

# Propositional Logic - Decision Procedures

K. Subramani<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Lane Department of Computer Science and Electrical Engineering  
West Virginia University

28 January

- 1 Decision Procedures
  - Simple Decision Procedures
  - Reconsidering the Truth-Table Method
  - The Resolution Procedure
  - The Davis Putnam Logemann Loveland procedure

# Decision Procedures

# Decision Procedures

## Main Issues

Our goal in the Satisfiability problem, is to check if a given formula in propositional logic has *any* interpretation which makes it **true**.

# Decision Procedures

## Main Issues

Our goal in the Satisfiability problem, is to check if a given formula in propositional logic has *any* interpretation which makes it **true**. This is different from the Validity problem, where the goal is to check that all assignments are satisfying.

# Decision Procedures

## Main Issues

Our goal in the Satisfiability problem, is to check if a given formula in propositional logic has *any* interpretation which makes it **true**. This is different from the Validity problem, where the goal is to check that all assignments are satisfying. However, decision procedures for Validity can be used for Satisfiability!

# Decision Procedures

## Main Issues

Our goal in the Satisfiability problem, is to check if a given formula in propositional logic has *any* interpretation which makes it **true**. This is different from the Validity problem, where the goal is to check that all assignments are satisfying. However, decision procedures for Validity can be used for Satisfiability! How?

# Outline

- 1 Decision Procedures
  - Simple Decision Procedures
  - Reconsidering the Truth-Table Method
  - The Resolution Procedure
  - The Davis Putnam Logemann Loveland procedure



# Simple Decision Procedures

# Simple Decision Procedures

Naive methods

# Simple Decision Procedures

Naive methods

# Simple Decision Procedures

## Naive methods

- (i) Truth tables.

# Simple Decision Procedures

## Naive methods

- (i) Truth tables.
- (ii) Semantic arguments (proof tactics).

# Outline

- 1 Decision Procedures
  - Simple Decision Procedures
  - Reconsidering the Truth-Table Method
  - The Resolution Procedure
  - The Davis Putnam Logemann Loveland procedure

# A more sophisticated approach

## A more sophisticated approach

Refining exhaustive search



## A more sophisticated approach

### Refining exhaustive search

- (i) Need to generate only one row at a time.

## A more sophisticated approach

### Refining exhaustive search

- (i) Need to generate only one row at a time.
- (ii) Exploit disjunctive self-reducibility.

## A more sophisticated approach

### Refining exhaustive search

- (i) Need to generate only one row at a time.
- (ii) Exploit disjunctive self-reducibility.

### Example

Is the following formula satisfiable?

## A more sophisticated approach

### Refining exhaustive search

- (i) Need to generate only one row at a time.
- (ii) Exploit disjunctive self-reducibility.

### Example

Is the following formula satisfiable?

$$F : (P \rightarrow Q) \wedge P \wedge \neg Q$$

## A more sophisticated approach

### Refining exhaustive search

- (i) Need to generate only one row at a time.
- (ii) Exploit disjunctive self-reducibility.

### Example

Is the following formula satisfiable?

$$F : (P \rightarrow Q) \wedge P \wedge \neg Q$$

### Example

Is the following formula satisfiable?

## A more sophisticated approach

### Refining exhaustive search

- (i) Need to generate only one row at a time.
- (ii) Exploit disjunctive self-reducibility.

### Example

Is the following formula satisfiable?

$$F : (P \rightarrow Q) \wedge P \wedge \neg Q$$

### Example

Is the following formula satisfiable?

$$G : (P \rightarrow Q) \wedge \neg P$$

# Outline

- 1 **Decision Procedures**
  - Simple Decision Procedures
  - Reconsidering the Truth-Table Method
  - **The Resolution Procedure**
  - The Davis Putnam Logemann Loveland procedure

# The Resolution Procedure



# The Resolution Procedure

## Main Ideas

# The Resolution Procedure

## Main Ideas

Resolution is a technique that works on formulas in CNF.

