

# Beautiful Interpolants

Aws Albarghouthi<sup>1</sup> and Kenneth L. McMillan<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> University of Toronto

<sup>2</sup> Microsoft Research

**Abstract.** We describe a compositional approach to Craig interpolation based on the heuristic that simpler proofs of special cases are more likely to generalize. The method produces simple interpolants because it is able to summarize a large set of cases using one relatively simple fact. In particular, we present a method for finding such simple facts in the theory of linear rational arithmetic. This makes it possible to use interpolation to discover inductive invariants for numerical programs that are challenging for existing techniques. We show that in some cases, the compositional approach can also be more efficient than traditional lazy SMT as a decision procedure.

## 1 Introduction

*beau-ti-ful*    *adjective*    \ˈbyü-ti-fəl\  
1: ...*exciting aesthetic pleasure*  
2: *generally pleasing* [2]

In mathematics and physics, the beauty of a theory is an important quality. A simple or elegant argument is considered more likely to generalize than a complex one. Imagine, for example, proving a conjecture about an object in  $N$  dimensions. We might first try to prove the special case of two or three dimensions, and then generalize the argument to the  $N$ -dimensional case. We would prefer a proof of the two-dimensional case that is simple, on the grounds that it will be less prone to depend on particular aspects of this case, thus more likely to generalize.

We can apply this heuristic to the proof of programs or hardware systems. We produce a proof of correctness for some bounded collection of program executions. From this proof we can derive a conjectured invariant of the program using Craig interpolation methods, e.g., [22,24,21,11]. The simpler our conjecture, the less it is able to encode particular aspects of our bounded behaviors, so the more likely it is to be inductive. Typically, our bounded proofs will be produced by an SMT (satisfiability modulo theories) solver. Simplicity of our interpolant-derived conjecture depends on simplicity of the SMT solver's proof. Unfortunately, for reasons we will discuss shortly, SMT solvers may produce proofs that are far more complex than necessary.

In this paper, we consider an approach we call *compositional SMT* that is geared to produce simple interpolants. It is compositional in the sense that the interpolant acts as an intermediate assertion between components of the formula, localizing the reasoning. This approach allows us to solve inductive invariant

generation problems that are difficult for other techniques, and in some cases can solve bounded verification problems much more efficiently than standard lazy SMT [8] methods. The approach is simple to implement and uses an unmodified SMT solver as a “black box”.

A lazy SMT solver separates the problems of Boolean and theory reasoning. To test satisfiability of a formula  $A$  relative to a theory  $\mathcal{T}$ , it uses a SAT solver to find propositionally satisfying assignments. These can be thought of as disjuncts in the disjunctive normal form (DNF) of  $A$ . A theory solver then determines feasibility of these disjuncts in  $\mathcal{T}$ . In the negative case, it produces a *theory lemma*. This is a validity of the theory that contradicts the disjunct propositionally. In the worst case, each theory lemma rules out only one amongst an exponential collection of disjuncts.

In compositional SMT, we refute satisfiability of a conjunction  $A \wedge B$  by finding an *interpolant* formula  $I$ , such that  $A \Rightarrow I$ ,  $B \Rightarrow \neg I$  and  $I$  uses only the symbols common to  $A$  and  $B$ . We do this by building two collections of feasible disjuncts of  $A$  and  $B$  that we call *samples*. We then try to construct a simple interpolant  $I$  for the two sample sets. If  $I$  is an interpolant for  $A$  and  $B$ , we are done. Otherwise, we use our SMT solver to find a new sample that contradicts either  $A \Rightarrow I$  or  $B \Rightarrow \neg I$ , and restart the process with the new sample.

Unlike the theory solver in lazy SMT, our interpolant generator can “see” many different cases and try to find a simple fact that generalizes them. This more global view allows compositional SMT to find very simple interpolants in cases when lazy SMT produces an exponential number of theory lemmas.

We develop the technique here in the quantifier-free theory of linear rational arithmetic (QFLRA). This allows us to apply some established techniques based on Farkas’ lemma to search for simple interpolants. The contributions of this paper are (1) A compositional approach to SMT based on sampling and interpolation (2) An interpolation algorithm for QFLRA based on finding linear separators for sets of convex polytopes. (3) A prototype implementation that demonstrates the utility of the technique for invariant generation, and shows the potential to speed up SMT solving.

**Organization.** Sec. 2 illustrates our approach on a simple example. Sec. 3 gives a general algorithm for interpolation via sampling. Sec. 4 describes an interpolation technique for sets of convex polytopes. Sec. 5 presents our implementation and experimental results. Related work is discussed in Sec. 6.

## 2 Motivating Example

Figure 1 shows two QFLRA formulas  $A$  and  $B$  over the variables  $x$  and  $y$ . For clarity of presentation, the two formulas are in DNF, where  $A_1, A_2$ , and  $A_3$  are the disjuncts of  $A$ , and  $B_1$  and  $B_2$  are the disjuncts of  $B$ . Intuitively, since a disjunct is a conjunction of linear inequalities (*half-spaces*), it represents a *convex polyhedron* in  $\mathbb{R}^2$ . Fig. 2(a) represents  $A$  and  $B$  geometrically, where each disjunct is highlighted using a different shade of gray.

$$\begin{array}{llll}
 A = (x \leq 1 \wedge y \leq 3) & (A_1) & & \\
 \vee (1 \leq x \leq 2 \wedge y \leq 2) & (A_2) & B = (x \geq 2 \wedge y \geq 3) & (B_1) \\
 \vee (2 \leq x \leq 3 \wedge y \leq 1) & (A_3) & \vee (x \geq 3 \wedge 2 \leq y \leq 3) & (B_2)
 \end{array}$$

**Fig. 1.** Inconsistent formulas A and B


Since A and B do not intersect, as shown in Fig 2(a),  $A \wedge B$  is unsatisfiable. Thus, there exists an interpolant I such that  $A \Rightarrow I$  and  $I \Rightarrow \neg B$ . One such I is the half-space  $x + y \leq 4$ , shown in Fig. 2(b) as the region encompassing all of A, but not intersecting with B. We now discuss how our technique constructs such an interpolant.

We start by *sampling* disjuncts from A and B. In practice, we sample a disjunct from a formula  $\varphi$  by finding a model  $m \models \varphi$ , using an SMT solver, and evaluating all linear inequalities occurring in  $\varphi$  with respect to  $m$ . Suppose we sample the disjuncts  $A_2$  and  $B_1$ . We now find an interpolant of  $(A_2, B_1)$ . To do so, we utilize Farkas’ lemma and encode a system of constraints that is satisfiable *iff* there exists a *half-space interpolant* of  $(A_2, B_1)$ . That is, we are looking for an interpolant comprised of a single linear inequality, not an arbitrary Boolean combination of linear inequalities. In this case, we might find the half-space interpolant  $y \leq 2.5$ , shown in Fig. 2(c).

