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## Invariants: <br> The Golden Thread of Science

## Science is characterized by

- Observing an invariant, a law, etc...
- Proving that it is true
- Exploiting it to solve problems


## Biology/Chemistry is no more about Petri dish \& test tube than Computer Science is about programming

- What is an invariant?
- Bet on color of the bean
- Efficiency of PTPs
- Design a good database
- Diagnose leukemia
- Make computers safer
- Problem solving by logical reasoning on invariants
- Fixing db design by rectifying violation of invariants
- Guilt by association of invariants
- Rootkit detection by monitoring violation of invariants


## What is an invariant?

- Suppose you have a bag of $x$ red beans and $y$ green beans
- Repeat the following:
- Remove 2 beans
- If both green, discard both
- If both red, discard one, put back one
- If one green and one red, discard red, put back green
- If one bean is left behind, can you predict its colour?


## Bet on the last green bean

- Suppose you have a bag of $x$ red beans and $y$ green beans
- Repeat the following:
- Remove 2 beans
- If both green, discard both
- If both red, discard one, put back one
- If one green and one red, discard red, put back green
- If one bean is left behind, - y remains odd can you predict its colour? $\Rightarrow$ Last bean must be green!


## Bet on the last red bean

- Suppose you have a bag of $x$ red beans and $y$ green beans
- Repeat the following:
- Remove 2 beans
- If both green, discard both
- If both red, discard one, put back one
- If one green and one red, discard red, put back green
- If one bean is left behind, - y remains even can you predict its colour? $\Rightarrow$ Last bean must be red!


## Bet on color of the last bean ... and

- Suppose you have a bag of $x$ red beans and $y$ green beans
- Repeat the following:
- Remove 2 beans
- If both green, discard both
- If both red, discard one, put back one
- If one green and one red, discard red, put back green
- If one bean is left behind, can you predict its colour?
- If you start w/ odd \# (even \#) of green beans, there will always be an odd \# (even \#) of green beans in the bag
$\Rightarrow$ Parity of green beans is invariant
$\Rightarrow$ Bean left behind is green iff you start with odd \# of green beans


## - What have we just seen?

- Problem solving by logical reasoning on invariants


## Science is characterized by ...

## Observing an invariant: Parity of green beans is invariant

## Bet on the last red bean

- Suppose you have a bag of $x$ red beans and $y$ green beans
Proving it:

> Exploit it to solve problems: Predict colour of the last bean

## Why are some PTPs inefficient?

## Protein Tyrosine Phosphatase

 of Singapore>gi|00000|FTPA-D2

## Sequence from a typical PTP

EEEFKKLTGIKIQNDFMPTGNLPANMEKWRWLQI IPYEFNRUI IPWKRGEENTDYWNASF
 GYGDITUELKFEEEGEGYTWRDLLUTWTRENKGFQIFQFHFHGWPEWGIFGDGKGMIGII
 MUGLEGYEFGYKUTGEYIDAFGDYANFK

- Some PTPs are much less efficient than others
- Why? And how do you figure out which mutations cause the loss of efficiency?


## Reasoning based on an invariant...20



## Key Mutation Site：PTP D1 vs D2

？！？？
？
？2？

| gi｜00000｜P | D2 |
| :--- | :--- |
| gi｜126467｜ |  |
| gi｜2499753 |  |
| gi｜462550｜ |  |
| gi｜2499751 |  |
| gi｜1709906 | D1 |
| gi｜126471｜ |  |
| gi｜548626｜ |  |
| gi｜131570｜ |  |
| gi｜2144715 |  |