# The Resolution Procedure

## Main Ideas

Resolution is a technique that works on formulas in CNF. It is based on the following observation:

# The Resolution Procedure

## Main Ideas

Resolution is a technique that works on formulas in CNF. It is based on the following observation: If clause  $C_1$  contains the literal  $x_i$  and clause  $C_2$  contains the literal  $\neg x_i$ , then in any satisfying assignment, either the rest of  $C_1$  must be satisfied or the rest of  $C_2$  must be satisfied.

# The Resolution Procedure

## Main Ideas

Resolution is a technique that works on formulas in CNF. It is based on the following observation: If clause  $C_1$  contains the literal  $x_i$  and clause  $C_2$  contains the literal  $\neg x_i$ , then in any satisfying assignment, either the rest of  $C_1$  must be satisfied or the rest of  $C_2$  must be satisfied. Therefore, the clause  $C_1[\perp] \vee C_2[\perp]$  can be added as a conjunction to the original CNF formula to produce an equivalent formula still in CNF.

# The Resolution Procedure

## Main Ideas

Resolution is a technique that works on formulas in CNF. It is based on the following observation: If clause  $C_1$  contains the literal  $x_i$  and clause  $C_2$  contains the literal  $\neg x_i$ , then in any satisfying assignment, either the rest of  $C_1$  must be satisfied or the rest of  $C_2$  must be satisfied. Therefore, the clause  $C_1[\perp] \vee C_2[\perp]$  can be added as a conjunction to the original CNF formula to produce an equivalent formula still in CNF. In other words, we are using the following proof rule:

# The Resolution Procedure

## Main Ideas

Resolution is a technique that works on formulas in CNF. It is based on the following observation: If clause  $C_1$  contains the literal  $x_i$  and clause  $C_2$  contains the literal  $\neg x_i$ , then in any satisfying assignment, either the rest of  $C_1$  must be satisfied or the rest of  $C_2$  must be satisfied. Therefore, the clause  $C_1[\perp] \vee C_2[\perp]$  can be added as a conjunction to the original CNF formula to produce an equivalent formula still in CNF. In other words, we are using the following proof rule:

$$\frac{C_1[P] \quad C_2[\neg P]}{C_1[\perp] \vee C_2[\perp]}$$

# The Resolution Procedure

## Main Ideas

Resolution is a technique that works on formulas in CNF. It is based on the following observation: If clause  $C_1$  contains the literal  $x_i$  and clause  $C_2$  contains the literal  $\neg x_i$ , then in any satisfying assignment, either the rest of  $C_1$  must be satisfied or the rest of  $C_2$  must be satisfied. Therefore, the clause  $C_1[\perp] \vee C_2[\perp]$  can be added as a conjunction to the original CNF formula to produce an equivalent formula still in CNF. In other words, we are using the following proof rule:

$$\frac{C_1[P] \quad C_2[\neg P]}{C_1[\perp] \vee C_2[\perp]}$$

The resultant clause is called the **resolvent** and it is deduced from the original formula.



# The Resolution Procedure

## Main Ideas

Resolution is a technique that works on formulas in CNF. It is based on the following observation: If clause  $C_1$  contains the literal  $x_i$  and clause  $C_2$  contains the literal  $\neg x_i$ , then in any satisfying assignment, either the rest of  $C_1$  must be satisfied or the rest of  $C_2$  must be satisfied. Therefore, the clause  $C_1[\perp] \vee C_2[\perp]$  can be added as a conjunction to the original CNF formula to produce an equivalent formula still in CNF. In other words, we are using the following proof rule:

$$\frac{C_1[P] \quad C_2[\neg P]}{C_1[\perp] \vee C_2[\perp]}$$

The resultant clause is called the **resolvent** and it is deduced from the original formula. Note that if  $\perp$  is ever deduced, then the original formula **must** be unsatisfiable.

# The Resolution Procedure

## Main Ideas

Resolution is a technique that works on formulas in CNF. It is based on the following observation: If clause  $C_1$  contains the literal  $x_i$  and clause  $C_2$  contains the literal  $\neg x_i$ , then in any satisfying assignment, either the rest of  $C_1$  must be satisfied or the rest of  $C_2$  must be satisfied. Therefore, the clause  $C_1[\perp] \vee C_2[\perp]$  can be added as a conjunction to the original CNF formula to produce an equivalent formula still in CNF. In other words, we are using the following proof rule:

$$\frac{C_1[P] \quad C_2[\neg P]}{C_1[\perp] \vee C_2[\perp]}$$

The resultant clause is called the **resolvent** and it is deduced from the original formula. Note that if  $\perp$  is ever deduced, then the original formula **must** be unsatisfiable. If every possible resolution produces a clause that is either an original clause or a previously deduced clause, then the original formula must be satisfiable.

