

The Calculus of Computation

Zohar Manna

Spring 2009

Lecturer:

Zohar Manna (manna@cs.stanford.edu)

Calculus of Computation?

*It is reasonable to hope that the relationship between **computation** and **mathematical logic** will be as fruitful in the next century as that between **analysis** and **physics** in the last. The development of this relationship demands a concern for both applications and mathematical elegance.*

John McCarthy

A Basis for a Mathematical Theory of Computation, 1963

Assignment #1

- ▶ 1.1 e, f [10 points each]
- ▶ 1.2 s, x [10 points each]
- ▶ 1.3 (note typo: the last \vee should be a \wedge) [30 points]
- ▶ 1.5 d [30 points]

THE CALCULUS OF COMPUTATION:
Decision Procedures with
Applications to Verification

by
Aaron Bradley
Zohar Manna

Springer 2007

There are two copies in CS-Math Library and you could also use `socrates.stanford.edu` to read the book according to its policy.

Copyrighted Material

Aaron R. Bradley
Zohar Manna

The Calculus of Computation

Decision Procedures
with Applications to Verification

 Springer

Copyrighted Material

Topics: Overview

1. First-Order logic
2. Specification and verification
3. Satisfiability decision procedures

Part I: Foundations

1. Propositional Logic
2. First-Order Logic
3. First-Order Theories
4. Induction
5. Program Correctness: Mechanics
Inductive assertion method, Ranking function method

Part II: Decision Procedures

7. Quantified Linear Arithmetic
Quantifier elimination for integers and rationals
8. Quantifier-Free Linear Arithmetic
Linear programming for rationals
9. Quantifier-Free Equality and Data Structures
10. Combining Decision Procedures
Nelson-Oppen combination method
11. Arrays
More than quantifier-free fragment

The Calculus of Computation

Zohar Manna

Spring 2009

Motivation

Motivation I

Decision Procedures are algorithms to decide formulae.

These formulae can arise

- ▶ in software verification.
- ▶ in hardware verification

Consider the following program:

```
for
  @  $l \leq i \leq u \wedge (rv \leftrightarrow \exists j. l \leq j < i \wedge a[j] = e)$ 
  (int  $i := l; i \leq u; i := i + 1$ ) {
  if ( $a[i] = e$ )  $rv := true$ ;
}
```

How can we decide whether the formula is a loop invariant?

Motivation II

Prove:

assume $l \leq i \leq u \wedge (rv \leftrightarrow \exists j. l \leq j < i \wedge a[j] = e)$

assume $i \leq u$

assume $a[i] = e$

$rv := \text{true};$

$i := i + 1$

@ $l \leq i \leq u \wedge (rv \leftrightarrow \exists j. l \leq j < i \wedge a[j] = e)$

Motivation III

assume $l \leq i \leq u \wedge (rv \leftrightarrow \exists j. l \leq j < i \wedge a[j] = e)$

assume $i \leq u$

assume $a[i] \neq e$

$i := i + 1$

@ $l \leq i \leq u \wedge (rv \leftrightarrow \exists j. l \leq j < i \wedge a[j] = e)$

A Hoare triple $\{P\} S \{Q\}$ holds, iff

$$P \rightarrow wp(S, Q)$$

(wp denotes “weakest precondition”)

Motivation IV

For assignments wp is computed by substitution:

$\text{assume } l \leq i \leq u \wedge (rv \leftrightarrow \exists j. l \leq j < i \wedge a[j] = e)$

$\text{assume } i \leq u$

$\text{assume } a[i] = e$

$rv := \text{true};$

$i := i + 1$

$@ l \leq i \leq u \wedge (rv \leftrightarrow \exists j. l \leq j < i \wedge a[j] = e)$

Substituting \top for rv and $i + 1$ for i , the postcondition (denoted by the $@$ symbol) holds if and only if:

$$l \leq i \leq u \wedge (rv \leftrightarrow \exists j. l \leq j < i \wedge a[j] = e) \wedge i \leq u \wedge a[i] = e \\ \rightarrow l \leq i + 1 \leq u \wedge (\top \leftrightarrow \exists j. l \leq j < i + 1 \wedge a[j] = e)$$

Motivation V

We need an algorithm that decides whether this formula holds. If the formula does not hold, the algorithm should give a counterexample; e.g.,

$$\ell = 0, i = 1, u = 1, rv = \textit{false}, a[0] = 0, a[1] = 1, e = 1.$$

We will discuss such algorithms in later lectures.