QF HF HGWPEVGIPSDGKGMIS I IAAVQKQQQQ－SGNHP ITVHCSAGAGRTGTFCALSTVL QFHFTSTWPDFGVPFTP IGMLKFLKKVKACNP－－QYAGAIVVHCSAGVGRTGTFVVIDAML QF HF TGWPDHGVPYHATGLLSF IRRVKLSNP－－PSAGP IVVHCSAGAGRTGCYIVID IML QYHYTQWPD MGVPEYALPVLTFVRRSSAARM－－PETGPVLVHCSAGVGRTGTYIVIDSML QFHFTSWPDHGVPDTTDLL INFRYLVRDYMKQSPPESPILVHCSAGVGRTGTFIAIDRLI QFQFTATWPDHGVPEHPTPFLAFLRRVKTCNP－－PDAGPMVVHCSAGVGRTGCF IVIDAML QLHFTSWPDFGVPFTPIGMLKFLKKVKTLNP－－VHAGP IVVHCSAGVGRTGTF IVIDAMM QFHFTGWPDHGVPYHATGLLSF IRRVKLSNP－－PSAGPIVVHCSAGAGRTGCYIVIDIML QFHFTGWPDHGVPYHATGLLGFVRQVKSKSP－－PNAGPLVVHCSAGAGRTGCF IVIDIML QFHFTSWPDHGVPDTTDLL INFRYLVRDYMKQSPPESPILVHCSAGVGRTGTFIAIDRLI ＊．．＊＊．＊．＊
－Positions marked by＂！＂and＂？＂are likely places responsible for reduced PTP activity
－All PTP D1 agree on them
－All PTP D2 disagree on them

## Confirmation by Mutagenesis Exp

- Wet expts to confirm the prediction
- Mutate D $\rightarrow$ E in D1
- i.e., check if $D \rightarrow E$ can cause efficiency loss
- Mutate $\mathrm{E} \rightarrow \mathrm{D}$ in D 2
- i.e., show $D \rightarrow E$ is the cause of efficiency loss


## Impact: <br> Hundreds of mutagenesis expts saved by simple reasoning on (violation of) invariants!

## What is a good database design?

## Relational Data Model

## Contracts



## Design Issues

- How many possible alternate ways to represent movies using tables?
- Why this particular set of tables to represent movies?
- Indeed, why not use this alternative single table below to represent movies?

Wrong Movies

| Title | Year | Length | Film Type | Studio | Star |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Star Wars | 1997 | 124 | Color | Fox | Carrie Fisher |
| Star Wars | 1997 | 124 | Color | Fox | Mark Hamill |
| Star Wars | 1997 | 124 | Color | Fox | Harrison Ford |
| Mighty Ducks | 1991 | 104 | Color | Disney | Emilio Estevez |

## Anomalies

- What's wrong with the "Wrong Movies" table? Wrong Movies

| Title | Year | Length | Film Type | Studio | Star |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Star Wars | 1997 | 124 | Color | Fox | Carrie Fisher |
| Star Wars | 1997 | 124 | Color | Fox | Mark Hamill |
| Star Wars | 1997 | 124 | Color | Fox | Harrison Ford |
| Mighty Ducks | 1991 | 104 | Color | Disney | Emilio Estevez |

- Redundancy: Unnecessary repetition of info
- Update anomalies: If Star Wars is 125 min, we might carelessly update row 1 but not rows 2 \& 3
- Deletion anomalies: If Emilio Estevez is deleted from stars of Mighty Ducks, we lose all info on that movie


## Some Interesting Questions

- How to differentiate a good database design from a bad one?
- How to produce a good database design automatically from a bad one?


## Functional Dependency

- Functional dependency $\left(A_{1}, \ldots, A_{n} \rightarrow B_{1}, \ldots, B_{m}\right)$
- If two rows of a table $R$ agree on attributes $A_{1}, \ldots, A_{n}$, then they must also agree on attributes $\mathrm{B}_{1}, \ldots, \mathrm{~B}_{\mathrm{m}}$
$\Rightarrow$ Values of B's depend on values of A's
- $F D\left(A_{1}, \ldots, A_{n} \rightarrow B_{1}, \ldots, B_{m}\right)$ is trivial if a $B_{i}$ is an $A_{j}$

Wrong Movies

| Title | Year | Length | Film Type | Studio | Star |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Star Wars | 1997 | 124 | Color | Fox | Carrie Fisher |
| Star Wars | 1997 | 124 | Color | Fox | Mark Hamill |
| Star Wars | 1997 | 124 | Color | Fox | Harrison Ford |
| Mighty Ducks | 1991 | 104 | Color | Disney | Emilio Estevez |

