

Efficient compilation of expressive problem space specifications to neural network solvers ^{*}

Matthew L. Daggitt^{1,2}, Wen Kokke³, and Robert Atkey³

¹ Heriot-Watt University, Edinburgh, UK

² University of Western Australia, Perth, Australia

³ University of Strathclyde, Glasgow, UK

Abstract. Recent work has described the presence of the embedding gap in neural network verification. On one side of the gap is a high-level specification about the network’s behaviour, written by a domain expert in terms of the interpretable problem space. On the other side are a logically-equivalent set of satisfiability queries, expressed in the uninterpretable embedding space in a form suitable for neural network solvers. In this paper we describe an algorithm for compiling the former to the latter. We explore and overcome complications that arise from targeting neural network solvers as opposed to standard SMT solvers.

Keywords: Verification · Neural Network Solvers · DSL compilation.

1 Introduction

Neural network verification is a fast growing field and in recent years there has been a rapid increase in the number of neural network solvers. These solvers are capable of checking whether there exists a satisfying assignment to a given set of linear constraints over the inputs and outputs of neural networks [6,7,8,11,14]. However, as with the SMTLib format for traditional SMT solvers, the input formats for these solvers are low-level and are designed to be read by machines rather than humans [1]. To address this, various tools have proposed domain specific languages (DSLs), which allow users to write their specifications at a higher level of abstraction. These specifications are then compiled down to low-level queries for solvers. For example, the DNNV framework [13] uses a Python DSL, and the Caisar framework [5] uses the WhyML language [4].

There are still several ways the expressive power of the current generation of DSLs can be improved. They currently cannot express properties containing multiple applications of the same network (e.g. monotonicity of a network [9]) or properties involving two different networks (e.g. approximate equality of teacher-student networks [12]). Furthermore, they don’t support conditional statements or arbitrary numbers of quantifiers. However, we believe the most crucial missing capability is that currently specifications can only be written in terms of the

^{*} Supported by organization x.

direct inputs and outputs to the network. We will now elaborate further on this last point.

Recall that in a typical neural network setup, an unknown function $\mathcal{H} : P \rightarrow Q$ is approximated by $u \circ f \circ e$, where $e : P \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$ is the embedding function, $f : \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is the neural network and $u : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow Q$ is the unembedding function. By design, neural network solver queries can only refer to the m input and n output variables in the embedding space, $\mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^n$. However, these vectors of numbers are often uninterpretable to users as the functions e and u usually remove all structure present in the problem space, $P \times Q$. Consequently, specifications written in terms of these input and output variables are not easily interpretable in terms of the original problem space. We argue that DSLs should allow domain experts to write specifications in the problem space, i.e. $P \times Q$.

Let us look at an example. Consider a neural network trained to control the brakes of a car and a specification “*if the distance to the object is more than 100m the force applied to the brakes should be less than 250 newtons*”. As stated above, values are expressed in SI units in the problem space. However if the embedding functions map inputs and outputs values to and from the range $[0,1]$ and the domain expert is forced by the DSL to write the specification in the embedding space, then the specification might become “*if the distance to the object is more than 0.7514 the force applied to the brakes should be less than 0.1123*”. This new version is no longer as interpretable as the original version, as the reader cannot easily map the values in the embedding space back to SI units in the problem space.

1.1 Contributions

In this paper we describe a DSL and an efficient compilation algorithm which addresses the issues described: specifications are allowed to refer to an arbitrary number of networks, network applications, and quantifiers and supports conditional statements and higher-order functions. Furthermore, quantified variables can be first arbitrarily linearly transformed before being used as inputs to neural networks, allowing them to represent values in the problem space rather than the embedding space. We show the algorithm scales optimally for a selection of common queries, even when m and $n > 1000$ as is common in image processing.

The paper proceeds as follows. In Section 2 we describe a query language for neural network solvers and our high-level DSL for writing specifications. In Section 3 we describe the compilation algorithm itself.

2 Background

2.1 Query language

A generic query language for neural network solvers is shown in Figure 1. Given a list of l neural networks $f_1 : \mathbb{R}^{m_1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_1}, f_2 : \mathbb{R}^{m_2} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_2}, \dots, f_l : \mathbb{R}^{m_l} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_l}$, a single query is a tree of conjunctions and disjunctions with assertions at the

leaves. An assertion is pair of a linear expression and a constant related either by an equality or an inequality. The variables in the linear expression must be of the form X_i for $i < \sum_{k=1}^l m_k$ or Y_j for $j < \sum_{k=1}^l n_k$. Concretely if $i = (\sum_{k=0}^a m_k) + b$ for some $a \in [1, l]$ and $b \in [1, m_a]$ then X_i represents the a^{th} input of the b^{th} network. Likewise if $i = (\sum_{k=0}^a n_k) + b$ for some $a \in [1, l]$ and $b \in [1, n_a]$ then Y_i represents the a^{th} output of the b^{th} network. For example, given two networks $f_1 : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, f_2 : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ then X_1, X_2 and Y_1 are inputs and outputs of f_1 , and X_3, Y_2 and Y_3 are inputs and outputs of the f_2 .

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \text{query} \rangle \ni q &::= q \text{ and } q \mid q \text{ or } q \mid a & \langle \text{constant} \rangle \ni c &::= \mathbb{R} \\ \langle \text{assertion} \rangle \ni a &::= e == c \mid e <= c \mid e >= c \mid e < c \mid e > c \\ \langle \text{expr} \rangle \ni e &::= e + e \mid c * X_i \mid c * Y_j \end{aligned}$$

Fig. 1: Syntax for a generic neural network solver query language.