We call  $y \leq 2.5$  a *partial interpolant*, since it is an interpolant of  $A_2$  and  $B_1$ , which are parts of (i.e., subsumed by) A and B, respectively. We now check if this partial interpolant is an interpolant of  $(A, B)$  using an SMT solver. First, we check if  $A \wedge y > 2.5$  is satisfiable. Since it is satisfiable,  $A \not\Rightarrow y \leq 2.5$ , indicating that  $y \leq 2.5$  is not an interpolant of  $(A, B)$ . A satisfying assignment of  $A \wedge y > 2.5$  is a model of A that lies outside the region  $y \leq 2.5$ , for example, the point (1, 3) shown in Fig. 2(c). Since (1, 3) is a model of the disjunct  $A_1$ , we add  $A_1$  to the set of samples in order to take it into account.

At this point, we have two A samples,  $A_1$  and  $A_2$ , and one B sample  $B_1$ . We now seek an interpolant for  $(A_1 \vee A_2, B_1)$ . Of course, we can construct such an interpolant by taking the disjunction of two half-space interpolants: one for  $(A_1, B_1)$  and one for  $(A_2, B_1)$ . Instead, we attempt to find a *single* half-space that is an interpolant of  $(A_1 \vee A_2, B_1)$  – we say that the samples  $A_1$  and  $A_2$  are *merged* into a *sampleset*  $\{A_1, A_2\}$ . As before, we construct a system of constraints and solve it for such an interpolant. In this case, we get the half-space  $x + y \leq 4$ , shown in Fig. 2(d). Since  $x + y \leq 4$  is an interpolant of  $(A, B)$ , the algorithm terminates successfully. If there is no half-space interpolant for  $(A_1 \vee A_2, B_1)$ , we *split* the sampleset  $\{A_1, A_2\}$  into two samples, and find two half-space interpolants for  $(A_1, B_1)$  and  $(A_2, B_1)$ .

The key intuition underlying our approach is two-fold: (1) Lazily sampling a small number of disjuncts from A and B often suffices for finding an interpolant for all of A and B. (2) By merging samples, e.g., as  $A_1$  and  $A_2$  above, and encoding a system of constraints to find half-space interpolants, we are forcing



**Fig. 2.** (a) Illustration of the formulas  $A$  and  $B$ . (b) An interpolant  $x + y \leq 4$  for  $(A, B)$ . (c) An interpolant  $y \leq 2.5$  for  $(A_2, B_1)$ . (d) An interpolant  $x + y \leq 4$  for samples  $(A_1 \vee A_2, B_1)$ . (e) An interpolant computed by MATHSAT5.

the procedure to take a holistic view of the problem and produce simpler and possibly more general interpolants.

Given the formulas  $A$  and  $B$ , an SMT solver is generally unable to find the simple fact  $x + y \leq 4$ , due to the specificity of the theory lemmas it produces.

For example, we used the MATHSAT SMT solver to find an interpolant for  $A$  and  $B$ , and it produced the following formula<sup>1</sup>:

$$(x \leq 2 \wedge y \leq 2) \vee ((x \leq 1 \vee y \leq 1) \wedge ((x \leq 2 \wedge y \leq 2) \vee (x \leq 1 \vee y \leq 1))),$$

illustrated in Fig. 2(e). This interpolant is more complex and does not capture the emerging pattern of the samples. As we add more disjuncts to  $A$  and  $B$  following the pattern, the interpolants produced by MATHSAT grow in size, whereas our approach produces the same result. This ability to generalize a series is key to invariant generation. In the SMT approach, the theory solver sees only one pair of disjuncts from  $A$  and  $B$  at a time, and thus cannot generalize.

### 3 Constructing Interpolants from Samples

We now present CSMT (Compositional SMT), a generic algorithm for computing an interpolant for a pair of quantifier-free first-order formulas  $(A, B)$ . CSMT attempts to partition samples from  $A$  and  $B$  as coarsely as possible into *samplesets*, such that each  $A$  sampleset can be separated from each  $B$  sampleset by an atomic interpolant formula (for linear arithmetic, this means a single linear constraint). Although CSMT applies to any theory that allows quantifier-free interpolation, for concreteness, we consider here only linear arithmetic.

**Preliminaries.** A formula of *quantifier-free linear rational arithmetic*, LRA, is a Boolean combination of *atoms*. Each atom is a linear inequality of the form  $c_1x_1 + \dots + c_nx_n \triangleleft k$ , where  $c_1, \dots, c_n$  and  $k$  are rational constants,  $x_1, \dots, x_n$  are distinct variables, and  $\triangleleft$  is either  $<$  or  $\leq$ . The atom is an *open* or *closed half-space* if  $\triangleleft$  is  $<$  or  $\leq$ , respectively. We use  $\text{Linlq}(\varphi)$  to denote the set of atoms appearing in formula  $\varphi$ , and  $\text{Vars}(\varphi)$  to denote the set of variables. We will often write  $cx \triangleleft k$  for a half-space  $c_1x_1 + \dots + c_nx_n \triangleleft k$ , where  $c$  is the row vector of the coefficients  $\{c_i\}$ , and  $x$  is the column vector of the variables  $\{x_i\}$ .

A *model* of  $\varphi$  is an assignment of rational values to  $\text{Vars}(\varphi)$  that makes  $\varphi$  true. Given a model  $m$  of  $\varphi$ , we define the *sample* of  $\varphi$  w.r.t.  $m$ , written  $\text{sample}_\varphi(m)$ , as the formula

$$\bigwedge \{P \mid P \in \text{Linlq}(\varphi), m \models P\} \wedge \bigwedge \{\neg P \mid P \in \text{Linlq}(\varphi), m \not\models P\}.$$

Note, there are finitely many samples of  $\varphi$  and  $\varphi$  is equivalent to the disjunction of its samples. Geometrically, each sample can be thought of as a convex polytope.

Given two formulas  $A, B \in \text{LRA}$  such that  $A \wedge B$  is unsatisfiable, an *interpolant* of  $(A, B)$  is a formula  $I \in \text{LRA}$  such that  $\text{Vars}(I) \subseteq \text{Vars}(A) \cap \text{Vars}(B)$ ,  $A \Rightarrow I$ , and  $B \Rightarrow \neg I$ . An interpolant exists for every inconsistent  $(A, B)$ .

