Last week, looked at CDCL, zChaff.

Studied CDCL basics: like DPLL, but includes clause learning.

Today: how do we justify clause learning conceptually? Also: study implementation details of modern CDCL solvers.
Algorithm 1: Typical CDCL algorithm

\[
\text{CDCL}(\varphi, \nu) \\
\text{1} \quad \text{if} \ (\text{UNITPROPAGATION}(\varphi, \nu) = \text{CONFLICT}) \\
\text{2} \quad \text{then return} \ \text{UNSAT} \\
\text{3} \quad dl \leftarrow 0 \quad \triangleright \text{Decision level} \\
\text{4} \quad \text{while (not ALLVARIABLESASSIGNED}(\varphi, \nu)) \\
\text{5} \quad \text{do} \ (x, v) = \text{PICKBRANCHINGVARIABLE}(\varphi, \nu) \quad \triangleright \text{Decide stage} \\
\text{6} \quad dl \leftarrow dl + 1 \quad \triangleright \text{Increment decision level due to new decision} \\
\text{7} \quad \nu \leftarrow \nu \cup \{(x, v)\} \\
\text{8} \quad \text{if} \ (\text{UNITPROPAGATION}(\varphi, \nu) = \text{CONFLICT}) \quad \triangleright \text{Deduce stage} \\
\text{9} \quad \text{then} \ \beta = \text{CONFLICTANALYSIS}(\varphi, \nu) \quad \triangleright \text{Diagnose stage} \\
\text{10} \quad \text{if} \ (\beta < 0) \\
\text{11} \quad \text{then return} \ \text{UNSAT} \\
\text{12} \quad \text{else} \ \text{BACKTRACK}(\varphi, \nu, \beta) \\
\text{13} \quad dl \leftarrow \beta \quad \triangleright \text{Decrement decision level due to backtracking} \\
\text{14} \quad \text{return} \ \text{SAT}
\]
Recall the implication graph, where vertices are literals. Decisions are roots, which branch to unit propagations.
The conflict is always the “most recent” thing that happened in the graph. So WLOG, we can always visualize the conflict as on the “right” side of the graph.
A **cut** is a set of edges which—when removed—break reachable flows.

For the implication graph: we can always build a cut that puts the conflict on the “right” side and the rest of the graph on the “left.”
For example, these green edges form a cut in the implication graph.
Notice that if you remove any edge from this set of four (for example, take only the right three as the cut), you no longer cut off the transitive flow.
Intuitively, we can look back at these roots and say: whenever each of these things is true, we know we’re destined to end up with a conflict.

Thus, we learn $\neg(x_3 \land \neg x_8 \land x_7) = \neg x_3 \lor x_8 \lor \neg x_7$

$\neg x_3 \lor x_8 \lor \neg x_7$
**UIP — Unique Implication Point**

A Unique Implication Point in an implication graph is a dominator for a conflict. I.e., a node \( x \) such that all paths eventually reaching the conflict must go through \( x \)

Most modern CDCL-based solvers use UIP cuts
A Unique Implication Point in an implication graph is a dominator for a conflict. I.e., a node x such that all paths eventually reaching the conflict must go through x.

Most modern CDCL-based solvers use UIP cuts because they produce unit clauses after backtracking.
Non Chronological Backtracking

Let’s say we’re at decision level 10, and we learn the following clause:
\( \neg x_7 \land x_3 \lor \neg x_5 \land x_5 \)

We add this clause to our database. Then, instead of backtracking to try \( x_5 \) (as DPLL would), we instead backtrack to decision level 5!

Now, by construction, the clause is unit and we can propagate \( \neg x_5 \)

In general the trick is this: take your learned clause, backtrack to the second-highest decision level. When you do that, you know all of the variables (except the one from the most-recent decision level) must be false (you wouldn’t have kept propagating if one had been true!)

This strategy produces asserting literals. Upon backtracking, there is guaranteed to be a unit clause which will allow unit propagation to occur. This lowers the burden of guessing on the search.
Visualization of CDCL

I will defer to these excellent notes with visualizations of UIPs, UIP cuts, and their associated learned clauses

UIP cuts in the implication graph are a beautiful theory for understanding how to justify the correctness of learned clauses.

