

soonhok@cs.cmu.edu Carnegie Mellon University



#### Discrete Control + Continuous Dynamics

#### Discrete Control + Continuous Dynamics



 $\frac{du}{dt} = \varepsilon - \frac{1}{\tau_{so2} - \tau_{so1}}$ 

 $\frac{du}{dt} = \varepsilon - \frac{u}{\tau_{o2}}$ 

Cardiac Cell Action Potential Model

 $\frac{du}{dt} = \varepsilon - \frac{u}{\tau_{a1}}$ 

#### Discrete Control + Continuous Dynamics

Prostate CancerTreatment Model



Control (cancer therapy)

Plant (cancer progression)





Power Train Control (Toyota Research)



Autonomous Vehicle (CMU ECE)



Microfluidic Chip Design (Univ. of Waterloo)

# Can we find a set of initial values/parameters for which a cardiac cell loses excitability?



# Can we find a personalized treatment model which prevents the cancer recurrence in 5 years??



Can we automate a non-trivial parking?



#### Can we automate a non-trivial parking?



Can a hybrid system run into an unsafe region of its state space?

Can a hybrid system run into an unsafe region of its state space?



Can a hybrid system run into an unsafe region of its state space?



The standard bounded reachability problems for simple hybrid systems are **undecidable**[Alur et al, 1992].

The standard bounded reachability problems for simple hybrid systems are **undecidable**.

The standard bounded reachability problems for simple hybrid systems are **undecidable**.

I. Give up



"I can't find an algorithm, but neither can all these famous people."

The standard bounded reachability problems for simple hybrid systems are **undecidable**.

I. Give up

2. Don't give Up

The standard bounded reachability problems for simple hybrid systems are **undecidable**.

I. Give up

2. Don't give Up

A. Find a decidable fragment and solve it

The standard bounded reachability problems for simple hybrid systems are **undecidable**.

I. Give up

2. Don't give Up

A. Find a decidable fragment and solve it

B. Use approximation

The standard bounded reachability problems for simple hybrid systems are **undecidable**.

I. Give up

2. Don't give Up

A. Find a decidable fragment and solve it



Given  $\delta \in \mathbb{Q}^+$ ,  $\llbracket H^{\delta} \rrbracket$  and  $\llbracket unsaf^{\delta} \rrbracket$  over-approximate  $\llbracket H \rrbracket$  and  $\llbracket unsafe \rrbracket$ 

 $\delta$ -reachability problem asks for one of the following answers:



Given  $\delta \in \mathbb{Q}^+$ ,  $\llbracket H^{\delta} \rrbracket$  and  $\llbracket unsaf^{\delta} \rrbracket$  over-approximate  $\llbracket H \rrbracket$  and  $\llbracket unsafe \rrbracket$ 

 $\delta$ -reachability problem asks for one of the following answers:



- Decidable for a wide range of nonlinear hybrid systems

- polynomials, log, exp, trigonometric functions, ...

Given  $\delta \in \mathbb{Q}^+$ ,  $\llbracket H^{\delta} \rrbracket$  and  $\llbracket unsaf^{\delta} \rrbracket$  over-approximate  $\llbracket H \rrbracket$  and  $\llbracket unsafe \rrbracket$ 

 $\delta$ -reachability problem asks for one of the following answers:



- Decidable for a wide range of nonlinear hybrid systems
- Reasonable complexity bound (PSPACE-complete)



#### I. "Unreachable" answers is **sound**.



# 2. Analysis is parameterized with $\delta$ If using a delta leads to a **infeasible** counterexample, you may try a **smaller delta** and possibly get rid of it.



#### 3. Robustness

If your system is  $\delta$ -reachable under a reasonably small  $\delta$ , then a small error can lead your system to an unsafe state

"δ-reachability analysis checks robustness which implies safety."



# Input Format (drh) for Hybrid System

```
#define D 0.45
#define K 0.9
[0, 15] x;
                                                              12
[9.8] g;
[-18, 18] v;
                                                                      21
[0, 3] time;
{
   mode 1;
    invt: (v <= 0);
          (x >= 0);
    flow: d/dt[x] = v;
                                                                         25 31
                                                                   17
          d/dt[v] = -q - (D * v ^ 2);
    jump: (x = 0) = 0 (and (x' = x) (v' = -K * v)); }
{
    mode 2;
    invt: (v >= 0);
          (x >= 0);
    flow: d/dt[x] = v;
          d/dt[v] = -q + (D * v ^ 2);
    jump: (v = 0) = 0 (and (x' = x) (v' = v)); }
init: (1 (and (x \ge 5) (v = 0)));
goal: (and (x \ge 0.45));
```

Inelastic bouncing ball with air resistance

Can a system run into an **unsafe** region after making k steps?