**General Algorithm.** We formalize CSMT in Fig. 3 as a set of guarded commands. In each, if the condition above the line is satisfied, the assignment below may be executed. The state of CSMT is defined by the following variables:

<sup>1</sup> Produced using MATHSAT 5.2.2, and slightly modified for clarity of presentation.

$$\frac{}{S_A := \emptyset \quad S_B := \emptyset \quad \text{Pltp} := \emptyset} \text{INIT}$$

- Rules for distributing samples into samplesets:

$$\frac{X \in \{A, B\} \quad s_1 \in S_X \quad s_2 \in S_X \quad s_1 \neq s_2}{S_X := (S_X \setminus \{s_1, s_2\}) \cup \{s_1 \cup s_2\}} \text{MERGE}$$

$$\frac{X \in \{A, B\} \quad s_1 \cup s_2 \in S_X \quad s_1 \neq \emptyset \quad s_2 \neq \emptyset}{S_X := (S_X \setminus \{s_1 \cup s_2\}) \cup \{s_1\} \cup \{s_2\}} \text{SPLIT}$$

- Rules for constructing and checking interpolants:

$$\frac{s_A \in S_A \quad s_B \in S_B \quad \text{HALFITP}(s_A, s_B) \neq \diamond \quad \text{Pltp}(s_A, s_B) \text{ is undefined}}{\text{Pltp}(s_A, s_B) := \text{HALFITP}(s_A, s_B)} \text{PARTIALITP}$$

$$\frac{C = \text{CAND}(S_A, S_B, \text{Pltp}) \neq \diamond \quad m \models A \wedge \neg C}{S_A := S_A \cup \{\{sample_A(m)\}\}} \text{CHECKITPA}$$

$$\frac{C = \text{CAND}(S_A, S_B, \text{Pltp}) \neq \diamond \quad m \models C \wedge B}{S_B := S_B \cup \{\{sample_B(m)\}\}} \text{CHECKITPB}$$

- Termination conditions:

$$\frac{s_A \in S_A \quad s_B \in S_B \quad |s_A| = |s_B| = 1 \quad \text{HALFITP}(s_A, s_B) = \diamond}{A \wedge B \text{ is satisfiable}} \text{SAT}$$

$$\frac{C = \text{CAND}(S_A, S_B, \text{Pltp}) \quad A \Rightarrow C \quad C \Rightarrow \neg B}{C \text{ is an interpolant of } (A, B)} \text{UNSAT}$$

**Fig. 3.** CSMT as guarded commands

- *Sampleset collections*  $S_A, S_B$  are sets of samplesets of  $A$  and  $B$ , respectively. Initially, as dictated by the command INIT,  $S_A = S_B = \emptyset$ .
- *Partial interpolant map*  $\text{Pltp}$  is a map from pairs of samplesets to half-spaces. Invariantly, if  $(s_A, s_B)$  is in the domain of  $\text{Pltp}$  then  $\text{Pltp}(s_A, s_B)$  is an interpolant for  $(\bigvee s_A, \bigvee s_B)$ .

We do not attempt to find a smallest set of half-spaces that separate the samples, as this problem is NP-complete. This can be shown by reduction from *k-polyhedral separability*: given two sets of points on a plane, is there a set of less than  $k$  half-spaces separating the two sets of points [26]. Instead, we heuristically cluster the samples into large samplesets such that each pair of samplesets  $(s_A, s_B)$  is linearly separable. Even with a minimal clustering, this solution may be sub-optimal, in the sense of using more half-spaces than necessary. Since our objective is a heuristic one, we will seek reasonably simple interpolants with moderate effort, rather than trying to optimize.

In practice, we heuristically search the space of clusterings using MERGE and SPLIT. MERGE is used to combine two samplesets in  $S_{\{A,B\}}$  and make them a single sampleset. SPLIT performs the opposite of MERGE: it picks a sampleset in  $S_{\{A,B\}}$  and splits it into two samplesets. The command PARTIALITP populates the map  $\text{Pltp}$  with interpolants for pairs of samplesets  $(s_A, s_B)$ . This is done by calling HALFITP  $(s_A, s_B)$ , which returns a half-space interpolant of  $(\bigvee s_A, \bigvee s_B)$  if one exists, and the symbol  $\diamond$  otherwise (Sec. 4 presents an implementation of HALFITP).

The commands CHECKITPA and CHECKITPB check if the current *candidate interpolant* is *not* an interpolant of  $(A, B)$ , in which case, samples produced from counterexamples are added to  $S_A$  and  $S_B$ . The function CAND constructs a candidate interpolant from  $\text{Pltp}$ . If the domain of  $\text{Pltp}$  contains  $S_A \times S_B$ , then

$$\text{CAND}(S_A, S_B, \text{Pltp}) \equiv \bigvee_{s_A \in S_A} \left( \bigwedge_{s_B \in S_B} \text{Pltp}(s_A, s_B) \right)$$

Otherwise the result is  $\diamond$ . The result of CAND is an interpolant of  $(A', B')$ , where  $A'$  and  $B'$  are the disjunction of all samples in  $S_A$  and  $S_B$ , respectively. This DNF formula may not be optimal in size. Synthesizing optimal candidate interpolants from partial interpolants is a problem that we hope to explore in the future.

If SAT or UNSAT apply, then the algorithm terminates. SAT checks if two singleton samplesets do not have a half-space separating them. Since both samples define convex polytopes, if no half-space separates them, then they intersect, and therefore  $A \wedge B$  is satisfiable. UNSAT checks if a candidate interpolant  $C$  is indeed an interpolant, in which case CSMT terminates successfully.