Note that when representing queries about multiple applications of the same network with different inputs (e.g. in monotonicity specifications), f_c and f_d are not necessarily distinct even when $c \neq d$. This language is a generalisation of the standard VNNLib query format [1] supported by a wide range of solvers. There are two main differences: firstly readability has been improved by making operators infix, and secondly, support for queries over multiple networks has been added.

In practice very few solvers support queries with arbitrary interleavings of disjunctions and conjunctions. Instead most require that queries must be converted to disjunctive normal form (DNF) and submitted as multiple separate queries. Nonetheless in this paper we target the non-DNF form above, as a) it is a generalisation of DNF and therefore DNF is trivial to obtain from it, b) maintaining the disjuncts is actually a harder compilation problem than doing everything in DNF, c) it avoids an exponential increase in the size of the queries in the worst case, and d) we hypothesise that some solvers may be able to reuse intermediate results between different disjunctive branches.

2.2 Specification language

Figure 2 shows a typed lambda calculus, with builtin operations for logic, arithmetic and size-safe vector operations, for writing high-level specifications. In this language a specification is a list of two types of declarations: **@network** declarations which bring a new network into scope and **@property** declarations which define a boolean expression whose veracity should be checked by queries to a neural network solver. At the type-level it has a sized index and vector types, the latter of which is polymorphic in its element type, as well as **Bool** and **Real**.

```

⟨decl⟩ ∋ d ::= @network ⟨id⟩ : τ | @property ⟨id⟩ = e
⟨type⟩ ∋ τ ::= τ → τ | n ∈ ℕ | Vector τ τ | Index τ | Bool | Num
⟨expr⟩ ∋ e ::= λ(x : τ).e | e e | x | r | e + e | e * e | b | not e | e and e | e or e | e == e |
  e != e | e <= e | e < e | if e then e else e | forall (x : τ). e | exists (x : τ). e | i
  | [e, ..., e] | e ! e | e ⊕ e | e ⊖ e | map e e | fold e e e | zipWith e e e
⟨bool⟩ ∋ b = ℬ      ⟨index⟩ ∋ i = ℕ      ⟨real⟩ ∋ r = ℝ

```

Fig. 2: Syntax for the computational fragment of the Vehicle DSL

Available vector-level operations include the lookup operator `!`, where `x ! i` is the value at position `i` in vector `x` and higher-order functions such as `map`, `fold` and `zipWith` which can be used to define further operations over vectors. The language also includes vector addition `⊕` and vector equality `⊖` as builtins, despite the fact that they are definable using a combination of polymorphism and type-classes and the operations `fold` and `zipWith`. The reason for this will be made clear in Section 3.6.

We emphasise this is a *core* language. A usable specification language should contain quality of life features such as auxiliary definitions, `@parameter` and `@datasets` declarations, polymorphism (allowing the same function to work over different types, e.g. `map` and `fold`), type-classes (allowing the same symbol to represent different functions, e.g. `+` can represent addition over both numbers and vectors). However, we assume these features are dealt with in compiler passes prior to compilation to queries and therefore they are not considered in this paper. We also assume the presence of a sound and complete typing relation.

2.3 What is *not* compilable

It is crucial to note that the addition of a high-level DSL on top of a neural network solver does not increase the classes of problems that can be solved. Therefore the following classes of specifications cannot be compiled. In all the examples we assume a single network declaration:

```
@network f : Vector Real 1 -> Vector Real 1
```

Non-linear relationships between problem space and embedding space variables - in general query language’s only support linear constraints, and therefore `example1` is not compilable as it requires solving the non-linear relationship $X_1 = a * a * a$ between the problem space and embedding space variables.

```
@property example1 = forall a . f [a * a * a] ! 0 >= 0
```

Alternating quantifiers - `example2` is not compilable as it has alternating quantifiers in it, and therefore cannot be reduced to an equi-satisfiable set of queries involving only implicit existentials.

```
@property example2 = forall (a : Real) . exists (b : Real) . f [b] ! 0 ==
→ a
```

Quantifying over functions - [example3](#) is not compilable as it involves quantifying over functions, something not supported .

```
@property example3 = forall (h : Real -> Real) . f [h x] ! 0 == 0
```

Recent work has showed how specifications with non-linear constraints or alternating quantifiers can be detected and detailed explanations of why they are uncompileable can be generated via an evidence producing type-system [2].

2.4 What should be compilable

Conceptually the approach to compilation is simple: normalise the specification while replacing network applications with embedding space variables and solving for user variables. We now present a set of examples, many of which are minimised versions of real-world specifications, that illustrate why it is challenging to do this in general for such an expressive DSL. All examples assume the presence of two network declarations:

```
@network f : Vector Rat 1 -> Vector Rat 1
@network g : Vector Rat 2 -> Vector Rat 1
```

Multiple nested network applications - multiple network applications may be nested arbitrarily deeply and the same network may be applied multiple times.

```
@property example4 =
  forall (a : Real). g [0.5 + f [a] ! 0 , g [0, a] ! 0] ! 0 >= 0
```

Hidden boolean structure in assertions - `if` statements allow the embedding of arbitrary boolean structure, including quantifiers inside what appear to be simple assertions.

```
@property example5 =
  0.5 <= (if (forall (a : Real) . f [a] >= 1) then 0 else 1)
```

Multiply determined and under-determined user variables - disjunctions may result in there not being a single consistent solution for the user quantified variables in terms of the network variables. Furthermore, in the right-hand side of [example3](#)'s disjunct, the user variables are undetermined as there is only one network input variable, but two user variables that need to be eliminated.

```
@property example6 =
  exists (a b : Real). g [a , b] >= 5 or f [ a + b ] >= 0
```

Quantified vector variables that block evaluation of higher-order functions - vector variables may be quantified over and these variables can block the evaluation of higher order functions such as `fold` and `map`.

```
@property example7 =
  forall (as : Vector Real 10). fold (\a r -> f a >= 0 and r) false as
```

3 Compilation algorithm

In this section, we describe an algorithm for compiling a `@property` in the specification language in 2 to a set of queries in the query language in Figure 1. The algorithm is implemented in Haskell [10], and while we restrict ourselves to using basic syntax as much as possible, the use of monads to cleanly represent global state is unavoidable. For readers not well-versed in the dark arts of monadic programming, `MonadWriter` can be thought of a write-only global variables, and `MonadState` can be thought of as read-and-write global variables.