Can a system run into an **unsafe** region after making k steps?



 $Init(\vec{x}_0) \wedge flow_{q_0}(\vec{x}_0, \vec{x}_0^t, t_0) \wedge jump_{q_0 \to q_1}(\vec{x}_0^t, \vec{x}_1)$ 

Can a system run into an **unsafe** region after making k steps?



 $Init(\vec{x}_{0}) \wedge flow_{q_{0}}(\vec{x}_{0}, \vec{x}_{0}^{t}, t_{0}) \wedge jump_{q_{0} \to q_{1}}(\vec{x}_{0}^{t}, \vec{x}_{1}) \wedge flow_{q_{1}}(\vec{x}_{1}, \vec{x}_{1}^{t}, t_{1}) \wedge jump_{q_{1} \to q_{2}}(\vec{x}_{1}^{t}, \vec{x}_{2})$ 

Can a system run into an unsafe region after making k steps?



 $Init(\vec{x}_{0}) \wedge flow_{q_{0}}(\vec{x}_{0}, \vec{x}_{0}^{t}, t_{0}) \wedge jump_{q_{0} \to q_{1}}(\vec{x}_{0}^{t}, \vec{x}_{1}) \wedge flow_{q_{1}}(\vec{x}_{1}, \vec{x}_{1}^{t}, t_{1}) \wedge jump_{q_{1} \to q_{2}}(\vec{x}_{1}^{t}, \vec{x}_{2}) \wedge flow_{q_{1}}(\vec{x}_{1}, \vec{x}_{1}^{t}, t_{1}) \wedge jump_{q_{1} \to q_{2}}(\vec{x}_{1}^{t}, \vec{x}_{2}) \wedge flow_{q_{1}}(\vec{x}_{1}, \vec{x}_{1}^{t}, t_{1}) \wedge flow_{q_{1}}(\vec{x}_{1}, t_{1}^{t}, t_{1}) \wedge flow_{q_{1}}(\vec{x}_{1}, t_{1}^{t}, t_{1}) \wedge flow_{q_{1}}(\vec{x}_{1}, t_{1}^{t}, t_{1}) \wedge flow_{q_{$ 

 $flow_{q_k}(\vec{x}_k, \vec{x}_k^t, t_k)$ 

Can a system run into an unsafe region after making k steps?



 $Init(\vec{x}_{0}) \wedge flow_{q_{0}}(\vec{x}_{0}, \vec{x}_{0}^{t}, t_{0}) \wedge jump_{q_{0} \to q_{1}}(\vec{x}_{0}^{t}, \vec{x}_{1}) \wedge flow_{q_{1}}(\vec{x}_{1}, \vec{x}_{1}^{t}, t_{1}) \wedge jump_{q_{1} \to q_{2}}(\vec{x}_{1}^{t}, \vec{x}_{2}) \wedge flow_{q_{1}}(\vec{x}_{1}, \vec{x}_{1}^{t}, t_{1}) \wedge jump_{q_{1} \to q_{2}}(\vec{x}_{1}^{t}, \vec{x}_{2}) \wedge flow_{q_{1}}(\vec{x}_{1}, \vec{x}_{1}^{t}, t_{1}) \wedge flow_{q_{1}}(\vec{x}_{1}, \vec{x}_{2}^{t}) \wedge flow_{q_{1}}(\vec{x}_{1}, \vec{x}_{1}^{t}, t_{1}) \wedge flow_{q_{1}}(\vec{x}_{1}, \vec{x}_{2}^{t}) \wedge flow_{q_{1}}(\vec{x}_{1}, \vec{x}_{2}^{t}) \wedge flow_{q_{1}}(\vec{x}_{1}, \vec{x}_{1}^{t}, t_{1}) \wedge flow_{q_{1}}(\vec{x}_{1}, \vec{x}_{2}^{t}) \wedge flow_{q_{1}}(\vec{x}_{1}, \vec{x}_{1}^{t}, t_{1}) \wedge flow_{q_{1}}(\vec{x}_{1}, \vec{x}_{2}^{t}) \wedge flow_{q_{1}}(\vec{x}_{1}, \vec{x}_{1}^{t}, t_{1}) \wedge flow_{q_{1}}(\vec{x}_{1}, \vec{x}_{2}^{t}) \wedge flow_{q_{1}}(\vec{x}_{1}, \vec{x}_{2}^{t}) \wedge flow_{q_{1}}(\vec{x}_{1}, \vec{x}_{1}^{t}, t_{1}) \wedge flow_{q_{1}}(\vec{x}_{1}, \vec{x}_{2}^{t}) \wedge flow_{q_{1}}(\vec{x}_{1}, \vec{x}_{$ 

