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SAT-based Bounded Model Checking

▷ Key problems with BDD’s:
  • they can explode in space
  • an expert user can make the difference (e.g. reordering, algorithms)

▷ A possible alternative:
  • Propositional Satisfiability Checking (SAT)
  • SAT technology is very advanced

▷ Advantages:
  • reduced memory requirements
  • limited sensitivity: one good setting, does not require expert users
  • much higher capacity (more variables) than BDD based techniques
Key ideas:

- look for counter-example paths of increasing length $k$
  - oriented to finding bugs
- for each $k$, builds a boolean formula that is satisfiable iff there is a counter-example of length $k$
  - can be expressed using $k \cdot |s|$ variables
  - formula construction is not subject to state explosion
- satisfiability of the boolean formulas is checked using a SAT procedure
  - can manage complex formulae on several 100K variables
  - returns satisfying assignment (i.e., a counter-example)
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Basic notation & definitions

- **Boolean formula**
  - $\top, \bot$ are formulas
  - A propositional atom $A_1, A_2, A_3, \ldots$ is a formula;
  - if $\varphi_1$ and $\varphi_2$ are formulas, then $\neg \varphi_1$, $\varphi_1 \land \varphi_2$, $\varphi_1 \lor \varphi_2$, $\varphi_1 \rightarrow \varphi_2$, $\varphi_1 \leftrightarrow \varphi_2$ are formulas.

- **Literal**: a propositional atom $A_i$ (positive literal) or its negation $\neg A_i$ (negative literal)

- N.B.: if $l := \neg A_i$, then $\neg l := A_i$

- **Atoms($\varphi$)**: the set $\{A_1, \ldots, A_N\}$ of atoms occurring in $\varphi$.

- a boolean formula can be represented as a tree or as a DAG
Basic notation & definitions (cont)

- **Total truth assignment** $\mu$ for $\varphi$:
  $\mu : Atoms(\varphi) \mapsto \{ \top, \bot \}$.

- **Partial Truth assignment** $\mu$ for $\varphi$:
  $\mu : \mathcal{A} \mapsto \{ \top, \bot \}, \mathcal{A} \subset Atoms(\varphi)$.

- **Set and formula representation of an assignment:**
  - $\mu$ can be represented as a set of literals:
    \[
    \{ \mu(A_1) := \top, \mu(A_2) := \bot \} \implies \{ A_1, \neg A_2 \}
    \]
  - $\mu$ can be represented as a formula:
    \[
    \{ \mu(A_1) := \top, \mu(A_2) := \bot \} \implies A_1 \land \neg A_2
    \]
Basic notation & definitions (cont)

- $\mu \models \varphi$ (μ satisfies φ):
  - $\mu \models A_i \iff \mu(A_i) = \top$
  - $\mu \models \neg \varphi \iff \text{not } \mu \models \varphi$
  - $\mu \models \varphi_1 \land \varphi_2 \iff \mu \models \varphi_1 \text{ and } \mu \models \varphi_2$
  - ...

- φ is satisfiable iff $\mu \models \varphi$ for some $\mu$

- $\varphi_1 \models \varphi_2$ (φ₁ entails φ₂):
  - $\varphi_1 \models \varphi_2$ iff for every $\mu$ $\mu \models \varphi_1 \implies \mu \models \varphi_2$

- $\models \varphi$ (φ is valid):
  - $\models \varphi$ iff for every $\mu$ $\mu \models \varphi$

- φ is valid $\iff \neg \varphi$ is not satisfiable
Equivalence and equi-satisfiability

- $\phi_1$ and $\phi_2$ are equivalent iff, for every $\mu$,
  $$\mu \models \phi_1 \iff \mu \models \phi_2$$

- $\phi_1$ and $\phi_2$ are equi-satisfiable iff
  exists $\mu_1$ s.t. $\mu_1 \models \phi_1$ iff exists $\mu_2$ s.t. $\mu_2 \models \phi_2$

- $\phi_1$, $\phi_2$ equivalent

- $\phi_1 \lor \phi_2$ and $(\phi_1 \lor \neg A_3) \land (A_3 \lor \phi_2)$, $A_3$ not in $\phi_1 \lor \phi_2$, are equi-satisfiable but not equivalent.
The problem of deciding the **satisfiability** of a propositional formula is **NP-complete**.

The most important logical problems (**validity**, **inference**, **entailment**, **equivalence**, ...) can be straightforwardly reduced to **satisfiability**, and are thus **(co)NP-complete**.

