

# PolyHorn: A Polynomial Horn Clause Solver

Krishnendu Chatterjee<sup>1</sup>, Amir Kafshdar Goharshady<sup>2</sup>, Ehsan Kafshdar Goharshady<sup>1</sup>, Mehrdad Karrabi<sup>1</sup>, Milad Saadat<sup>3</sup>, Maximilian Seeliger<sup>4</sup>, and Đorđe Žikelić<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Institute of Science and Technology Austria, Klosterneuburg, Austria  
{krishnendu.chatterjee,ehsan.goharshady,mehrdad.karrabi}@ist.ac.at

<sup>2</sup> Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, Hong Kong  
goharshady@cse.ust.hk

<sup>3</sup> Sharif University of Technology, Tehran, Iran  
Milad.Saadat@sharif.edu

<sup>4</sup> Vienna University of Technology  
maximilian.seeliger@tuwien.ac.at

<sup>5</sup> Singapore Management University, Singapore, Singapore  
dzikelic@smu.edu.sg

**Abstract.** Polynomial Horn clauses with existentially and universally quantified variables arise in many problems of verification and program analysis. We present POLYHORN which is a tool for solving polynomial Horn clauses in which variables on both sides of the implication are real valued or unbounded integers. Our tool provides a unified framework for polynomial Horn clause solving problems that arise in several papers in the literature. Our experimental evaluation over a wide range of benchmarks shows the applicability of the tool as well as its benefits as opposed to simply using existing SMT solvers to solve such constraints.

## 1 Introduction

*Polynomial constraint solving in verification.* A very fundamental computational task that arises in several contexts of verification and static analysis of programs is constraint solving over polynomials. The most prominent example of an application in program analysis is *template-based synthesis* [23]. Given a program and a property, a classical approach to proving that the program satisfies the property is to compute a certificate (i.e. a formal proof) of the property [18]. This can be achieved by fixing a suitable *symbolic template* for the certificate, which allows reducing the program verification problem to computing values of symbolic template variables that together give rise to a correct certificate [39]. Such an approach with symbolic templates being linear or polynomial functions has found extensive applications in static analysis of programs with linear or polynomial arithmetic, including termination analysis [12,33,5], invariant generation [11,17,6], reachability [2], cost analysis [28,24,41], program synthesis [22,20] and probabilistic program analysis [4,5,9]. This approach has also found extensive applications in other domains of computer science, e.g. controller verification and synthesis [1,35,34].

*Polynomial Horn clauses.* In all cases mentioned above, the goal of template-based synthesis is to compute a certificate for the property of interest, where the certificate is computed in the form of a symbolic linear or polynomial function. The computation is achieved by a reduction to solving a system of *polynomial entailments*, i.e. a system of  $K \in \mathbb{N}$  constraints of the form

$$\exists t \in \mathbb{R}^m. \bigwedge_{i=1}^K \left( \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n. \Phi^i(x, t) \implies \Psi^i(x, t) \right).$$

Here, the variables  $t \in \mathbb{R}^m$  present real-valued *template coefficients* of the symbolic linear or polynomial function that together define the certificate, and each  $\Phi^i$  and  $\Psi^i$  is a *boolean combination of polynomial inequalities* over a vector  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$  of program variables. The entailments  $\forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n. \Phi^i(x, t) \implies \Psi^i(x, t)$  together encode the necessary properties for the symbolic template polynomial to define a correct certificate. Hence, any valuation of the variables  $t \in \mathbb{R}^m$  that gives rise to a solution to the system of constraints above also gives rise to a concrete instance of the correct certificate. We refer to each entailment  $\forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n. \Phi^i(x, t) \implies \Psi^i(x, t)$  as a *polynomial Horn clause (PHC)*, and to the problem of solving a system of PHCs in eq. (1) as *PHC solving*.

*Comparison to constrained Horn clauses.* The problem of PHC solving syntactically resembles the more studied problem of constrained Horn clause (CHC) solving. CHC solving is a classical approach to program verification [21] with many readily available tools, e.g. [25,29,30,14]. However, the goal of the PHC solving problem is fundamentally different from CHC solving, and methods for one problem are not readily applicable to the other problem. In CHC solving, the focus is on computing boolean predicates that together make the CHC valid. In contrast, template-based synthesis applications discussed above require computing *values of template variables* that together define a certificate conforming to a given template, where the template is specified as a boolean combination of symbolic linear or polynomial inequalities over program variables. Hence, what would be viewed as an uninterpreted predicate in CHC solving, becomes a fixed boolean combination of polynomial inequalities of a specified maximal polynomial degree in PHC solving. The existing CHC solvers are thus not applicable to the problem of PHC solving.

*Solving PHCs via positivity theorems.* Initial work on template-based synthesis has focused on linear programs and linear certificate templates. A classical approach to solving this problem is to use Farkas' lemma that considers implications over linear expressions [15], which has been applied in several works related to program analysis, e.g. [11,27,4,7]. However, this method was insufficient for analyzing programs described by polynomials, e.g. programs that may contain program variable multiplication. A generalization of Farkas' lemma-style reasoning to the setting of polynomial constraints and PHCs is achieved by using *positivity theorems*, such as Handelman's [26] and Putinar's theorem [36]. It was shown in [5,2] that they can be applied towards effectively solving

systems of PHCs, with applications in static analysis of polynomial programs for termination [5], reachability [2], invariant generation [6], non-termination [8] properties and for probabilistic program analysis [9,40].

POLYHORN. PHC solving via positivity theorems is becoming increasingly popular in static program analysis, however tool support for its integration into these analyses is non-existent and researchers have relied on their own implementations. In this work, we present our tool POLYHORN which implements methods for solving systems of PHCs over the theories of polynomial real or unbounded integer arithmetic, based on Handelman’s theorem, Putinar’s theorem and Farkas’ lemma. We provide efficient implementations of each of these methods together with practical heuristics that we observed to improve their performance. At the same time, our tool preserves soundness and relative completeness guarantees of these translations as established in the previous results in the literature [2,6]. We envision that POLYHORN will allow future research to focus on the design of appropriate certificate templates, whereas the constraint solving part can be fully delegated to our tool. POLYHORN is implemented in Python and publicly available on GitHub <sup>6</sup>. It allows users to provide constraints as input in the SMT-LIB syntax [3], which is a standard and widely used input format. POLYHORN also automates the selection of the positivity theorem to be used (Handelman’s theorem, Putinar’s theorem or Farkas’ lemma) in order to achieve most efficient constraint solving while providing the soundness and relative completeness guarantees.