3.1 Variables

For efficiency of normalisation, variables are represented using de Bruijn levels, and referred to using the Haskell type `Level`. For clarity, we introduce the following type synonyms for the various categories of variables:

```

1 type UserRealVar = Level    type NetworkRealVar = Level
2 data UserVectorVar = Level  type NetworkVectorVar = Level
3 type RealVar = Level        type VectorVar = Level    type AnyVar = Level

```

The the global state of the algorithm is represented by a `Ctx` object and contains i) the stack of variables current in scope, where `Levels` are used to index from the bottom of the stack and ii) a mapping between vector variables and a list of variables that represent the elements of that vector:

```

1 data Ctx = Context
2   { boundVars :: Stack AnyVar
3     , vectorVars :: Map VectorVar [RealVar]
4   }

```

As we will discuss in Section 3.6, maintaining variables for both a vector and its elements will be crucial for getting efficient performance. We therefore define the following helper function which introduces a new set of variables representing a vector of size n and its individual elements to the context and returns the vector variable:

```

1 addVectorVariableToCtx :: MonadState Ctx m => Int -> m Value
2 addVectorVariableToCtx n = do
3   GlobalCtx {..} <- get
4   let l = length boundVars
5       v = Var l []
6       v1, ..., vn = Var (l + 1) [], ..., Var (l + n) []
7   set (GlobalCtx
8     { boundVars = [vn...,v1,v] <> boundVars
9       , elementVars = {v -> [vn,...,v1]} <> elementVars
10    })
11 return a

```

3.2 Normalising Vehicle expressions

We assume the existence of a datatype `Expr` which faithfully represents the Vehicle language’s `<expr>` type in Figure 2 post-type checking. Compilation operates on normalised expressions, where functions are fully applied and all user definitions have been inlined. We therefore define the `Value` datatype which represents the normal form of `Expr`. Normalisation takes place in an *environment* represented by the following datatype:

```
1 type Env = Stack Value
```

where the variable at `Level` i is assigned the i^{th} `Value` counting from the bottom of the stack.

Crucial to the efficiency of the algorithm, will be the ability to adjust the environment when we traverse over a universal or existential quantifier introducing a problem-space user variable. Therefore our definition of `Value` encodes expressions in *weak-head normal form* [?] as opposed to *full normal form*. Concretely this means that the body of lambdas and quantifiers are represented by an unnormalised `(Env, Expr)` pair, rather than a fully normalised `Value`.

```
1 data Value
2   = Lam Binder (Env, Expr)
3   | Var Level [Value]
4   | RealLiteral Real
5   | Add Value Value
6   | Mul Value Value
7   | BoolLiteral Bool
8   | Not Value
9   | And Value Value
10  | Or Value Value
11  | Equal Value Value
12  | NotEqual Value Value
13  | OrderOp Value Value
14  | If Value Value Value
15  | Forall Binder (Env, Expr)
16  | Exists Binder (Env, Expr)
17  | IndexLiteral Int
18  | VecLiteral [Value]
19  | At Value Value
20  | VectorEqual Value Value
21  | VectorNotEqual Value Value
22  | VectorAdd Value Value
23  | Map Value Value
24  | Fold Value Value Value
25  | NetworkApplication Name Value
```

Finally, for each of builtin functions in the `Value` we define an evaluation function which tries to evaluate the expression if possible, otherwise returning the unevaluated expression in which case we say it’s evaluation is “blocked”. For example, `evalAdd` would be defined as:

```
1 evalAdd : Value -> Value -> Value
2 evalAdd (RealLiteral x) (RealLiteral y) = RealLiteral (x + y)
3 evalAdd e1 e2 = Add e1 e2
```

We assume the existence of the `eval` function that uses these to take an environment `Env` and an unnormalised `Expr` and returns a normalised `Value`:

```
1 eval : Env -> Expr -> Value.
```

3.3 Blocking

Compilation will proceed by normalising the expression and recursively processing “compilable” boolean values.

Definition 1 (Compilable). *A Value e of type $Bool$ is compilable if it is one of $BoolLiteral$, Not , And , Or , If , $Equal$, $NotEqual$, $VectorEqual$, $VectorNotEqual$, $Order$, $Exists$, $Forall$.*

However, as illustrated by [example7](#) in Section 2.4, we may encounter non-compilable higher-order functions whose evaluation is blocked. Being able to unblock such expressions will be crucial for the algorithm to make progress.

Definition 2 (Blocked). *A Value e is blocked by subexpressions $\{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$ if replacing all e_i with literals of the same type allows e to evaluate further.*

For example, ‘ $x + y$ ’ is blocked on the variables $\{x, y\}$, and ‘ $fold (\lambda x y \rightarrow x + y) 0 (map f xs)$ ’ is blocked on either $\{xs\}$ or $\{map f xs\}$.

Lemma 1 (Blocked vectors and indices). *If a blocked Value e is of type $Vector$ or $Index$, there exists a set of blocking subexpressions, each one of which is either a i) a $NetworkApplication$, ii) an If , iii) a Var of type $Vector$ or $Index$.*

Proof. If e is well-typed as a $Vector$ then it must be one of the following cases:

1. $NetworkApplication f x$ - case i) holds.
2. $If c x y$ - case ii) holds.
3. $Var l$ - case iii) holds.
4. $Map f xs / Fold f e xs$ - must be blocked on xs of type $Vector$ and so holds by induction.
5. $At xs i$ - must be blocked on at least one of xs of type $Vector$ or i of type $Index$ and so holds by induction.
6. $VectorAdd xs ys / VectorEqual xs ys / VectorNotEqual xs ys$ - must be blocked on at least one of xs or ys both of type $Vector$ and so holds by induction.