↓

No existing worst-case-polynomial algorithm.
POLARITY of subformulas

**Polarity**: the number of nested negations modulo 2.

- **Positive/negative occurrences**
  - $\phi$ occurs positively in $\phi$;
  - if $\neg \phi_1$ occurs positively [negatively] in $\phi$, then $\phi_1$ occurs negatively [positively] in $\phi$;
  - if $\phi_1 \land \phi_2$ or $\phi_1 \lor \phi_2$ occur positively [negatively] in $\phi$, then $\phi_1$ and $\phi_2$ occur positively [negatively] in $\phi$;
  - if $\phi_1 \rightarrow \phi_2$ occurs positively [negatively] in $\phi$, then $\phi_1$ occurs negatively [positively] in $\phi$ and $\phi_2$ occurs positively [negatively] in $\phi$;
  - if $\phi_1 \leftrightarrow \phi_2$ occurs in $\phi$, then $\phi_1$ and $\phi_2$ occur positively and negatively in $\phi$;
Negative normal form (NNF)

- φ is in **Negative normal form** iff it is given only by applications of \&, \lor \text{ to literals.}

- *every φ can be reduced into NNF:*
  1. substituting all →’s and ↔’s:
     
     \[ \phi_1 \rightarrow \phi_2 \implies \neg \phi_1 \lor \phi_2 \]
     
     \[ \phi_1 \leftrightarrow \phi_2 \implies (\neg \phi_1 \lor \phi_2) \land (\phi_1 \lor \neg \phi_2) \]

  2. pushing down negations recursively:
     
     \[ \neg (\phi_1 \land \phi_2) \implies \neg \phi_1 \lor \neg \phi_2 \]
     
     \[ \neg (\phi_1 \lor \phi_2) \implies \neg \phi_1 \land \neg \phi_2 \]
     
     \[ \neg \neg \phi_1 \implies \phi_1 \]

- The reduction is **linear** if a DAG representation is used.

- Preserves the **equivalence** of formulas.
Conjunctive Normal Form (CNF)

- $\varphi$ is in **Conjunctive normal form** iff it is a conjunction of disjunctions of literals:
  $$\bigwedge L \bigvee_{i=1}^{K_i} \bigvee_{j_i=1}^{l_{j_i}}$$

- the disjunctions of literals $\bigvee_{j_i=1}^{K_i} l_{j_i}$ are called **clauses**

- Easier to handle: list of lists of literals.
  \(\implies\) no reasoning on the recursive structure of the formula
Classic CNF Conversion $CNF(\varphi)$

- Every $\varphi$ can be reduced into CNF by, e.g.,
  1. converting it into NNF;
  2. applying recursively the DeMorgan’s Rule:
     \[
     (\varphi_1 \land \varphi_2) \lor \varphi_3 \implies (\varphi_1 \lor \varphi_3) \land (\varphi_2 \lor \varphi_3)
     \]
- Worst-case exponential.
- $Atoms(CNF(\varphi)) = Atoms(\varphi)$.
- $CNF(\varphi)$ is equivalent to $\varphi$.
- **Normal**: if $\varphi_1$ equivalent to $\varphi_2$, then $CNF(\varphi_1)$ identical to $CNF(\varphi_2)$ modulo reordering.
- Rarely used in practice.
Labeling CNF conversion $CNF_{label}(\varphi)$

- Every $\varphi$ can be reduced into CNF by, e.g., applying recursively bottom-up the rules:
  \[
  \varphi \quad \Rightarrow \quad \varphi[(l_i \lor l_j)\mid B] \land CNF(B \leftrightarrow (l_i \lor l_j))
  \]
  \[
  \varphi \quad \Rightarrow \quad \varphi[(l_i \land l_j)\mid B] \land CNF(B \leftrightarrow (l_i \land l_j))
  \]
  \[
  \varphi \quad \Rightarrow \quad \varphi[(l_i \leftrightarrow l_j)\mid B] \land CNF(B \leftrightarrow (l_i \leftrightarrow l_j))
  \]
  $l_i, l_j$ being literals and $B$ being a “new” variable.

- Worst-case linear.

- $Atoms(CNF_{label}(\varphi)) \supseteq Atoms(\varphi)$.

- $CNF_{label}(\varphi)$ is equi-satisfiable w.r.t. $\varphi$.