*Experimental evaluation.* We experimentally evaluate POLYHORN on several benchmarks collected from the literature on termination and non-termination analysis in polynomial programs, termination of probabilistic programs and polynomial program synthesis. While all these problems could also be directly solved using off-the-shelf SMT solvers that support quantifier elimination, e.g. Z3 [13], our experimental results show *significant improvements in runtime* when positivity theorems are used to eliminate quantifier alternation.

## 2 Tool Overview

We now provide an overview of our tool. First, we formalize the notion of polynomial Horn clauses and define the problem that POLYHORN is designed to solve in Section 2.1. We then present an overview of the tool architecture in Section 2.2. Next, we overview the backend of POLYHORN for constraint solving, describe when each of the different positivity theorems is invoked and the heuristics that we implemented in Section 2.3. Finally, we provide the technical details behind positivity theorems in Section 2.4.

---

<sup>6</sup> <https://github.com/ChatterjeeGroup-ISTA/PolyHorn>

## 2.1 Problem Statement

The problem of *polynomial Horn clause (PHC) solving* is concerned with computing a valuation of existentially quantified variables  $t_1, \dots, t_m$  that make the following logical formula valid

$$\exists t \in \mathbb{R}^m. \bigwedge_{i=1}^K \left( \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n. \Phi^i(x, t) \implies \Psi^i(x, t) \right). \quad (1)$$

Here, each  $\Phi^i$  and  $\Psi^i$  is a boolean combination of polynomial inequalities of the form  $p(t_1, \dots, t_m, x_1, \dots, x_n) \bowtie 0$ , with  $p$  a polynomial function and  $\bowtie \in \{\geq, >\}$ . We refer to each entailment  $\forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n. \Phi^i(x, t) \implies \Psi^i(x, t)$  as a *polynomial Horn clause (PHC)*, and to the formula in eq. (1) as a *system of PHCs*.

In what follows, we consider systems of PHCs defined over the background theory of *real arithmetic*. However, our POLYHORN is also applicable to PHCs defined over *unbounded integer arithmetic* (i.e. mathematical integers). While our presentation will mostly focus on PHCs defined over real arithmetic, in Section 2.3 we discuss differences that arise in considering unbounded integer arithmetic and how POLYHORN addresses them.

*Canonical form of PHCs.* We say that a PHC  $\forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n. \Phi(x, t) \implies \Psi(x, t)$  is in the *canonical form*, if  $\Phi$  is a conjunction of finitely many polynomial inequalities and  $\Psi$  is a single polynomial inequality, i.e. if

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi &\equiv \bigwedge_{j=1}^n \left( p_j(t_1, \dots, t_m, x_1, \dots, x_n) \bowtie 0 \right), \\ \Psi &\equiv p(t_1, \dots, t_m, x_1, \dots, x_n) \bowtie 0. \end{aligned}$$

Each PHC can be translated into an equisatisfiable PHC in the canonical form, defined over the same set of free variables  $t \in \mathbb{R}^m$  and universally quantified variables  $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ . This is an important result, as this translation presents the preprocessing step of our POLYHORN. The following proposition formally proves this claim. The proof, together with the procedure employed by POLYHORN to achieve this translation, is provided in the Appendix.

**Proposition 1.** *Each PHC can be translated into an equisatisfiable PHC in the canonical form, defined over the same sets of free and universally quantified variables.*

*Example 1.* To illustrate how the problem of solving a system of PHCs arises in template-based synthesis for program analysis, we consider an example of proving termination of programs by computing ranking functions. Consider the program in Fig. 1 (left) and termination as a specification. We describe the three steps of the classical template-based method for synthesizing linear ranking functions [11]. We consider linear programs and ranking functions for the simplicity of the example, however this method was extended to the setting of polynomial programs and ranking functions in [5] and is supported in POLYHORN:




Fig. 1: A simple program (left) and the corresponding system of polynomial Horn clauses for computing ranking function that proves termination (right).




Fig. 2: Overview of the tool architecture.

1. To find a linear ranking function, we first fix a symbolic linear expression template for each cutpoint location in the program:

$$T_l(x) = \begin{cases} t_1 x + t_2 & \text{if } l = l_1 \\ t_3 x + t_4 & \text{if } l = l_t \end{cases}$$

where  $t_1, t_2, t_3$  and  $t_4$  are the symbolic template variables.

2. A system of PHCs in Fig. 1 (right) encodes that  $T$  is a ranking function.
3. Hence, any valuation of template variables  $t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4$  that makes all PHCs valid gives rise to a correct ranking function for the program in Fig. 1 (left).

## 2.2 Tool Architecture

*Architecture.* An overview of the architecture of POLYHORN is shown in Figure 2. The tool takes as input a system of PHCs in the form as in eq. (1). The input is provided in the SMT-LIB format [3], alongside with an optional config file in the `.json` format (see the following paragraph for details). Examples are provided in the tool’s repository. Note that we do not assume any logical structure of the polynomial inequalities in the PHCs, i.e. polynomial predicates in each PHC can have arbitrary **and** and **or** logical connectives.

The input files are then parsed and the PHCs are translated to their equisatisfiable canonical forms as in Proposition 1. POLYHORN then applies the

appropriate positivity theorem to reduce the problem of PHC solving to solving a fully existentially quantified system of polynomial constraints (see Section 2.3 for details). The resulting fully existentially quantified system of polynomial constraints is then fed to an SMT-solver. In case when the “UNSAT Core” heuristic is used, POLYHORN will further process the output of the SMT-solver (see Section 2.3 for details). Finally, the output of POLYHORN is either (1) SAT with a valuation of existentially quantified variables for which the system of PHCs is valid, (2) UNSAT if the SMT-solver proves unsatisfiability, or (3) **Unknown** if the SMT-solver returns unknown.

*Configuration file (optional).* POLYHORN has a default (and recommended) configuration, which does not require the user to provide the config file. However, we also allow the user to change some of the parameter values used by POLYHORN and the set of heuristics used by providing a `.json` config file:

1. Positivity theorem to be used (`farkas`, `handelman` or `putinar`). The default configuration of POLYHORN automatically chooses the most efficient positivity theorem to be applied while preserving soundness and relative completeness guarantees (see Section 2.3 for details). However, this optional parameter allows the user to opt for a different positivity theorem whose application is sound but not relatively complete, but may sometime lead to a more efficient constraint solving.
2. Parameters of the positivity theorem to be used. See Section 2.4 for details. The default parameter values are also specified in Section 2.4.
3. The set of heuristics (if any) to be applied. The default configuration applies the Assume-SAT heuristic (see Section 2.3 for details).
4. An SMT-solver to be used to solve the fully existentially quantified system of polynomial constraints resulting from applying the positivity theorem. The default configuration uses `z3` [13], however POLYHORN also supports `mathsat` [10].
5. Background theory to be considered. The default is real arithmetic, however the config file allows the user to choose unbounded integer arithmetic.