Unfortunately, they don’t really tell us how to implement things. Modern solvers do not literally materialize an implication graph—calculating dominators on-the-fly is quite laborious and compute-intensive.

There are some key tricks the solver exploits.
Watchlist Tricks

MiniSAT and others use representational tricks, i.e., vectors to represent clauses with watch literals in a canonical location.

We will discuss these tricks on Thursday’s class.
Analyzing the Trail

As the solver does its work, it builds up a decision trail, which could be (in principle) extended to an implication graph.

Surprisingly, it is possible to inspect only the trail to construct the learned clause, without materializing the implication graph or calculating UIPs via dominators.
"In a breadth-first manner, continue to trace literals of the current decision level, until there is just one left."
Input: confl — the conflicting clause, 
   reason — mapping from vars to clauses

Outputs: out_clause, the output clause; out_btlevel, the bt level
seen-vars = {}
counter = 0
lit p = ⊥
do
   // initially when p is ⊥, reason returns each lit
   p_reason = confl.reason(p) // returns the "reason" vector
   // For each literal in the reason vector...
   for (int j = 0; j < p_reason.size(); j++) {
      lit q = p_reason[j];
      if (var(q) ∉ seen-vars):
         Add var(q) to seen-vars
         If decision level of q is current decision level:
            counter++
         Else if (decision level of q is > 0):
            Push ¬q onto the learned clause
   // Select next literal
   do
      p = trail.last
      confl = reason[var(p)]
      undoOne(); // Pop one decision from the trail
   while (p ∉ seen-vars)
      counter -= 1;
   while (counter > 0)
      out_clause[0] = ¬p
Input: confl – the conflicting clause,  
reason – mapping from vars to clauses

Outputs: out_clause, the output clause; out_btlevel, the bt level

seen-vars = {}  
counter = 0  
lit p = ⊥  
do
  // initially when p is ⊥, reason returns each lit  
  p_reason = confl.reason(p) // returns the “reason” vector  
  // For each literal in the reason vector…  
  for (int j = 0; j < p_reason.size(); j++) {  
    lit q = p_reason[j];  
    if (var(q) ∉ seen-vars):  
      Add var(q) to seen-vars  
      If decision level of q is current decision level:  
        counter++  
      Else if (decision level of q is > 0):  
        Push ¬q onto the learned clause  
  // Select next literal  
  do
    p = trail.last  
    confl = reason[var(p)]  
    undoOne(); // Pop one decision from the trail  
    while (p ∉ seen-vars)  
      counter -= 1;  
    while (counter > 0)  
      out_clause[0] = ¬p

- Initially, p = ⊥, which sets p_reason to the conflict clause  
- E.g., if the conflict is ¬x₃ v x₅ v ¬x₈  
- p_reason is x₃ v ¬x₅ v x₈  
- For each literal q in p_reason:  
  - Mark q as seen  
  - If q comes from the current level, bump count & exclude it from learned clause  
  - If q was at DL > 0, add ¬q to output  
  - out_level is max of old level and q’s DL  
- Throw away decisions until you hit one of the “seen” ones, call that p  
- At the end of everything there is one (asserting) literal at the current decision level: p  
  - So set out_clause[0] = ¬p
Horn Clauses and Datalog
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Today, we’ll talk about how to operationalize the rules from last class as a specific programming paradigm: logic programming
Review: Resolution

The resolution rule tells us how to infer new knowledge from preexisting knowledge

\[
P \lor \ldots \lor Q \quad \neg Q \lor R \ldots \lor \quad P \lor \ldots R \lor \ldots
\]

If we derive \( \bot \), we know the original formula is tantamount to \( \bot \)

We can view resolution as giving us the **transitive closure of our current knowledge base to explicate latent implications**
The Problem with Resolution

Resolution may or may not be helpful—it may produce new clauses which are not useful.

Churning on unproductive work can be very costly.

Resolution-based solvers must judiciously select how to apply resolution.
In future lectures, we’ll see how DPLL, CDCL, and related systems apply resolution intelligently (but heuristically) to scale SAT solving to formulas with tens of thousands of variables and millions of clauses.