- Non-normal.

- More used in practice.
- **Davis-Putnam-Longeman-Loveland procedure** (DPLL)
- Tries to build recursively an assignment $\mu$ satisfying $\varphi$;
- At each recursive step assigns a truth value to (all instances of) one atom.
- Performs deterministic choices first.
DPLL Algorithm

function $DPLL(\varphi, \mu)$

if $\varphi = \top$

    then return True; /* base */

if $\varphi = \bot$

    then return False; /* backtrack */

if \{a unit clause $l$ occurs in $\varphi$\}

    then return $DPLL(assign(l, \varphi), \mu \land l)$; /* unit */

if \{a literal $l$ occurs pure in $\varphi$\}

    then return $DPLL(assign(l, \varphi), \mu \land l)$; /* pure */

$l := \text{choose-literal}(\varphi)$; /* split */

return $DPLL(assign(l, \varphi), \mu \land l)$  or  
$DPLL(assign(\neg l, \varphi), \mu \land \neg l)$;
Variants of DPLL

DPLL is a family of algorithms.

- different splitting heuristics
- preprocessing: (subsumption, 2-simplification)
- backjumping
- learning
- random restart
- horn relaxation
- ...

CDLS in Informatica
DPLL – summary

▶ Handles **CNF formulas**

▶ Probably **the most efficient SAT algorithm**

▶ Requires **polynomial space!!!**
  ➞ very limited memory requirements

▶ **ChooseLiteral() critical!**

▶ **Advanced optimization techniques**

▶ Many very efficient implementations [e.g., Chaff]
Many applications of SAT

- Many successful applications of SAT:
  - Boolean circuits
  - (Bounded) Planning
  - (Bounded) Model Checking
  - Cryptography
  - Scheduling
  - ...

- All NP-complete problem can be (polynomially) converted to SAT.

- Key issue: find an efficient encoding.
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Bounded Model Checking: Example

- LTL Formula: $G(p \rightarrow Fq)$
- Negated Formula (violation): $F(p \& G \lnot q)$
- $k = 0$:

  - No counter-example found.
Bounded Model Checking: Example

- **LTL Formula:** \( G(p \rightarrow Fq) \)
- **Negated Formula (violation):** \( F(p \land G \neg q) \)
- \( k = 1: \)

  - No counter-example found.
Bounded Model Checking: Example

- LTL Formula: \( G(p \rightarrow Fq) \)
- Negated Formula (violation): \( F(p \land G \neg q) \)
- \( k = 2 \):
- No counter-example found.
Bounded Model Checking: Example

- LTL Formula: \( G(p \rightarrow Fq) \)
- Negated Formula (violation): \( F(p \& G!q) \)
- \( k = 3 \):

\[ 1 \rightarrow 2 \rightarrow 3 \rightarrow 4 \]

- The 2nd trace is a counter-example!
The problem [Biere et al, 1999]

Ingredients:

- A system written as a Kripke structure \( M := \langle S, I, T, L \rangle \)
- A property \( f \) written as a LTL formula:
- an integer \( k \) (bound)

Problem:

- Is there an execution path of \( M \) of length \( k \) satisfying the temporal property \( f \)?:
  \[
  M \models_k Ef
  \]
- check repeated for increasing values of \( k = 1, 2, 3, ... \)
The encoding

Equivalent to the satisfiability problem of a boolean formula $\left[\left[ M, f \right]\right]_k$ defined as follows:

\[
\left[\left[ M, f \right]\right]_k := \left[\left[ M \right]\right]_k \land \left[\left[ f \right]\right]_k
\]

(1)

\[
\left[\left[ M \right]\right]_k := I(s^0) \land \bigwedge_{i=0}^{k-1} R(s^i, s^{i+1}),
\]

(2)

\[
\left[\left[ f \right]\right]_k := (\neg \bigvee_{l=0}^{k} R(s^k, s^l) \land \left[\left[ f \right]\right]_l^0) \lor \bigvee_{l=0}^{k} (R(s^k, s^l) \land l\left[\left[ f \right]\right]_l^0),
\]

(3)

- the vector $s$ of propositional variables is replicated $k+1$ times $s^0, s^1, ..., s^k$
- $\left[\left[ M \right]\right]_k$ encodes the fact that the $k$-path is an execution of $M$
- $\left[\left[ f \right]\right]_k$ encodes the fact that the $k$-path satisfies $f$
The Encoding [cont.]