*Remark 1.* We integrated the commands for running Z3 and MathSAT5 into POLYHORN. However, POLYHORN also stores the obtained system of existentially quantified polynomial inequalities in an SMTLIB format output file which can then be fed to other SMT-solvers.

### 2.3 Backend Algorithms and Heuristics

We now overview the backend of our tool. Observe that the system of PHCs in eq. (1) contains quantifier alternation with existential quantification preceding universal quantification. As mentioned in Section 1, constraints involving such quantifier alternation can in principle be solved directly by using an off-the-shelf SMT solver that supports quantifier elimination, e.g. Z3 [13]. However, decision procedures for solving such constraints are known to be highly unscalable and

a major source of inefficiency [37]. PHC solving can be made *significantly more efficient* by first using positivity theorems to eliminate universal quantification and reduce the problem to solving a purely existentially quantified system of polynomial constraints, before feeding the resulting system of constraints to an SMT solver. Our experiments in Section 3 support this claim. In what follows, we describe an overview of positivity theorems and also how POLYHORN uses them for quantifier elimination. For more details about positivity theorems, see 2.4.

*Overview of positivity theorems.* All three positivity theorems implemented in POLYHORN, namely Handelman’s theorem, Putinar’s theorem and Farkas’ lemma, consider constraints of the form

$$\begin{aligned} \forall x_1, \dots, x_n \in \mathbb{R}. \left( f_1(x_1, \dots, x_n) \bowtie 0 \wedge \dots \wedge f_m(x_1, \dots, x_n) \bowtie 0 \right. \\ \left. \implies g(x_1, \dots, x_n) \bowtie 0 \right), \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where  $f_1, \dots, f_m, g$  are polynomials over real-valued variables  $x_1, \dots, x_n$  and each  $\bowtie \in \{\geq, >\}$  (we discuss the unbounded integer variables case in the following paragraph). These theorems provide *sound* translations of the implication in eq. (2) into a purely existentially quantified system of polynomial inequalities over newly introduced auxiliary symbolic variables. Translations are sound in the sense that, if the obtained purely existentially quantified system of constraints is satisfiable, then the implication in eq. (2) is valid. Moreover, these theorems provide additional sufficient conditions under which the translation is also *complete*, i.e. the implication in eq. (2) and the resulting existentially quantified system are equisatisfiable:

- **Farkas’ lemma.** Farkas’ lemma [15,32] provides a sound and complete translation if all  $f_i$ ’s and  $g$  are linear expressions.
- **Handelman’s theorem.** Handelman’s theorem [26] provides a sound translation if all  $f_i$ ’s are linear expressions and  $g$  is a polynomial expression. Moreover, the translation can be made complete if in addition all inequalities  $f_i(x_1, \dots, x_n) \bowtie 0$  are non-strict, the inequality  $g(x_1, \dots, x_n) \bowtie 0$  is strict and the set  $\{(x_1, \dots, x_n) \mid \forall 1 \leq i \leq n. f_i(x_1, \dots, x_n) \geq 0\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$  is bounded.
- **Putinar’s Theorem.** Putinar’s theorem [36] provides a sound translation if all  $f_i$ ’s and  $g$  are polynomial expressions. Moreover, the translation can be made complete if in addition all inequalities  $f_i(x_1, \dots, x_n) \bowtie 0$  are non-strict, the inequality  $g(x_1, \dots, x_n) \bowtie 0$  is strict and the set  $\{(x_1, \dots, x_n) \mid \forall 1 \leq i \leq n. f_i(x_1, \dots, x_n) \geq 0\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$  is bounded.

*Polynomial unbounded integer arithmetic.* While positivity theorems consider polynomials defined over real-valued variables, the resulting translations remain sound under unbounded integer arithmetic (i.e. mathematical integers). In this case, strict inequalities can always be treated as non-strict by incrementing the appropriate side of the inequality by 1, and the above yield sound but incomplete translations. The usage of positivity theorems in polynomial unbounded integer arithmetic was discussed in [8]. POLYHORN supports both real arithmetic as well as unbounded integer arithmetic PHCs.

*Positivity theorems in POLYHORN.* POLYHORN implements the translations via Farkas’ lemma, Handelman’s theorem and Putinar’s theorem, and uses them to eliminate quantifier alternation in the system of PHCs. When applied to a PHC in the canonical form, the translation yields a purely existentially quantified system of polynomial constraints. Hence, the system of PHCs is translated into a purely existentially quantified formula, with the first-order variables being the existentially quantified variables  $t \in \mathbb{R}^m$  as in eq. (1) as well as new symbolic variables introduced by the translation. For each PHC, the default configuration of POLYHORN automatically chooses the positivity theorem that leads to a most efficient translation, while satisfying the soundness and relative completeness requirements of each theorem listed above, with Farkas’ Lemma being the most efficient, followed by Handelman’s theorem, and finally Putinar’s Theorem. Alternatively, by providing the `.json` config file as described in Section 2.2, the user can opt for a different positivity theorem to be used.

In Section 2.4, we provide formal statements of each positivity theorem that POLYHORN implements. When invoked in POLYHORN each theorem has some input parameters which are set to default values, that can be modified in the config file. Definitions of these parameters and their default values are also presented in Section 2.4.

*Heuristics.* We conclude by outlining two heuristics that we implemented in POLYHORN and that we observed to improve the tool’s performance. The effect of each heuristic is studied in our experimental evaluation in Section 3:

1. *Assume-SAT.* For a PHC to be valid, either (1) the left-hand-side of the entailment needs to be satisfiable and to imply the right-hand-side at all satisfying points, or (2) the left-hand-side of the entailment needs to be unsatisfiable. Positivity theorems translate a system of PHCs into a purely existentially quantified system of polynomial constraints, whose satisfiability implies either (1) or (2). The Assume-SAT heuristic instead collects a system of constraints whose satisfiability only implies (1). This heuristic is sound but it leads to incompleteness, as (2) also implies that the system of PHCs is satisfiable. However, we observed that the Assume-SAT heuristic can sometimes considerably reduce the size of the obtained system of constraints, which can make the subsequent SMT solving step significantly more efficient. In Section 2.4, we formalize all the constraints collected by each positivity theorem. Remark 2 then specifies the set of constraints collected by the Assume-SAT heuristic.
2. *UNSAT core.* This heuristic was proposed in [20], a work which uses positivity theorems for program synthesis. Since the positivity theorem translations introduce a large number of fresh symbolic variables that are now existentially quantified, the idea behind the heuristic is to first try to solve the resulting system of constraints while adding additional constraints that set the values of some of these newly introduced symbolic variables to 0. If the SMT-solver returns **SAT**, then the original system is satisfiable as well. Otherwise, SMT solvers such as Z3 [13] and MathSAT [10] can return an



unsatisfiability core, a subset of constraints that are unsatisfiable themselves. If the core contains none of the newly added constraints, it implies that the original system was unsatisfiable. Otherwise, POLYHORN removes the newly added  $t = 0$  constraints that are in the core and repeats this procedure.