*Example 1.* Consider the formulas  $A$  and  $B$  from Sec. 2. Suppose that CSMT is in the state  $S_A = \{\{A_2\}\}$ ,  $S_B = \{\{B_1\}\}$ ,  $\text{Pltp} = \emptyset$ , where  $A_2$  and  $B_1$  are the samples of  $A$  and  $B$  defined in Sec. 2. By applying PARTIALITP, we find a half-space separating the only two samplesets. As a result,  $\text{Pltp}(\{A_2\}, \{B_1\}) = y \leq 2.5$ . Suppose we now apply CHECKITPA. The candidate interpolant  $\text{CAND}(S_A, S_B, \text{Pltp})$  at this point is  $y \leq 2.5$ . Since  $A \wedge y > 2.5$  is satisfiable, CHECKITPA adds the sampleset  $\{A_1\}$ , which is not subsumed by the candidate interpolant, to  $S_A$ . Now,  $S_A = \{\{A_1\}, \{A_2\}\}$ . Since we have two samplesets in  $S_A$ , we apply MERGE and get  $S_A = \{\{A_1, A_2\}\}$ . PARTIALITP is now used to find a half-space interpolant for the samplesets  $\{A_1, A_2\}$  and  $\{B_1\}$ . Suppose it finds the plane  $x + y \leq 4$ . Then UNSAT is applicable and the algorithm terminates with  $x + y \leq 4$  as an interpolant of  $(A, B)$ .  $\square$

The key rule for producing simpler interpolants is MERGE, since it decreases the number of samplesets, and forces the algorithm to find a smaller number of half-spaces that separate a larger number of samples. In Example 1 above, if we do not apply MERGE, we might end up adding all the samples of  $A$  and  $B$  to  $S_A$  and  $S_B$ . Thus, producing an interpolant with a large number of half-spaces like the one illustrated in Fig. 2(e).

**Theorem 1 (Soundness of CSMT).** *Given two formulas  $A$  and  $B$ , if CSMT terminates using*

1. SAT, then  $A \wedge B$  is satisfiable.
2. UNSAT, then  $\text{CAND}(\mathcal{S}_A, \mathcal{S}_B, \text{Pltp})$  is an interpolant of  $(A, B)$ .

*Proof (Sketch).* In case 1, by definition of the rule SAT, we know that there is a sample  $a$  of  $A$  and a sample  $b$  of  $B$  such that there does not exist a half-space  $I$  that is an interpolant of  $(a, b)$ . Since both  $a$  and  $b$  define convex polytopes, if  $a$  and  $b$  do not have a half-space separating them, then  $a \wedge b$  is satisfiable, and therefore  $A \wedge B$  is satisfiable.

In case 2, the candidate interpolant  $C$ , checked in rule UNSAT, is over the shared variables of  $A$  and  $B$  (by definition of HALFITP),  $A \Rightarrow C$ , and  $C \Rightarrow \neg B$ . Therefore, it is an interpolant of  $(A, B)$ .  $\square$

We now consider the termination (completeness) of CSMT. It is easy to see that one can keep applying the commands MERGE and SPLIT without ever terminating. To make sure that does not happen, we impose the restriction that for any sampleset in  $P_{\{A, B\}}$ , if it is ever split, it never reappears in the sampleset collection. For example, if a sampleset  $s_A \in \mathcal{S}_A$  is split into two samplesets  $s_A^1$  and  $s_A^2$  using SPLIT, then  $s_A$  cannot reappear in  $\mathcal{S}_A$ . Given this restriction, CSMT always terminates.

**Theorem 2 (Completeness of CSMT).** *For any two formulas  $A$  and  $B$ , CSMT terminates.*

*Proof (Sketch).* Since there are finitely many samples, CHECKITPA, CHECKITPA and PARTIALITP must be executed finitely. Due to our restriction, MERGE is also bounded. Thus, if we do not terminate, eventually SPLIT reduces all samplesets to singletons, at which point SAT or UNSAT must terminate the procedure.

## 4 Half-Space Interpolants

In this section, we present a constraint-based implementation of the parameter HALFITP of CSMT. Given two samplesets  $s_A$  and  $s_B$ , our goal is to find a half-space interpolant  $ix \triangleleft k$  of  $(\bigvee s_A, \bigvee s_B)$ . Since both  $s_A$  and  $s_B$  represent a union (set) of convex polytopes, we could compute the *convex hulls* of  $s_A$  and  $s_B$  and use techniques such as [29,7] to find a half-space separating the two convex hulls. To avoid the potentially expensive convex hull construction, we set up a system of linear constraints whose solution encodes both the separating half-space and the proof that it is separating. We then solve the constraints using an LP solver. This is an extension of the method in [29] from pairs of convex polytopes to pairs of *sets* of convex polytopes.

The intuition behind this construction is simple. We can represent the desired separator as a linear constraint  $I$  of the form  $ix \leq k$ , where  $x$  is a vector of variables,  $i$  is a vector of unknown coefficients, and  $k$  is an unknown constant. We wish to solve for the unknowns  $i$  and  $k$ . To express the fact that  $I$  is a separator, we apply Farkas' lemma. This tells us that a set of linear constraints



$\{C_j\}$  implies  $I$  exactly when  $I$  can be expressed as a linear combination of  $\{C_j\}$  with non-negative coefficients. That is, when  $\sum_j c_j C_j + d \equiv I$  for some non-negative  $\{c_j\}$  and  $d$ . The key insight is that this equivalence is itself a set of linear equality constraints with unknowns  $\{c_j\}$ ,  $d$ ,  $i$  and  $k$ . The values of  $\{c_j\}$  and  $d$  constitute a certificate that in fact  $\{C_j\}$  implies  $I$ . We can therefore construct constraints requiring that each sample in  $s_A$  implies (is contained in)  $I$ , and similarly that each sample in  $s_B$  implies  $\neg I$  (equivalent to  $-ix < -k$ ). Solving these constraints we obtain a separator  $I$  and simultaneously a certificate that  $I$  is a separator. What is new here is only that we solve for multiple Farkas proofs: one for each sample in  $s_A$  or  $s_B$ .

We now make this construction precise. Let  $N_A = |s_A|$  and  $N_B = |s_B|$ . Each sample in  $s_A$  is represented as a vector inequality  $A_j x \leq a_j$ , for  $j \in [1, N_A]$ . Similarly, samples in  $s_B$  are of the form  $B_j x \leq b_j$ , for  $j \in [1, N_B]$ . Here,  $x$  is a column vector of the variables  $\text{Vars}(A) \cup \text{Vars}(B)$ . For example, the sample  $y \leq 1 \wedge z \leq 3$  is represented as follows:

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} y \\ z \end{pmatrix} \leq \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 3 \end{pmatrix}$$

In the remainder of this section, we assume that all samples are conjunctions of closed half-spaces, i.e., non-strict inequalities. (In [6], we present a simple extension to our construction for handling open half-spaces.) It follows that if there exists a half-space interpolant for  $(\bigvee s_A, \bigvee s_B)$ , then there exists a *closed* half-space that is also an interpolant. Thus, our goal is to find a closed half-space  $ix \leq k$  that satisfies the following two conditions:

$$\forall j \in [1, N_A] \cdot A_j x \leq a_j \Rightarrow ix \leq k \tag{1}$$

$$\forall j \in [1, N_B] \cdot B_j x \leq b_j \Rightarrow \neg ix \leq k \tag{2}$$