In general, the encoding for a formula \( f \) with \( k \) steps

\[
[[f]]_k
\]

is the disjunction of

▷ the constraints needed to express a model without loopback,

\[
(\neg (\bigvee_{l=0}^{k} R(s^k, s^l)) \land [[[f]]_k]^0)
\]

▷ the constraints needed to express a given loopback, for all possible points of loopback

\[
\bigvee_{l=0}^{k} (R(s^k, s^l) \land l[[f]]_k^0)
\]
The encoding of $[[f]]^i_k$ and $l[[f]]^i_k$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$f$</th>
<th>$[[f]]^i_k$</th>
<th>$l[[f]]^i_k$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>$p_i$</td>
<td>$p_i$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\neg p$</td>
<td>$\neg p_i$</td>
<td>$\neg p_i$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$h \land g$</td>
<td>$[[h]]^i_k \land [[g]]^i_k$</td>
<td>$l[[h]]^i_k \land l[[g]]^i_k$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$h \lor g$</td>
<td>$[[h]]^i_k \lor [[g]]^i_k$</td>
<td>$l[[h]]^i_k \lor l[[g]]^i_k$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_g$</td>
<td>$[[g]]^i_k$ if $i &lt; k$ (\perp) otherwise.</td>
<td>$l[[g]]^i_k$ if $i &lt; k$ (\perp) otherwise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$G_g$</td>
<td>$\perp$</td>
<td>$\land_{j=\min(i,l)}^{k} l[[g]]^j$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F_g$</td>
<td>$\lor_{j=i}^{k} [[g]]^j_k$</td>
<td>$\lor_{j=\min(i,l)}^{k} l[[g]]^j$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$hUg$</td>
<td>$\lor_{j=i}^{k} \left( [[g]]^j_k \land \land_{n=i}^{j-1} [[h]]^n_k \right)$</td>
<td>$\lor_{j=i}^{k} \left( l[[g]]^j_k \land \land_{n=i}^{j-1} l[[h]]^n_k \right) \lor$ $\lor_{j=1}^{i-1} \left( l[[g]]^j_k \land \land_{n=i}^{k} l[[h]]^n_k \land \land_{n=l}^{j-1} l[[h]]^n_k \right)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$hRg$</td>
<td>$\lor_{j=i}^{k} \left( [[h]]^j_k \land \land_{n=i}^{j} [[g]]^n_k \right)$</td>
<td>$\lor_{j=\min(i,l)}^{k} l[[g]]^j$ \lor $\lor_{j=i}^{k} \left( i[[h]]^j_k \land \land_{n=i}^{j} l[[g]]^n_k \right)$ \lor $\lor_{j=1}^{i-1} \left( i[[h]]^j_k \land \land_{n=i}^{k} l[[g]]^n_k \land \land_{n=l}^{j-1} l[[g]]^n_k \right)$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Example: $\mathbf{F}p$ (reachability)

- $f := \mathbf{F}p$: is there a reachable state in which $p$ holds?
- a finite path can show that the property holds
- $[[M, f]]_k$ is:

\[
I(s^0) \land \bigwedge_{i=0}^{k-1} R(s^i, s^{i+1}) \land \bigvee_{j=0}^k p^j
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\neg p & \quad \rightarrow \\
S_0 & \quad \rightarrow \\
\neg p & \quad \rightarrow \\
S_1 & \quad \rightarrow \\
\ldots & \quad \rightarrow \\
\neg p & \quad \rightarrow \\
S_{k-1} & \quad \rightarrow \\
p & \quad \rightarrow \\
S_k &
\end{align*}
\]
Example: \( G_p \)

▷ \( f := G_p \): is there a path where \( p \) holds forever?

▷ We need to produce an infinite behaviour, with a finite number of transitions

▷ We can do it by imposing that the path loops back

\[
\frac{\text{[[}M, f\text{]]}_k}{\begin{align*}
I(s^0) \land \bigwedge_{i=0}^{k-1} R(s^i, s^{i+1}) \land \\
\bigvee_{l=0}^{k} R(s^k, s^l) \land \\
\bigwedge_{j=0}^{k} p^j
\end{align*}}
\]
Example: $\mathbf{GF}_q \land \mathbf{F}p$ (fair reachability)

- $f := \mathbf{GF}_q \land \mathbf{F}p$: provided that $q$ holds infinitely often, is there a reachable state in which $p$ holds?
- Again, we need to produce an infinite behaviour, with a finite number of transitions