Otherwise if e is well-typed as a $Index$ then it must one of the following cases:

1. $IndexLiteral$ - contradicts assumption that expression is blocked.
2. $If c x y$ - case ii) holds.
3. $Var l$ - case iii) holds.
4. $Fold f e xs$ - same as $Fold$ case above.
5. $At xs i$ - same as At case above. □

Lemma 2 (Non-compilable booleans). *If a Value e is of type $Bool$ and is not compilable, there exists a set of blocking subexpressions, each one of which is either i) a $NetworkApplication$, ii) an If or iii) a Var of type $Vector$, $Index$, or $Bool$.*

Proof. As e is well-typed and not one of the above constructors, then it must be one of:

1. `Var i` - case iii) holds.
2. `Fold f e xs` - must be blocked on `xs` of type `Vector` and so holds by Lemma 1.
3. `At xs i` - must be blocked on at least one of `xs` of type `Vector` or `i` of type `Index` and so holds by Lemma 1. \square

Thanks to Lemma 2, it is possible to determine a way of unblocking non-compilable expressions of type `Bool`. First, as a `@property` is always of type `Bool` we know that the only variables in scope in a normalised expression are those introduced by `Forall` and `Exists`. We can expand out `Forall` and `Exists` over the finite types `Index` or `Bool` into a finite conjunction/disjunction. Therefore we can maintain the invariant that there are never any variables of `Index` or `Bool` in scope. Consequently by Lemma 2, a non-compilable boolean expression must be blocked by a set of subexpressions that are either an i) `If` or a ii) `NetworkApplication` or iii) `Var` of type `Vector`. We now explore how to handle each case.

3.4 Handling blocking `If`s

If we are blocked on an `If`, we can lift it out to the top-level. For example the value `'0 == (if c then x else y)'` becomes `'if c then 0 == x else 0 == y'`. This is achieved by the following function:

```

1 liftIf :: Monad m => Value -> (Value -> m Value) -> m Value
2 liftIf (If c x y) k = If c <$> liftIf e1 k <*> liftIf e2 k
3 liftIf e k = k e

```

which takes a continuation and a value. If the value is an `If` it recursively lifts the true and false branches and reconstructs the `If` around the results, otherwise it applies the continuation.

3.5 Handling blocking `NetworkApplications`

If we are blocked on a `NetworkApplication`, we can replace it with the corresponding input/output embedding space variables as follows:

```

1 elimNetworkApplication ::
2   (MonadState Ctx m, MonadWriter [Value] m) =>
3   Name -> Value -> m Value
4 elimNetworkApplication networkName arg = do
5   x <- addVectorVariableToCtx (numberOfInputs networkName)
6   y <- addVectorVariableToCtx (numberOfOutputs networkName)
7   tell [EqualVector arg x]
8   return y

```

Note that we cannot conjunct the input equality to the output variable, as it will not type check and so instead the equality is added to a global list of such generated equalities using the `tell` function of `MonadWriter`. For example, in the expression `'0 <= f [a + 2] ! 0'` we would end up replacing `'f [a + 2]'` with `'y0'` and storing the equality `'x0 == a + 2'`.

3.6 Handling blocking `Var` of type `Vector`

If we are blocked on a `Var x` of type `Vector A n` for some type `A` and size `n`, we can replace it with the expression `'VecLiteral [x_1, ..., x_n]'` where `xi` are variables of type `A` and represent the *elements* of the vector. The `vectorVars` field in the definition of `Ctx` in Section 3.1 is used to track the relationship between a vector variable and the variables representing its elements.

Note that similar to `Index` and `Bool` types, it would be possible to maintain the invariant that there are *no* variables of type `Vector` by expanding out a quantifier over vectors into a series of `n` quantifiers over numeric variables. Given this, an important question is why do we allow vector variables to appear in the expression at all? The answer is efficiency. Consider the property `'forall (a : Vector Real n) . f [a + c] >= 0'` where `c` is some large constant vector. If we immediately replace `a` with `[a1, ..., an]` then later when solving for the user variables in terms of the embeddings space variables we will have to solve a system of `n` identical equations:

$$a_1 + c_1 == X_1, \quad \dots, \quad a_n + c_n == X_n$$

and perform `n` substitutions through the AST. This would result in extremely slow compilation when `n`, the number of network inputs, is large. However, if we choose to keep vector variables, then we can instead solve the following equation only once at the vector level:

$$a + c == X$$

and perform only a single substitution through the tree. However, this results in a subtlety. In order to preserve the vector level equalities we need to not normalise the vector variables if they are arguments to operators in such an equality, i.e. `VectorAdd`, `VectorEqual`, `VectorNotEqual` and `NetworkApplication`. In summary we therefore have the following code:

```

1 elimVectorVariable :: MonadState Ctx m => Bool -> AnyVar -> m Value
2 elimVectorVariable isVecOpArg var = do
3   Context{..} <- get
4   case lookup var vectorVars of
5     Just elements | not isVecOpArg -> return (VecLiteral elements)
6     Nothing -> return (Var var [])

```

3.7 Unblocking

Using these three functions we can define the function `unblock` that locates the set of blocking subexpressions in a `Value` and unblocks them while keeping track of whether we are recursing over a vector operation or not.

```

1 -- Invariant: `expr` is not a function type.
2 unblock :: (MonadState Ctx m, MonadWriter [Value] m) =>
3   Bool -> Value -> m Value

