

Propositional Logic

Definitional CNF

Definitional CNF

The **definitional CNF** of a formula is obtained in 2 steps:

1. Repeatedly replace a subformula G of the form $\neg A'$, $A' \wedge B'$ or $A' \vee B'$ by a new atom A and conjoin $A \leftrightarrow G$.
This replacement is not applied to the “definitions” $A \leftrightarrow G$ but only to the (remains of the) original formula.
2. Translate all the subformulas $A \leftrightarrow G$ into CNF.

Example

$$\neg(A_1 \vee A_2) \wedge A_3$$

\rightsquigarrow

$$\neg A_4 \wedge A_3 \wedge (A_4 \leftrightarrow (A_1 \vee A_2))$$

\rightsquigarrow

$$A_5 \wedge A_3 \wedge (A_4 \leftrightarrow (A_1 \vee A_2)) \wedge (A_5 \leftrightarrow \neg A_4)$$

\rightsquigarrow

$$A_5 \wedge A_3 \wedge \text{CNF}(A_4 \leftrightarrow (A_1 \vee A_2)) \wedge \text{CNF}(A_5 \leftrightarrow \neg A_4)$$

Definitional CNF: Complexity

Let the initial formula have size n .

1. Each replacement step increases the size of the formula by a constant.
There are at most as many replacement steps as subformulas, linearly many.
2. The conversion of each $A \leftrightarrow G$ into CNF increases the size by a constant.
There are only linearly many such subformulas.

Thus the definitional CNF has size $O(n)$.

Notation

Definition

The notation $F[G/A]$ denotes the result of replacing all occurrences of the atom A in F by G .

We pronounce it as “ F with G for A ”.

Example

$$(A \wedge B)[(A \rightarrow B)/B] = (A \wedge (A \rightarrow B))$$

Definition

The notation $\mathcal{A}[v/A]$ denotes a modified version of \mathcal{A} that maps A to v and behaves like \mathcal{A} otherwise:

$$(\mathcal{A}[v/A])(A_i) = \begin{cases} v & \text{if } A_i = A \\ \mathcal{A}(A_i) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Substitution Lemma

Lemma

$$\mathcal{A}(F[G/A]) = (\mathcal{A}[\mathcal{A}(G)/A])(F)$$

Example

$$\mathcal{A}((A_1 \wedge A_2)[G/A_2]) = (\mathcal{A}[\mathcal{A}(G)/A_2])(A_1 \wedge A_2)$$

Proof by structural induction on F .

Definitional CNF: Correctness

Each replacement step produces an equisatisfiable formula:

Lemma

Let A be an atom that does not occur in G .

Then $F[G/A]$ is equisatisfiable with $F \wedge (A \leftrightarrow G)$.

Proof If $F[G/A]$ is satisfiable by some assignment \mathcal{A} , then by the Substitution Lemma, $\mathcal{A}' = \mathcal{A}[\mathcal{A}(G)/A]$ is a model of F . Moreover $\mathcal{A}' \models (A \leftrightarrow G)$ because $\mathcal{A}'(A) = \mathcal{A}(G)$ and $\mathcal{A}(G) = \mathcal{A}'(G)$ by the Coincidence Lemma (Exercise 1.2).

Thus $F \wedge (A \leftrightarrow G)$ is satisfiable (by \mathcal{A}').

Conversely we actually have $F \wedge (A \leftrightarrow G) \models F[G/A]$.

Suppose $\mathcal{A} \models F \wedge (A \leftrightarrow G)$. This implies $\mathcal{A}(A) = \mathcal{A}(G)$.

Therefore $\mathcal{A}[\mathcal{A}(G)/A] = \mathcal{A}$.

Thus $\mathcal{A}(F[G/A]) = (\mathcal{A}[\mathcal{A}(G)/A])(F) = \mathcal{A}(F) = 1$ by the Substitution Lemma.

Does $F[G/A] \models F \wedge (A \leftrightarrow G)$ hold?

Summary

Theorem

*For every formula F of size n
there is an **equisatisfiable CNF** formula G of size $O(n)$.*

Similarly it can be shown:

Theorem

*For every formula F of size n
there is an **equivalent DNF** formula G of size $O(n)$.*

Validity of CNF

Validity of formulas in CNF can be checked in linear time.

A formula in CNF is valid iff all its disjunctions are valid.

A disjunction is valid iff it contains both an atomic A and $\neg A$ as literals.

Example

Valid: $(A \vee \neg A \vee B) \wedge (C \vee \neg C)$

Not valid: $(A \vee \neg A) \wedge (\neg A \vee C)$

Satisfiability of DNF

Satisfiability of formulas in DNF can be checked in linear time.

A formula in DNF is satisfiable iff at least one of its conjunctions is satisfiable. A conjunction is satisfiable iff it does not contain both an atomic A and $\neg A$ as literals.

Example

Satisfiable: $(\neg B \wedge A \wedge B) \vee (\neg A \wedge C)$

Unsatisfiable: $(A \wedge \neg A \wedge B) \vee (C \wedge \neg C)$

Satisfiability/validity of DNF and CNF

Theorem

*Satisfiability of formulas in **CNF** is NP-complete.*

Theorem

*Validity of formulas in **DNF** is coNP-complete.*