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Abstract—Invariant generation plays a central role in the verification of programs and hybrid systems. In this paper, we propose an approach to synthesize invariants using semidefinite programming (SDP) that combine advantages of both symbolic constraint solving and numeric constraint solving. The advantages of our approach is threefold: first, it is powerful enough that can be applied to arbitrary predefined templates as symbolic computation based techniques do; second, it uses semidefinite programming instead of time-consuming symbolic subroutines and is therefore efficient enough as other numeric computation based techniques are; lastly, it can also have some (although weaker) theoretical guarantees of completeness as those symbolic computation based techniques have. In addition, we discuss how to generalize our approach to the case when templates are semialgebraic instead of polynomial and the case when non-polynomial functions such as trigonometric functions, logarithmic functions, exponential functions, rational functions are present in programs.

I. INTRODUCTION

The dominant approach to program verification is the so-called Floyd-Hoare-Naur’s inductive assertion method[1], [2], [3], based on Hoare Logic[2]. The hardest parts thereof are invariant generation and termination analysis. Powerful as this approach may be in theory, it has only limited success in the early stage[4], [5], [6], [7] as in practice it depends on what kind of invariants can be generated, and back then automatic generating only gives some special linear invariants. In the past two decades, safety-critical systems has become an important part of our daily life, a thorough validation and verification is necessary to enhance the quality of software. Thus, invariant generation plays a central role in the verification of programs and hybrid systems. In particular, invariant synthesis algorithms based on symbolic computation can be (relatively) complete normally. The basic idea of template-based invariant synthesis is to predefine parameterized invariants (templates), then derive constraints on parameters according to the conditions on a formula being an inductive invariant by constraint solving, and solve the resulted constraints. Any solution can be used to instantiate the template and get a valid invariant.

Among numerous approaches to invariant synthesis, template-based constraint solving approaches are more promising, because

- possibly synthesized invariants are too weak to guarantee properties to be verified using abstraction interpretation based techniques;
- interpolation based techniques heavily depend on Craig interpolant synthesis, while the current interpolant synthesis techniques can only be applicable to decidable fragments of first order logic, linear arithmetics, equality logic with uninterpreted functions, possibly non-linear arithmetics with restrictions, and their combinations. In addition, these approaches are not (relatively) complete;
- Machine learning based techniques are very efficient, but normally not (relatively) complete;
- Polynomial theories based techniques can only be applied to synthesize invariants of special forms.

Comparing with aforementioned approaches, constraint solving based techniques are more powerful. They can be used to synthesize more expressive invariants efficiently with the advance of the state-of-the-art constraint solving techniques. In particular, invariant synthesis algorithms based on symbolic computation can be (relatively) complete normally. The basic idea of template-based invariant synthesis is to predefine parameterized invariants (templates), then derive constraints on parameters according to the conditions on a formula being an inductive invariant by constraint solving, and solve the resulted constraints. Any solution can be used to instantiate the template and get a valid invariant.

Obviously, two major challenges in the above process exist: how to extract constraints on parameters from a given template and how to predefine a template according to the property to be verified. To address the former, we generally have to make a tradeoff between the expressiveness of templates and the efficiency of constraint solvers, and therefore we can classify all existing template-based approaches to invariant synthesis into two categories:
Symbolic computation based. Given a polynomial (semialgebraic) invariant template, deriving constraints on parameters from it exactly corresponds to either quantifier elimination problem (if the template is a general parameterized polynomial formula) \(^{23}\), or polynomial membership problem (if the template is a parameterized polynomial equality) \(^{24}\), or whether a set of linear inequalities is unsatisfiable (if the template is linear) \(^{25}\), therefore respectively quantifier elimination \(^{26}\), Gröbner basis \(^{26}\) or Farkas’ lemma \(^{27}\) can be used to derive the corresponding constraints. Then, we can further apply computer algebra tools (e.g. Redlog \(^{28}\) or QEPCAD \(^{29}\)) or SMT solvers (e.g. Z3 \(^{30}\)) to solve the resulting constraints and eventually obtain some solutions. The advantage lies in the powerfulness of symbolic computation based constraint solvers, which enables some of those methods to prove (relative) completeness, i.e. they can eventually discover valid invariants (with regard to the given template) whenever such invariants exist. However, since these methods rely heavily on time-consuming subroutines such as quantifier elimination or Gröbner basis computation, they can only be used on very small programs in practice and scale poorly on larger ones.

Numeric computation based. On the other hand, one can transform invariant synthesis problem to optimization problem (usually sum-of-squares programming) first, then employ corresponding optimization solvers to extract constraints and eventually get solutions \(^{31}\). Generally speaking, numeric computation based approaches are very efficient, and usually applicable to larger programs. However, such transformation either only works for templates with special forms, e.g., convexity like barrier certificate \(^{32}\) and its various relaxations \(^{33},\ 34\), or needs abstraction like Lagrangian relaxation \(^{31}\). This means that these approaches cannot guarantee (relative) completeness in general.

It is a long-standing challenge to find an approach that can compromise the advantages of symbolic computation based and numeric computation based, and avoid their disadvantages. In this paper, we address this issue and propose an approach to synthesize polynomial (and semialgebraic) invariants by using semi-definite programming, which is complete in the sense that when some non-degenerate assumptions are satisfied, it can always find an invariant with regard to the given template. The basic idea of our solution can be sketched as: Given a template \(I(\alpha, x)\), we denote by \(R_I\) all the valuations of \(\alpha\) such that for any \(\alpha_0 \in R_I\) \(I(\alpha, x)\) is an inductive invariant. First, by Lasserre’s results in \(^{35},\ 36\), we prove that there is a particular representing function \(\phi\) such that \(R_I = \{ \alpha \mid \phi(\alpha) \leq 0 \}\); then we further show that any such representing function is semialgebraic, and can be approximated by solving a series of semidefinite programs. That amounts to underapproximate \(R_I\) from inside with increasing precision; finally, we prove that, under some non-degenerate conditions such as the set of potential solutions being compact, the underapproximations obtained by solving those SDPs can converge to the actual set \(R_I\) with regard to measure. This directly implies that when the set \(R_I\) has positive measure (such as when \(R_I\) has an inner point), our algorithm will definitely find an invariant.

In addition, we further discuss how to extend the above approach to more general programs which may contain some elementary functions like trigonometric functions, logarithmic functions, exponential functions, rational functions, etc. The basic idea is to use abstraction to reduce them to polynomial cases by symbolic abstraction \(^{37},\ 38\).

The rest of this paper is organized as follows: In Section II we introduce some basic notions and theories that will be used later, program model of interest, and define the problem to be solved. Section III is devoted to underapproximating the valid set of parameter valuations for a given program and an invariant template. Section IV presents an algorithmic implementation of the above procedure. The approach is illustrated by some examples in Section V. Section VI discusses how to extend our approach to deal with more general programs with more expressive templates. We conclude this paper and discuss future work in Section VII.

II. Preliminaries

In this section we introduce the invariant synthesis problem of interest as well as the sum-of-squares programming which is the main tool for synthesizing invariants in this paper.

A. Basic Notions

The following basic notations will be used throughout the rest of this paper: \(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^+\) and \(\mathbb{N}\) respectively stand for the set of real numbers, the set of positive numbers and the set of non-negative integers; \(\mathbb{R}[\cdot]\) denotes the ring of polynomials in variables given by the argument, \(\mathbb{R}^d[\cdot]\) denotes the set of polynomials of degree less or equal to \(d\) in variables given by the argument, \(d \in \mathbb{N}\); \(\Sigma^d[\cdot]\) denotes sum-of-squares polynomials of degree less than or equal to \(d\). Vectors are denoted by boldface letters. \(\phi[E/x]\) stands for a function in which \(x\) is replaced by \(E\).

A basic semialgebraic set \(A\) is of the form \(\{ x \mid p_1(x) > 0 \land \cdots \land p_n(x) > 0 \}\), where \(p_i(x) \in \mathbb{R}[x]\), \(\lor \in \{\leq, <\}\). For \(A\) defined by (not strict) polynomial inequalities, We say the representation of \(A = \{ x \mid p_1(x) \leq 0 \land \cdots \land p_n(x) \leq 0 \}\) is a Archimedean representation, or satisfies Archimedean condition, if there is some \(M > 0\) such that:

\[
M - \| x \|^2 = \sigma_0 - \sum_{j=1}^n \sigma_j p_j
\]

where \(\sigma_0, \sigma_j\) are sum of squares in \(x\). Note that if a bound \(M\) of \(A\) such that \(\forall x \in A. \| x \|^2 \leq M\) is known, we can make any representation of such \(A\) become an Archimedean representation simply by adding the (dummy) constraint \(\| x \|^2 - M \leq 0\).