Today, we’ll focus on a simpler logic programming language based on a restricted form of clauses.
Horn Clauses

A horn clause is a clause with at most one positive (i.e., not negated) literal

\neg B_0 \lor ... \lor \neg B_n \lor H \quad \text{or, equivalently...} \quad H \leftarrow B_0 \land ... B_n

H is the “head” of the clause, and the B_n's are the “body”

“If everything in the body is true, the head must be true”
Horn clauses allow chain forward reasoning: if the body is true, then the head must be true.

The language **Datalog** implements chain forward Horn clauses over a universe of atoms; in this lecture we’ll look at Datalog, its foundations and applications, and its implementation.
**Datalog**

- **Declarative** language used to implement analytics queries over large amounts of data

- Extends **SQL** with the ability to deduce “facts”

- For example, starting with an initial database of edges, transitively compute a **path** relation

```
.decl edge(x:number, y:number)
.input edge

.decl path(x:number, y:number)
.output path

path(x, y) :- edge(x, y).
path(x, y) :- path(x, z), edge(z, y).
```
Example: Transitive Closure in Soufflé

// Transitive Closure
.decl edge(x:number, y:number)
.decl path(x:number, y:number)
.output path // materializes path on disc

path(x, y) :- edge(x, y).
path(x, z) :- path(x, y), edge(y, z).
/ Transitive Closure
.decl edge(x:number, y:number)
.decl path(x:number, y:number)
.output path // materializes path on disc

path(x, y) :- edge(x, y).
path(x, z) :- path(x, y), edge(y, z).

// Extensional DataBase (EDB)
edge(0,1). edge(1,2). edge(2,3). edge(2,4).
Computation **materializes** the result

```prolog
// Transitive Closure
芝加 edge(x:number, y:number)
芝加 path(x:number, y:number)
巴巴 output path // materializes path on disc

path(x, y) :- edge(x, y).
path(x, z) :- path(x, y), edge(y, z).

// Extensional DataBase (EDB)
edge(0,1). edge(1,2). edge(2,3). edge(2,4).
```
Let’s run it and see

```
kmicinski % souffle tc.dl
kmicinski % cat path.csv
0 1
0 2
0 3
0 4
1 2
1 3
1 4
2 3
2 4
```
Challenge: Triangle Counting, etc…

Write a Soufflé program which takes an input edge of the same form as before. You should output triples

How does this generalize to k-clique (k > 3)?

What is (worst-case) runtime complexity of k-clique, increasing with k? (Hint: k-clique is NP complete!)
A conjunction in the head is technically disallowed:

\[ H_0 \land H_1 \leftarrow B_0 \land \ldots B_n \]

But this is only superficial: we can simply refactor this into two rules

\[ H_0 \leftarrow B_0 \land \ldots B_n \]

\[ H_1 \leftarrow B_0 \land \ldots B_n \]
Disjunction in rule heads

Horn clauses allow chain forward reasoning: if the body is true, then the head must be true.

Notice that this rules out (a) negation in the body and (b) disjunction in the head; consider the alternative:

\[ H_0 \lor H_1 \leftarrow B_0 \land \ldots \land B_n \quad H_0 \lor H_1 \lor \neg B_0 \lor \ldots \lor \neg B_n \]

Here, when we know the body is true, we know that either \( H_0 \lor H_1 \) is true—this means we need to consider both possibilities.

Extending Datalog to include disjunction in the head is called disjunctive Datalog and is much more complex.
Datalog Programs

- Consist of **facts** and **rules**

- Facts stipulate extensionally-known data
  
  - Form “input” database, real impls. don’t generally have many facts (instead loaded via CSV)

  - Formal Datalog: facts must be “flat,” i.e., relation arguments must be atoms

- Rules: if everything in the body is true, then head is true
Rules

• Must be Horn-clauses

  • \( P(x, \ldots) \leftarrow Q(y, \ldots), R(z, \ldots) \)

• Head implied by conjunction (and) of body clauses

• Variables in head must be **ground** (appear in body)

• Negation is **not** allowed, except when stratified

  • Stratified negation easy to add metatheoretically: run stratified stuff first; then treat it as an EDB
Datalog Applications — Graph Mining

- **k-Clique** computation (e.g., big social network graphs)

  
  two_clique(x, y) :- edge(x,y), edge(y,x).
  three_clique(x,y,z) :- two_clique(x,y), two_clique(x,z), two_clique(y,z)
  four_clique(a,b,c,d) :- three_clique(a,b,c), two_clique(a,d), ...