The Calculus of Computation

Zohar Manna

Spring 2009

Chapter 1: Propositional Logic (PL)

Propositional Logic (PL)

PL Syntax

Atom truth symbols \top (“true”) and \perp (“false”)
propositional variables $P, Q, R, P_1, Q_1, R_1, \dots$

Literal atom α or its negation $\neg\alpha$

Formula literal or application of a
logical connective to formulae F, F_1, F_2

$\neg F$ “not” (negation)

$F_1 \wedge F_2$ “and” (conjunction)

$F_1 \vee F_2$ “or” (disjunction)

$F_1 \rightarrow F_2$ “implies” (implication)

$F_1 \leftrightarrow F_2$ “if and only if” (iff)

Example:

formula $F : (P \wedge Q) \rightarrow (T \vee \neg Q)$

atoms: P, Q, T

literals: $P, Q, T, \neg Q$

subformulae: $P, Q, T, \neg Q, P \wedge Q, T \vee \neg Q, F$

abbreviation

$$F : P \wedge Q \rightarrow T \vee \neg Q$$

PL Semantics (meaning of PL)

Formula F + Interpretation I = Truth value
(true, false)

Interpretation

$$I : \{P \mapsto \text{true}, Q \mapsto \text{false}, \dots\}$$

Evaluation of F under I :

| F | $\neg F$ | |
|-----|----------|--|
| 0 | 1 | where 0 corresponds to value false 1 true |
| 1 | 0 | |

| F_1 | F_2 | $F_1 \wedge F_2$ | $F_1 \vee F_2$ | $F_1 \rightarrow F_2$ | $F_1 \leftrightarrow F_2$ |
|-------|-------|------------------|----------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |

Example:

$$F : P \wedge Q \rightarrow P \vee \neg Q$$

$$I : \{P \mapsto \text{true}, Q \mapsto \text{false}\} \quad \text{i.e., } I[P] = \text{true}, I[Q] = \text{false}$$

| P | Q | $\neg Q$ | $P \wedge Q$ | $P \vee \neg Q$ | F |
|-----|-----|----------|--------------|-----------------|-----|
| 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |

1 = true

0 = false

F evaluates to true under I ; i.e., $I[F] = \text{true}$.

Inductive Definition of PL's Semantics

$I \models F$ if F evaluates to true under I

$I \not\models F$ false

Base Case:

$I \models \top$ $I \not\models \perp$

$I \models P$ iff $I[P] = \text{true}$; i.e., P is true under I

$I \not\models P$ iff $I[P] = \text{false}$

Inductive Case:

$I \models \neg F$ iff $I \not\models F$

$I \models F_1 \wedge F_2$ iff $I \models F_1$ and $I \models F_2$

$I \models F_1 \vee F_2$ iff $I \models F_1$ or $I \models F_2$ (or both)

$I \models F_1 \rightarrow F_2$ iff $I \models F_1$ implies $I \models F_2$

$I \models F_1 \leftrightarrow F_2$ iff, $I \models F_1$ and $I \models F_2$,
or $I \not\models F_1$ and $I \not\models F_2$

Note:

$I \models F_1 \rightarrow F_2$ iff $I \not\models F_1$ or $I \models F_2$.

$I \not\models F_1 \rightarrow F_2$ iff $I \models F_1$ and $I \not\models F_2$.

$I \not\models F_1 \vee F_2$ iff $I \not\models F_1$ and $I \not\models F_2$.

Example of Inductive Reasoning:

$$F : P \wedge Q \rightarrow P \vee \neg Q$$

$$I : \{P \mapsto \text{true}, Q \mapsto \text{false}\}$$

1. $I \models P$ since $I[P] = \text{true}$
2. $I \not\models Q$ since $I[Q] = \text{false}$
3. $I \models \neg Q$ by 2 and \neg
4. $I \not\models P \wedge Q$ by 2 and \wedge
5. $I \models P \vee \neg Q$ by 1 and \vee
6. $I \models F$ by 4 and \rightarrow Why?

Thus, F is true under I .

Note: steps 1, 3, and 5 are nonessential.

Satisfiability and Validity

F satisfiable iff there exists an interpretation I such that $I \models F$.

F valid iff for all interpretations I , $I \models F$.

F is valid iff $\neg F$ is unsatisfiable

Goal: devise an algorithm to decide validity or unsatisfiability of formula F .