A semialgebraic set is of the form \(\bigcup_{i=1}^k S_i\), where \(S_i\)’s are basic semialgebraic sets.

A function \(f : X \mapsto \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty, -\infty\}\) is upper-semicontinuous at \(x_0\) is defined as \(\limsup_{x \mapsto x_0} f(x) \leq f(x_0)\). That is to say, for every \(\varepsilon > 0\), there exists \(\delta\) such that its neighborhood \(U(x_0, \delta)\) satisfies \(f(x) \leq f(x_0) + \varepsilon\) for all \(x \in U\) when \(f(x_0) > -\infty\) and \(f(x)\) tends to \(-\infty\) as \(x\)
tends towards \( x_0 \) when \( f(x_0) = -\infty \). A function \( f \) is upper-semicontinuous on \( C \subseteq X \) if \( f \) is upper-semicontinuous at each \( x \in C \).

B. Programs Model

To clarify the idea of our algorithm, we focus on the following simple loops, which are specific guarded commands \(^9\), thereof all expressions are polynomials \(^4\). Formally:

\[
\begin{align*}
\{ \text{Pre}(x) \leq 0 \} \\
\quad \text{DO} \quad c_1(x) \leq 0 \rightarrow x := f_1(x); \\
\quad \| \quad c_2(x) \leq 0 \rightarrow x := f_2(x); \\
\quad \| \quad \cdots \\
\quad \| \quad c_{k-1}(x) \leq 0 \rightarrow x := f_{k-1}(x); \\
\quad \| \quad c_k(x) \leq 0 \rightarrow x := f_k(x); \\
\quad \text{OD},
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\{ \text{Post}(x) \leq 0 \}
\]

Fig. 1. Program Model

where:

1) \( x \in \mathbb{R}^n \) denotes the vector of program variables;

2) \( \text{Pre}(x), \text{Post}(x), c_i(x), f_i(x) \) are polynomial vector functions.

- Our goal here is to check the validity of the Hoare triple, that is, to verify whether the value \( x_0^i \) of the program variables satisfies \( \text{Post}(x_0^i) \leq 0 \) when the loop terminates for the program with an initial state \( x_0 \) satisfying \( \text{Pre}(x_0) \leq 0 \).

- Informally, the meaning of the program in Fig. 1 is that given an input \( x \), whenever some constraints \( c_i(x) \leq 0 \) are satisfied, one of them is non-deterministically chosen and the corresponding branch is taken, then the procedure is repeated until none of the guards holds.

- Obviously, if \( c_i(x) \leq 0 \wedge c_j(x) \leq 0 \) has no real solution for any \( i \neq j \), then the choice among these updates becomes deterministic. This means that conditional and while statements widely used in imperative programming languages can be well defined with the program model in Fig. 1 e.g.,

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{IF } c(x) \leq 0 \text{ THEN } x := A_1(x) \text{ ELSE } x := A_2(x),
\end{align*}
\]

\( c(x) \leq 0 \) can be defined as

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{IF } c(x) \leq 0 \rightarrow x := A_1(x) \\
\| \quad c(x) > 0 \rightarrow x := A_2(x) \text{ FI.}
\end{align*}
\]

- Without loss of generality, we assume \( \{ x \mid \text{Pre}(x) \leq 0 \} \) and \( \{ x \mid c_i(x) \leq 0 \} \) satisfies Archimedean condition. Since computers can only represent finite numbers with known bound, we can always choose large enough \( M \) and add \( \| x \| - M \leq 0 \) to them to make the representation become Archimedean.

\(^{1}\text{Notice that the approach presented in this paper can be applied to more general programs, e.g., nested loops, general recursions and so on, without any substantial change.}\)

- As \( \{ x \mid \text{Pre}(x) \leq 0 \} \) and \( \{ x \mid c_i(x) \leq 0 \} \) are assumed to be Archimedean, and all functions involved in program model are assumed to be known polynomials (or continuous functions in Section VI), we observe that during the entire run of program in Fig. 1 the program states \( x \) has a known bound. Therefore, for program state \( x \), we have \( x \in C_x \) for some compact set \( C_x \) of which an Archimedean representation is known.

\[
\begin{align*}
\{ x^2 + y^2 \leq 4 \} \\
\quad \text{DO } x \leq 0 \rightarrow x := x + 0.25y^2 + 1; \\
\quad \| \quad y := 0.5y; \\
\quad \text{OD},
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\{ x \leq 7 \}
\]

Fig. 2. An Example of Program

**Example 1:** Fig. 2 presents a program with two variables. The variables \( x \) and \( y \) take initial values from a ball with center the origin and radius 4, then they enter the while loop and update their values continuously until the current value of the variable \( x \) is larger than 4. The objective here is to prove that the value of \( x \) is less than 7 when the while loop terminates.

This program can be modeled by our program model in Fig. 1 by letting \( t = 1, c_1(x, y) = x - 4, f_{11}(x, y) = x + 0.25y^2 + 1 \) and \( f_{12}(x, y) = 0.5y \). The resulting model is presented in Fig. 3

\[
\begin{align*}
\{ x^2 + y^2 \leq 4 \} \\
\quad \text{DO } x \leq 0 \rightarrow x := x + 0.25y^2 + 1; \\
\quad \| \quad y := 0.5y; \\
\quad \text{OD},
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\{ x \leq 7 \}
\]

Fig. 3. Model for Program in Fig. 2

Now we give a formal definition of (inductive) invariants.

**Definition 1 (Invariance):** An invariant of program in Fig. 1 is a subset \( \text{Inv} \) of \( \mathbb{R}^n \) satisfying the following conditions:

1) \( \text{Pre}(x) \leq 0 \implies x \in \text{Inv}; \)

2) \( \{ c_i(x) \leq 0 \wedge x \in \text{Inv} \} \implies \{ f_i(x) \in \text{Inv} \}, \)

3) \( \bigwedge_{i=1}^{n} \{ c_i(x) \geq 0 \} \wedge x \in \text{Inv} \implies \{ \text{Post}(x) \leq 0 \} \)

**Remark 1:** Strictly speaking, in the last condition of Definition 1 it should be \( c_i(x) > 0 \) instead of \( c_i(x) \geq 0 \). However, since we will be using numeric methods to do the following computations, it would be unnecessary and unrealistic to check “strictly greater than” such as \( c_i(x) > 0 \). Therefore we relaxed it to \( c_i(x) \geq 0 \) in Definition 1. Note that if the third condition holds for \( c_i(x) \geq 0 \), it will also holds for \( c_i(x) > 0 \).

Clearly, the existence of an invariant implies the validity of the Hoare triple.
C. Sum-of-squares Programming

In this section we give a brief introduction to the use of sum-of-squares decomposition for multivariate polynomials to deal with polynomial optimization problems of the form (1).

\[
\begin{align*}
    & \min u = (u_1, \ldots, u_r) c^T u \\
    \text{s.t.} & \\
    & a_{10}(x) + a_{11}(x)u_1 + \cdots + a_{1r}(x)u_r > 0 \quad \forall x \in K_1 \\
    & \vdots \\
    & a_{s0}(x) + a_{s1}(x)u_1 + \cdots + a_{sr}(x)u_r > 0 \quad \forall x \in K_s
\end{align*}
\]

where

\[
K_i = \{ x \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid g_{i1}(x) \leq 0, \ldots, g_{im_i}(x) \leq 0 \}, i = 1, \ldots, s,
\]

and \(a_{ij}\) are known polynomials.

The optimization (1) is a polynomial optimization with linear objective functions over decision variables \(u_i\), subject to some polynomial non-negative constraints. Such a constraint demands that when \(u_i\) are used as the coefficients of certain polynomials, the resulted polynomials are non-negative on some basic semialgebraic set \(K_i\).