## 2.4 Positivity Theorems

We now present the formal details behind the positivity theorems implemented in POLYHORN. Provided are theorem statements, their use in POLYHORN and tool parameters, the default configuration parameter values and how to change parameter values. All theorem claims are adopted from [2], and we refer the reader to [2] for more details. Reading this section is optional for the users interested solely in running POLYHORN with the default configuration.

*Farkas' lemma.* We start by presenting Farkas' lemma, which is utilized by POLYHORN when both the left-hand-side (LHS) and the right-hand-side (RHS) of PHCs in canonical form are specified in terms of linear inequalities.

**Theorem 1 (Farkas' lemma [15]).** *Consider a set  $V = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$  of real-valued variables and the following system of  $m$  linear inequalities over  $V$*

$$\Phi := \begin{cases} a_{1,0} + a_{1,1} \cdot x_1 + \dots + a_{1,n} \cdot x_n \bowtie_1 0 \\ \vdots \\ a_{m,0} + a_{m,1} \cdot x_1 + \dots + a_{m,n} \cdot x_n \bowtie_m 0 \end{cases}$$

where each  $\bowtie_i \in \{>, \geq\}$ . Exactly one of the following is true

F1)  $\Phi$  is satisfiable. Then,  $\Phi$  entails the linear inequality

$$\psi := c_0 + c_1 \cdot x_1 + \dots + c_n \cdot x_n \geq 0$$

if and only if  $\psi$  can be written as non-negative linear combination of the inequalities in  $\Phi$  and  $1 \geq 0$ , i.e. if and only if there exist non-negative real-valued coefficients  $y_0, \dots, y_m$  such that:

$$\begin{aligned} c_0 &= y_0 + \sum_{i=1}^m y_i \cdot a_{i,0} \\ c_1 &= \sum_{i=1}^m y_i \cdot a_{i,1} \\ &\vdots \\ c_n &= \sum_{i=1}^m y_i \cdot a_{i,n}. \end{aligned}$$

F2)  $\Phi$  is unsatisfiable and  $-1 \geq 0$  can be derived as above.

F3)  $\Phi$  is unsatisfiable and  $0 > 0$  can be derived as above, with at least one of the strict inequalities having strictly positive coefficient  $y_i > 0$ .

If the inequality  $\psi := c_0 + c_1 \cdot x_1 + \dots + c_n \cdot x_n > 0$  is strict, then the case (F1) should be modified by requiring at least one coefficient  $y_i$  with  $\bowtie_i = \{>\}$  to be strictly positive, i.e.  $y_i > 0$ .

Given a PHC in canonical form where both the LHS and the RHS are specified in terms of linear inequalities, Farkas' lemma specifies the necessary and sufficient conditions for the LHS of the PHC to be unsatisfiable, i.e.  $(F2)$  and  $(F3)$ , as well as for the LHS to be satisfiable and to entail the RHS, i.e.  $(F1)$ . Hence, POLYHORN translates each such PHC into a system of constraints defined by the Farkas' lemma. The application of Farkas' lemma in POLYHORN introduces no new parameter values.

*Handelman's theorem.* Next, we present Handelman's theorem. POLYHORN utilizes this theorem when all inequalities on the LHS of a PHC in canonical form are linear, but the inequality on the RHS contains a polynomial of degree at least 2. In order to formally present Handelman's theorem, we first need to define the notion of a monoid of a system of linear inequalities. Consider a set  $V = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$  of real-valued variables and the following system of linear inequalities over  $V$

$$\Phi := \{f_1 \bowtie_1 0, \dots, f_m \bowtie_m 0\},$$

where each  $f_i = a_{i,0} + a_{i,1} \cdot x_1 + \dots + a_{i,n} \cdot x_n$  and each  $\bowtie_i \in \{>, \geq\}$ . The *monoid* of  $\Phi$  of degree  $d$ , denoted  $\text{Monoid}(\Phi, d)$ , is the set of all polynomials over  $V$  of degree at most  $d$  that can be expressed as a product of linear expressions in  $\Phi$ , i.e.

$$\text{Monoid}(\Phi, d) := \left\{ \prod_{i=1}^m f_i^{k_i} \mid \forall i : k_i \in \mathbb{N}_0 \wedge \sum_{i=1}^m k_i \leq d \right\}.$$

We are now ready to formally state Handelman's theorem.

**Theorem 2 (Handelman's theorem [26]).** *Consider a set  $V = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$  of real-valued variables and the following system of  $m$  linear inequalities over  $V$*

$$\Phi := \begin{cases} a_{1,0} + a_{1,1} \cdot x_1 + \dots + a_{1,n} \cdot x_n \bowtie_1 0 \\ \vdots \\ a_{m,0} + a_{m,1} \cdot x_1 + \dots + a_{m,n} \cdot x_n \bowtie_m 0 \end{cases}.$$

where each  $\bowtie_i \in \{>, \geq\}$ . Suppose that  $\Phi$  is satisfiable. Then,  $\Phi$  entails polynomial inequality  $g(x_1, \dots, x_n) \bowtie 0$  if there exist a natural number  $\bar{d}$ , non-negative real numbers  $y_0, y_1, \dots, y_u$  and  $h_1, \dots, h_u \in \text{Monoid}(\Phi, \bar{d})$  such that

$$g = y_0 + \sum_{i=1}^u y_i \cdot h_i.$$

Moreover, if the satisfiability set of  $\Phi$  is bounded in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , the linear inequalities  $\bowtie_1, \dots, \bowtie_m$  are all non-strict and the polynomial inequality  $\bowtie$  is strict, then  $\Phi$  entails polynomial inequality  $g(x_1, \dots, x_n) > 0$  if and only if there exist a natural number  $\bar{d}$ , non-negative real numbers  $y_0, y_1, \dots, y_u$  and  $h_1, \dots, h_u \in \text{Monoid}(\Phi, \bar{d})$  such that  $g = y_0 + \sum_{i=1}^u y_i \cdot h_i$ .