Method 1: Truth Tables

Example $F : P \wedge Q \rightarrow P \vee \neg Q$

| P | Q | $P \wedge Q$ | $\neg Q$ | $P \vee \neg Q$ | F |
|-----|-----|--------------|----------|-----------------|-----|
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |

Thus F is valid.

Example $F : P \vee Q \rightarrow P \wedge Q$

| P | Q | $P \vee Q$ | $P \wedge Q$ | F |
|-----|-----|------------|--------------|-----|
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |

← satisfying /

← falsifying /

Thus F is satisfiable, but invalid.

Method 2: Semantic Argument

- ▶ Assume F is not valid and I a falsifying interpretation:
 $I \not\models F$
- ▶ Apply proof rules.
- ▶ If no contradiction reached and no more rules applicable,
 F is invalid.
- ▶ If in every branch of proof a contradiction reached,
 F is valid.

Proof Rules for Semantic Arguments I

$$\frac{I \models \neg F}{I \not\models F}$$

$$\frac{I \not\models \neg F}{I \models F}$$

$$\frac{I \models F \wedge G}{I \models F}$$

←and

$$I \models G$$

$$\frac{I \not\models F \wedge G}{I \not\models F \mid I \not\models G}$$

↙or

$$\frac{I \models F \vee G}{I \models F \mid I \models G}$$

$$\frac{I \not\models F \vee G}{I \not\models F}$$
$$I \not\models G$$

Proof Rules for Semantic Arguments II

$$\frac{I \models F \rightarrow G}{I \not\models F \mid I \models G}$$

$$\frac{I \not\models F \rightarrow G}{I \models F}$$
$$I \not\models G$$

$$\frac{I \models F \leftrightarrow G}{I \models F \wedge G \mid I \not\models F \vee G}$$

$$\frac{I \not\models F \leftrightarrow G}{I \models F \wedge \neg G \mid I \models \neg F \wedge G}$$

$$I \models F$$

$$I \not\models F$$

$$\frac{}{I \models \perp}$$

Example: Prove

$F : P \wedge Q \rightarrow P \vee \neg Q$ is valid.

Let's assume that F is not valid and that I is a falsifying interpretation.

1. $I \not\models P \wedge Q \rightarrow P \vee \neg Q$ assumption
2. $I \models P \wedge Q$ 1 and \rightarrow
3. $I \not\models P \vee \neg Q$ 1 and \rightarrow
4. $I \models P$ 2 and \wedge
5. $I \not\models P$ 3 and \vee
6. $I \models \perp$ 4 and 5 are contradictory

Thus F is valid.

Example: Prove

$F : (P \rightarrow Q) \wedge (Q \rightarrow R) \rightarrow (P \rightarrow R)$ is valid.

Let's assume that F is not valid.

1. $I \not\models F$ assumption
2. $I \models (P \rightarrow Q) \wedge (Q \rightarrow R)$ 1 and \rightarrow
3. $I \not\models P \rightarrow R$ 1 and \rightarrow
4. $I \models P$ 3 and \rightarrow
5. $I \not\models R$ 3 and \rightarrow
6. $I \models P \rightarrow Q$ 2 and \wedge
7. $I \models Q \rightarrow R$ 2 and \wedge

- 6. $I \models P \rightarrow Q$ 2 and \wedge
- 7. $I \models Q \rightarrow R$ 2 and \wedge
- 8a. $I \not\models P$ 6 and \rightarrow (case a)
- 9a. $I \models \perp$ 4 and 8
- 8b. $I \models Q$ 6 and \rightarrow (case b)
- 9ba. $I \not\models Q$ 7 and \rightarrow (subcase ba)
- 10ba. $I \models \perp$ 8b and 9ba
- 9bb. $I \models R$ 7 and \rightarrow (subcase bb)
- 10bb. $I \models \perp$ 5 and 9bb
- 9b. $I \models \perp$ 10ba and 10bb
- 8. $I \models \perp$ 9a and 9b

Our assumption is contradictory in all cases, so F is valid.

Example 3: Is

$$F : P \vee Q \rightarrow P \wedge Q$$

valid? Assume F is not valid:

1. $I \not\models P \vee Q \rightarrow P \wedge Q$ assumption
2. $I \models P \vee Q$ 1 and \rightarrow
3. $I \not\models P \wedge Q$ 1 and \rightarrow
- 4a. $I \models P$ 2, \vee (case a)
- 5aa. $I \not\models P$ 3, \vee (subcase aa)
- 6aa. $I \models \perp$ 4a, 5aa
- 5ab. $I \not\models Q$ 3, \vee (subcase ab)
- 6ab. ?
- 5a. ?