 $flow_{q_k}(\vec{x}_k, \vec{x}_k^t, t_k) \wedge Unsafe(\vec{x}_k^t)$ 

Can a system run into an unsafe region after making k steps?



$$\exists \vec{x}_{0}, \vec{x}_{1}, \dots, \vec{x}_{k} \exists \vec{x}_{0}^{t}, \vec{x}_{1}^{t}, \dots, \vec{x}_{k}^{t} \exists t_{0}, t_{1}, \dots, t_{k} \\ Init(\vec{x}_{0}) \land flow_{q_{0}}(\vec{x}_{0}, \vec{x}_{0}^{t}, t_{0}) \land jump_{q_{0} \rightarrow q_{1}}(\vec{x}_{0}^{t}, \vec{x}_{1}) \land \\ flow_{q_{1}}(\vec{x}_{1}, \vec{x}_{1}^{t}, t_{1}) \land jump_{q_{1} \rightarrow q_{2}}(\vec{x}_{1}^{t}, \vec{x}_{2}) \land$$

 $flow_{q_k}(\vec{x}_k, \vec{x}_k^t, t_k) \wedge Unsafe(\vec{x}_k^t)$ 



#### **Decision Problem**



Standard Form  $\phi := \exists^{\mathbf{I}} \mathbf{x} \bigvee_{i} \bigwedge_{j} f_{i,j}(\mathbf{x}) = 0$ 

### **δ-Decision Problem**



 $\delta \text{-Weakening of } \varphi$  $\phi^{\delta} := \exists^{\mathbf{I}} \mathbf{x} \bigvee_{i} \bigwedge_{j} |f_{i,j}(\mathbf{x})| \leq \delta$


- SAT solver finds a satisfying Boolean assignment
- Theory solver checks whether the assignment is feasible under theory of Real



- SAT solver finds a satisfying Boolean assignment
- Theory solver checks whether the assignment is feasible under theory of Real



- SAT solver finds a satisfying Boolean assignment
- Theory solver checks whether the assignment is feasible under theory of Real



- SAT solver finds a satisfying Boolean assignment
- Theory solver checks whether the assignment is feasible under theory of Real



- SAT solver finds a satisfying Boolean assignment
- Theory solver checks whether the assignment is feasible under theory of Real



- SAT solver finds a satisfying Boolean assignment
- Theory solver checks whether the assignment is feasible under theory of Real

### Main Algorithm of Theory Solver



# Main Algorithm of Theory Solver: ICP(Interval Constraint Propagation)



Reductive  $f(B) \subseteq B$ Solution-Preserving  $x \in B \land x \in Sol(f) \implies x \in f(B)$ 

Monotone

# Main Algorithm of Theory Solver: ICP(Interval Constraint Propagation)



### Two Termination Conditions of ICP



 $\exists x, y \in [0.5, 1.0] : y = sin(x) \land y = atan(x)$ 



ANSWER: UNSAT



 $\exists x, y \in [0.5, 1.0] : y = \sin(x) \land y = \operatorname{atan}(x)$ 

 $\exists x, y \in [0.5, 1.0] : y = \sin(x) \land y = \operatorname{atan}(x)$ 







*x* : [0.524, 1.0], *y* : [0.5, 0.841]

 $\exists x, y \in [0.5, 1.0] : y = \sin(x) \land y = \operatorname{atan}(x)$ 



 $\exists x, y \in [0.5, 1.0] : y = \sin(x) \land y = \operatorname{atan}(x)$ 



- $y' = y \cap \operatorname{atan}(x)$ 
  - $= [0.5, 0.841] \cap atan([0.546, 1.0])$
  - $= [0.5, 0.841] \cap [0.5, 1.0]$
  - = [0.5, 0.785]



*x* : [0.524, 1.0], *y* : [0.5, 0.785]

