By exploiting the relation between non-negative polynomials and sum-of-squares (sum of squares of polynomials), some efficient methods have been proposed to solve this type of optimization problems. In particular, based on Putinar’s Positivstellensatz, Lasserre [40] showed that we can use a hierarchy of sum-of-squares(SOS) programing:

\[
\begin{align*}
    & \min u = (u_1, \ldots, u_r) c^T u \\
    \text{s.t.} & \\
    & a_{10}(x) + \sum_{r=1}^n a_{1r}(x)u_r = \sigma_{10}(x) + \sum_{r=1}^{m_1} \sigma_{1r}(x)g_{1r}(x) \\
    & \vdots \\
    & a_{s0}(x) + \sum_{r=1}^n a_{sr}(x)u_r = \sigma_{s0}(x) + \sum_{r=1}^{m_s} \sigma_{sr}(x)g_{sr}(x) \\
    & \sigma_{ij} \in \Sigma^{2d}[x], i = 1, \ldots, s; j = 1, \ldots, m_i
\end{align*}
\]

to approximate the optimal solution when a constraint of the form \(||x||^2 - M_i \leq 0\) is included in \(g_{ij} \leq 0\) for \(K_i\), \(i = 1, \ldots, s\). The SOS program (2) can then be reduced to a semidefinite programming (SDP), which can be solved efficiently via interior-point methods in polynomial time, given the numeric error bound \(\epsilon\).

D. Template-based Invariant Generation

In this subsection we introduce the template-based invariant generation problem of interest in this paper. Before presenting the problem, we give the definition of polynomial templates.

**Definition 2 (Polynomial Template):** A polynomial template \(I(a, x) = C_a \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\) is a polynomial in \(\mathbb{R}[a, x]\), where \(C_a\) is a compact subset of \(\mathbb{R}^m\) satisfying Archimedean condition. We refer \(a = (a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m) \in C_a\) in \(I(a, x)\) as parameters of \(I(a, x)\).

We give the definition of the set of parameters \(a\) such that \(I(a, x) \in \mathbb{R}[a, x]\) is an invariant of the program in Fig. 1. Our invariant synthesis algorithm builds on underapproximating this set.

**Definition 3 (Valid Set):** Given a program of the form in Fig. 1 and a polynomial template \(I(a, x) \in \mathbb{R}[a, x]\), a parameter valuation \(a_0 \in C_a\) is valid if its instantiation \(\{x \mid I(a_0, x) \leq 0\}\) is an invariant of this program. The valid set, denoted as \(R_I\), is the set of all valid parameter valuations for a polynomial template \(I(a, x)\).

Give a polynomial template \(I(a, x)\), the invariant generation problem is reduced to the search of a valid parameter valuation \(a_0\) such that the set \(\{x \mid I(a_0, x) \leq 0\}\) is an invariant. We illustrate our template-based invariant generation problem based on the program in Example 1.

**Example 2:** For the program presented in Fig 2 we choose an invariant template \(I(a, x, y) = y^2 + x + a\), where \(a\) is a parameter.

By Definition 1 a parameter \(a \in [-8, -4]\) is valid if and only if the following formulas are satisfied for all \(x\) and \(y\).

\[
\begin{align*}
    & (x^2 + y^2 \leq 4) \implies (y^2 + x + a \leq 0) \\
    & (x \leq 4) \land (y^2 + x + a \leq 0) \implies \left(\frac{1}{2}y^2 + x + 1 + a \leq 0\right) \\
    & (x \geq 4) \land (y^2 + x + a \leq 0) \implies (x \leq 7)
\end{align*}
\]

Any valid parameter valuation \(a_0\) such that the above formulas holds true for all \(x\) and \(y\) can then be substituted back to the template to obtain an invariant \(\{(x, y) \mid y^2 + x + a_0 \leq 0\}\).

However, directly applying symbolic constraint solving methods, such as SMT solvers, to find valid parameter valuation \(a_0\) using those formulas is impractical for general nonlinear program due to their extremely high computational complexity (up to double exponential). In this paper we consider the valid parameter valuation generation problem in the semidefinite programming framework and show that the special form of such formulas enable us to underapproximate the valid set \(R_I\) by solving a series of semidefinite programming. Each of these programming can then be solved by SDP solver using (e.g. internal-point methods) in polynomial time for a given numeric error bound \(\epsilon\).

III. Underapproximating Valid Set

Definition 1 and Definition 3 indicate that if we can find a concrete element of \(R_I\), a corresponding invariant can be obtained by simply substituting it for the parameters in the template. The main difficulty here is that the conditions on parameters \(a\) may involve nonlinear arithmetics, which makes satisfiable assignments hard to find using symbolic methods. We show, on the other hand, that the special form of those conditional formulas enables us to construct underapproximations of \(R_I\) by defining conjunctions of polynomial inequalities using SOS programming. A concrete element of such an underapproximation (and also an element of \(R_I\)) can then be found by numeric optimization methods. We further prove that the underapproximations series \(\{R_I^{(k)}\}\) constructed by SOS programming actually converges to the valid set \(R_I\) with
respect to measure, provided that some non-degenerate conditions are satisfied. That is to say, almost all valid parameter valuations can be included in those underapproximations.

A. Underapproximating $R_I$ by Intersections

The valid set $R_I$ itself is generally complicated and hard to approximate. As the first step of underapproximation, we show that the conditions in Definition $\PageIndex{1}$ can be treated separately. This corresponds to first write $R_I$ as the intersection of some simpler set $R_I(i)$. Underapproximation of $R_I$ can then be obtained by underapproximating each $R_I(i)$ and taking their intersection. Performing underapproximations on $R_I(i)$ rather than $R_I$ helps to reduce the numeric computation burden and make the convergence of underapproximations faster.

Definition $\PageIndex{1}$ indicates that the valid set $R_I$ can be written as the intersection of some $R_I(i)$ and each $R_I(i)$ corresponds to the $i$-th conditions in Definition $\PageIndex{1}$. More specifically, if we define $R_I(i)$ as follows:

$$\begin{align*}
R_I(0) &= \{a \in C_a \mid \forall x \in C_x \left( \text{Pre}(x) \leq 0 \right) \Rightarrow (I(a, x) \leq 0) \} \\
R_I(i) &= \{a \in C_a \mid \forall x \in C_x \left( (c_i(x) \leq 0) \land (I(a, x) \leq 0) \right) \Rightarrow (I(a, f_i(x)) \leq 0) \} \\
R_I(k+1) &= \{a \in C_a \mid \forall x \in C_x \left( \sum_{i=1}^{k} c_i(x) \geq 0 \right) \land (I(a, x) \leq 0) \Rightarrow \text{Post}(x) \leq 0 \}
\end{align*}$$

Then it can be verified by Definition $\PageIndex{1}$ that

$$R_I = \bigcap_{i=0}^{k+1} R_I(i)$$

Therefore, to underapproximate $R_I$, we only need to underapproximate each $R_I(i)$ and take their intersections.

B. Representing Functions

Approximations of $R_I(i)$ can be obtained by approximating their representing functions. Representing functions of set $R_I(i)$ are functions whose sub-level sets are equal to $R_I(i)$. The formal definition is given as follows:

**Definition 4**: A representing function $\phi : C_a \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ of a set $R \subseteq C_a$ is a function such that $R = \{a \in C_a \mid \phi(a) \leq 0 \}$.

Representing functions may not be unique for a given set $R$. However, a representing function always exists for a set $R_I(i)$. For example, the function $\phi_i(a) = \begin{cases} 0, & a \in R \\ 1, & a \in C_a \setminus R \end{cases}$ is a representing function of the set $R$ according to Definition $\PageIndex{1}$.

Let $\phi_i$ be a representing function of $R_I(i)$, $i \in \{0, \ldots, k+1\}$. It’s easy to see that a function $g_i : C_a \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ such that $g_i(a) \geq \phi_i(a)$ for $a \in C_a$ defines an underapproximation $R_g(i)$ of $R_I(i)$, where $R_g(i) = \{a \in C_a \mid g_i(a) \leq 0 \}$. Obviously, the better $g_i$ approximates $\phi_i$, the less conservative $R_g(i)$ underapproximates $R_I(i)$.

However, certain properties are required if we want to obtain good underapproximations of $R_I(i)$ using numeric solvers. More specifically, a good representing function should:

1) be continuous enough so that numerically computed approximations may converge to it; 2) assign most elements of $R_I(i)$ to negative (non-zero) values so that some numeric errors can be tolerated; 3) have clear properties which can be used in numeric computations.