- Example: Title, Year $\rightarrow$ Length, Film Type, Studio
- Key is a minimal set of attributes $\left\{A_{1}, \ldots, A_{n}\right\}$ that functionally determine all other attributes of a table
- Superkey is a set of attributes that contains a key

Wrong Movies

| Title | Year | Length | Film Type | Studio | Star |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Star Wars | 1997 | 124 | Color | Fox | Carrie Fisher |
| Star Wars | 1997 | 124 | Color | Fox | Mark Hamill |
| Star Wars | 1997 | 124 | Color | Fox | Harrison Ford |
| Mighty Ducks | 1991 | 104 | Color | Disney | Emilio Estevez |

- Example superkey: Any set of attributes that contains \{Title, Year, Star\} as a subset


## Boyce-Codd Normal Form

- A relation $R$ is in Boyce-Codd Normal Form iff whenever there is a nontrivial FD $\left(A_{1}, \ldots, A_{n} \rightarrow B_{1}\right.$, $\ldots, B_{m}$ ) for $R$, it is the case that $\left\{A_{1}, \ldots, A_{n}\right\}$ is a superkey for $R$
- Theorem (Codd, 1972)

A database design has no anomalies due to FD iff all its relations are in Boyce-Codd Normal Form

## How is BCNF violated here?

| Title | Year | Length | Film Type | Studio | Star |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Star Wars | 1997 | 124 | Color | Fox | Carrie Fisher |
| Star Wars | 1997 | 124 | Color | Fox | Mark Hamill |
| Star Wars | 1997 | 124 | Color | Fox | Harrison Ford |
| Mighty Ducks | 1991 | 104 | Color | Disney | Emilio Estevez |

- A nontrivial FD:
- Title, Year $\rightarrow$ Length, Film Type, Studio
- The LHS not superset of the key \{Title, Year, Star\}
$\Rightarrow$ Violate BCNF!
- Anomalies are due to FD's whose LHS is not superkey


## Towards a Better Design

- Use an offending FD ( $\left.A_{1}, \ldots, A_{n} \rightarrow B_{1}, \ldots, B_{m}\right)$ to decompose $R\left(A_{1}, \ldots, A_{n}, B_{1}, \ldots, B_{m}, C_{1}, \ldots, C_{h}\right)$ into 2 tables

$$
\begin{aligned}
& -R_{1}\left(A_{1}, \ldots, A_{n}, B_{1}, \ldots, B_{m}\right) \\
& -R_{2}\left(A_{1}, \ldots, A_{n}, C_{1}, \ldots, C_{n}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$



Wrong Movies

| Title | Year | Length | Film Type | Studio | Star |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Star Wars | 1997 | 124 | Color | Fox | Carrie Fisher |
| Star Wars | 1997 | 124 | Color | Fox | Mark Hamill |
| Star Wars | 1997 | 124 | Color | Fox | Harrison Ford |
| Mighty Ducks | 1991 | 104 | Color | Disney | Emilio Estevez |


| Title | Year | Star |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Star Wars | 1997 | Carrie Fisher |
| Star Wars | 1997 | Mark Hamill |
| Star Wars | 1997 | Harrison Ford |
| Mighty Ducks | 1991 | Emilio Estevez |

## The "Invariant" Perspective

of Singapore

- The invariants:

BCNF is an invariant of a good database design

- The lesson learned:


## Deliver a better database design by fixing violated invariants

## Impact

## ORACLE CORPORATION

Q3 FISCAL 2010 FINANCIAL RESULTS CONDENSED CONSOLIDATED STATEMENTS OF OPERATIONS
(\$ in millions, except per share data)

|  | Three Months Ended February 28, |  |  |  |  |  | \% Increase <br> (Decrease) in US \$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2010 |  | \% of Revenues |  | 2009 | \% of Revenues |  |
| REVENUES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| New software licenses | $\$$ | 1,718 | 27\% | \$ | 1,516 | 28\% | 13\% |
| Software license updates and product support |  | 3,297 | 51\% |  | 2,917 | 53\% | 13\% |
| Software Revenues |  | 5,015 | 78\% |  | 4,433 | 81\% | 13\% |
| Hardware systems products |  | 273 | 4\% |  | - | 0\% | * |
| Hardware systems support |  | 185 | 3\% |  | - | 0\% | * |
| Hardware Systems Revenues |  | 458 | 7\% |  | - | 0\% | * |
| Services |  | 931 | 15\% |  | 1,020 | 19\% | (9\%) |
| Total Revenues |  | 6,404 | 100\% |  | 5,453 | 100\% | 17\% |

## Diagnosing Leukemias



## Some Patient Samples



- Does Mr. A have cancer?


## Let's rearrange the rows...



- Does Mr. A have cancer?


## and the columns too...



## Invariant Profile of Leukomia Subtye Invariant Profile of Leukemia Subtypes ${ }^{*=}$



## - What have we just seen?

- Guilt by association of invariants


## Exploit Invariant Gene Expr Profiles <br> National University of Singapore

- Low-intensity treatment applied to $50 \%$ of patients
- Intermediate-intensity treatment to 40\% of patients
- High-intensity treatment to $10 \%$ of patients
$\Rightarrow$ Reduced side effects
$\Rightarrow$ Reduced relapse
$\Rightarrow$ 75-80\% cure rates
- US\$36m (US\$36k * 2000 * 50\%) for low intensity
- US\$48m (US\$60k * 2000 * 40\%) for intermediate intensity
- US\$14.4m (US\$72k * 2000 * 10\%) for high intensity
- Total US\$98.4m/yr
$\Rightarrow$ Save US\$51.6m/yr, compared to applying intermediate-intensity treatment to everyone


## How to make computers safer?

## COMPUTERWORLD

## RSA: Microsoft on 'rootkits': Be afraid, be very afraid <br> Rootkits are a new generation of powerful system-monitoring programs

News Story by Paul Roberts
FEBRUARY 17, 2005 (IDG NEWS SERVICE) - Microsoft Corp. security researchers are waming about a new generation of powerful system-monitoring programs, or "rootkits," that are almost impossible to detect using current security products and could pose a serious risk to corporations and individuals .......the only reliable way to remove kernel rootkits is to completely erase an infected hard drive and reinstall the operating system from scratch......

## Rootkit Problem

- Traditional rootkits • Modern rootkits
- Modify static scalar invariants in OS
- kernel text
- interrupt table
- syscall table
- Direct Kernel Object Manipulation (DKOM)
- Rather than modify scalar invariants in OS, dynamic data of kernel are modified to:
- Hide processes
- Increase privilege level


## Credit: Bill Arbaugh

## Hiding a window process



## Semantic integrity

- Current integrity monitoring systems focus on the scalar / static nature of the monitored data
- Don't work for non-scalar / dynamic data
- Semantic integrity
- Monitor non-invariant portions of a system via predicates that remain valid during the proper operation of the system
- I.e., monitor invariant dynamic properties!


## DKOM Example

- Semantic integrity predicate (ie., dynamic invariant) is

- There is no thread such that its parent process is not on the process list


## $\Rightarrow$ kHIVE (contains 20k other predicates)



## - What have we just seen?

- Maintain computer safety by checking violation of invariants!


## Impact

- 2008: Komoku (kHIVE) acquired by Microsoft
- 2009: Put into MS Security Essentials (~4m hosts)
- 2010: Put into Windows Update ( $\sim 500 \mathrm{~m}$ hosts)
"There is no other field out there where you can get right out of university and define substantial aspects of a product that is going to go out and over 100 million people are going to use it". ---Bill Gate


## Remarks

## What have we learned?

 of Singapore- Invariant is a fundamental property of many problems
- Paradigms of problem solving
- Problem solving by logical reasoning on invariants
- Problem solving by rectifying/monitoring violation of invariants
- Guilt by association of invariants


## Computer Science is no more about programming than Biology/Chemistry is about Petri dish \& test tube