$[[M,f]]_k$ is:

$$I(s^0) \land \bigwedge_{i=0}^{k-1} R(s^i,s^{i+1}) \land \bigvee_{j=0}^k p_j \land \bigvee_{l=0}^k \left( R(s^k,s^l) \land \bigvee_{j=l}^k q \right)$$
Example: a bugged 3-bit shift register

▷ System $M$:
  - $I(x) := \top$ (arbitrary initial state)
  - Correct $R$:
    \[
    R(x, x') := (x'[0] \leftrightarrow x[1]) \land (x'[1] \leftrightarrow x[2]) \land (x'[2] \leftrightarrow 0)
    \]
  - Bugged $R$:
    \[
    R(x, x') := (x'[0] \leftrightarrow x[1]) \land (x'[1] \leftrightarrow x[2]) \land (x'[2] \leftrightarrow 1)
    \]

▷ Property: $\mathbf{AF}(!x[0] \land !x[1] \land !x[2])$

▷ BMC Problem: $M \models_k \mathbf{EG}((x[0] \lor x[1] \lor x[2]))$
Example: a bugged 3-bit shift register (cont.)

$k = 2$

\[
[[M]]_2 : \left( (x_1[0] \leftrightarrow x_0[1]) \land (x_1[1] \leftrightarrow x_0[2]) \land (x_1[2] \leftrightarrow 1) \land \\
(x_2[0] \leftrightarrow x_1[1]) \land (x_2[1] \leftrightarrow x_1[2]) \land (x_2[2] \leftrightarrow 1) \right) \land \\
\big((x_0[0] \leftrightarrow x_2[1]) \land (x_0[1] \leftrightarrow x_2[2]) \land (x_0[2] \leftrightarrow 1)\big) \lor \\
\big((x_1[0] \leftrightarrow x_2[1]) \land (x_1[1] \leftrightarrow x_2[2]) \land (x_1[2] \leftrightarrow 1)\big) \lor \\
\big((x_2[0] \leftrightarrow x_2[1]) \land (x_2[1] \leftrightarrow x_2[2]) \land (x_2[2] \leftrightarrow 1)\big)
\]

\[\bigwedge_{i=0}^2 (x \neq 0) : \left( (x_0[0] \lor x_0[1] \lor x_0[2]) \land \\
(x_1[0] \lor x_1[1] \lor x_1[2]) \land \\
(x_2[0] \lor x_2[1] \lor x_2[2]) \right) \land \\
\bigwedge_{i=0}^2 (x \neq 0)
\]

\[\implies \text{SAT: } x_i[j] := 1 \ \forall i, j\]
Bounded Model Checking: summary

- **incomplete technique:**
  - if you find all formulas unsatisfiable, it tells you nothing
  - computing the maximum $k$ (diameter) possible but extremely hard
- **very efficient** for some problems (typically debugging)
- lots of enhancements
- current symbolic model checkers embed a SAT based BMC tool
Efficiency Issues in Bounded Model Checking

- Caching different problems:
  - can we exploit the similarities between problems at $k$ and $k+1$?

- Simplification of encodings
  - Reduced Boolean Circuits (RBC)
  - Boolean Expression Diagrams (BED)
  - Simplification based on Binary-Clauses Reasoning

- Extend usage to CTL formulae

- When can we stop increasing the bound $k$ if we don’t find violations?
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Basic Bound

Theorem. If $k = |M|$, then $M \models Ef \iff M \models_k Ef$.

- $|M|$ is always a bound of $k$. ($2^{|s|}$ is a bound as well.)
  - $|M|$ huge!
  - not so easy to compute in a symbolic setting.

$\implies$ need to find better bounds!
Diameter: Given $M$, the diameter of $M$ is the minimum integer $d$ s.t. for every path $s_0, ..., s_{d+1}$ there exist a path $t_0, ..., t_l$ s.t. $l \leq d$, $t_0 = s_0$ and $t_l = s_{d+1}$.

Intuition: if $u$ is reachable from $v$, then there is a path from $v$ to $u$ of length $d$ or less.