With respect to these requirements, we choose $\phi_i : C_a \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ as the representing function of $R_I(i)$:

$$\phi_i(a) = \begin{cases} -M, & \text{if } K_i(a) = \emptyset, \\ \max(-M, \sup_{x \in K_i(a)} l_i(a, x)), & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

(5)

where $i = 0, \ldots, k+1$, $M > 0$ and $l_i \in \mathbb{R}[a, x]$, $K_i(a)$ defined as:

$$\begin{align*}
l_0(a, x) &= I(a, x), \\
l_i(a, x) &= I(a, f_i(x)), i = 1, \ldots, k, \\
l_{k+1}(a, x) &= \text{Post}(x)
\end{align*}$$

and

$$\begin{align*}
K_0(a) &= \{x \in C_x \mid \text{Pre}(x) \leq 0 \} \\
K_i(a) &= \{x \in C_x \mid (c_i(x) \leq 0) \land (I(a, x) \leq 0) \} \\
K_{k+1}(a) &= \{x \in C_x \mid \sum_{i=1}^{k} (c_i(x) \geq 0) \land (I(a, x) \leq 0) \}
\end{align*}$$

(7)

The following theorem states that $\phi_i$ are indeed representing functions of $R_I(i)$.

**Theorem 1**: $\phi_i$ in (5) is a representing function of the set $R_I(i)$, i.e.

$$R_I(i) = \{a \in C_a \mid \phi_i(a) \leq 0 \},$$

where $i = 0, \ldots, k$.

**Proof**: Direct verification by the definition of $R_I(i)$ in (4) and the definition of $\phi_i$ in (5). \hfill \Box

The representing functions in (5) are upper-semicontinuous.

**Theorem 2 (Upper-semicontinuity)**: $\phi_i$ in (5) is upper-semicontinuous, $i = 0, \ldots, k+1$.

**Proof**: We prove that $\phi_i$ is upper-semicontinuous for $a \in C_a$, $i = 0, 1, \ldots, k+1$.

First we observe that $\phi_i$ can be seen as the maximum function of two functions $\phi_i'$ and $\phi_i''$, where

$$\begin{align*}
\phi_i'(a) &= -M, \\
\phi_i''(a) &= \begin{cases} -\infty, & K_i(a) = \emptyset, \\ \sup_{x \in K_i(a)} l_i(a, x), & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}
\end{align*}$$

Since the maximum function of two upper-semicontinuous functions is still upper-semicontinuous and $\phi_i'$ is obviously
upper-semicontinuous, we only need to prove the upper-semicontinuity of the function $\phi''_i$.

For the case that $K_i(a) \neq \emptyset$, according to \[36\] Lemma 1, we obtain that $\phi''_i$ is upper-semicontinuous at $a \in C_a$.

We in the following prove the upper-semicontinuity of $\phi''(a)$ when $K_i(a)$ is empty. Suppose $\{a_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ with $a_j \in C_a$ is a sequence such that $\lim_{j \to \infty} a_j = a$, we show that $K_i(a_j)$ would be empty when $j$ is large enough. This is true for $i = 0$ as $K_0(a)$ contains no inequalities in variable $a$ and $K(a_j) = K(a) = \emptyset$. For $1 \leq i \leq k + 1$, assume $K_i(a_j)$ is not empty, then there exists at least one $x_j$ such that $I_i(a_j, x_j) \leq 0$. Since $C_a$ and $C_a$ are compact sets, $\{(a_j, x_j)\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a bounded sequence of real numbers. According to Bolzano-Weierstrass theorem, there is a convergent subsequence $\{(a_{j_k}, x_{j_k})\}_{j_k \in \mathbb{N}}$ which converges to $(a, x)$. Moreover, we have $I_i(a, x) \leq 0$ since $I_i(a_j, x_j) \leq 0$, i.e. $K_i(a)$ is not empty, which contradicts the assumption. Therefore, $\phi''_i$ is upper-semicontinuous at $a \in C_a$.

Since every representing functions in (5) is upper semicontinuous according to Theorem 2 it can be approximated by polynomial functions in $L^1$ norm.

**Corollary 1**: For each $\phi_i$ in (5), $i = 0, \ldots, k$, there exists a sequence of polynomials $\{p_{ij}\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ with $p_{ij} \geq \phi_i$ over $C_a$ such that

$$\lim_{j \to \infty} \int_{C_a} |p_{ij}(a) - \phi_i(a)|d\mu(a) = 0. \quad (8)$$

It is clear that $\phi_i \geq -M$ for $0 \leq i \leq k + 1$. Moreover, according to Theorem 2 each $\phi_i$ is upper semicontinuous on the compact set $C_a$, which implies that it is bounded from above as well. According to [35] Theorem 1, we know that there exists a sequence of polynomials $\{p_{ij}\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ satisfying Corollary 1 for $0 \leq i \leq k + 1$.

**C. Semidefinite Programming Implementation**

In this subsection we present a semidefinite programming based method for synthesizing an under-approximation of the valid set $R_i$ based on representing functions. Moreover, we show that the semi-definite program can provide a convergent sequence of under-approximations to the valid set $R_i$ in measure under appropriate assumptions.

Let's start with the following polynomial optimization problem:

$$\inf_{p_i} \sum_{\alpha} \gamma_\alpha p_i^\alpha$$

s.t. \[(9)\]

$$p_i(a) - l_i(a, x) \geq 0, \forall (a, x) \in (C_a \times K_i(a)),
$$

$$p_i(a) + M \geq 0, \forall (a, x) \in (C_a \times C_x),$$

where $p_i(a) \in \mathbb{R}[a]$, $p_i^\alpha$ denotes the coefficient of the monomial of degree $\alpha$ in polynomial $p_i$, and $\gamma_\alpha$ denotes the moment of the monomial of degree $\alpha$, i.e.

$$\gamma_\alpha = \int_{C_a} a^\alpha d\mu(a)$$

where $\mu$ is the Lebesgue measure on $C_a$.

**Remark 2**: $M$ in (9) guarantees that the program (9) has bounded objective value (i.e. $\sum_\alpha \gamma_\alpha p_i^\alpha$ does not tends to $-\infty$).

We can construct an under-approximation of the valid set $R_i$ via addressing (9).

**Theorem 3 (Soundness)**: Let $p_i(a) \in \mathbb{R}[a]$ be a solution to (9). Then the intersection of its zero sub-level set $R_i$ and the set $C_a$ is an under-approximation of the valid set $R_i$, i.e., $R(i) \subseteq R_i$, where

$$R(i) = \{a \in C_a \mid p_i(a) \leq 0\}. \quad (10)$$

**Proof**: Assume $a_0 \in R(i)$. Since $p_i$ is a solution to (9), we have

$$l_i(a_0, x) \leq p_i(a_0) \leq 0 \quad \forall (a, x) \in (C_a, K_i(a))$$

which immediately implies that $a_0 \in R_i$ according to (4), (7) and (6). Therefore, $R(i) \subseteq R_i$.

In the following we prove that the optimization (9) can provide a convergent sequence of under-approximations to the valid set $R_i$ in measure under Assumption 1.

**Assumption 1**: For $i = 0, \ldots, k + 1$, the zero level set of $\phi_i$, i.e.

$$R_i^0(i) = \{a \mid \phi_i(a) = 0\}$$

has Lebesgue measure zero.

**Remark 3**: Assumption 1 basically states that the zero level set of $\phi_i$ should be negligible. Note that the zero level set of $\phi_i$ actually equals to the zero points of $\phi''_i$ defined in the proof of Theorem 2 and $\phi''_i$ can be proved to be a semialgebraic function in the following Lemma 1. Therefore, $R_i^0(i)$ is actually the zero level set of a semialgebraic function $\phi''_i$.

By [41] Lemma 2.5.2, there exists a nonzero polynomial $h \in \mathbb{R}[a, y]$ such that $h(a, \phi''(a)) = 0$ for every $a \in C_a$. The zero level set of $\phi''(a)$ is then contained in the zero level set of $h(a, 0)$.

Note that $h(a, 0)$ is a polynomial. If Assumption 1 were to be violated, $h(a, 0)$ must be constant zero. In other words, $h(a, y)$ contains $y$ as a factor, which is generally not the case in practice.

**Lemma 1 (Semialgebraic functions)**: Let $A \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ and $B \subset \mathbb{R}^{m+n}$ be two semialgebraic sets. Let $\psi : B \to \mathbb{R}$ be a polynomial function. Then $\theta(a) = \sup_{x \in A} \psi(a, x)$ is a semialgebraic function. In particular, $\phi''_i$'s are semialgebraic functions.