- **Pagerank, SSSP, and Connected Components** can be calculated if we also add *recursive aggregation*

  
  - Yihao will discuss this in several weeks.

  - Datalog a popular implementation target for social-media mining and graph mining broadly.
Datalog Applications — Program Analysis

• Datalog’s rough expressive power is reachability-based analyses over graphs, where the graph structure is dynamic

• Most scalable points-to (and related) analysis to date (DOOP, cclyzer, ddisasm) use Soufflé — fast single-node compilation

• Scales to hundreds of thousands of lines in hours, variety of experimental context sensitivities

```c
void a(Foo *x) {
    x.f(0);
}

void b(Foo *x) {
    x.f(1);
}

int main() {
    Baz *baz = new Baz();
    Bar *bar = new Bar();
    a(baz);
    b(bar);
}
```
Datalog Applications — Business Analytics/Databases

• Datalog is roughly the backend structure of many business analytics platforms.

• Lots of industry applications consisting of ad-hoc implementations that scale to things like customer logs, etc…

Datomic: high-speed in-memory (memcached) database via Datalog

Datamic
Data, meet Simple
Semantics of Datalog

• Typically given via an extensional (model-theoretic) and intensional (iteration to a fixed-point up a lattice) semantics

• **Model-theoretic semantics** gives ground truth, but does not immediately lend itself to efficient calculation
  
  • Can argue about universal properties of models, etc…

• **Fixed-point semantics** gives operational semantics
  
  • Efficient implementation, semi-naive evaluation, etc…
Model-Theoretic Semantics

- A program $P$ consists of a set of $\textbf{Rules}$ and a set of $\textbf{Facts}$. There is a set of $\textbf{Predicates}$ whose arguments are variables or ground $\textbf{Terms}$

// Facts
edge(0,1). edge(1,2). edge(1,3). edge(2,4). edge(3,4).

// Rules — $A \leftarrow B \land C \land \ldots$
path(x, y) :- edge(x, y).
pth(x, y) :- path(x, z), edge(z, y).

$\textbf{Preds} = \{\text{path, edge}\}$
$\textbf{Terms} = \{0,1,2,3,4\}$
Model-Theoretic Semantics

- A program P consists of a set of **Rules** and a set of **Facts**. There is a set of **Predicates** whose arguments are variables or ground **Terms**

- The **Herbrand base** is the set of all ground instances of predicates from terms in the program

```plaintext
// Facts
edge(0,1). edge(1,2). edge(1,3). edge(2,4). edge(3,4).

// Rules – A <- B \ C \ ...
path(x, y) :- edge(x, y).
path(x, y) :- path(x, z), edge(z, y).
```

**Herbrand base is**

\{edge(0,0), ..., edge(4,4), path(0,0), ..., path(4,4)\}
Model-Theoretic Semantics

• A program P consists of a set of **Rules** and a set of **Facts**. There is a set of **Predicates** whose arguments are variables or ground **Terms**

• The **Herbrand base** is the set of all ground instances of predicates from terms in the program

• The Herbrand base forms a *lattice* (it is a set!)—join is $\cup$, meet is $\cap$, ordering is via inclusion

• The Herbrand base is **finite**
Herbrand Interpretations

• Any subset of the Herbrand base forms an **interpretation**: a classification of ground atoms as either “true” or “false.”

• Interpretations do not have to be consistent with the program
Herbrand Interpretations

• Any subset of the Herbrand base forms an interpretation: a classification of ground atoms as either “true” or “false.”