Condition (1) specifies that  $ix \leq k$  subsumes all  $s_A$  samples. Condition (2) specifies that  $ix \leq k$  does not intersect with any of the  $s_B$  samples. By forcing coefficients of unshared variables to be 0 in  $ix \leq k$ , we ensure that  $ix \leq k$  is an interpolant of  $(\bigvee s_A, \bigvee s_B)$ . To construct such half-space interpolant, we utilize Farkas' lemma [30]:

**Theorem 3 (Farkas' lemma).** *Given a satisfiable system of linear inequalities  $Ax \leq b$  and a linear inequality  $ix \leq k$ , then:  $Ax \leq b \Rightarrow ix \leq k$  iff there exists a row vector  $\lambda \geq 0$  s.t.  $\lambda A = i$  and  $\lambda b \leq k$ .*

Using this fact, we construct a constraint  $\Phi_A$  that, when satisfiable, implies that a half-space  $ix \leq k$  satisfies condition (1). Consider a sample  $A_j x \leq a_j$ , where  $A_j$  is an  $m_j \times n_j$  matrix. We associate with this sample a row vector  $\lambda_{A_j}$  of size  $m_j$ , consisting of fresh variables, called *Farkas coefficients* of the  $m_j$  linear inequalities represented by  $A_j x \leq a_j$ . We now define  $\Phi_A$  as follows:

$$\Phi_A \equiv \forall j \in [1, N_A] \cdot \lambda_{A_j} \geq 0 \wedge \lambda_{A_j} A_j = i \wedge \lambda_{A_j} a_j \leq k$$

The row vector  $i$  is of the form  $(i_{x_1} \cdots i_{x_n})$ , where each  $i_{x_j}$  is a variable denoting the coefficient of variable  $x_j$  in the interpolant. Similarly,  $k$  is a variable denoting

the constant in the interpolant. Suppose we have an assignment to  $i, k$ , and  $\lambda_{A_j}$  that satisfies  $\Phi_A$ . Then, by Farkas' lemma, the half-space  $ix \leq k$  satisfies condition (1), where  $i$  and  $k$  are replaced by their assignment values. This because a satisfying assignment of  $\Phi_A$  implies that for every  $j \in [1, N_A]$ ,  $A_j x \leq a_j \Rightarrow ix \leq k$ .

We now encode a constraint  $\Phi_B$  that enforces condition (2). As before, we associate a row vector  $\lambda_{B_j}$  with each sample  $B_j x \leq b_j$ . We define  $\Phi_B$  as follows:

$$\Phi_B \equiv \forall j \in [1, N_B] \cdot \lambda_{B_j} \geq 0 \wedge \lambda_{B_j} B_j = -i \wedge \lambda_{B_j} b_j < -k$$

Following Farkas' lemma, a satisfying assignment of  $\Phi_B$  results in a half-space  $-ix < -k$  that subsumes all samples in  $s_B$ . That is,  $B_j x \leq b_j \Rightarrow -ix \leq k$ , for all  $j \in [1, N_B]$ , thus satisfying condition (2). Therefore, a satisfying assignment of  $\Phi_A \wedge \Phi_B$  produces a half-space interpolant  $ix \leq k$  for  $(\bigvee s_A, \bigvee s_B)$ . Note that our encoding implicitly ensures that coefficients of unshared variables are 0 in  $ix \leq k$ . See [6] for an example of solving these constraints to obtain an interpolant. Thm. 4 below states soundness and completeness of our encoding for samples that are conjunctions of closed half-spaces.

**Theorem 4 (Soundness and Completeness of HALFITP).** *Given two samplesets (where all samples are systems of closed half-spaces),  $s_A$  and  $s_B$ , and their corresponding encoding  $\Phi \equiv \Phi_A \wedge \Phi_B$ , then:*

1. *If  $\Phi$  is satisfiable using a variable assignment  $m$ , then  $i^m x \leq k^m$  is an interpolant for  $(\bigvee s_A, \bigvee s_B)$ , where  $i^m$  and  $k^m$  are the values of  $i$  and  $k$  in  $m$ , respectively.*
2. *Otherwise, no half-space interpolant exists for  $(\bigvee s_A, \bigvee s_B)$ .*

## 5 Implementation and Evaluation

We implemented the compositional SMT technique, CSMT, in the C# language, using the Z3 SMT solver [27] for constraint solving and sampling. The primary heuristic choice in the implementation is how to split and merge samplesets. The heuristics we use for this are described in [6], along with some optimizations that improve performance.

To experiment with CSMT, we integrated it with DUALITY [25], a tool that uses interpolants to construct inductive invariants. We will call this CSMTDUA. In the configuration we used, DUALITY can be thought of as implementing *Lazy Abstraction With Interpolants* (LAWI), as in IMPACT [22]. The primary difference is that we use a large-block encoding [9], so that edges in the abstract reachability tree correspond to complete loop bodies rather than basic blocks.

**Sequence Interpolants with CSMT.** Duality produces sequences of formulas corresponding to (large block) program execution paths in static single assignment (SSA) form, and requires interpolants to be computed for these sequences. An interpolant sequence for formulas  $A_1, \dots, A_n$  is a sequence of formulas  $I_1, \dots, I_{n-1}$  where  $I_i$  is an interpolant for  $(\bigwedge_{k \leq i} A_k, \bigwedge_{k > i} A_k)$ . The interpolant sequence must also be *inductive*, in the sense that  $I_{i-1} \wedge A_i \Rightarrow I_i$ . In

Program	CsMTDUA	CPA	UFO	INVGENAI	INVGENCS
f2	✓	X	X	X <sub>f</sub>	X <sub>f</sub>
gulv	✓	X	X	X <sub>f</sub>	X <sub>f</sub>
gulv_simp	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
substring1	✓	X	✓	✓	✓
pldi08	✓	✓	✓	X <sub>f</sub>	X <sub>f</sub>
pldi082unb	✓	X	X	✓	✓
xy0	✓	X	X	✓	✓
xy10	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
xy4	✓	X	X	✓	✓
xyz	✓	X	X	✓	✓
xyz2	✓	X	X	✓	✓
dillig/01	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
dillig/03	✓	X	X	✓	✓
dillig/05	✓	X	✓	✓	✓
dillig/07	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
dillig/09	✓	X	X	✓	X
dillig/12	✓	X	✓	X	X
dillig/15	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
dillig/17	✓	✓	X	✓	✓
dillig/19	✓	✓	✓	X <sub>f</sub>	X <sub>f</sub>
dillig/20	✓	✓	✓	X <sub>f</sub>	X <sub>f</sub>
dillig/24	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
dillig/25	✓	✓	✓	✓	X <sub>f</sub>
dillig/28	✓	X	X	✓	✓
dillig/31	✓	✓	X	✓	X
dillig/32	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
dillig/33	✓	✓	X <sub>f</sub>	X	X
dillig/35	✓	✓	✓	X <sub>f</sub>	X <sub>f</sub>
dillig/37	✓	✓	✓	X <sub>f</sub>	X <sub>f</sub>
dillig/39	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
#SOLVED	30	17	17	21	18