```

```

4 unblock isVecOpArg expr = case expr of
5   -- Base cases --
6   Var v [] -> elimVectorVariable isVecOpArg v spine
7   BoolLiteral {} -> return expr
8   And{} -> return expr
9   Or{} -> return expr
10  Not{} -> return expr
11  If{} -> return expr
12  Forall{} -> return expr
13  Exists{} -> return expr
14  -- Inductive vector cases (VectorEqual, VectorNotEqual are similar)
15  NetworkApplication name x ->
16    liftIf (unblock True arg) (\x' -> elimNetworkApplication name x')
17  AddVector xs ys ->
18    liftIf (unblock True xs) (\xs' ->
19      liftIf (unblock True ys) (\ys' ->
20        AddVector xs' ys'))
21  -- Other inductive cases (all other missing cases are similar)
22  Add x y ->
23    liftIf (unblock False x) (\x' ->
24      liftIf (unblock False y) (\y' ->
25        evalAdd x' y'))
26  Fold f e xs ->
27    liftIf (unblock False xs) (\xs' -> evalFold f e xs')

```

If we reach any non-trivial boolean structure or a variable we immediately stop recursing. Otherwise if we reach a builtin function that does not have boolean arguments we first recurse into only the arguments that it could be blocked by, and then lift any `If`s out of those arguments. For example, for `Add` we recurse into both the left and right arguments as it could be blocked on either. For the higher order functions `Fold` we only recurse into the last vector argument. Crucially this means that we never recurse into expressions which have a function type and therefore the `Lam` case is impossible. The final case is the network application. Here we first recurse into the argument, and then replace the network application. Note it is important to do it in this order, so that nested network applications as in [example1](#) in Section ?? are handled correctly.

Finally, we can define the function `tryUnblockBool` as follows:

```

1 -- Invariant: `expr` is of type Bool.
2 tryUnblockBool :: MonadState Ctx m =>
3   Value -> (Value -> m a) -> m a -> m a
4 tryUnblockBool expr success failure = do
5   (unblockedExpr, networkEqualities) <- runWriterT (unblockExpr expr)
6   let finalExpr = foldr And unblockedExpr networkEqualities
7   return (if expr /= finalExpr then success finalExpr else failure)

```

This function takes a `Value` of type `Bool` and tries to unblock it, obtaining the list of noted network input equalities. Because we know the resulting expression is of type `Bool` we can conjunct the resulting expression with any input variable

equalities that were generated by replacing network applications while preserving well-typedness. Crucially this also maintains equisatisfiability with the original expression as `unblock` never recurses inside any `Or`, `If` or `Exists` constructors. Finally if we succeeded in unblocking the expression then we apply the continuation that was passed as the second argument to the unblocked result, otherwise we return the fallback value provided as the third argument.

3.8 Queries

We use a sparse representation of linear expressions that are generic over the variable and constant representations:

```
1 data LinearExpr var const = LinearExpr (Map var Real) const
```

and use it to define the following types of assertions where the linear expression is implicitly related to zero or the zero vector in the appropriate way:

```
1 data RealEquality = RealEquality (LinearExpr RealVar Real)
2 data RealInequality = RealInequality Order (LinearExpr RealVar Real)
3 data VectorEquality = VectorEquality (LinearExpr VectorVar Vector)
4 data Assertion = RE RealEquality | RI RealInequality | VE VectorEquality
```

The boolean structure will be represented by the following types:

```
1 type Disjuncts a = NonEmptyList a
2 type Conjuncts a = NonEmptyList a
3 data MaybeTrivial a = Trivial Bool | NonTrivial a
4 data Tree a = Atom a | Conj (Tree a) (Tree a) | Disj (Tree a) (Tree a)
```

Therefore the structure that is the final target for compilation:

```
1 type Query = Tree Assertion
2 type QuerySet = Disjuncts Query
3 type Property = MaybeTrivial (Tree (Bool, QuerySet))
```

A `Query` is a perhaps trivial tree of assertions. A `QuerySet` is a list of disjuncted queries each with a different solution for the problem-space variables in terms of embedding space variables (see [example6](#) in Section 2.4). A `Property` is a tree at the top level because the users may have arbitrary structure:

```
@property example8 = (forall a . f a > 0) or (exists b . f b < -5)
```

At the leaves of the tree, in addition to a `QuerySet`, a `Bool` is also stored to mark whether the queries have been negated because there was a top-level universal quantifier.

3.9 Compiling properties

We now have sufficient machinery to start describing compilation. The top-level boolean structure over a property compiled using `compileProperty`.

```

1  -- Invariant: `expr` is of type Bool in the empty context.
2  compileProperty :: MonadState Ctx m => Expr -> m Property
3  compileProperty expr = go (eval emptyEnv expr)
4  where
5  go :: Value -> m Property
6  go expr = case expr of
7  -----
8  -- Inductive cases --
9  -----
10 And e1 e2 -> andTrivial Conj <$> go e1 <*> go e2
11 Or e1 e2 -> orTrivial Disj <$> go e1 <*> go e2
12 If c x y -> go (eliminateIf c x y)
13 Not e -> go =<< eliminateNot e
14 Equal e1 e2 -> tryUnblockBool expr go IMPOSSIBLE
15 NotEqual e1 e2 -> tryUnblockBool expr go IMPOSSIBLE
16 Order _ e1 e2 -> tryUnblockBool expr go IMPOSSIBLE
17 EqualsVector e1 e2 -> tryUnblockBool expr go IMPOSSIBLE
18 NotEqualsVector e1 e2 -> tryUnblockBool expr go IMPOSSIBLE
19 -----
20 -- Base cases --
21 -----
22 BoolLiteral b -> return (Trivial b)
23 Exists binder body -> do
24   querySet <- compileQueries (Exists binder body)
25   return (NonTrivial (Atom (False, querySet)))
26 Forall binder body -> do
27   querySet <- compileQueries (Exists binder (Not body))
28   return (NonTrivial (Atom (True, querySet)))
29 _ -> IMPOSSIBLE