- 4b. $I \models Q$ 2, \vee (case b)
- 5ba. $I \not\models P$ 3, \vee (subcase ba)
- 6ba. ?
- 5bb. $I \not\models Q$ 3, \vee (subcase bb)
- 6bb. $I \models \perp$ 4b, 5bb
- 5b. ?
5. ?

We cannot derive a contradiction in both cases (4a and 4b), so we cannot prove that F is valid. To demonstrate that F is not valid, however, we must find a falsifying interpretation (here are two):

$$I_1 : \{P \mapsto \text{true}, Q \mapsto \text{false}\} \quad I_2 : \{Q \mapsto \text{true}, P \mapsto \text{false}\}$$

Note: we have to derive a contradiction in all cases for F to be valid!

Equivalence

F_1 and F_2 are equivalent ($F_1 \Leftrightarrow F_2$)

iff for all interpretations I , $I \models F_1 \leftrightarrow F_2$

To prove $F_1 \Leftrightarrow F_2$, show $F_1 \leftrightarrow F_2$ is valid, that is, both $F_1 \rightarrow F_2$ and $F_2 \rightarrow F_1$ are valid.

F_1 entails F_2 ($F_1 \Rightarrow F_2$)

iff for all interpretations I , $I \models F_1 \rightarrow F_2$

Note: $F_1 \Leftrightarrow F_2$ and $F_1 \Rightarrow F_2$ are not formulae!!

Example: Show

$$P \rightarrow Q \Leftrightarrow \neg P \vee Q$$

i.e.

$$F : (P \rightarrow Q) \leftrightarrow (\neg P \vee Q) \text{ is valid.}$$

Assume F is not valid, then we have two cases:

Case a: $I \not\models \neg P \vee Q$,

$$I \models P \rightarrow Q$$

Case b: $I \models \neg P \vee Q$,

$$I \not\models P \rightarrow Q$$

Derive contradictions in both cases.

Normal Forms

1. Negation Normal Form (NNF)

\neg, \wedge, \vee are the only boolean connectives allowed.

Negations may occur only in literals of the form $\neg P$.

To transform F into equivalent F' in NNF, apply the following template equivalences recursively (and left-to-right):

$$\begin{aligned} \neg\neg F_1 &\Leftrightarrow F_1 & \neg\top &\Leftrightarrow \perp & \neg\perp &\Leftrightarrow \top \\ \neg(F_1 \wedge F_2) &\Leftrightarrow \neg F_1 \vee \neg F_2 \\ \neg(F_1 \vee F_2) &\Leftrightarrow \neg F_1 \wedge \neg F_2 & \left. \vphantom{\begin{aligned} \neg(F_1 \wedge F_2) \\ \neg(F_1 \vee F_2) \end{aligned}} \right\} & \text{De Morgan's Law} \\ F_1 \rightarrow F_2 &\Leftrightarrow \neg F_1 \vee F_2 \\ F_1 \leftrightarrow F_2 &\Leftrightarrow (F_1 \rightarrow F_2) \wedge (F_2 \rightarrow F_1) \end{aligned}$$

“Complete” syntactic restriction: every F has an equivalent F' in NNF.

Example: Convert

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

to NNF.

$$F' : \neg(\neg P \vee \neg(P \wedge Q)) \quad \rightarrow$$

$$F'' : \neg\neg P \wedge \neg\neg(P \wedge Q) \quad \text{De Morgan's Law}$$

$$F''' : P \wedge P \wedge Q \quad \neg\neg$$

F''' is equivalent to F ($F''' \Leftrightarrow F$) and is in NNF.

2. Disjunctive Normal Form (DNF)

Disjunction of conjunctions of literals

$$\bigvee_i \bigwedge_j l_{i,j} \quad \text{for literals } l_{i,j}$$

To convert F into equivalent F' in DNF,
transform F into NNF and then
use the following template equivalences (left-to-right):

$$\left. \begin{array}{l} (F_1 \vee F_2) \wedge F_3 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad (F_1 \wedge F_3) \vee (F_2 \wedge F_3) \\ F_1 \wedge (F_2 \vee F_3) \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad (F_1 \wedge F_2) \vee (F_1 \wedge F_3) \end{array} \right\} \textit{dist}$$

Note: formulae can grow exponentially as the distributivity laws are applied.