**Proof**: By definition of semialgebraic function, we only need to show the graph of $\theta$ is a semialgebraic set (see e.g. [41] Definition 2.2.5). The graph of the function $\theta(a)$ is

$$\{(a, y) \in \mathbb{R}^{m+1} \mid \forall x \in A, \psi(a, x) \leq y \quad \text{and} \quad \forall \epsilon \in \mathbb{R}^+, \exists x \in B, \psi(a, x) + \epsilon > y\},$$

which is a semialgebraic set in $\mathbb{R}^{m+1}$ by Tarski-Seidenberg principle (see e.g. [41] Definition 2.2.3, Proposition 2.2.4).
Theorem 4 (Optimality): There exists optimal solution $p^*_ij(a)$ to (9) such that the objective value of $p^*_ij$ tends to $v^*$, i.e.,
\[
\lim_{j \to \infty} \sum_{\alpha} \gamma_{ij} p^*_{ij} = v^*,
\]
where $v^* = \int_{C_a} \phi_i(a) d\mu(a)$. Furthermore, the zero sub-level set of $p^*_ij$
\[
R^{(j)}(i) = \{a \in C_a \mid p^*_ij(a) \leq 0\}
\]
satisfies
\[
\lim_{j \to \infty} \mu(R^{(j)}(i)) = 0,
\]
if Assumption 1 is satisfied. Here $\mu$ denotes Lebesgue measure.

Proof: According to (5) and (9), we have that if $p_i(a)$ is a solution to (9), $p_i(a) \geq \phi_i(a)$ over $a \in C_a$.

According to Corollary 1 there exists a sequence $\{p_{ij}\}$ with $p_{ij} \geq \phi_i$ on $C_a$ such that
\[
\lim_{j \to \infty} \int_{C_a} |p_{ij}(a) - \phi_i(a)| d\mu(a) = 0
\]
holds.

Also, according to (5),
\[
p_{ij}(a) \geq \left\{ l_i(a, x) \quad \forall (a, x) \in (C_a \times K_i(a)), -M \quad \forall a \in C_a. \right\}
\]
That is, $p_{ij}$ is a feasible solution to (9).

On the other hand, since $p_{ij} \geq \phi_i$ over $C_a$, we have
\[
\int_{C_a} |p_{ij}(a) - \phi_i(a)| d\mu(a) = \sum_{\alpha} \gamma_{ij} p_{ij} - \int_{C_a} \phi_i(a) d\mu(a) \geq 0.
\]
Then there exists optimal solution $p^*_{ij}(a)$ to (9) such that the objective value of $p^*_{ij}$ tends to $v^*$ and (13) holds.

The proof of (12) is similar to the one in [36, Theorem 3].

A Lasserre hierarchy of SOS programming can be built to approximate (9) in the standard way. The degree $d$ relaxation $M_d(i)$ of (9) can be written as follows:
\[
M_d(i) = \min_{p_{ij} \in R, \sigma_i, \sigma'_i \in S^{2d}\{a, x\}} \sum_{\alpha} \gamma_{ij} p_{ij}^{\alpha} \sigma_i(a, x) \sigma'_i(a, x)
\]
\[
p_i(a) - l_i(a, x) = \sigma_{i0}(a, x) - \sum_{r=1}^{m_i} \sigma'_{ir}(a, x) g_{ir}(a, x)
\]
\[
- \sum_{r=1}^{s_a} \sigma''_{ir}(a, x) h_{ir}^a(x) - \sum_{r=1}^{s_a} \sigma''_{ir}(a, x) h_{ir}^e(x),
\]
\[
p_i(a) + M = \sigma'_{i0}(a, x) - \sum_{r=1}^{s_a} \sigma''_{ir}(a, x) h_{ir}^a(a)
\]
\[
- \sum_{r=1}^{s_a} \sigma''_{ir}(a, x) h_{ir}^e(x),
\]
where $g_{ir}(a, x), h_{ir}^a(a)$ and $h_{ir}^e(x)$ are chosen such that
\[
C_a = \{a \mid \bigwedge_{r=1}^{s_a} h_{ir}^a(a) \leq 0\}
\]
\[
C_x = \{x \mid \bigwedge_{r=1}^{s_a} h_{ir}^e(x) \leq 0\}
\]
\[
K_i(a) = \{x \in C_x \mid \bigwedge_{r=1}^{m_i} g_{ir}(a, x) \leq 0\}
\]
and $\sigma_{ir}, \sigma'_{ir}$ are sum of squares of degree $2d$.

In [36], Theorem 5, it has been shown that if the feasible region of (9) satisfies Archimedean condition and contains an interior point, then the SOS problem (14) has no dual gap with its dual moment problem (see formulas (17) (18) in [36]) and a sequence of optimal solutions $p^*_{ij}(a)$ to the SOS problems (14) converges to $v^*$ and satisfies (13). Moreover, as shown in [42, Theorem 1], we can also avoid to check the existence of an interior point by adding the constraints of variables $x^2 \leq M_x$, $a^2 \leq M_a$ to (14), which will also guarantee that the SOS problem (14) has no dual gap with its the dual problem and its optimal solution $p^*_{ij}(a)$ converges to $v^*$. For numerical stability of solving the SOS problem (14), we also prefer to scale all variables belong to the unit sphere or rescale the moments to
\[
\gamma_{ij} = \frac{1}{\mu(C_a)} \int_{C_a} a^\alpha d\mu(a)
\]

IV. ALGORITHM

In this section we elucidate our algorithm based on solving (9) for computing an invariant of the program in Fig. 1. The algorithm mainly consists of two steps: the first one is to synthesize a non-empty under-approximation of the valid robust invariant $R_i$ by solving (9); the second step is to extract a valuation in the computed under-approximation to form an invariant. The algorithm is formally presented in Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 1 Invariant Synthesis Algorithm

Input: $I_i(a, x)$ and a program of the form in Fig. 1

Output: a valid parameter valuation $a_0$

1: $d \leftarrow 1$

2: while True do

3: for $i = 0, 1, \ldots, k + 1$ do

4: $M_d(i) \leftarrow$ Lasserre relaxation of (9) of degree $d$

5: $p^*_{ij} \leftarrow$ solutions of $M_d(i)$ \n
6: $R^{(d)}(i) \leftarrow \{a \in C_a \mid p^*_{ij}(a) \leq 0\}$

7: end for

8: if $a_0 \in \bigcap_{i=0}^{k+1} R^{(d)}(i)$ is found then

9: return $a_0$ \n
else

10: $d \leftarrow d + 1$ \n
11: increase degree iteratively

12: end if

13: end while
In order to find an invariant, we first assign \( d = 1 \) and obtain the corresponding semidefinite programs \( M_d(i) \) for some constant \( M \). The polynomial optimization can be solved for an \( \alpha_0 \) such that \( \alpha_0 \in \bigcap_{l=0}^{k+1} R^{(d)}(i) \). If \( \alpha_0 \) is found, \( \alpha_0 \) belongs to the valid set \( R_l \), and the corresponding semidefinite programs \( R^{(d)}(i) \) is an invariant. On the other hand, if no \( \alpha_0 \) is found, which is either due to incompleteness of numerical methods for polynomial optimization, we increase the relaxation degree \( d \) as shown in Line 8 of Algorithm 1 and repeat the above process to compute less conservativeness underapproximations, in which an \( \alpha_0 \) is more likely to be found.

Example 3: Continue with Example 2. In order to synthesize an invariant with respect to the template \( I(a, x, y) = y^2 + x + a \), we need to underapproximate the following sets \( R_l(0) \), \( R_l(1) \) and \( R_l(2) \), where

\[
R_l(0) = \{ -8 \leq a \leq -4 \mid \forall x, y. (y^2 + x^2 \leq 4), \Rightarrow (y^2 + x + a \leq 0) \}
\]

\[
R_l(1) = \{ -8 \leq a \leq -4 \mid \forall x, y. (y^2 + x + a \leq 0), \Rightarrow (1/2 y^2 + x + 1 + a \leq 0) \} \text{ and} \]

\[
R_l(2) = \{ -8 \leq a \leq -4 \mid \forall x, y. (y^2 + x + a \leq 0), \Rightarrow (x \leq 7) \}.
\]

The first iteration of Algorithm 1 generates the following under-approximations:

\[
R^{(1)}(1) = \{ a \in [-8, -4] \mid 1.000000071a + 6.00000032 \leq 0 \},
\]

\[
R^{(1)}(2) = \{ a \in [-8, -4] \mid 0.6616197 + 3.8232235 \leq 0 \}
\]

\[
R^{(1)}(3) = \{ a \in [-8, -4] \mid -0.9999999a - 6.9999999 \leq 0 \}
\]

The polynomial \( a_0 = -6.5 \) is found from \( R^{(1)}(1) \cap R^{(1)}(2) \cap R^{(1)}(3) \) and thus a valid invariant \( \{ (x, y) \mid y^2 + x - 6.5 \leq 0 \} \) is obtained. The SMT solver Z3 further verifies that \( \{ (x, y) \mid y^2 + x - 6.5 \leq 0 \} \) is an invariant of the example program in Fig.2.

