

Unsatisfiability of Nonlinear Constrains

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:

$$\begin{aligned}d[TetR]/dt &= f_1 - k_d[TetR] - k_+[Tc][TetR] + k_-[TetRTc] \\d[TetRTc]/dt &= k_+[Tc][TetR] - k_-[TetRTc] - k_d[TetRTc] \\d[Tc]/dt &= k_i([Tc]^0 - [Tc]) - \frac{k_p[Tc][TetA]}{K} - k_-[TetRTc] - k_d[Tc] \\d[TetA]/dt &= f_2 - k_d[TetA]\end{aligned}$$

If C denotes the constraint that $d\vec{x}/dt|_{\langle [TetR]_0, [TetRTc]_0, [Tc]_0, [TetA]_0 \rangle}$ 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, ...

Known Results

- The full FO theory of reals is decidable [Tarski48]
Nonelementary decision procedure, impractical
- Double-exponential time decision procedure [Collins74, Mor...
- Exponential space lower bound
- Collin's algorithm based on "cylindrical algebraic decompos...
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

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

Example: consider

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

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 $w \geq 0$

$$P = 0, \quad Q > 0, \quad R \geq 0 \quad \mapsto$$

$$\underline{P = 0}, \quad \underline{Q - \vec{v} = 0}, \quad \underline{R - \vec{w} = 0}, \quad \vec{v} > 0, \quad \vec{w} \geq 0$$

- Search for a polynomial p s.t.

$$\underline{P = 0} \Rightarrow p = 0$$

$$\vec{v} > 0, \quad \vec{w} \geq 0 \Rightarrow p > 0$$

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

Note the parallel to Simplex

Example

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

⊥

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

$$p \in \text{Ideal}(P) \qquad \{\sum_i p_i q_i : p_i \in P\}$$

$$q \in \text{Cone}[Q] \qquad \{\sum_i c_i^+ q_1 q_2 \dots q_k : q_i \in Q\}$$

$$r \in [R] \qquad \{r_1 r_2 \dots r_k : r_i \in R\}$$

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

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

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 in the Gröbner basis for P constructed using \succ .

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

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 $p' \in GB_{\succ}$

- 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 $(w_1 - w_2)^2$ 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 $\mu_0 \in [V_{>0}]$

Extend2:
$$\frac{(V, P)}{(V \cup \{x'\}, P \cup \{\nu_0 + \alpha\nu_1 - x'\})}$$
 if $\langle \nu_0, \nu_1 \rangle \in C$
 $x' \in V^{new}$

Detect:
$$\frac{(V, P' = P \cup \{c_0\mu_0 + p\})}{(V, P \cup \{c_0\mu_0, p\})}$$
 if $c_0\mu_0 + p$
 nomial over

Witness:
$$\frac{(V, P \cup \{c\mu\})}{\perp}$$
 if $\mu \in [V_{>0}]$

Refutational Completeness

If P_0 is unsatisfiable and $(V_0, P_0) \vdash^* (V, P)$ is a derivation using 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
- the witness in the new system is smaller in some well-founded

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

Implementation

- In our applications, termination and soundness are more important than refutational completeness.

We have implemented a terminating and sound procedure of refutation by restricting the number of new definitions.

- Projection onto the slack variables and testing satisfiability of the resulting formula 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, the procedure for checking formulas generated during the abstraction of polynomial hybrid systems. As fast as our earlier FM-based procedure, but gets more the

Conclusion

A simple sound and refutationally complete set of inference rules for the 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 algorithm turns into a decision procedure.
- Can be combined with Simplex as well as unsound, complete procedures
- A logical approach to practical decision procedures