# Examples

# Examples

## Example

Are the following formulas satisfiable?

# Examples

## Example

Are the following formulas satisfiable?

(i)  $F : (\neg P \vee Q) \wedge P \wedge \neg Q.$

# Examples

## Example

Are the following formulas satisfiable?

(i)  $F : (\neg P \vee Q) \wedge P \wedge \neg Q.$

(ii)  $G : (\neg P \vee Q) \wedge \neg Q.$

# Outline

- 1 Decision Procedures
  - Simple Decision Procedures
  - Reconsidering the Truth-Table Method
  - The Resolution Procedure
  - The Davis Putnam Logemann Loveland procedure

# The DPLL procedure



# The DPLL procedure

## Main Ideas

# The DPLL procedure

## Main Ideas

- (i) Uses Unit resolution and Boolean Constraint Propagation (BCP).

# The DPLL procedure

## Main Ideas

- (i) Uses Unit resolution and Boolean Constraint Propagation (BCP).
- (ii) The resolvent always replaces one of the two clauses,

# The DPLL procedure

## Main Ideas

- (i) Uses Unit resolution and Boolean Constraint Propagation (BCP).
- (ii) The resolvent always replaces one of the two clauses, i.e., the formula becomes smaller.

# The DPLL procedure

## Main Ideas

- (i) Uses Unit resolution and Boolean Constraint Propagation (BCP).
- (ii) The resolvent always replaces one of the two clauses, i.e., the formula becomes smaller.

$$\frac{\{l\} \quad C_1[\neg l]}{C_1[\perp]}$$

# Examples

# Examples

## Example

Is the following formula satisfiable?

# Examples

## Example

Is the following formula satisfiable?

$$P \wedge (\neg P \vee Q) \wedge (R \vee \neg Q \vee S).$$



# Examples

## Example

Is the following formula satisfiable?

$$P \wedge (\neg P \vee Q) \wedge (R \vee \neg Q \vee S).$$

## Note

*Assume that a variable  $P$  appears only positively or only negatively. An easy optimization is to remove clauses in which this variable appears.*

# Examples

## Example

Is the following formula satisfiable?

$$P \wedge (\neg P \vee Q) \wedge (R \vee \neg Q \vee S).$$

## Note

*Assume that a variable  $P$  appears only positively or only negatively. An easy optimization is to remove clauses in which this variable appears.*

## Example

Are the following formulas satisfiable?

# Examples

## Example

Is the following formula satisfiable?

$$P \wedge (\neg P \vee Q) \wedge (R \vee \neg Q \vee S).$$

## Note

*Assume that a variable  $P$  appears only positively or only negatively. An easy optimization is to remove clauses in which this variable appears.*

## Example

Are the following formulas satisfiable?

# Examples

## Example

Is the following formula satisfiable?

$$P \wedge (\neg P \vee Q) \wedge (R \vee \neg Q \vee S).$$

## Note

*Assume that a variable  $P$  appears only positively or only negatively. An easy optimization is to remove clauses in which this variable appears.*

## Example

Are the following formulas satisfiable?

(i)

$$P \wedge (\neg P \vee Q) \wedge (R \vee \neg Q \vee S).$$

## Examples

## Example

Is the following formula satisfiable?

$$P \wedge (\neg P \vee Q) \wedge (R \vee \neg Q \vee S).$$

## Note

*Assume that a variable  $P$  appears only positively or only negatively. An easy optimization is to remove clauses in which this variable appears.*

## Example

Are the following formulas satisfiable?

(i)

$$P \wedge (\neg P \vee Q) \wedge (R \vee \neg Q \vee S).$$

(ii)

$$(\neg P \vee Q \vee R) \wedge (\neg Q \vee R) \wedge (\neg Q \vee \neg R) \wedge (P \vee \neg Q \vee \neg R).$$