Example: Convert

$$F : (Q_1 \vee \neg\neg Q_2) \wedge (\neg R_1 \rightarrow R_2)$$

into equivalent DNF

$$F' : (Q_1 \vee Q_2) \wedge (R_1 \vee R_2) \quad \text{in NNF}$$

$$F'' : (Q_1 \wedge (R_1 \vee R_2)) \vee (Q_2 \wedge (R_1 \vee R_2)) \quad \text{dist}$$

$$F''' : (Q_1 \wedge R_1) \vee (Q_1 \wedge R_2) \vee (Q_2 \wedge R_1) \vee (Q_2 \wedge R_2) \quad \text{dist}$$

F''' is equivalent to F ($F''' \Leftrightarrow F$) and is in DNF.

3. Conjunctive Normal Form (CNF)

Conjunction of disjunctions of literals

$$\bigwedge_i \bigvee_j \ell_{i,j} \quad \text{for literals } \ell_{i,j}$$

To convert F into equivalent F' in CNF,
transform F into NNF and then
use the following template equivalences (left-to-right):

$$\begin{aligned}(F_1 \wedge F_2) \vee F_3 &\Leftrightarrow (F_1 \vee F_3) \wedge (F_2 \vee F_3) \\ F_1 \vee (F_2 \wedge F_3) &\Leftrightarrow (F_1 \vee F_2) \wedge (F_1 \vee F_3)\end{aligned}$$

A disjunction of literals is called a clause.

Example: Convert

$$F : P \leftrightarrow (Q \rightarrow R)$$

to an equivalent formula F' in CNF.

First get rid of \leftrightarrow :

$$F_1 : (P \rightarrow (Q \rightarrow R)) \wedge ((Q \rightarrow R) \rightarrow P)$$

Now replace \rightarrow with \vee :

$$F_2 : (\neg P \vee (\neg Q \vee R)) \wedge (\neg(\neg Q \vee R) \vee P)$$

Drop unnecessary parentheses and apply De Morgan's Law:

$$F_3 : (\neg P \vee \neg Q \vee R) \wedge ((\neg\neg Q \wedge \neg R) \vee P)$$

Simplify double negation (now in NNF):

$$F_4 : (\neg P \vee \neg Q \vee R) \wedge ((Q \wedge \neg R) \vee P)$$

Distribute disjunction over conjunction (now in CNF):

$$F' : (\neg P \vee \neg Q \vee R) \wedge (Q \vee P) \wedge (\neg R \vee P)$$

Equisatisfiability

Definition

F and F' are *equisatisfiable*, iff

F is satisfiable if and only if F' is satisfiable

Every formula is equisatisfiable to either \top or \perp .

Goal: Decide satisfiability of PL formula F

Step 1: Convert F to equisatisfiable formula F' in CNF

Step 2: Decide satisfiability of formula F' in CNF

Step 1: Convert F to equisatisfiable formula F' in CNF I

There is an *efficient conversion* of F to F' where

- ▶ F' is in CNF and
- ▶ F and F' are equisatisfiable

Note: efficient means polynomial in the size of F .

Basic Idea:

- ▶ Introduce a new variable P_G for every subformula G of F , unless G is already an atom.

Step 1: Convert F to equisatisfiable formula F' in CNF II

- ▶ For each subformula

$$G : G_1 \circ G_2,$$

produce a small formula

$$P_G \leftrightarrow P_{G_1} \circ P_{G_2}.$$

Here \circ denotes an arbitrary connective (\neg , \vee , \wedge , \rightarrow , \leftrightarrow); if the connective is \neg , G_1 should be ignored.

Step 1: Convert F to equisatisfiable formula F' in CNF III




Figure: Parse tree for $F : P \vee Q \rightarrow \neg(P \wedge \neg R)$

Step 1: Convert F to equisatisfiable formula F' in CNF IV

- ▶ Convert each of these (small) formulae separately to an equivalent CNF formula

$$\text{CNF}(P_G \leftrightarrow P_{G_1} \circ P_{G_2}) .$$

Let S_F be the set of all non-atom subformulae G of F (including F itself). The formula

$$P_F \wedge \bigwedge_{G \in S_F} \text{CNF}(P_G \leftrightarrow P_{G_1} \circ P_{G_2})$$

is equisatisfiable to F . (Why?)

The number of subformulae is linear in the size of F .
The time to convert one small formula is constant!

Example: CNF I

Convert

$$F : P \vee Q \rightarrow P \wedge \neg R$$

to an equisatisfiable formula in CNF.

Introduce new variables: P_F , $P_{P \vee Q}$, $P_{P \wedge \neg R}$, $P_{\neg R}$.