```

The first four inductive cases are relatively straight-forward. `And` and `Or` are preserved, and thanks to the assumption that `expr` is typable as `Bool` in the empty context, we can eliminate `If` and `Not` easily (see Section 3.10 for code). The remaining inductive cases are when we hit an assertion. As we are in the empty context, all assertions must be trivial, and their evaluation cannot be blocked by a variable or a network application, and hence by Lemma 2 they must be blocked by `If` within the assertion. Therefore we can call `tryUnblockBool` to lift the `If` out and then recurse, and failing to unblock is impossible.

There are three base cases. `BoolLiteral` is the trivial case for when the property is vacuously true or false. If we reach an `Exists` or `Forall` then we need to start compiling a set of queries. If we find a `Forall` we must first change it to an `Exists` and mark any queries as negated. The function `compileQueries` is shown below.

```

1  -- Invariant: `expr` is of type `Bool` in the current global context
2  compileQueries :: MonadState Ctx m =>
3  Value -> m (MaybeTrivial QuerySet)
4  compileQueries = go
5  where

```

```

6   go :: Value -> m (MaybeTrivial QuerySet)
7   go expr = case expr of
8     -- Base cases --
9     BoolLiteral b -> return (Trivial b)
10    Forall {} -> error "alternating quantifiers"
11    -- Maybe base cases --
12    Order op x y -> tryUnblockBool expr go (compileIneq op x y)
13    Equal x y -> tryUnblockBool expr go (compileEq x y)
14    VectorEqual xs ys -> tryUnblockBool expr go (compileVecEq xs ys)
15    -- Inductive cases --
16    If c x y -> go (eliminateIf c x y)
17    Not x -> go =<< eliminateNot x
18    NotEqual x y -> go =<< eliminateNotEqual x y
19    VectorNotEqual xs ys -> go =<< eliminateVectorNotEqual xs ys
20    Exists binder body -> eliminateExists binder body
21    And x y -> andTrivial (cartesianProduct Conj) <$> go x <*> go y
22    Or x y -> orTrivial (++) <$> go x <*> go y
23    _ -> tryUnblockBool expr go IMPOSSIBLE

```

The bases cases are when we reach either a boolean literal or a positive assertion. However, the latter three may only appear to be a base case if the relation has an `If` hidden inside of it as demonstrated by `example5` in Section 2.4. We therefore need to first recurse through the expression and lift all the `If` out of the relation using `tryUnblockBool`. Only if that fails do we know that we can then proceed to compile the assertion. Compiling assertions is relatively unexciting. The full code for `compileEq` and `compileIneq` can be found in the appendices. The only interesting function is `compileVecEq`, which may fail to compile.

The recursive cases can be split into three classes. The first class consists of `If`, `Not`, `NotEqual`, `VectorNotEqual`, `Exists`, all of which can be eliminated. The second class consists of `Or` and `And`, and in this case we recurse directly and then combine the results by appending them or taking the cartesian product respectively. In the final case, we know we have a blocked, non-compilable boolean value and therefore by Lemma 2 we can unblock and then recurse.

3.10 Elimination operations

The first three elimination algorithms for `If`, `NotEqual` and `NotVectorEqual` are direct translations as they can be expressed natively in the DSL:

```

1  eliminateNotEqual :: Value -> Value -> Value
2  eliminateNotEqual x y = Or (Order Le x y) (Order Ge x y)
3
4  eliminateVectorNotEqual :: Value -> Value -> Value
5  eliminateVectorNotEqual x y = -- Haskell encoding of
6  -- `fold (\a b -> a or b) False (zipWith (\a b -> a != b) x y)`
7
8  eliminateIf :: Value -> Value -> Value -> Value
9  eliminateIf c x y = Or (And c x) (And (Not c) y)

```

The elimination algorithm for `Not` is a little more complicated and may once again require the argument be unblocked, invoking Lemma 2 for soundness.

```

1 eliminateNot :: MonadState Ctx m => Value -> m Value
2 eliminateNot expr = case expr of
3   Not x -> return x
4   BoolLiteral b -> return (BoolLiteral (not b))
5   Order op x y -> return (Order (neg op) x y)
6   Equal x y -> return (NotEqual x y)
7   NotEqual x y -> return (Equal x y)
8   Forall binder (env, body) -> return (Exists binder (env, Not body))
9   Exists binder (env, body) -> return (Forall binder (env, Not body))
10  EqualsVector xs ys -> NotEqualsVector xs ys
11  NotEqualsVector xs ys -> EqualsVector xs ys
12  Or x y -> And <$> eliminateNot x <*> eliminateNot y
13  And x y -> Or <$> eliminateNot x <*> eliminateNot y
14  If c x y -> If c <$> eliminateNot x <*> eliminateNot y
15  _ -> tryUnblockBool expr eliminateNot IMPOSSIBLE

```

The most complicated operation is the elimination of an existential introducing a new problem-space variable.

```

1 eliminateExists :: MonadState Ctx m =>
2   Binder -> (Env, Expr) -> m (MaybeTrivial QuerySet)
3 eliminateExists binder env body = do
4   v <- addVectorVariableToCtx (vectorSize binder)
5   normExpr <- eval (push v env) body
6   queries <- compileQueries normExpr
7   return (solveVariable queries v)

```

First we create the problem space variable from the binder assuming, without loss of generality, that the variable is a vector. Next we add that variable to the environment and normalise the body of the quantifier, which we then recursively compile to obtain a set of queries that are using that variable. The final step is to then solve for the problem-space variable in terms of the embedding space variables in each of the individual queries.

```

1 solveVariable :: MaybeTrivial Queries -> UserVar -> MaybeTrivial Queries
2 solveVariable queries v = do
3   let solve query = fmap (solveConstraints v) (findConstraints v query)
4       solvedQueries = fmap (fmap solve) queries
5       flattenTrivial (fmap (filterTrivial . fmap filterTrivial) solvedQueries

```

Solving for the user variable within a single query comes in two stages. First we use `findConstraints` to extract the relevant assertions that involve the variable, and then we use `solveConstraints` to eliminate it. The last line flattens the result of type `MaybeTrivial (Disjuncts (Disjuncts (MaybeTrivial QuerySet))` back to `MaybeTrivial QuerySet`.