 $\exists x, y \in [0.5, 1.0] : y = sin(x) \land y = atan(x)$ 



Unsat



ANSWER: SAT

 $\exists x \in [0.5, 2.0], y \in [0.0, 2.0] : y = sin(x) \land y = atan(x)$ 

Begin 🛛 🗴 dim : 🛛 x 😒 y dim : 🛛 y 😂 🛛 Next



 $\exists x \in [0.5, 2.0], y \in [0.0, 2.0] : y = sin(x) \land y = atan(x)$ 

Begin X dim : 🗙 😒 Y dim : 💡 😂 Next



 $\exists x \in [0.5, 2.0], y \in [0.0, 2.0] : y = sin(x) \land y = atan(x)$ 

Begin X dim : 🗙 😒 Y dim : 🗴 🗘 Next



 $\exists x \in [0.5, 2.0], y \in [0.0, 2.0] : y = sin(x) \land y = atan(x)$ 

Begin X dim : 🗙 😒 Y dim : 🗴 🗘 Next



 $\exists x \in [0.5, 2.0], y \in [0.0, 2.0] : y = sin(x) \land y = atan(x)$ 

Begin X dim : 🗴 😒 Y dim : 🗴 🗘 Next



 $\exists x \in [0.5, 2.0], y \in [0.0, 2.0] : y = sin(x) \land y = atan(x)$ 

Begin X dim : 🗴 😒 Y dim : 🗴 🗘 Next



 $\exists x \in [0.5, 2.0], y \in [0.0, 2.0] : y = sin(x) \land y = atan(x)$ 

Begin 🛛 🗴 dim : 🛛 x 😒 y dim : 🛛 y 😂 🗍 Next



 $\exists x \in [0.5, 2.0], y \in [0.0, 2.0] : y = sin(x) \land y = atan(x)$ 

Begin X dim : 🗴 😒 Y dim : 🗴 🗘 Next


$\exists x \in [0.5, 2.0], y \in [0.0, 2.0] : y = sin(x) \land y = atan(x)$ 



 $\exists x \in [0.5, 2.0], y \in [0.0, 2.0] : y = sin(x) \land y = atan(x)$ 



 $\exists x \in [0.5, 2.0], y \in [0.0, 2.0] : y = sin(x) \land y = atan(x)$ 



 $\exists x \in [0.5, 2.0], y \in [0.0, 2.0] : y = sin(x) \land y = atan(x)$ 



 $\exists x \in [0.5, 2.0], y \in [0.0, 2.0] : y = sin(x) \land y = atan(x)$ 

Begin X dim : 🗙 😒 Y dim : 🗴 y 😂 Next



 $\exists x \in [0.5, 2.0], y \in [0.0, 2.0] : y = sin(x) \land y = atan(x)$ 

Begin 🗴 dim : 🗴 📀 y dim : 🗴 🛇 Next



 $\exists x \in [0.5, 2.0], y \in [0.0, 2.0] : y = sin(x) \land y = atan(x)$ 



 $\exists x \in [0.5, 2.0], y \in [0.0, 2.0] : y = sin(x) \land y = atan(x)$ 



 $\exists x \in [0.5, 2.0], y \in [0.0, 2.0] : y = sin(x) \land y = atan(x)$ 



 $\exists x \in [0.5, 2.0], y \in [0.0, 2.0] : y = sin(x) \land y = atan(x)$ 

Begin X dim : 🗙 😒 Y dim : 🗴 y 😂 Next



 $\exists x \in [0.5, 2.0], y \in [0.0, 2.0] : y = sin(x) \land y = atan(x)$ 



 $\exists x \in [0.5, 2.0], y \in [0.0, 2.0] : y = sin(x) \land y = atan(x)$ 



 $\exists x \in [0.5, 2.0], y \in [0.0, 2.0] : y = sin(x) \land y = atan(x)$ 



 $\exists x \in [0.5, 2.0], y \in [0.0, 2.0] : y = sin(x) \land y = atan(x)$ 



 $\exists x \in [0.5, 2.0], y \in [0.0, 2.0] : y = sin(x) \land y = atan(x)$ 



 $\exists x \in [0.5, 2.0], y \in [0.0, 2.0] : y = sin(x) \land y = atan(x)$ 



 $\exists x \in [0.5, 2.0], y \in [0.0, 2.0] : y = sin(x) \land y = atan(x)$ 



 $\exists x \in [0.5, 2.0], y \in [0.0, 2.0] : y = sin(x) \land y = atan(x)$ 



 $\exists x \in [0.5, 2.0], y \in [0.0, 2.0] : y = sin(x) \land y = atan(x)$ 



 $\exists x \in [0.5, 2.0], y \in [0.0, 2.0] : y = sin(x) \land y = atan(x)$ 



 $\exists x \in [0.5, 2.0], y \in [0.0, 2.0] : y = sin(x) \land y = atan(x)$ 



 $\exists x \in [0.5, 2.0], y \in [0.0, 2.0] : y = sin(x) \land y = atan(x)$ 

Begin 🗴 dim : 🗴 📀 y dim : 🗴 y 😂 Next



 $\exists x \in [0.5, 2.0], y \in [0.0, 2.0] : y = sin(x) \land y = atan(x)$ 



Begin 🗴 dim : 🗴 📀 y dim : 🗴 🛇 Next

#### $\epsilon = 0.001$ ANSWER: **\delta-SAT**

### Main Algorithm of ICP

```
Algorithm 1: Theory Solving in DPLL(ICP)