**Fig. 4.** Verification results of CsMT, CPACHECKER, UFO, and two configurations of INVGEN on a collection of C benchmarks


this application, an inductive interpolant sequence can be thought of as a Hoare logic proof of the given execution path.

A key heuristic for invariant generation is to try to find a *common* interpolant for positions that correspond to the same program location. The requirement to find a simple common interpolant forces us to “fit” the emerging pattern of consecutive loop iterations, much as occurs in Figure 2(b). We can easily reduce the problem of finding a common interpolant to finding a single interpolant for a pair  $(A, B)$ , provided we know the correspondence between variables in successive positions in the sequence.

Say we have substitutions  $\sigma_i$  mapping each program variables to its instance at position  $i$  in the SSA sequence. We construct formula  $A$  as  $\bigvee_{i < n} (\bigwedge_{k \leq i} A_k)(\sigma_i^{-1})$  and  $B$  as  $\bigvee_{i < n} (\bigwedge_{k > i} A_k)(\sigma_i^{-1})$ . That is,  $A$  represents all the prefixes of the execution path and  $B$  all the suffixes. If  $I$  is an interpolant for  $(A, B)$ , then the sequence  $\{I_i\}$  where  $I_i = I\sigma_i$  is an interpolant sequence for  $A_1, \dots, A_n$ . If it is *inductive*, we are done, otherwise we abandon the goal of a common interpolant.

#ITERS	iZ3		CSMT	
	TIME(s)	SIZE	TIME(s)	SIZE
2	0.083	13	0.556	2
4	0.076	15	1.284	2
6	0.087	35	2.111	2
8	0.133	59	3.439	2
10	0.195	124	5.480	2
12	0.473	447	7.304	2
14	0.882	762	19.750	11
16	0.710	158	15.040	4
18	0.753	147	18.730	4
20	0.847	57	44.136	24
22	0.867	45	54.710	17
24	0.857	47	138.197	45
26	0.895	23	56.643	6
28	0.888	11	31.417	2
30	0.882	1	31.318	1

**Fig. 5.** Size of interpolants from CSMT and iZ3 for BMC unrollings of increasing length



**Fig. 6.** Solving time (s) of CSMT and Z3 vs. formula size  $n$

## 5.1 Evaluation

We now present an evaluation of CSMT. First, we compare CSMTDUA against a variety of verification tools on a set of benchmarks requiring non-trivial numerical invariants. Second, we demonstrate how our prototype implementation of CSMT can outperform Z3 at SMT solving. Finally, we compare the size of the interpolants computed by CSMT to those computed by iZ3 [23], an interpolating version of Z3.

**CSMT for Verification.** We compared CSMTDUA against the state-of-the-art verifiers CPACHECKER (CPA) [10] and UFO [5] – the top abstraction-based verifiers from the 2013 software verification competition (SV-COMP) [1]. CPA is a lazy abstraction tool that admits multiple configurations – we used its predicate abstraction and interpolation-based refinement configuration `predicateAnalysis`. UFO is an interpolation-based verification tool that guides interpolants with abstract domains [4,3] – we did not use any abstract domains for guidance (using an abstract domain does not change the number of solved benchmarks). We also compared against INVGEN [17], an invariant generation tool that combines non-linear constraint solving, numerical abstract domains, and dynamic analysis to compute safe invariants. We use INVGENAI to denote the default configuration of INVGEN, and INVGENCS to denote a configuration where abstract interpretation invariants are not used to strengthen invariants computed by constraint solving (`-nostrength` option).

To study the effectiveness of CSMTDUA, we chose small C programs from the verification literature that require non-trivial numeric invariants. The benchmarks `f2`, `gulv*`, and `substring1` are from [15]. The benchmarks `pldi08*` are from [16]. The benchmarks `xy*` are variations on a classic two-loop example requiring linear congruences. The benchmarks `dilling/*` were provided Dilling, *et al.* [13]. Some are from the literature and some are original and are

intended to test arithmetic invariant generation. We omitted benchmarks using the mod operator, as we do not support this, and also elided some duplicates and near-duplicates. The benchmarks and tool output are available at <http://www.cs.utoronto.ca/~aws/cav13.zip>.

Fig. 4 shows the result of applying CSMT and the aforementioned tools on 30 such benchmarks. In the table,  $\checkmark$  means the tool verified the program,  $\times$  means that the tool timed out (after 60s), and  $\times_f$  means the tool terminated unsuccessfully. The run times in successful cases tend to be trivial (less than 2s), so we do not report them. We observe that CSMTDUA produced proofs for all benchmarks, whereas CPA and UFO failed to prove 13, and INVGENAI failed to prove 9.

This shows the effectiveness of the heuristic that simple proofs tend to generalize. For example, in the case of `p1di082unb`, CSMTDUA produces the intricate invariant  $x+y-2N \leq 2\wedge y \leq x$ . On the other hand, interpolant-based refinement in CPA and UFO diverges, producing an unbounded sequence of predicates only containing  $x$  and  $N$ .

**Compositional SMT Solving.** One way prove unsatisfiability of a formula  $\Phi \equiv A \wedge B$  is to exhibit an interpolant  $I$  of  $(A, B)$ . Using CSMT, this might be more efficient than direct SMT solving because (1) CSMT only makes SMT queries on the components  $A$  and  $B$ , and (2) by merging samples, CSMT can find proofs not available to the SMT solver's theory solver. This is especially true if  $\Phi$  has many disjuncts.