$\implies$ it is the maximum distance between two states in $M$. 
The diameter: computation

- **d** is the minimum integer \(d\) which makes the following formula true:

\[
\forall s_0, \ldots, s_{d+1}. \exists t_0, \ldots, t_d. \bigwedge_{i=0}^{d} T(s_i, s_{i+1}) \rightarrow \left( t_0 = s_0 \land \bigwedge_{i=0}^{d-1} T(t_i, t_{i+1}) \land \bigvee_{i=0}^{d} t_i = s_{d+1} \right)
\]

- Quantified boolean formula (QBF): much harder than NP-complete!
The recurrence diameter

Recurrence diameter: Given $M$, the recurrence diameter of $M$ is the minimum integer $d$ s.t. for every path $s_0, \ldots, s_{d+1}$ there exist $j \leq d$ s.t. $s_{d+1} = s_j$

Intuition: the maximum length of a non-loop path
The recurrence diameter: computation

▷ $d$ is the minimum integer $d$ which makes the following formula true:

$$\forall s_0, \ldots, s_{d+1}. \bigwedge_{i=0}^{d} T(s_i, s_{i+1}) \rightarrow \bigvee_{i=0}^{d} s_i = s_{d+1}$$

▷ Validity problem: coNP-complete (solvable by SAT).

▷ Possibly much longer than the diameter!

Diameter = 1

Recurrence Diameter = 3
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Inductive Reasoning on Invariants

1. If all the initial states are good,

2. and if from any good state we only go to good states

⇒ then we can conclude that the system is correct for all reachable states.
SAT-based Inductive Reasoning on Invariants

1. If all the initial states are good
   - $I(s^0) \rightarrow Good(s^0)$ is valid (its negation is unsatisfiable)

2. If from any good state we only go to good states
   - $\neg \left( \neg \left( (I(s^0) \rightarrow Good(s^0)) \right) \right)$
   - $\neg \left( \neg \left( \left( Good(s^k) \land R(s^k, s^{k+1}) \right) \rightarrow Good(s^{k+1}) \right) \right)$
   then we can conclude that the system is correct for all reachable states.

⇒ Check for the unsatisfiability of the boolean formulas:
SAT-based Inductive Reasoning on Invariants [cont.]
Problem: Induction may fail because of unreachable states:

- if $(\text{Good}(s^k) \land R(s^k, s^{k+1})) \rightarrow \text{Good}(s^{k+1})$ is not valid, this does not mean that the property does not hold
- both $s^k$ and $s^{k+1}$ might be unreachable
Solution: increase the depth of induction
\[(Good(s^k) \land R(s^k, s^{k+1}) \land Good(s^{k+1}) \land R(s^{k+1}, s^{k+2})) \rightarrow Good(s^{k+2})\]
force loop freedom with \(- (s^i = s^j)\)

⇒ Check for the unsatisfiability of the boolean formulas:

\[-(I(s^0) \rightarrow Good(s^0))\]
\[-( (Good(s^k) \land R(s^k, s^{k+1})) \rightarrow Good(s^{k+1}) )\]
\[-( (Good(s^k) \land R(s^k, s^{k+1}) \land Good(s^{k+1}) \land R(s^{k+1}, s^{k+2})) \rightarrow Good(s^{k+2})\]

▷ repeat for increasing values of the gap 1, 2, 3, 4,....

▷ dual to bounded model checking
Guess (or, better, infer) $\phi$ such that $Good \land \phi$ is an invariant

- All the above checks are implementable with SAT technologies
Mixed BMC & Inductive reasoning [Sheeran et al. 2000]

1. function \texttt{CHECKPROPERTY} \((I, R, \varphi)\)
2. \hspace{1em} for \(n := 0, 1, 2, 3, \ldots\) do
3. \hspace{2em} if \((\text{DPLL}(Base_n) == \text{SAT})\)
4. \hspace{3em} then return \texttt{PROPERTY\_VIOLATED};
5. \hspace{2em} else if \((\text{DPLL}(Step_n \land Unique_n) == \text{UNSAT})\)
6. \hspace{3em} then return \texttt{PROPERTY\_VERIFIED};
7. \hspace{1em} end for;

\[
Base_n := I(s_0) \land \bigwedge_{i=0}^{n-1} (R(s_i, s_{i+1}) \land \varphi(s_i)) \land \neg \varphi(s_n)
\]

\[
Step_n := \bigwedge_{i=0}^{n} (R(s_i, s_{i+1}) \land \varphi(s_i)) \land \neg \varphi(s_{n+1})
\]

\[
Unique_n := \bigwedge_{0 \leq i \leq j \leq n} \neg (s_i = s_{j+1})
\]