    input : A conjunction of theory atoms, seen as constraints,
              c_1(x_1,...,x_n),...,c_m(x_1,...,x_n), the initial interval bounds on all
              variables B^0 = I_1^0 \times \cdots \times I_n^0, box stack S = \emptyset, and precision \delta \in \mathbb{Q}^+.
   output: \delta-sat, or unsat with learned conflict clauses.
 1 S.\operatorname{push}(B_0);
 2 while S \neq \emptyset do
        B \leftarrow S.pop();
 3
        while \exists 1 \leq i \leq m, B \neq \text{Prune}(B, c_i) do
 4
             //Pruning without branching, used as the assert() function.
 5
             B \leftarrow \text{Prune}(B, c_i);
        end
 6
        //The \varepsilon below is computed from \delta and the Lipschitz constants of
 7
        functions beforehand.
        if B \neq \emptyset then
 8
             if \exists 1 \leq i \leq n, |I_i| \geq \varepsilon then
 9
                 \{B_1, B_2\} \leftarrow \text{Branch}(B, i); //\text{Splitting on the intervals}
10
                 S.push(\{B_1, B_2\});
             else
11
                 return \delta-sat; //Complete check() is successful.
12
             \mathbf{end}
13
        end
14
15 end
16 return unsat;
```



pruning on Xt

How can we have smaller  $X'_t$ ?



pruning on Xt



pruning on Xt



pruning on Xt

## Pruning using ODEs (Backward)



Pruning on X<sub>0</sub>

## Pruning using ODEs (on Time)



Pruning on T

## Pruning using ODEs (on Time)



Pruning on T

## Pruning using ODEs (on Time)



Pruning on T

# dReach: δ-Reachability Analysis of Hybrid Systems



- Open Source (GPL3), available at <u>https://dreal.github.io</u>
- Support polynomials, transcendental functions and nonlinear ODEs
- Formulas with 100+ ODEs have been solved.

# Visualization of Counterexample



# Visualization of Counterexample



Click and drag above to zoom / pan the data

# Applications

\* Cardiac Cells, Prostate Cancer (CMU, GIT, TU Vienna)

\* Prostate Cancer (CMU, UPITT)

\* Power-train Control (Toyota Research Lab)

\* Microfluidic Chip Designs (Waterloo)

\* Analog Circuits (City University London)

\* Quadcopter Control, Autonomous Driving (CMU)

\* FDA-accepted non-linear hybrid physiological model for diabetes, (UPENN)
## Tools based on dReal/dReach

- \* ProbReach: Probabilistic reachability analysis of hybrid systems (Univ. of Newcastle)
- \* BioPSy: Parameter set synthesis on biological models (Univ. of Newcastle)
- \* SReach: Bounded model checker for stochastic hybrid systems (CMU)
- \* Osmosis: Semantic importance sampling for statistical model checking (CMU SEI)
- \* Sigma: Probabilistic programming language (MIT)

## Conclusion

- \* δ-reachability analysis checks robustness of hybrid systems which implies safety.
- \* **Decidable** (PSPACE-Complete)
- \* It uses dReal, a  $\delta$ -complete SMT solver, which supports nonlinear functions and nonlinear ODEs
- \* Based on DPLL (ICP) framework
- \* Scalable with our experiments
- \* Open-source: available at <u>http://dreal.github.io</u>

## Future Work

## \* Scalability

- \* Parallelization
- \* Learning from failures during ICP
- \* Smart Backtracking in ICP (Non-chronological BackJumping)
- \* Expressivity
  - \* Support Exist-Forall formulas (for optimization problems)

Thank you

Any Questions?