Suppose, for example, we have

$$A \equiv x_0 = y_0 = 0 \wedge \bigwedge_{i=1}^n (\text{inc}_i \vee \text{eq}_i)$$

$$B \equiv \bigwedge_{i=n+1}^{2n} (\text{dec}_i \vee \text{eq}_i) \wedge x_{2n} = 0 \wedge y_{2n} \neq 0,$$

where  $\text{inc}_i$  is  $x_i = x_{i-1} + 1 \wedge y_i = y_{i-1} + 1$ ,  $\text{dec}_i$  is  $x_i = x_{i-1} - 1 \wedge y_i = y_{i-1} - 1$  and  $\text{eq}_i$  is  $x_i = x_{i-1} \wedge y_i = y_{i-1}$ . The formula  $\Phi_n = A \wedge B$  is essentially the BMC formula for our benchmark `xy0`, where the two loops are unrolled  $n$  times. The pair  $(A, B)$  has a very simple interpolant, that is,  $x_n = y_n$ , in spite of the fact that each of  $A$  and  $B$  have  $2^n$  disjuncts. Moreover, the conjunction  $A \wedge B$  has  $2^{2n}$  disjuncts. In a lazy SMT approach, each of these yields a separate theory lemma. Fig. 6 shows the time (in seconds) taken by Z3 and CSMT to prove unsatisfiability of  $\Phi_n$  for  $n \in [1, 14]$ . For  $n = 10$ , Z3 takes 160 seconds to prove unsatisfiability of  $\Phi_n$ , whereas CSMT requires 1.4 seconds. For  $n > 10$ , Z3 terminates without producing an answer. This shows that a compositional approach can be substantially more efficient in cases where a large number of cases can be summarized by a simple interpolant.

**Interpolant Size.** We now examine the relative complexity of the interpolants produced by CSMT and SMT-based interpolation methods, represented by iZ3 [23]. For our formulas, we used BMC unrollings of `s3_c1nt_1`, an SSH benchmark from the software verification competition (SV-COMP) [1]. Fig. 5 shows the sizes of the

interpolants computed by iZ3 and CSMT (and the time taken to compute them) for unrollings ( $\#ITER$ ) of  $N$  iterations of the loop, with the interpolant taken after  $N/2$  iterations. The size of the interpolant is measured as the number of operators and variables appearing in it. Since the loop has a reachability depth of 14, all the interpolants from  $N = 30$  are *false*. For  $N = 12$ , the interpolant size for iZ3 is 447, whereas for CSMT it is 2, a 200X reduction. A large reduction in interpolant size is observed for most unrolling lengths. Notice that, since this example has few execution paths, SMT is quite fast. This illustrates the opposite case from the previous example, in which the compositional approach is at a significant performance disadvantage.

## 6 Related Work

We compare CSMT against interpolation and invariant generation techniques.

**Constraint-Based Techniques.** In [29], Rybalchenko and Stokkermans describe a method of for computing half-spaces separating two convex polytopes using Farkas’ lemma. Here, we generalize this method to separators for sets of polytopes. This helps us search for a simple interpolant separating all the samples, rather than constructing one separating plane for each sample pair. This in turn gives us an interpolation procedure for arbitrary formulas in QFLRA, rather than just conjunctions of literals.

**Interpolants from Classifiers.** Our work is similar in flavor to, and inspired by, an interpolant generation approach of Sharma et al. [31]. This approach uses point samples of  $A$  and  $B$  (numerical satisfying assignments) rather than propositional disjuncts. A machine learning technique – *Support Vector Machines* (SVM’s) – is used to create linear separators between these sets. The motivation for using disjuncts (polytopes) rather than points is that they give a broader view of the space and allow us to exploit the logical structure of the problem. In particular, it avoids the difficult problem of clustering random point samples in a meaningful way. In practice, we found that bad clusterings led to complex interpolants that did not generalize. Moreover, we found the SVM’s to be highly sensitive to the sample set, in practice often causing the interpolation procedure to diverge, *e.g.*, by finding samples that approach the boundary of a polytope asymptotically.

**Interpolants from Refutation Proofs.** A number of papers have studied extracting “better” interpolants from refutation proofs. For example, [14,32,28] focused on the process of extracting interpolants of varying strengths from refutation proofs. Hoder et al. [19] proposed an algorithm that produces syntactically smaller interpolants by applying transformations to refutation proofs. Jhala and McMillan [20] described a modified theory solver that yields interpolants in a bounded language. In contrast, we have taken the approach of structuring the proof search process expressly to yield simple interpolants. Our method can compute simpler and more general interpolants, by discovering facts that are not found in refutation proofs produced by lazy SMT solvers. On the other hand, constructing interpolants from refutation proofs can be much faster in

cases where the number of theory lemmas required is small. Also, while the compositional approach may be applicable to the various theories handled by proof-based interpolation, we have as yet only developed a method for LRA.

**Template Methods.** A more direct approach to synthesize linear inductive invariants is based on Farkas' Lemma and non-linear constraint solving [12]. The invariant is expressed as a fixed conjunction of linear constraints with unknown coefficients, and one solves simultaneously for the invariant and the Farkas proof of its correctness. This has the advantage, relative to the interpolant approach, that it does not require unfolding the program and the disadvantage that it requires a non-linear arithmetic solver. Currently, such solvers do not scale to more than a few variables. Thus, the difficulty of finding a solution grows rapidly with the number of constraints in the invariant [12]. An example of a tool using this approach is INVGEN, run without abstract interpretation (called INVGENCS in Table 4). An examination of the 12 cases in which INVGENCS fails shows that in most the invariant we found has at least three conjuncts, and in some it is disjunctive, a case that the authors of INVGEN have found impractical using the method [17]. Thus, it appears that by searching for simple interpolants, we can synthesize invariants with greater propositional complexity than can be obtained using the constraint-based approach.

## 7 Conclusion

We have developed a compositional approach to interpolation based on the heuristic that simpler proofs of special cases are more likely to generalize. The method produces simple (perhaps even beautiful) interpolants because it is able to summarize a large set of cases using one relatively simple fact. In particular, we presented a method for finding such simple facts in the theory of linear rational arithmetic. This made it possible to use interpolation to discover inductive invariants for numerical programs that are challenging for existing techniques. We also observed that for formulas with many disjuncts, the compositional approach can be more efficient than non-compositional SMT.

Our work leaves many avenues open for future research. For example, can the method be effectively applied to integer arithmetic, or the theory of arrays? From a scalability standpoint, we would like to improve the performance of CSMT on formulas requiring more complex interpolants. One possible direction is parallelism, e.g., instead of decomposing a formula into  $A \wedge B$ , we could decompose it into multiple sets of conjuncts and use techniques such as [18] to parallelize SMT solving.