Create new formulae and convert them to equivalent formulae in CNF separately:

▶ $F_1 = \text{CNF}(P_F \leftrightarrow (P_{P \vee Q} \rightarrow P_{P \wedge \neg R})):$

$$(\neg P_F \vee \neg P_{P \vee Q} \vee P_{P \wedge \neg R}) \wedge (P_F \vee P_{P \vee Q}) \wedge (P_F \vee \neg P_{P \wedge \neg R})$$

▶ $F_2 = \text{CNF}(P_{P \vee Q} \leftrightarrow P \vee Q):$

$$(\neg P_{P \vee Q} \vee P \vee Q) \wedge (P_{P \vee Q} \vee \neg P) \wedge (P_{P \vee Q} \vee \neg Q)$$

Example: CNF II

▶ $F_3 = \text{CNF}(P_{P \wedge \neg R} \leftrightarrow P \wedge P_{\neg R})$:

$$(\neg P_{P \wedge \neg R} \vee P) \wedge (\neg P_{P \wedge \neg R} \vee P_{\neg R}) \wedge (P_{P \wedge \neg R} \vee \neg P \vee \neg P_{\neg R})$$

▶ $F_4 = \text{CNF}(P_{\neg R} \leftrightarrow \neg R)$:

$$(\neg P_{\neg R} \vee \neg R) \wedge (P_{\neg R} \vee R)$$

$P_F \wedge F_1 \wedge F_2 \wedge F_3 \wedge F_4$ is in CNF and equisatisfiable to F .

Step 2: Decide the satisfiability of PL formula F' in CNF

Boolean Constraint Propagation (BCP)

If a clause contains one literal l ,

Set l to \top :

Remove all clauses containing l :

Remove $\neg l$ in all clauses:

based on the unit resolution

$$\frac{l \quad \neg l \vee C \quad \leftarrow \text{clause}}{C}$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \dots \wedge \overset{\top}{l} \wedge \dots \\ & \dots \wedge (\dots \vee \cancel{l} \vee \dots) \wedge \dots \\ & \dots \wedge (\dots \vee \cancel{\neg l} \vee \dots) \wedge \dots \end{aligned}$$

Pure Literal Propagation (PLP)

If P occurs only positive (without negation), set it to \top .

If P occurs only negative set it to \perp .

Then do the simplifications as in Boolean Constraint Propagation

Davis-Putnam-Logemann-Loveland (DPLL) Algorithm

Decides the satisfiability of PL formulae in CNF

Decision Procedure DPLL: Given F in CNF

```
let rec DPLL  $F$  =  
  let  $F'$  = BCP  $F$  in  
  let  $F''$  = PLP  $F'$  in  
  if  $F'' = \top$  then true  
  else if  $F'' = \perp$  then false  
  else  
    let  $P$  = CHOOSE vars( $F''$ ) in  
    (DPLL  $F''\{P \mapsto \top\}$ )  $\vee$  (DPLL  $F''\{P \mapsto \perp\}$ )
```

Simplification

Simplify according to the template equivalences (left-to-right)
[exercise 1.2]

$$\neg \perp \Leftrightarrow \top$$

$$F \wedge \top \Leftrightarrow F$$

$$F \vee \top \Leftrightarrow \top$$

$$\neg \top \Leftrightarrow \perp$$

$$F \wedge \perp \Leftrightarrow \perp$$

$$F \vee \perp \Leftrightarrow F$$

$$\neg \neg F \Leftrightarrow F$$

...

...

Example I

Consider

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

Branching on Q

On the first branch, we have

$$F\{Q \mapsto \top\} : (R) \wedge (\neg R) \wedge (P \vee \neg R).$$

By unit resolution,

$$\frac{R \quad (\neg R)}{\perp},$$

so $F\{Q \mapsto \top\} = \perp \Rightarrow \text{false}$.

Example II

Recall

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

On the other branch, we have

$$F\{Q \mapsto \perp\} : (\neg P \vee R).$$

Furthermore, by PLP,

$$F\{Q \mapsto \perp, R \mapsto \top, P \mapsto \perp\} = \top \Rightarrow \text{true}$$

Thus F is satisfiable with satisfying interpretation

$$I : \{P \mapsto \text{false}, Q \mapsto \text{false}, R \mapsto \text{true}\}.$$

Example

$$F : (\neg P \vee Q \vee R) \wedge (\neg Q \vee R) \wedge (\neg Q \vee \neg R) \wedge (P \vee \neg Q \vee \neg R)$$