Given a PHC in canonical form where inequalities on the LHS are linear but the inequality on the RHS is at least a degree 2 polynomial, Handelman’s theorem specifies the sufficient conditions for the LHS to be satisfiable and to entail the RHS. On the other hand, the conditions for the LHS to be unsatisfiable are as in the Farkas’ Lemma, i.e. conditions (F2) and (F3) in Theorem 1. Hence, POLYHORN translates each such PHC into a system of constraints defined by Handelman’s theorem as well as (F2) and (F3) in Farkas’ lemma.

The translation is sound. The translation is also relatively complete, subject to the assumptions stated in Theorem 2, i.e. that the satisfiability set of the inequalities on the LHS is bounded, the inequalities on the LHS are non-strict and the inequality on the RHS is strict.

*POLYHORN parameters for Handelman’s theorem.* POLYHORN defines a parameter for the maximal polynomial degree  $\bar{d}$  of the monoid to be used in the translation. The value used by the POLYHORN default configuration is the maximal polynomial degree appearing in the system of PHCs. In the config file, this value can be changed by setting a new value of the *degree\_of\_sat* parameter.

*Putinar’s theorem.* Finally, we present Putinar’s theorem, and its extension for the case when the LHS of the entailment is unsatisfiable which was proved in [2]. POLYHORN utilizes these theorems when both the LHS and the RHS of a PHC in canonical form contain at least one polynomial of degree at least 2. In what follows, we say that a polynomial  $h$  is *sum-of-squares*, if it can be written as a finite sum  $h = \sum h_j^2$  for squares of polynomials  $h_j$ .

**Theorem 3 (Putinar’s theorem [36]).** *Consider a set  $V = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$  of real-valued variables and the following system of  $m$  polynomial inequalities over  $V$*

$$\Phi := \{f_1(x_1, \dots, x_n) \bowtie_1 0, \dots, f_m(x_1, \dots, x_n) \bowtie_m 0\}.$$

where each  $\bowtie_i \in \{>, \geq\}$ . Suppose that  $\Phi$  is satisfiable. Then,  $\Phi$  entails a polynomial inequality  $g(x_1, \dots, x_n) \bowtie 0$  if there exist positive real number  $y_0$  and sum-of-squares polynomials  $h_0, \dots, h_m$  such that

$$g = y_0 + h_0 + \sum_{i=1}^m h_i \cdot f_i.$$

Moreover, if the satisfiability set of at least one  $f_i \geq 0$  is topologically compact (i.e. closed and bounded), the linear inequalities  $\bowtie_1, \dots, \bowtie_m$  are all non-strict and the polynomial inequality  $\bowtie$  is strict, then  $\Phi$  entails polynomial inequality  $g(x_1, \dots, x_n) > 0$  if and only if there exist positive real number  $y_0$  and sum-of-squares polynomials  $h_0, \dots, h_m$  such that  $g = y_0 + h_0 + \sum_{i=1}^m h_i \cdot f_i$ .

**Theorem 4 (Unsatisfiability theorem [2]).** *Consider a set  $V = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$  of real-valued variables and the following system of  $m$  polynomial inequalities over  $V$*

$$\Phi := \{f_1(x_1, \dots, x_n) \bowtie_1 0, \dots, f_m(x_1, \dots, x_n) \bowtie_m 0\}.$$

where each  $\bowtie_i \in \{>, \geq\}$ . Then  $\Phi$  is unsatisfiable if and only if at least one of the following two conditions holds:

*U1)* There exist a positive real number  $y_0$  and sum-of-square polynomials  $h_0, \dots, h_m$  such that

$$-1 = y_0 + h_0 + \sum_{i=1}^m h_i \cdot f_i$$

*U2)* There exist  $d \in \mathbb{N}_0$  and polynomials  $h'_1, \dots, h'_m$  over  $V \cup \{w_1, \dots, w_m\}$ , such that for some  $j$  in which  $\bowtie_j \in \{>\}$ ,  $w_j^{2 \cdot d} = \sum_{i=1}^m h'_i \cdot (f_i - w_i^2)$ .

Given a PHC in canonical form where both the LHS and the RHS contain a polynomial of degree at least 2, Putinar's theorem specifies the sufficient conditions for the LHS to be satisfiable and to entail the RHS. On the other hand, the conditions for the LHS to be unsatisfiable are given by conditions (U1) and (U2) in Theorem 4. Hence, POLYHORN translates each such PHC into a system of constraints defined by Putinar's theorem and Theorem 4.

The translation is sound. The translation is also relatively complete, subject to the assumptions stated in Theorem 3, i.e. that the satisfiability set of at least one inequality on the LHS is topologically compact, that the inequalities on the LHS are non-strict and the inequality on the RHS is strict.

*POLYHORN parameters for Putinar's theorem.* POLYHORN defines the following parameters when invoking Putinar's theorem. In the default configuration, the values of all these parameters are set to the maximal polynomial degree appearing in the system of PHCs, and the values of these parameters can be changed by modifying the config file:

- Maximum degree of  $h_i$ 's in Theorem 3. In the config file, *degree\_of\_sat* represents this parameter.
- Maximum degree of  $h_i$ 's in Theorem 4 (condition (U1)). In the config file, *degree\_of\_nonstrict\_unsat* represents this parameter.
- Maximum degree of  $h_i$ 's in Theorem 4 (condition (U2)). In the config file, *degree\_of\_strict\_unsat* represents this parameter.
- Value of  $d$  in Theorem 4 (condition (U2)). In the config file, *max\_d\_of\_strict* represents this parameter.

*Remark 2 (Assume-SAT).* Heuristic *Assume-SAT* removes the conditions that consider the case when the LHS of a PHC is unsatisfiable in all the previous theorems. If Farkas' lemma or Handelman's theorem is applied, POLYHORN omits the conditions (F2) and (F3) in Theorem 1. If Putinar's theorem is applied, POLYHORN omits the conditions (U1) and (U2) in Theorem 4.

### 3 Experimental Evaluation

We evaluate the performance of our tool on three benchmark sets in the following three subsections. The goal of our experiments is to illustrate (1) soundness of

the tool, (2) its ability to solve PHCs that arise in program analysis literature, (3) the necessity of using positivity theorems for quantifier elimination as opposed to feeding PHCs to an SMT solver directly, and (4) to study the performance of different combinations of our two heuristics and different SMT solvers. Benchmarks are provided in the `.smt2` format. All the experiments were conducted on a Debian 11 machine with Intel(R) Xeon(R) CPU E5-2630 2.40GHz CPU and 6 GB RAM with a timeout of 180 seconds.