• Interpretations do not have to be consistent with the program

\[
\begin{align*}
q(1) \\
p(x) :&= q(x)
\end{align*}
\]

Four possible Herbrand interpretations

\[
\{\}, \{p(1)\}, \{q(1)\}, \{p(1), q(1)\}
\]
Herbrand Models

- An interpretation is a **model** when every rule in the program is satisfied by the model.

\[
\begin{align*}
q(1) \\
p(x) &:~ q(x)
\end{align*}
\]

Four possible Herbrand interpretations

\[
\{
\} \quad \{p(1)\} \quad \{q(1)\} \quad \{p(1), q(1)\}
\]

*This one is a model*
Least Herbrand Models

- Model theory—semantics of P is its least Herbrand model

- Many (but not all) larger interpretations may also be models...

\[
\begin{align*}
q(1) \\
p(x) & : \neg q(x) \\
r(2)
\end{align*}
\]

\{q(1), r(2), p(1), q(2), p(2)\}  Another larger (not least) model

\{r(2), q(1), p(1), q(2)\}  Not a model (requires p(2))

\{q(1), p(1), r(2)\}  Least Herbrand model for P

\{\}  Not a model (too small)
Implementing Datalog

- You need a **tuple representation strategy** and a **computation strategy**

- Early 2000s: bddbddb, Whaley and Lam scale inclusion-based alias analysis to Java-sized systems via *Binary Decision Diagrams (BDDs)*

- Variable ordering posed a significant problem

- Modern implementations use relational algebra w/ explicit representation (tries)
Translation to Relational Algebra

• Datalog ~ superficial syntax on top of relational algebra

• Projection, Selection, Renaming, Joins, etc...

• Relational algebra is “just a bunch of for loops”

• We built modern processors to be good at dense loops over good trie-like data structures

\[
\text{path}(x, y) \leftarrow \text{edge}(x, y).
\]
\[
\text{path}(x, y) \leftarrow \text{path}(x, z), \text{edge}(z, y).
\]
\[
\text{for}(x \text{ in path}):
\]
\[
\text{for}(z \text{ in path}):
\]
\[
\text{for all } y \text{ such that } \text{edge}(z, y):
\]
\[
\text{insert } \text{path}(x, y)
\]
Fixed-Point Iteration

• Model theory gives us least-Herbrand models as an extensional representation of a Datalog program

• Computing this least-Herbrand model can be done via a fixed-point (operational, intensional) semantics

• Start with {}, add all facts (equiv: prepare an EDB), and then iterate each rule—Horn clauses force ground implications

```prolog
edge(0,1). edge(1,2).
path(x, y) :- edge(x, y).
path(x, y) :- path(x, z), edge(z, y).
```

{}``
Fixed-Point Iteration

- Model theory gives us least-Herbrand models as an extensional representation of a Datalog program.

- Computing this least-Herbrand model can be done via a fixed-point (operational, intensional) semantics.

- Start with {}, add all facts (equiv: prepare an EDB), and then iterate each rule—Horn clauses force ground implications.

```prolog
edge(0,1). edge(1,2).
path(x, y) :- edge(x, y).
path(x, y) :- path(x, z), edge(z, y).
```

```prolog
{}  {edge(0,1), edge(1,2)}
```
Fixed-Point Iteration

- Model theory gives us least-Herbrand models as an extensional representation of a Datalog program.

- Computing this least-Herbrand model can be done via a fixed-point (operational, intensional) semantics.

- Start with {}, add all facts (equiv: prepare an EDB), and then iterate each rule—Horn clauses force ground implications.

```
edge(0,1). edge(1,2).
pred(x, y) :- edge(x, y).
pred(x, y) :- path(x, z), edge(z, y).
```

\[
\{ \ldots, \text{path}(0,1), \text{path}(1,2) \} \\
\{ \text{edge}(0,1), \text{edge}(1,2) \}
\]
Fixed-Point Iteration

- Model theory gives us least-Herbrand models as an extensional representation of a Datalog program

- Computing this least-Herbrand model can be done via a fixed-point (operational, intensional) semantics

- Start with {}, add all facts (equiv: prepare an EDB), and then iterate each rule—Horn clauses force ground implications

  ```
  edge(0,1). edge(1,2).
  path(x, y) :- edge(x, y).
  path(x, y) :- path(x, z), edge(z, y).
  ```