## References

1. Competition On Software Verification, <http://sv-comp.sosy-lab.org/>
2. Merriam-Webster Dictionary (December 2012), [www.merriam-webster.com](http://www.merriam-webster.com)
3. Albarghouthi, A., Gurfinkel, A., Chechik, M.: Craig interpretation. In: Miné, A., Schmidt, D. (eds.) SAS 2012. LNCS, vol. 7460, pp. 300–316. Springer, Heidelberg (2012)

4. Albarghouthi, A., Gurfinkel, A., Chechik, M.: From under-approximations to over-approximations and back. In: Flanagan, C., König, B. (eds.) TACAS 2012. LNCS, vol. 7214, pp. 157–172. Springer, Heidelberg (2012)
5. Albarghouthi, A., Li, Y., Gurfinkel, A., Chechik, M.: UFO: A framework for abstraction- and interpolation-based software verification. In: Madhusudan, P., Seshia, S.A. (eds.) CAV 2012. LNCS, vol. 7358, pp. 672–678. Springer, Heidelberg (2012)
6. Albarghouthi, A., McMillan, K.L.: Beautiful interpolants. Tech. Rep. MSR-TR-2013-42, Microsoft Research (April 2013)
7. Alur, R., Dang, T., Ivančić, F.: Counter-example guided predicate abstraction of hybrid systems. In: Garavel, H., Hatcliff, J. (eds.) TACAS 2003. LNCS, vol. 2619, pp. 208–223. Springer, Heidelberg (2003)
8. Barrett, C.W., Sebastiani, R., Seshia, S.A., Tinelli, C.: Satisfiability modulo theories. In: Handbook of Satisfiability (2009)
9. Beyer, D., Cimatti, A., Griggio, A., Keremoglu, M.E., Sebastiani, R.: Software Model Checking via Large-Block Encoding. In: FMCAD 2009, pp. 25–32 (2009)
10. Beyer, D., Keremoglu, M.E.: CPACHECKER: A tool for configurable software verification. In: Gopalakrishnan, G., Qadeer, S. (eds.) CAV 2011. LNCS, vol. 6806, pp. 184–190. Springer, Heidelberg (2011)
11. Cimatti, A., Griggio, A., Sebastiani, R.: Efficient Generation of Craig Interpolants in Satisfiability Modulo Theories. *ACM Trans. Comput.* 12(1), 7 (2010)
12. Colón, M.A., Sankaranarayanan, S., Sipma, H.B.: Linear invariant generation using non-linear constraint solving. In: Hunt Jr., W.A., Somenzi, F. (eds.) CAV 2003. LNCS, vol. 2725, pp. 420–432. Springer, Heidelberg (2003)
13. Dillig, I., Dillig, T., Li, B.: Personal Communication (2012)
14. D’Silva, V., Kroening, D., Purandare, M., Weissenbacher, G.: Interpolant strength. In: Barthe, G., Hermenegildo, M. (eds.) VMCAI 2010. LNCS, vol. 5944, pp. 129–145. Springer, Heidelberg (2010)
15. Gulavani, B.S., Chakraborty, S., Nori, A.V., Rajamani, S.K.: Automatically Refining Abstract Interpretations. In: Ramakrishnan, C.R., Rehof, J. (eds.) TACAS 2008. LNCS, vol. 4963, pp. 443–458. Springer, Heidelberg (2008)
16. Gulwani, S., Srivastava, S., Venkatesan, R.: Program analysis as constraint solving. In: PLDI 2008, pp. 281–292 (2008)
17. Gupta, A., Rybalchenko, A.: InvGen: An efficient invariant generator. In: Bouajjani, A., Maler, O. (eds.) CAV 2009. LNCS, vol. 5643, pp. 634–640. Springer, Heidelberg (2009)
18. Hamadi, Y., Marques-Silva, J., Wintersteiger, C.M.: Lazy decomposition for distributed decision procedures. In: PDMC 2011, pp. 43–54 (2011)
19. Hoder, K., Kovács, L., Voronkov, A.: Playing in the grey area of proofs. In: POPL 2012, pp. 259–272 (2012)
20. Jhala, R., McMillan, K.L.: A practical and complete approach to predicate refinement. In: Hermanns, H., Palsberg, J. (eds.) TACAS 2006. LNCS, vol. 3920, pp. 459–473. Springer, Heidelberg (2006)
21. Kroening, D., Weissenbacher, G.: Lifting propositional interpolants to the word-level. In: FMCAD 2007, pp. 85–89 (2007)
22. McMillan, K.L.: Interpolation and SAT-Based Model Checking. In: Hunt Jr., W.A., Somenzi, F. (eds.) CAV 2003. LNCS, vol. 2725, pp. 1–13. Springer, Heidelberg (2003)
23. McMillan, K.L.: Interpolants from Z3 proofs. In: FMCAD 2011, pp. 19–27 (2011)
24. McMillan, K.L.: An interpolating theorem prover. In: Jensen, K., Podelski, A. (eds.) TACAS 2004. LNCS, vol. 2988, pp. 16–30. Springer, Heidelberg (2004)



25. McMillan, K.L., Rybalchenko, A.: Computing relational fixed points using interpolation. Tech. Rep. MSR-TR-2013-6, Microsoft Research (2013)
26. Megiddo, N.: On the complexity of polyhedral separability. *Discrete & Computational Geometry* 3, 325–337 (1988)
27. de Moura, L., Bjørner, N.S.: Z3: An Efficient SMT Solver. In: Ramakrishnan, C.R., Rehof, J. (eds.) TACAS 2008. LNCS, vol. 4963, pp. 337–340. Springer, Heidelberg (2008)
28. Rollini, S.F., Sery, O., Sharygina, N.: Leveraging interpolant strength in model checking. In: Madhusudan, P., Seshia, S.A. (eds.) CAV 2012. LNCS, vol. 7358, pp. 193–209. Springer, Heidelberg (2012)
29. Rybalchenko, A., Sofronie-Stokkermans, V.: Constraint solving for interpolation. *J. Symb. Comput.* 45(11), 1212–1233 (2010)
30. Schrijver, A.: Theory of linear and integer programming. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York (1986)
31. Sharma, R., Nori, A.V., Aiken, A.: Interpolants as classifiers. In: Madhusudan, P., Seshia, S.A. (eds.) CAV 2012. LNCS, vol. 7358, pp. 71–87. Springer, Heidelberg (2012)
32. Weissenbacher, G.: Interpolant strength revisited. In: Cimatti, A., Sebastiani, R. (eds.) SAT 2012. LNCS, vol. 7317, pp. 312–326. Springer, Heidelberg (2012)