^{new}$
Detect:	$\frac{(V, P' = P \cup \{c_0\mu_0 + p\})}{(V, P \cup \{c_0\mu_0, p\})}$	if $c_0\mu_0 + p$ is a positive polynomial over $[V_{\geq 0}]$
Witness:	$\frac{(V, P \cup \{c\mu\})}{\perp}$	if $\mu \in [V_{> 0}]$, $c \neq 0$

Refutational Completeness

If P_0 is **unsatisfiable** and $(V_0, P_0) \vdash^* (V, P)$ is a derivation using the above inference rules s.t. $P \neq \perp$, then there exists a derivation from (V, P) to \perp .

Main idea of proof:

- consider the witness given by Positivstellensatz
- if it does not explicitly appear, then we can add a new definition s.t.
- the witness in the new system is smaller in some well-founded ordering.

Inference rules yield a **sound** and **refutationally complete** procedure; but **non-terminating**

Implementation

- In our applications, **termination** and **soundness** are more important than **refutational completeness**.
We have implemented a **terminating** and **sound** procedure obtained by restricting the number of new definitions.
- **Projection onto the slack variables** and testing satisfiability of the projection is a powerful heuristic.
- Implementation is recursive: each new definition is introduced in an “incremental” way.
Implementation is in Lisp.
- Experience is that it is much faster than, and about as good as, QEPCAD on formulas generated during the abstraction of polynomial hybrid systems.
As fast as our earlier **FM-based procedure**, but gets more theorems

Conclusion

A simple **sound** and **refutationally complete** set of inference rules to test unsatisfiability of nonlinear constraints. Features:

- Generalization of **Simplex** for linear constraints
- Simple: **Gröbner basis computation + new definitions**
- Refutationally complete: based on **Positivstellensatz**
- Degree bounds for Positivstellensatz is **OPEN**. If solved, our procedure turns into a **decision** procedure.
- Can be **combined** with **Simplex** as well as **unsound, complete** techniques
- A **logical** approach to practical decision procedures