*Baseline.* In order to illustrate the necessity of using positivity theorems for quantifier elimination, on all three benchmark sets we compare POLYHORN against a baseline method which directly uses Z3 [13] to solve the system of PHCs, i.e. without separately performing quantifier elimination.

### 3.1 Termination and Non-Termination

The first benchmark set consists of systems of PHCs that arise in termination analysis of programs. We consider TermComp’23 [19], C-Integer category, benchmark suite that consists of 335 non-recursive programs written in C. Initial value of every program variable is assumed to be in the range  $[-1024, 1023]$ . The goal is to either prove termination or non-termination of each program.

*Extraction of PHCs.* For both termination and non-termination proving, we consider one template-based synthesis method and use it to extract a system of PHCs whose every solution gives rise to a correct certificate of termination and non-termination, respectively.

For termination proving, we use the template-based synthesis method for computing ranking functions [2]. For each program, as is common in termination analysis, we first used ASPIC [16] to generate a supporting invariant with respect to which ranking function is to be computed. We then use the method of [2] to extract two systems of PHCs that each encode the ranking function synthesis problem – one for the linear (polynomial degree 1) and one for the quadratic (polynomial degree 2) ranking function templates. Finally, we run POLYHORN with Farkas’ lemma to solve the first system of PHCs, and with Putinar’s theorem to solve the second system of PHCs, respectively.

For non-termination proving, we use the template-based synthesis method for computing a non-termination certificate of [8]. We use the same parameters as in the ‘best config’ setting of the artifact of [8] to define the template for the non-termination certificate. We run the method of [8] to generate the system of PHCs that encodes the non-termination certificate synthesis problem. Finally, to solve the resulting system of PHCs, we run POLYHORN with Farkas’ lemma in 101/103 cases where ‘best config’ prescribes linear templates, and with Putinar’s theorem in 2/103 cases where it prescribes polynomial templates.

*Results.* Table 1 shows a summary of our results on POLYHORN’s performance on PHCs coming from termination analysis. Clearly, POLYHORN performs far better than using Z3 directly for quantifier elimination. Comparing performance of different heuristics, we observe several interesting points:

Specification	Base			Base+H1			Base+H2			Base+H1+H2			Direct Z3
	MS 5	Z3	U.	MS 5	Z3	U.	MS 5	Z3	U.	MS 6	Z3	U.	
Termination	55	151	151	148	149	152	47	123	124	125	131	146	38
Non-Termination	77	86	88	101	92	103	65	80	83	79	85	94	45
Avg. Time (s)	5.2	4.6	2.7	1.0	5.7	0.8	6.0	6.6	5.5	3.4	4.8	4.8	5.3

Table 1: Summary of our results on TermComp’23 benchmarks. The **Base** column shows the results of POLYHORN without any heuristics. The next 3 columns enable heuristics H1(Assume-SAT) and H2(UNSAT Core). The ‘Direct Z3’ column summarises the results obtained by applying Z3 directly, i.e. without quantifier elimination based on Positivstellensätze. For each setting, we show the number of instances solved by MathSAT 5 (MS 5), Z3 and their union (U.).

- Applying heuristic H1 (Assume-SAT) helps POLYHORN greatly, especially when using MathSAT as the backend solver.
- Applying heuristic H2 (UNSAT Core) does not prove any unique cases that other configurations of POLYHORN could not prove. However, Z3 solves more instances than MathSAT when both are equipped with this heuristic.
- A total of 154 benchmarks are proved terminating. As none of the settings can individually solve 154 instances, one should run several different settings of POLYHORN in parallel for best performance.
- While Z3 solves more instances of PHCs coming from termination analysis, MathSAT outperforms it in solving PHCs coming from non-termination analysis. This also suggests running several SMT solvers in parallel in order to achieve the best results.

*Runtime comparison.* Fig. 3 plots the number of instances solved by each tool against tool runtime. There are a few benchmarks which can be solved by the direct-Z3 method nearly instantly. Apart from them, it can be seen that Z3 is faster than MathSAT in settings where H1 heuristic is not applied, but applying H1 makes MathSAT slightly more efficient than Z3. Moreover, compared to not using any heuristics, applying H1 and H2 results in a speed-up in 243 and 32 benchmarks, respectively.

### 3.2 Almost-Sure Termination

The second benchmark set comes from almost-sure termination proving in probabilistic programs. We collected benchmarks from two sources: i) 10 benchmarks from [40] (Table 3) and ii) 7 benchmarks from [31]. We choose these benchmarks because both works consider probabilistic program models of different applications which are required to be almost-surely terminating.

*Extraction of PHCs.* To prove almost-sure termination, we use the template-based synthesis method for computing ranking supermartingales [5]. For each program, as is common in termination analysis, we used ASPIC [16] and StInG [38] to generate supporting invariants with respect to which ranking supermartingale is to be computed. We then fix a quadratic (polynomial




Fig. 3: Performance of POLYHORN with different settings in comparison to Direct Z3 method. Both axes are scaled logarithmically for better visualization. The leftmost four plots demonstrate the effect of using different solvers and heuristic settings, and the rightmost plot unionizes solvers to just compare heuristics.

Benchmark set	Base			Base+H1			Base+H2			Base+H1+H2			Direct Z3
	MS 5	Z3	U.	MS 5	Z3	U.	MS 5	Z3	U.	MS 6	Z3	U.	
From [40]	6	6	6	6	5	6	7	7	7	7	5	7	0
From [31]	6	5	6	5	6	6	5	5	6	6	5	6	0
Avg. Time (s)	7.3	8.0	7.3	5.7	6.8	7.1	19.1	20.1	20.3	22.6	10.9	22.5	NA

Table 2: Results on the second benchmark set.

degree 2) template for the ranking supermartingale and use the method of [5] to extract a system of PHCs that encodes the synthesis problem. Finally, we use POLYHORN with Handelman’s theorem to solve the system of PHCs.

*Results.* Table 2 shows a summary of our results on POLYHORN’s performance on PHCs coming from almost-sure termination analysis. Applying Z3 directly is not successful on any of the benchmarks. On the other hand, POLYHORN successfully solves 13 out of 17 instances. Moreover, it can be seen that in most of the settings, running one SMT-solver alone does not provide the best results. This again suggests running several SMT solvers in parallel. We note that, only under the H2 heuristic, is POLYHORN able to solve the pollutant-disposal benchmark from [40]. This shows the significance of this heuristic.