Next we show that Algorithm 1 can provide an invariant under appropriate assumptions.

Assumption 2: One of the polynomial defining the set \( C_x \) is equal to \( \| x \|^2 - M_x \) for some constant \( M_x \). Also, one of the polynomial defining the set \( C_a \) is equal to \( \| a \|^2 - M_a \).

Assumption 2 is without loss of generality because of compactness of \( C_x \) and \( C_a \). Thus \( \| x \|^2 - M_x \) and \( \| a \|^2 - M_a \) can respectively be added to the constraint defining \( C_x \) and \( C_a \) as a redundant constraint for sufficiently large \( M_x \) and \( M_a \).

Theorem 5 (Weakly Completeness): Under Assumption 1 and 2 if the valid set \( R_l \) has positive measure, Algorithm 1 can return an invariant provided that the numerical method used in Line 8 is able to find a valid \( \alpha_0 \) when \( \bigcap_{l=0}^{k+1} R^{(d)}(i) \) has positive measure.

Proof: According to Corollary 1 there exists a sequence \( \{ p_{i,j} \}_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \) with \( p_{i,j} \geq \phi_i \) on \( C_a \) such that

\[
p_{i,j} \geq \left\{ \begin{array}{ll}
l_i(a, x), & \forall (a, x) \in (C_a \times K_i(a)), \\
-M, & \forall a \in C_a.
\end{array} \right.
\]

Therefore, \( p_{i,j} \) is a solution to (9). According to Theorem 1, the SOS problem has no dual gap with its dual moment problem (see formulas (17) (18) in [36]) and has an optimal solution \( p_{i,u}(a) \) satisfying (13). According to Assumption 1 and Theorem 3 we have

\[
\lim_{d \to \infty} \mu(R_l(1) \setminus R^{(d)}(i)) = 0, \forall i \in 0, 1, \ldots, k + 1.
\]

Let \( R^{(d)} = \bigcap_{l=0}^{k+1} R^{(d)}(i) \). Since \( R_l = \bigcap_{l=0}^{k+1} R_l(i) \) has positive measure, (15) indicates that

\[
\lim_{d \to \infty} \mu(R_l \setminus R^{(d)}) = 0,
\]

which further implies that \( R^{(d)} \) has positive measure when \( d \) is large enough. Therefore, Algorithm 1 can find an invariant if the condition on the numerical method for finding a \( \alpha_0 \) in Algorithm 1 is satisfied.

V. Experiments

A. Environment

The following experiments are performed on a PC with AMD Ryzen 2200G CPU and 16GB RAM running Manjaro Linux 18.0 x86_64.

We used SumOfSquares.jl package [43] of Julia [44] to invoke the SDP solvers of Mosek [45] to solve the resulted semidefinite programming. For comparison, we also use Z3 version 4.8.0 and Redlog version 3258 to do non-linear real SMT solving and non-linear real quantifier elimination.

B. The First Example

We consider synthesizing invariants for the following program from [36] as the first example:

\[
\{ x^2 + y^2 \leq 1 \}
\]

\[
\text{while } (x^*2 + y^*2 <= 3) \\
\{ \\
\quad x := x^*2 + y - 1; \\
\quad y := x*y + y + 1; \\
\} \\
\{ x^2 - 2y^2 \leq 4 \}
\]

Obviously, it can be modelled by the guarded command in Fig.1.

We use the following polynomial template

\[
I(a, b, x, y) = x^2 + ay^2 + b,
\]

and limit the range of variables \( x, y \) to be \([-100, 100]\) and range of parameters \( a, b \) to be \([-2, 2]\).

According to Definition 1 the conditions on \( a, b \) for the set \( \{ (x, y) \mid I(a, b, x, y) \leq 0 \} \) to be an invariant can be written as
the following first-order formulas:

\[ \text{cond}_1 = \forall x, y. (x^2 + y^2 \leq 1) \implies (x^2 + ay^2 + b \leq 0) \]

\[ \text{cond}_2 = \forall x, y. ((x^2 + y^2 \leq 3) \land (x^2 + ay^2 + b \leq 0)) \]

\[ \implies (ax^4 + 2ax^2y^2 + ay^4 +
    x^4 + 2ax^2y + 2x^2y + 2ay^2 -
    2x^2y - 2y + a + b + 1)) \]

\[ \text{cond}_3 = \forall x, y. ((x^2 + y^2 \geq 3) \land (x^2 + ay^2 + b \leq 0)) \]

\[ \implies (x^2 - 2y^2 \leq 4)). \]

(16)

The problem of synthesizing invariants can then be reduced to finding \( a \) and \( b \) such that the formula \( \text{cond} = \text{cond}_1 \land \text{cond}_2 \land \text{cond}_3 \) is satisfied, which can be done by modern SMT solvers or quantifier eliminators.

However, it’s difficult for symbolic solvers to find satisfiable assignments due to the complicated form of \( \text{cond} \). 23 fails to find a satisfying assignment for \( \text{cond} \) after 12 hours of running. Moreover, quantifier eliminators such as Redlog also fails to give a quantifier-free equivalent formula of \( \text{cond} \) after running for 12 hours. The main reason here is the extremely high complexity (up to double exponential) of the algorithms they used.

On the other hand, our algorithm treats this example very well. We use three different polynomials \( p_1, p_2, \) and \( p_3 \) to represent the three conditions of Definition \( \text{I} \) respectively. In particular, we have:

\[ (p_1(a, b) \leq 0) \implies \text{cond}_1 \]

\[ (p_2(a, b) \leq 0) \implies \text{cond}_2 \]

\[ (p_3(a, b) \leq 0) \implies \text{cond}_3 \]

where \( \text{cond}_i \) is defined in (16) and \( p_i \) are solutions to SOS programmings (9).

Solving Lasserre hierarchy of (9) gives us a series of polynomials \( p_i^{(j)} \). In this particular example, relaxation of (9) of degree 4 results in a semidefinite programming of only several hundreds of constraints, and can be solved by \text{Mosek} \ SDP solver within 1 second. The synthesized \( p_i \)’s are:

\[ p_1'(a, b) = 0.140637a^2 + 0.187482a + 0.999999b + 1.062482 \]

\[ p_2'(a, b) = -1.239529a^2 - 2.410281ab - 0.677936b^2 + 0.059746a - 4.313426b + 7.46404 \]

\[ p_3'(a, b) = 0.999999b - 3.999999 \]

Using polynomial optimization algorithms provided by \text{Mosek}, we can obtain an assignment \( a = -1.95, b = -1.95 \) such that \( (p_1(a, b) \leq 0) \land (p_2(a, b) \leq 0) \land (p_3(a, b) \leq 0) \). The corresponding invariant is

\[ \text{Inv} = \{(x, y) \mid x^2 - 1.95y^2 - 1.95 \leq 0 \}, \]

which can be verified by 2.3 to be a valid invariant of the program.

It should also be noted that the synthesized invariant is not a barrier certificate as defined in [32], whose value is required to be non-increasing when loop body executes for all \( (x, y) \) such that \( I(x, y) \leq 0 \). In fact, when \( x = -1, y = -1.25 \), the value of \( x^2 - 1.95y^2 - 1.95 \) increases after loop body executes instead of decreasing (it’s still less than zero, though). This observation shows that our algorithm indeed generates a boarder class of invariants compared to those based on barrier certificates such as [32].

C. The Second Example

Next we consider a more complicated example, trying to synthesize invariants for the branched program given as follows:

\[ \{ x^2 + y^2 \leq 1 \} \]

\[ \text{while } (x^2 + y^2 <= 3) \]

\[ \{ \]

\[ \text{if } (x <= 0) \text{ then } \]

\[ (x, y) := (0.5 * x + 0.5 * y \cdot y, \]

\[ y - 0.5 * x * y) \]

\[ \}

\[ \{ x^2 + y^2 - 3x + 2 \geq 0 \} \]

We still use the template \( I \) and range of \( x, y, a, b \) as in the first example.