Before we define `findConstraints` a key thing to note is that, as demonstrated by [example6](#) in Section 2.4, a `Query` may contain disjunctions and therefore each

side of the disjunctions may contain a different solution for the problem-space variable. Consequently when this happens it is necessary to split the query into multiple separate queries, with each query having consistent constraints for the variable. Furthermore, normally we would expect that every problem space variable is used as a unique network input, and therefore will generate an equality that we can solve. However, it is possible, as demonstrated by the LHS of [example6](#), that the system of linear equations relating the problem space and embedding space variables may be underconstrained. Therefore we may need to fall back on Fourier-Motzkin elimination [?] which uses inequalities instead of equalities to eliminate a problem-space variable. Given this we define the notion of a `ConstrainedQuery` as follows:

```

1 data ConstrainedQuery
2   = Equality (Either RealEquality VectorEquality, MaybeTrivial Query)
3   | Inequalities (ConjunctAll RealInequality, MaybeTrivial Query)
4   | NoConstraints Query

```

In particular, it represents the implicit conjunction of the strongest set of constraints over the problem space variable found so far and the remainder of the query. We can then define `findConstraints` as follows:

```

1 findConstraints :: UserVar -> Query -> Disjuncts ConstrainedQuery
2 findConstraints var query = case query of
3   Query assertion -> if var `notReferencedBy` assertion
4     then (NoConstraints query)
5     else case assertion of
6       (RE realEq) -> Equality (Left realEq, Trivial True)
7       (RI realIneq) -> Inequalities ([realIneq], Trivial True)
8       (VE vectorEq) -> Equality (Right vectorEq, Trivial True)
9   Disj x y -> findConstraints x <> findConstraints y
10  Conj x y -> do
11    r1 <- findConstraints x
12    r2 <- findConstraints y
13    let (eqsLHS, remainingLHS) = partition (map (shortCircuitEq y) r1)
14        (eqsRHS, remainingRHS) = partition (map (shortCircuitEq x) r2)
15        ineqs = cartesianProduct merge remainingLHS remainingRHS
16
17    if null remainingLHS then eqsLHS
18    else if null remainingRHS then eqsRHS
19    else eqsLHS <> eqsRHS <> ineqs

```

The `Conj` case is so complicated as we try to avoid unnecessarily converting the constrained to DNF, as that can lead to exponential explosion in the number of queries. This achieved by the function `shortCircuit`, which exploits the fact that if we find an equality constraint in one side of the conjunction, we can ignore any disjuncts found on the other side.

```

1 shortCircuit ::
2   Query ->
3   ConstrainedQuery ->

```



```

4   Either ConstrainedQuery ConstrainedQuery
5 shortCircuit disjunct constraint = case constraint of
6   Equality (eq, remaining) -> do
7     let newRemaining = andTrivial Conj remaining (NonTrivial disjunct)
8       Left (Equality (eq, newRemaining))
9     _ -> Right constraint

```

If there are still disjuncts left on both sides of the tree, then we do have to do a full DNF conversion using `cartesianProduct` and `merge`, the latter of which is:

```

1 merge :: ConstrainedQuery -> ConstrainedQuery -> ConstrainedQuery
2 merge c1 c2 = case (c1, c2) of
3   (NoConstraints t1, NoConstraints t2) ->
4     NoConstraints (Conj t1 t2)
5   (NoConstraints t1, Inequalities (ineqs2, t2)) ->
6     Inequalities (ineqs2, andTrivial Conj (NonTrivial t1) t2)
7   (Inequalities (ineqs1, t1), NoConstraints t2) ->
8     Inequalities (ineqs1, andTrivial Conj t1 (NonTrivial t2))
9   (Inequalities (ineqs1, t1), Inequalities (ineqs2, t2)) ->
10    Inequalities (ineqs1 <> ineqs2, andTrivial Conj t1 t2)

```

Once we have a `ConstrainedQuery` we can solve for the constraints as follows:

```

1 solveConstraints :: UserVar -> ConstrainedQuery -> MaybeTrivial QuerySet
2 solveConstraints var query = case query of
3   Equality (eq, remainingQuery) ->
4     fmap singleton (substituteFor var eq remainingQuery)
5   Inequalities (ineqs, remainingQuery) -> do
6     let newIneqs = fourierMotzkinElimination var ineqs
7       newTree = andTrivial Conj remainingQuery newIneqs
8     fmap singleton newTree
9   NoConstraints query -> do
10    Context{..} <- get
11    case lookup var vectorVars of
12      Nothing -> query
13      Just elemVars -> foldl solveVariable (NonTrivial [tree]) elemVars

```

If we found an equality involving the problem-space variable, we can use the equality to eliminate it from the remainder of the query. Note that in the case where `var` is a vector variable, we also need to substitute for its element variables as well. If we found a set of inequalities involving the variable, we can use Fourier-Motzkin elimination to generate a new equi-satisfiable set of inequalities without that variable. In this case, we don't have to substitute through, because the remainder of the tree is guaranteed to not refer to the user variable. If we found no constraints, then we check whether the variable being solved for is a vector variable. If not then the variable was never used so we can just return the query. If it is a vector variable, then we are forced instead to solve for each of the variables representing its elements individually.