### 3.3 Synthesis

The third benchmark set comes from polynomial program synthesis, where we collect 32 benchmarks from *PolySynth* [20]. Each benchmark is a non-deterministic program that contains holes and a desired specification. PolySynth uses a template-based technique to synthesize suitable polynomial expressions for the holes such that the specification is satisfied.

Benchmark Set	Base			Base+H1			Base+H2			Base+H1+H2			Direct Z3
	MS 5	Z3	U.	MS 5	Z3	U.	MS 5	Z3	U.	MS 6	Z3	U.	
From [20]	27	28	28	26	27	27	27	28	28	26	27	27	21
Avg. Time (s)	5.6	5.4	5.4	5.5	6.2	5.3	6.0	5.8	5.8	5.7	5.6	5.5	10

Table 3: Results on the third benchmark set.

*Extraction of PHCs.* We first use the method of [20] to extract a system of PHCs for polynomial program synthesis. For each benchmark, we ran POLYHORN using Farkas lemma as well as Handelman’s and Putinar’s theorem with polynomial degree 2 templates. For brevity, we present a union of these runs, where we consider the faster setting whenever several of them worked.

*Results.* Table 3 shows a summary of our results on POLYHORN’s performance on PHCs coming from program synthesis. We note that for two benchmarks (namely, `positive_square_with_holes` and `positive_square_with_number_holes`) the Direct Z3 method could find a solution while POLYHORN equipped with Farkas and Handelman could not. However, using Putinar with polynomial degree 2, POLYHORN can solve those instances as well. Other than that, POLYHORN outperforms the Direct Z3 approach both in terms of the number of solved instances and runtime. Comparing the performance of heuristics, it can be seen that the UNSAT Core heuristic slightly outperforms the Assume-SAT heuristic.

## 4 Conclusion

We presented our tool POLYHORN for solving systems of polynomial Horn clauses, a problem that arises in many template-based synthesis methods for program analysis and verification. The significance of POLYHORN is that, for template-based synthesis, it separates the task of certificate design, which future research can focus on, and the task of polynomial constraint solving, for which POLYHORN provides an efficient tool support. Future work includes studying further heuristics towards making POLYHORN even more efficient for solving systems of polynomial Horn clauses.

## References

1. Ahmadi, A.A., Majumdar, A.: Some applications of polynomial optimization in operations research and real-time decision making. *Optim. Lett.* **10**(4), 709–729 (2016)
2. Asadi, A., Chatterjee, K., Fu, H., Goharshady, A.K., Mahdavi, M.: Polynomial reachability witnesses via stellensätze. In: PLDI. pp. 772–787. ACM (2021)
3. Barrett, C., Fontaine, P., Tinelli, C.: The Satisfiability Modulo Theories Library (SMT-LIB). [www.SMT-LIB.org](http://www.SMT-LIB.org) (2016)
4. Chakarov, A., Sankaranarayanan, S.: Probabilistic program analysis with martingales. In: CAV. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol. 8044, pp. 511–526. Springer (2013)
5. Chatterjee, K., Fu, H., Goharshady, A.K.: Termination analysis of probabilistic programs through positivstellensatz’s. In: CAV (1). *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol. 9779, pp. 3–22. Springer (2016)



6. Chatterjee, K., Fu, H., Goharshady, A.K., Goharshady, E.K.: Polynomial invariant generation for non-deterministic recursive programs. In: PLDI. pp. 672–687. ACM (2020)
7. Chatterjee, K., Fu, H., Novotný, P., Hasheminezhad, R.: Algorithmic analysis of qualitative and quantitative termination problems for affine probabilistic programs. *ACM Trans. Program. Lang. Syst.* **40**(2), 7:1–7:45 (2018)
8. Chatterjee, K., Goharshady, E.K., Novotný, P., Zikelic, D.: Proving non-termination by program reversal. In: PLDI. pp. 1033–1048. ACM (2021)
9. Chatterjee, K., Novotný, P., Zikelic, D.: Stochastic invariants for probabilistic termination. In: POPL. pp. 145–160. ACM (2017)
10. Cimatti, A., Griggio, A., Schaafsma, B.J., Sebastiani, R.: The mathsat5 smt solver. In: International Conference on Tools and Algorithms for the Construction and Analysis of Systems. pp. 93–107. Springer (2013)
11. Colón, M., Sankaranarayanan, S., Sipma, H.: Linear invariant generation using non-linear constraint solving. In: CAV. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 2725, pp. 420–432. Springer (2003)
12. Colón, M., Sipma, H.: Synthesis of linear ranking functions. In: TACAS. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 2031, pp. 67–81. Springer (2001)
13. De Moura, L., Bjørner, N.: Z3: An efficient smt solver. In: International conference on Tools and Algorithms for the Construction and Analysis of Systems. pp. 337–340. Springer (2008)
14. Dietsch, D., Heizmann, M., Hoenicke, J., Nutz, A., Podelski, A.: Ultimate treeautomizer (CHC-COMP tool description). In: HCVS/PERR@ETAPS. EPTCS, vol. 296, pp. 42–47 (2019)
15. Farkas, J.: Theorie der einfachen ungleichungen. *Journal für die reine und angewandte Mathematik (Crelles Journal)* **1902**(124), 1–27 (1902)
16. Feautrier, P., Gonnord, L.: Accelerated invariant generation for C programs with aspic and c2fsm. In: Proceedings of the Tools for Automatic Program Analysis, TAPAS@SAS 2010, Perpignan, France, September 17, 2010. *Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science*, vol. 267, pp. 3–13 (2010)
17. Feng, Y., Zhang, L., Jansen, D.N., Zhan, N., Xia, B.: Finding polynomial loop invariants for probabilistic programs. In: ATVA. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 10482, pp. 400–416. Springer (2017)
18. Floyd, R.W.: Assigning meanings to programs. In: Program Verification: Fundamental Issues in Computer Science, pp. 65–81. Springer (1993)
19. Frohn, F., Giesl, J., Moser, G., Rubio, A., Yamada, A., et al.: Termination competition 2023 (2023), [https://termination-portal.org/wiki/Termination\\_Compensation\\_2023](https://termination-portal.org/wiki/Termination_Compensation_2023)
20. Goharshady, A.K., Hitarth, S., Mohammadi, F., Motwani, H.J.: Algebro-geometric algorithms for template-based synthesis of polynomial programs. *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.* **7**(OOPSLA1), 727–756 (2023)
21. Grebenshchikov, S., Lopes, N.P., Popeea, C., Rybalchenko, A.: Synthesizing software verifiers from proof rules. In: PLDI. pp. 405–416. ACM (2012)
22. Gulwani, S., Jha, S., Tiwari, A., Venkatesan, R.: Synthesis of loop-free programs. In: PLDI. pp. 62–73. ACM (2011)
23. Gulwani, S., Srivastava, S., Venkatesan, R.: Program analysis as constraint solving. In: PLDI. pp. 281–292. ACM (2008)
24. Gulwani, S., Zuleger, F.: The reachability-bound problem. In: PLDI. pp. 292–304. ACM (2010)