Trying to synthesize invariants for this program using symbolic methods would lead us to searching for valid parameter valuations for a even more complicated first-order formula than (16). We omit it here due to limit of space. 2.3 and Redlog again fail to synthesize an invariant after 12 hours of running.

Applying Algorithm 1 to this problem. When the relaxation degree \( d = 4 \), by solving a semidefinite programming of around 600 constraints (which is solved by \text{Mosek} within 1 second), we obtain the following underapproximations:

\[ R^{(4)}(0) = \{(a, b) \mid 0.562498a^2 + 0.375002a + 1.999999 + 1.052497 \leq 0} \]

\[ R^{(4)}(1) = \{(a, b) \mid -2.109967a^2 - 1.582054ab - 0.257991b^2 - 0.135675a - 0.0623692b + 2.242127 \leq 0} \]

\[ R^{(4)}(2) = \{(a, b) \mid -2.109967a^2 - 1.582054ab - 0.257991b^2 - 0.135675a - 0.0623692b + 2.242127 \leq 0} \]

\[ R^{(4)}(3) = \{(a, b) \mid 0.707105b - 0.767365 \leq 0} \]

note that \( R^{(4)}(2) \) is (almost) the same as \( R^{(4)}(1) \).

Polynomial optimization algorithms provided by \text{Mosek} can then be used to find a concrete element \( (-1.95, -1.95) \) of \( \cap_{i=0}^{3} R^{(d)}(i) \). That gives us (again) the following invariant:

\[ \text{Inv} = \{(x, y) \mid x^2 - 1.95y^2 - 1.95 \leq 0} \]

which can be verified by 2.3 to be an actual invariant of the branched program.

We also observe that \( \text{Inv} \) is not a barrier certificate. For example, when \( x = 0, y = 0.125 \) the value of \( x^2 - 1.95y^2 - 1.95 \) increases.

VI. EXTENSIONS

A. Semialgebraic Template

In this subsection we briefly introduce the extensions of our approach to invariant synthesis using semialgebraic
templates. We show that the techniques introduced in this paper can be applied to the case when templates are conjunctions of polynomial inequalities (instead of only one polynomial inequality) with a minor change. The immediate consequence is that Algorithm 1 can be applied to the cases when templates are semialgebraic (i.e. templates are the conjunction of parameterized polynomial inequalities). The basic semialgebraic invariant template is formally defined as:

**Definition 5:** A basic semialgebraic invariant template

\[ \text{Inv}_{b}(a, x) \]

is a finite collection of polynomials \( I_r \in \mathbb{R}[a, x] \), where \( a \) are referred as parameters. Given a parameter valuation \( a_0 \in \mathbb{R}^m \), the instantiation of \( \text{Inv}_{b} \) with regard to \( a_0 \) is the set \( \{ x | \bigwedge_r I_r(a_0, x) \leq 0 \} \).

A brief review of techniques presented in this paper indicates that our algorithm can be extended to basic semialgebraic case with a minor change. In particular, the definition of \( K_i(a) \) and \( I_i(a, x) \) should be changed to a slightly generalized version given as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{l}_0(a, x) &= \max_r I_r(a, x) \\
\text{l}_i(a, x) &= \max_r I_r(a, f_i(x)) \quad i = 1, \ldots, k \\
\text{l}_{k+1}(a, x) &= \text{Post}(x)
\end{align*}
\]

and:

\[
\begin{align*}
K_0(a) &= \{ x \in C_x | \text{Pre}(x) \leq 0 \} \\
K_i(a) &= \{ x \in C_x | (c_i(x) \leq 0) \\
&\quad \wedge (\bigwedge_r I_r(a, x) \leq 0) \} \quad i = 1, \ldots, k \\
K_{k+1}(a) &= \{ x \in C_x | (\wedge_{x=1}^k c_i(x) \geq 0) \wedge (\bigwedge_r I(a, x) \leq 0) \}
\end{align*}
\]

Then all other results can be derived similarly. Note that the constraint in SOS programming can be reduced to corresponding constraints concerning \( I_r \) (which increase the number of constraints).

Furthermore, we show that the general semialgebraic templates can be reduced to basic semialgebraic templates by *lifting*. This shows a theoretical possibility to use our algorithm to generate even general semialgebraic invariants. First we give formal definition of general semialgebraic templates as follows:

**Definition 6:** A (general) semialgebraic invariant template

\[ \text{Inv}_{g}(a, x) \]

is a finite collection of polynomials \( I_{r_{x}} \in \mathbb{R}[a, x] \), where \( a \) are referred as parameters. Given a parameter valuation \( a_0 \in \mathbb{R}^m \), the set \( \{ x | \bigwedge_r I_{r_{x}}(a_0, x) \leq 0 \} \) is referred to as its instantiation as an invariant candidate with regard to \( a_0 \).

The key observation here is that a general semialgebraic template can be reduced to a basic semialgebraic template of higher dimension by lifting to higher dimensions. The underlying reason for this is the fact that every semialgebraic set is the projection of a closed basic semialgebraic set. The following lemma details the lifting we needed and can be easily proven as e.g. a corollary of [47] Lemma 14.3.

**Lemma 2:** Let \( C \subset \mathbb{R}^d \) be a compact basic semialgebraic set defined as:

\[ C = \{ x \in \mathbb{R}^d | g_v(x) \leq 0, v = 1, \ldots, m \} \]

and suppose that \( \forall x \in C, M - \|x\| \geq 0 \) for some known \( M > 0 \).

For any semialgebraic set \( S \) defined on \( C \), i.e.:

\[ S = \{ x \in C | \bigvee_{i=1}^m f_{ij}(x) \leq 0 \} \]

where \( f_{ij} \in \mathbb{R}[x] \), there exists a basic semialgebraic lifting. In particular, there exists \( p, s \in \mathbb{N} \) and polynomials \( h_1, h_2, \ldots, h_s \in \mathbb{R}[x, y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_p] \) such that:

\[ S = \{ x \in C | (\bigwedge_{k=1}^s h_k(x, y) \leq 0) \land (y_p \leq 0) \} \]

Based on Lemma 2 we prove the following theorem regarding the reduction of general semialgebraic templates:

**Theorem 6:** General semialgebraic templates can be reduced to basic semialgebraic templates. More specifically, for any general semialgebraic template \( \text{Inv}_{g}(a, x) \), there exists a basic semialgebraic template \( \text{Inv}_{b}(a', x) \) such that for any \( a_0 \in C_a \), the instantiation of \( \text{Inv}_{g} \) with regard to \( a_0 \) equals to the instantiation of \( \text{Inv}_{b} \) with regard to some \( a'_0 \in C_a \).

**Proof:** Note that an Archimedean representation of condition is known for \( C_a \times C_x \). Applying Lemma 2 to it, we know that the set:

\[ \{ (a, x) | \bigvee_{i=1}^s I_{r_{x}}(a, x) \leq 0 \} \]

has a basic semialgebraic lifting. That is to say, it equals to:

\[ \{ (a, x) \land x \in C_x | \bigwedge_{k=1}^s h_k(a, x, y) \leq 0 \land (y_p \leq 0) \} \]

for \( p, s \in \mathbb{N} \) and \( h_k \in \mathbb{R}[a, x, y] \). \( y \) here is bounded when \( a \) and \( x \) are bounded.

The conclusion follows since \( h_k(a, x, y) \) and \( y_p \leq 0 \) can be viewed as a basic semialgebraic template \( \text{Inv}_{b} \) with parameters \( a \) and \( y \). Note that parameters \( y \) has a known bounded and therefore the range of \( (x, y) \) \( C_{x,y} \) has a known Archimedean representation, too.

Theorem 6 indicates that Algorithm 1 can be used to synthesize general semialgebraic invariants by first lifting the general semialgebraic template to a basic semialgebraic template. Regarding how to compute such a lift, readers may refer to [47].

However, Algorithm 1 proves to be less efficient for general semialgebraic cases compared to polynomial and basic semialgebraic cases in practice. The main reason lies in the lifting process: applying lifting dramatically increases either the degree of defining polynomials or the number of parameters, sometimes even both. The sets of valid parameter valuations of lifted templates also tend to have more complex boundaries, which means higher relaxation degree \( d \) in Algorithm 1 is needed.
B. Non-polynomial Functions

When the program of interest contains continuous non-polynomial functions (such as exponential, logarithmic or trigonometric functions) as conditions or assignments, it’s not possible to directly use Algorithm 1 to synthesize invariants, even if the template itself is polynomial. The main reason lies in the solving of (now a non-polynomial) optimization problem 9. In our approach, 9 is first relaxed to a hierarchy of SOS relaxations, then each of those SOS programings is cast to a semidefinite programming, which is solved by corresponding SDP solver. However, when non-polynomial functions are involved, both the relaxation and the solving would be problematic: Positivstellensatz for non-polynomial functions 47 are limited and hard to use; and even in cases when a hierarchy of SOS relaxation can be built, such a programming can no longer be easily cast as a semidefinite programming since non-polynomials are involved.