  Iteration steps:

  - Initial: {} → {edge(0,1), edge(1,2)}
  - After first iteration: {..., path(0,1), path(1,2)}
  - After second iteration: {..., path(0,2)}
Fixed-Point = Least Herbrand Model

- Easy theorem to prove: define an \textit{immediate consequence} operator that derives immediate consequences of facts in program
  - Immediate consequence of fact is itself
  - Head is immediately consequence of ground bodies
  - By induction, iterating immediate consequence operator starting with \{} gives us a least-Herbrand interpretation
Modern Datalog Compilation

• Continued resurgences in Datalog: semi-naive evaluation, BDDs (Whaley et al.), compilation to relational algebra

• Modern engines work by generating compiled relational algebra kernels (for loops), pushes stress onto high-performance tuple representation

• Also join planning / RA compilation
Semi-Naive Evaluation

- Each iteration we **reexamine** lots of tuples
- Datalog is *monotonic*: each iteration strictly grows result
- Here: result is monotonically-increasing set of tuples
  - “Sets of tuples” is the **only** lattice DL supports!
- Thus, no need to look at old tuples; only need to consider new tuples that may cause rules to “fire”
Semi-Naive Evaluation
Semi-Naive Evaluation

First, discover all edges in path
Semi-Naive Evaluation

First, discover all edges in path

Now, find next iteration...

Those all go into $\Delta$, then move into full as a new iteration enters $\Delta$
Semi-Naive Evaluation

Eventually get to a point where nothing new can be discovered…
Semi-Naive Evaluation

At which point full contains the result set
Semi-Naive Evaluation

• Compiler adds delta versions (in below rule: join $\Delta$ with full, joining $\Delta$ with $\Delta$ doesn’t work—would force facts to be discovered at same iteration).
• Heads implicitly add to “fresh” version, which becomes delta at end of each iteration
• After each iteration, delta merged into free; free becomes the “fresh” tuples

\[
\begin{align*}
p(x) & \text{ :- } q(x), s(x) \\
p(x) & \text{ :- } q_{\text{delta}}(x), s_{\text{full}}(x)
\end{align*}
\]
Partitioning

• We are forced to do one of the following:

  • \[(p \ x \ y \ z) \leftarrow (r \ x \ y) \ (int\_rel \ x \ y \ z)\]
    \[(int\_rel \ x \ y \ z) \leftarrow (q \ x \ z) \ (g \ y \ z)\]

  • \[(p \ x \ y \ z) \leftarrow (int\_rel \ x \ y \ z) \ (g \ y \ z)\]
    \[(int\_rel \ x \ y \ z) \leftarrow (r \ x \ y) \ (q \ x \ z)\]
Partitioning contd...

• \[(p \times y \times z) \leftarrow (r \times x \times y) (q \times x \times z) (g \times y \times z)\]

• \[(p \times y \times z) \leftarrow (r \times x \times y) (\text{int}_\text{rel} \times x \times y \times z)\]
  \[(\text{int}_\text{rel} \times x \times y \times z) \leftarrow (q \times x \times z) (g \times y \times z)\]

  • Good if we expect a small number of zs shared between q and g

• \[(p \times y \times z) \leftarrow (\text{int}_\text{rel} \times x \times y \times z) (g \times y \times z)\]
  \[(\text{int}_\text{rel} \times x \times y \times z) \leftarrow (r \times x \times y) (q \times x \times z)\]

  • Good if we expect a small number of xs shared between r and q
Partitioning is akin to let*

\[ \begin{align*}
\cdot & \quad [(p \times y z) \leftarrow \\
\quad & \quad (a \times y) ;; \text{and last this} \\
\quad & \quad \ldots (b \times z) ;; \text{then this} \\
\quad & \quad \ldots (c \times y) (d \times y z)] ;; \text{first compute this join}
\end{align*} \]

- Partitioning adds **sequential** cost—tuples in intermediate relation must propagate to outer joins
Tree Partitioning

• Other partitioning strategies exist, e.g., could partition into a tree, which may expose parallelism in sub-binary-joins that can be done in parallel