3.11 Post-processing

We have now completely described the function `compileProperty` that returns a set of queries referring only to the network input and output variables in the embedding space. These before being fed into a neural network solver they require a few uninteresting post-processing steps. Firstly, any `VectorEquality`s must be trivially converted to a conjunction of `RealEquality`s.

Secondly, note that in `elimNetworkApplication` in Section 3.5, we assigned a fresh set of embedding space variables to *every* network application despite it being the case that the user might have referred to the same neural network application more than once in a specification. In this case the solver will likely unnecessarily duplicate the entire network internally, resulting in exponentially greater amount of work. Eliminating these duplicates can't be handled via a cache inside `elimNetworkApplication`, as the notion of two applications being the same is a semantic rather than a syntactic notion, e.g. in

```
@property example9 = forall (x y : Vector Real 1) . f x == f y and x == y
```

the two applications `f x` and `f y` are syntactically different, but semantically identical. Therefore this procedure must be performed after we know solutions for the user variables.

4 Conclusions and open questions

In this paper we have presented an algorithm for compiling down high-level problem-space specifications to embedding space queries for neural network solvers. Such specifications are considerably more expressive than other state of the art of the DSLs for similar tools.

There remain important open questions in the domain of neural network DSL specification design, of which we now discuss two. Firstly, there is the issue that the soundness of compilation depends on the use of real numbers. Most DSLs, including this one, assume real number arithmetic, but are unsound under floating point arithmetic. In this algorithm in particular, the soundness of `compileRealAssert`, `eliminateNotEqual` and `solveConstraints` all depend on the use of real arithmetic.

A second open problem is the ergonomic compilation to abstract-interpretation based solvers. In particular, when the embedding space queries don't conform to the supported abstract domains, how to provide meaningful explanations to the user in terms of the problem space specification.

References

1. VNNLib format, <https://vnnlib.org/>, accessed on 01.12.2021
2. Daggitt, M.L., Atkey, R., Kokke, W., Komendantskaya, E., Arnaboldi, L.: Compiling higher-order specifications to SMT solvers: How to deal with rejection constructively. In: Krebbers, R., Traytel, D., Pientka, B., Zdancewic, S. (eds.)

- Proceedings of the 12th ACM SIGPLAN International Conference on Certified Programs and Proofs, CPP 2023, Boston, MA, USA, January 16–17, 2023. pp. 102–120. ACM (2023). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3573105.3575674>, <https://doi.org/10.1145/3573105.3575674>
3. Daggitt, M.L., Kokke, W., Atkey, B., Natalia, S., Arnaboldi, L., Komendantskaya, E.: Vehicle: Bridging the Embedding Gap in the Verification of Neuro-Symbolic Programs *abs/2007.11206* (2024), ???
 4. Filliâtre, J.C., Paskevich, A.: Why3—where programs meet provers. In: Programming Languages and Systems: 22nd European Symposium on Programming, ESOP 2013, Held as Part of the European Joint Conferences on Theory and Practice of Software, ETAPS 2013, Rome, Italy, March 16–24, 2013. Proceedings 22. pp. 125–128. Springer (2013)
 5. Girard-Satabin, J., Alberti, M., Bobot, F., Chihani, Z., Lemesle, A.: Caesar: A platform for characterizing artificial intelligence safety and robustness. In: AISafety. CEUR-Workshop Proceedings, Vienne, Austria (Jul 2022), <https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-03687211>
 6. Ivanov, R., Weimer, J., Alur, R., Pappas, G.J., Lee, I.: Verisig: verifying safety properties of hybrid systems with neural network controllers. In: Proceedings of the 22nd ACM International Conference on Hybrid Systems: Computation and Control. pp. 169–178 (2019)
 7. Katz, G., Barrett, C., Dill, D.L., Julian, K., Kochenderfer, M.J.: Reluplex: An efficient smt solver for verifying deep neural networks. In: International Conference on Computer Aided Verification. pp. 97–117. Springer (2017)
 8. Katz, G., Huang, D.A., Ibeling, D., Julian, K., Lazarus, C., Lim, R., Shah, P., Thakoor, S., Wu, H., Zeljić, A., et al.: The Marabou framework for verification and analysis of deep neural networks. In: International Conference on Computer Aided Verification. pp. 443–452. Springer (2019)
 9. Liu, X., Han, X., Zhang, N., Liu, Q.: Certified monotonic neural networks. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* **33**, 15427–15438 (2020)
 10. Marlow, S., et al.: Haskell 2010 language report (2010)
 11. Müller, M.N., Makarchuk, G., Singh, G., Püschel, M., Vechev, M.: Prima: general and precise neural network certification via scalable convex hull approximations. *Proceedings of the ACM on Programming Languages* **6**(POPL), 1–33 (2022)
 12. Park, D.Y., Cha, M.H., Kim, D., Han, B., et al.: Learning student-friendly teacher networks for knowledge distillation. *Advances in neural information processing systems* **34**, 13292–13303 (2021)
 13. Shriver, D., Elbaum, S., Dwyer, M.B.: DNNV: A Framework for Deep Neural Network Verification. In: Silva, A., Leino, K.R.M. (eds.) *Computer Aided Verification*. pp. 137–150. Springer International Publishing, Cham (2021)
 14. Wang, S., Zhang, H., Xu, K., Lin, X., Jana, S., Hsieh, C.J., Kolter, J.Z.: Beta-CROWN: Efficient bound propagation with per-neuron split constraints for complete and incomplete neural network verification. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* **34** (2021)