However, that does not mean that there is nothing we can do when such non-polynomial functions are present in programs. A common way of treating them is symbolic abstraction 37, 38. The basic idea is to use a formula in the abstract domain (in our case, the conjunction of polynomial inequalities) to best over-approximate the “real meaning” of the original formula.

In this subsection, we briefly introduce how to combine our approach with symbols abstraction to synthesis invariants for programs where non-polynomial continuous functions, such as trigonometric functions, logarithmic functions, exponential functions, rational functions, are present in programs. In this following, the precondition Pre(x), the postcondition Post(x), the guards c_i(x) and the assignments f_i(x) in program model presented in Fig 1 are assume to contain terms built by such non-polynomial continuous functions.

Let t_i be the collection of all variables and all non-polynomial terms resulted from the first application of some non-polynomial functions (such as sin(x+y) but not sin(x) + sin(y)), the abstract mapping abt can be defined from bottom up as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{abt}(c) &= c, c \in R \\
\text{abt}(a_j) &= a_j \\
\text{abt}(t_i) &= z_i \\
\text{abt}(u \leq 0) &= \text{abt}(u) \leq 0
\end{align*}
\]

where c is a constant, u denotes a term and w denotes a formula. Note that the result of abt is conjunctions of polynomial inequalities as all non-polynomial terms are abstracted as new variables.

Since all the non-polynomial functions used in program is assumed to be continuous and variables x are taken from a compact set C_x satisfying \( \forall x \in C_x, \|x\|^2 \leq M_x \), the abstracted variables z also fall in a compact set C_z satisfying \( \forall z \in C_z, \|z\|^2 \leq M_z \) for some \( M_z > 0 \).

We also define strengthening of abstraction of formula w as follows:

**Definition 7:** A strengthening \( \text{abt}(w) \) of an abstraction \( \text{abt}(w) \) is a formula consists of conjunctions of polynomial inequalities (just as \( \text{abt}(w) \)) satisfying \( w \implies \text{abt}(w) \) and \( \text{abt}(w) \implies \text{abt}(w) \).

The best (strongest) strengthening of an abstraction \( \text{abt}(w) \) is difficult to find, sometimes even does not exist. One usually needs to resort to some heuristics regarding the specific non-polynomial functions being abstracted to obtain a good strengthening. We do not expand further on this, interested readers may refer to e.g., 37, 48 for some examples. We assume in the following that such a strengthening procedure is available.

Recall that in previous discussions, valid set \( R_I \) is treated separately as \( R_I(0), R_I(1), \ldots, R_I(k+1) \). Using abstraction mapping \( \text{abt} \), we can define the following abstracted valid set \( R_a(0), R_a(k+1) \) as:

\[
\begin{align*}
R_a(0) &= \{ a \in C_a | \forall z \in C_z. \\
& \quad \quad \text{abt}(\text{Pre}(x) \leq 0) \\
& \quad \quad \implies \text{abt}(I(a, x) \leq 0) \} \\
R_a(k+1) &= \{ a \in C_a | \forall z \in C_z. \\
& \quad \quad \text{abt}(\bigwedge_{i=1}^{k} (c_i(x) \geq 0) \land (I(a, x) \leq 0)) \\
& \quad \quad \implies \text{abt}(\text{Post}(x) \leq 0) \}
\end{align*}
\]

It can be verified that \( R_a(0) \subseteq R_I(0) \) and \( R_a(k+1) \subseteq R_I(k+1) \). In order to deal with the remaining \( R_I(i) \), we need to keep two sets of fresh variables \( \{ z_i \} \) and \( \{ z_i' \} \), representing the abstraction of program states before and after the loop executes respectively. The abstracted valid set \( R_a(i) \) can then be defined as:

\[
\begin{align*}
R_a(i) &= \{ a \in C_a | \forall z \in C_z \exists z' \in C_z. \\
& \quad \quad \text{abt}(\text{Pre}(x) \leq 0) \land (I(a, x) \leq 0) \\
& \quad \quad \land (x' = f_i(x)) \\
& \quad \quad \implies \text{abt}(I(a, x') \leq 0) \}
\end{align*}
\]

for \( i = 1, \ldots, k \).

It can be verified that \( R_a(i) \subseteq R_I(i) \). Note that \( R_a(i) \) doesn’t contain non-polynomial functions any more and can be underapproximated using the techniques presented in this paper. If a valid parameter valuation \( a_0 \) was found from \( R_a(i) \), it can therefore be substituted back to template \( I \) to obtain an invariant. It should be noted though that weakly completeness does not hold due to information lost in the abstraction process.

**Example 4:** Consider the following program:

\[
\begin{align*}
\{ & x + y + \sin(x) \leq 0 \\
\text{while } (x <= 0) \quad \{ \\
& y := y + \sin(x) ; \\
& x := x + 2 \ast \pi ; \\
& y := y - 2 \ast \pi ; \\
& y := y - \sin(x) ; \\
\} & \{ x + y + \sin(x) \leq 2 \}
\end{align*}
\]

To generate invariant for this program, we use the template \( I(a, x, y) = x + y + a \leq 0 \). Apply the abstraction process presented above and let \( z_1 = x \), \( z_2 = y \) and \( z_3 = \sin(x) \), we
can build the abstracted valid set as:
\[ R_a(0) = \{ a \in C_a \mid \forall z \in C_z, ((z_1 + z_2 + z_3 \leq 0) \land (z_3 \geq -1)) \implies (z_1 + z_2 + a \leq 0) \} \]
\[ R_a(1) = \{ a \in C_a \mid \forall z \in C_z \forall z' \in C_z ((z_1 \leq 0) \land (z_1' = z_1 + 2\pi) \land (z_1 + z_2 + a \leq 0) \land (z_2' = z_2 - 2\pi + z_3 - z_3') \land (z_3 = z_3')) \implies (z_1' + z_2' + a \leq 0) \} \]
\[ R_a(2) = \{ a \in C_a \mid \forall z \in C_z, ((z_1 \geq 0) \land (z_1 + z_2 + a \leq 0) \land (z_3 \leq 1) \implies (z_1 + z_2 + z_3 \leq 2) \} \]

note that the additional formulas \( z_3 \geq -1 \), \( z_3 \leq 1 \) and \( z_3 = z_3' \) introduced by the strengthening process.

The abstracted valid set \( R_a(i) \) can then be underapproximated by the techniques presented in this paper. A valid parameter valuation \( a = -1 \) can be extracted from it, which gives us the invariant \( \{(x, y) \mid x + y + 1 \leq 0\} \). Obviously it is indeed an invariant and can be used to prove the validity of the Hoare triple.

VII. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we showed a new way of generating polynomial invariants with regards to a general template using semidefinite programming (SDP) based on Lasserre’s results in [35], [36]. Unlike symbolic methods such as SMT solving or quantifier elimination, our approach enjoys the efficiency brought by SDP solving (which can be done in polynomial time for a given numeric error \( \epsilon \)) and outperforms them greatly (as the decision process they used have double exponential complexity); on the other hand, we also proved a weaker completeness result stating that when some non-degenerate conditions are satisfied, our algorithm guarantees to find an invariant with regard to the given template, which is previously only guaranteed only by symbolic methods.

Some illustrative examples were given to show that our algorithm indeed synthesized more expressive invariants (which can’t be synthesized by previous works based on numeric computing) in much (incomparably, actually) less time compared to algorithms based on symbolic computations. We also briefly discussed the extension of our approach to the case when templates are semialgebraic instead of polynomials, and the case when non-polynomial functions are presented in programs.

As future work, we plan to extend the techniques presented in this paper to invariant synthesis for polynomial dynamical systems, hybrid systems. We also would like to investigate the possible use of moments in invariant synthesis for stochastic dynamical systems. Finally, we plan to analyse further the numeric error introduced by SDP in Algorithm 1 and see whether it can be bounded so that the invariant returned by it can be guaranteed to be an actual invariant without the need of verification by SMT solvers.
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