25. Gurfinkel, A., Kahsai, T., Komuravelli, A., Navas, J.A.: The seahorn verification framework. In: CAV (1). Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 9206, pp. 343–361. Springer (2015)
26. Handelman, D.: Representing polynomials by positive linear functions on compact convex polyhedra. *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* **132**(1), 35–62 (1988)
27. Heizmann, M., Hoenicke, J., Leike, J., Podelski, A.: Linear ranking for linear lasso programs. *CoRR* **abs/1401.5347** (2014)
28. Hoffmann, J., Aehlig, K., Hofmann, M.: Multivariate amortized resource analysis. *ACM Trans. Program. Lang. Syst.* **34**(3), 14:1–14:62 (2012)
29. Hojjat, H., Rümmer, P.: The ELDARICA horn solver. In: FMCAD. pp. 1–7. IEEE (2018)
30. Komuravelli, A., Gurfinkel, A., Chaki, S.: Smt-based model checking for recursive programs. *Formal Methods Syst. Des.* **48**(3), 175–205 (2016)
31. Kura, S., Urabe, N., Hasuo, I.: Tail probabilities for randomized program runtimes via martingales for higher moments. In: TACAS (2). Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 11428, pp. 135–153. Springer (2019)
32. Matoušek, J., Gärtner, B.: Understanding and using linear programming, vol. 1. Springer (2007)
33. Podelski, A., Rybalchenko, A.: A complete method for the synthesis of linear ranking functions. In: VMCAI. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 2937, pp. 239–251. Springer (2004)
34. Prajna, S., Jadbabaie, A.: Safety verification of hybrid systems using barrier certificates. In: HSCC. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 2993, pp. 477–492. Springer (2004)
35. Prajna, S., Papachristodoulou, A., Parrilo, P.A.: Introducing sostools: A general purpose sum of squares programming solver. In: Proceedings of the 41st IEEE Conference on Decision and Control, 2002. vol. 1, pp. 741–746. IEEE (2002)
36. Putinar, M.: Positive polynomials on compact semi-algebraic sets. *Indiana University Mathematics Journal* **42**(3), 969–984 (1993)
37. Renegar, J.: On the computational complexity and geometry of the first-order theory of the reals. part iii: Quantifier elimination. *Journal of Symbolic Computation* **13**(3), 329–352 (1992). [https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/S0747-7171\(10\)80005-7](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/S0747-7171(10)80005-7)
38. Sankaranarayanan, S., Sipma, H.B., Manna, Z.: Constraint-based linear-relations analysis. In: Static Analysis, 11th International Symposium, SAS 2004, Verona, Italy, August 26-28, 2004, Proceedings. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 3148, pp. 53–68. Springer (2004)
39. Srivastava, S., Gulwani, S., Foster, J.S.: Template-based program verification and program synthesis. *Int. J. Softw. Tools Technol. Transf.* **15**(5-6), 497–518 (2013)
40. Wang, P., Fu, H., Goharshady, A.K., Chatterjee, K., Qin, X., Shi, W.: Cost analysis of nondeterministic probabilistic programs. In: PLDI. pp. 204–220. ACM (2019)
41. Zikelic, D., Chang, B.E., Bolignano, P., Raimondi, F.: Differential cost analysis with simultaneous potentials and anti-potentials. In: PLDI. pp. 442–457. ACM (2022)

## A Proof of Proposition 1

**Proposition 1.** *Each PHC can be translated into an equisatisfiable PHC in the canonical form, defined over the same sets of free and universally quantified variables.*

*Proof.* Consider a system of PHCs as in eq. (1)

$$\exists t \in \mathbb{R}^m. \bigwedge_{i=1}^K \left( \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n. \Phi^i(x, t) \implies \Psi^i(x, t) \right),$$

with each  $\Phi^i$  and  $\Psi^i$  being an arbitrary boolean combination of polynomial inequalities over  $x$  and  $t$ . It is a classical result that every formula in propositional logic can be translated into an equivalent formula in conjunctive normal form (CNF). Hence, we can translate each  $\Phi^i(x, t) \implies \Psi^i(x, t)$  into an equisatisfiable formula of the form

$$\Theta^i(x, t) = \bigwedge_{j=1}^{m_i} \bigvee_{l=1}^{n_i} (p_{j,l}^i(x, t) \bowtie_{j,l}^i 0),$$

where each  $p_{j,l}^i(x, t) \bowtie_{j,l}^i 0$  is a polynomial inequality. We then have

$$\begin{aligned} & \exists t \in \mathbb{R}^m. \bigwedge_{i=1}^K \left( \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n. \Phi^i(x, t) \implies \Psi^i(x, t) \right) \\ \equiv & \exists t \in \mathbb{R}^m. \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n. \bigwedge_{i=1}^K \left( \Phi^i(x, t) \implies \Psi^i(x, t) \right) \\ \equiv & \exists t \in \mathbb{R}^m. \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n. \bigwedge_{i=1}^K \left( \bigwedge_{j=1}^{m_i} \bigvee_{l=1}^{n_i} (p_{j,l}^i(x, t) \bowtie_{j,l}^i 0) \right) \\ \equiv & \exists t \in \mathbb{R}^m. \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n. \bigwedge_{i=1}^K \bigwedge_{j=1}^{m_i} \left( \bigvee_{l=1}^{n_i} (p_{j,l}^i(x, t) \bowtie_{j,l}^i 0) \right) \\ \equiv & \exists t \in \mathbb{R}^m. \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n. \bigwedge_{i=1}^K \bigwedge_{j=1}^{m_i} \left( (-p_{j,1}^i(x, t) \bowtie_{j,1}^i 0) \wedge \dots \wedge (-p_{j,n_i-1}^i(x, t) \bowtie_{j,n_i-1}^i 0) \implies (p_{j,1}^i(x, t) \bowtie_{j,n_i}^i 0) \right). \end{aligned}$$

The last formula yields an equisatisfiable system of PHCs with each PHC in the canonical form. Note that the above also yields a procedure for translating individual PHCs into their canonical forms. This concludes the proof.  $\square$