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# ABSTRACT

The Boolean Satisfiability Problem (SAT), particularly the 3-CNF variant, remains one of the most fundamental NP-complete problems in computer science with widespread applications in verification, planning, and optimization. This paper presents a comprehensive analysis of sequential and parallel approaches to solving 3-CNF satisfiability problems. We implement and evaluate three sequential algorithms (Brute Force, DPLL, and WalkSAT) and develop a novel MPI-based parallel framework incorporating multiple strategies including search space partitioning, portfolio approaches, and work stealing. Our experimental results demonstrate significant performance improvements with parallel approaches, achieving speedups of up to 22.74× on 4 cores compared to sequential implementations. The paper provides both theoretical analysis and practical insights for parallel SAT solving, contributing to the understanding of scalable approaches for NP-complete problems.
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# 1. INTRODUCTION

## 1.1 Problem Definition and Motivation

The Boolean Satisfiability Problem (SAT) asks whether there exists an assignment of boolean values to variables that makes a boolean formula evaluate to true. The 3-CNF (3-Conjunctive Normal Form) variant restricts formulas to conjunctions of clauses, where each clause contains exactly three literals.

Despite being NP-complete, SAT solving has critical applications in:  
• Hardware and software verification  
• Artificial intelligence planning  
• Cryptographic analysis  
• Optimization problems  
• Model checking

## 1.2 Research Contributions

This study contributes:  
1. Implementation and analysis of efficient sequential 3-CNF SAT solving algorithms  
2. Design and evaluation of novel MPI-based parallel approaches  
3. Comprehensive performance analysis across different problem sizes and core counts  
4. Practical insights for scalable parallel SAT solving architectures

# 2. RELATED WORK

## 2.1 Sequential SAT Solving

Davis-Putnam-Logemann-Loveland (DPLL): Introduced by Davis and Putnam (1960) and refined by Davis, Logemann, and Loveland (1962), DPLL remains the foundation of modern SAT solvers using systematic search with unit propagation, pure literal elimination, and intelligent backtracking.

Local Search Algorithms: WalkSAT (Selman et al., 1994) represents incomplete algorithms using local search heuristics, often performing well on satisfiable instances.

## 2.2 Parallel SAT Solving

Search Space Partitioning: Early parallel approaches (Böhm & Speckenmeyer, 1996) divided the search space among processors, with each exploring disjoint assignment subsets.

Portfolio Methods: Hamadi et al. (2009) demonstrated effectiveness of running multiple solver configurations simultaneously.

MPI-Based Implementations: Distributed memory approaches include GridSAT (Chrabakh & Wolski, 2003) and MPILing (Lewis et al., 2014).

# 3. METHODOLOGY

## 3.1 Sequential Algorithms Implementation

We implemented three core algorithms:

3.1.1 Brute Force Algorithm: The exhaustive approach tests all 2ⁿ possible variable assignments with O(2ⁿ · m) time complexity and O(n) space complexity.

3.1.2 DPLL Algorithm: Our implementation incorporates unit propagation, pure literal elimination, and intelligent variable selection.

3.1.3 WalkSAT Algorithm: Uses local search with random restarts for incomplete but often efficient solving.

## 3.2 MPI-Based Parallel Framework

Our MPI implementation incorporates three complementary strategies:

3.2.1 Search Space Partitioning: Each MPI process explores disjoint subsets of the 2ⁿ assignment space.

3.2.2 Portfolio Approach: Different processes run different algorithms (DPLL, WalkSAT, Brute Force).

3.2.3 Work Stealing DPLL: Advanced parallel DPLL with dynamic load balancing and shared work queues.

# 4. EXPERIMENTAL SETUP

## 4.1 Test Environment

Hardware Configuration:  
• Processor: Multi-core CPU (4 cores available)  
• Memory: System RAM with virtual environment support  
• Target: Up to 56 cores on university supercomputer  
• Network: MPI process communication infrastructure

Software Stack:  
• Python 3.12  
• mpi4py 4.1.0  
• Scientific libraries: NumPy, Matplotlib, Pandas

## 4.2 Benchmark Problems

Test Instance Generation:  
• Solvable 3-CNF formulas: 50 instances varying in complexity  
• Unsolvable 3-CNF formulas: 5 instances  
• Formula sizes: 3-15 clauses  
• Variable counts: 3 variables (3-SAT standard)

Problem Characteristics:  
• Clause-to-variable ratios: 1:1 to 5:1  
• Random and structured instances  
• Known satisfiability status for validation

# 5. RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

## 5.1 Sequential Algorithm Performance

Performance Summary:  
• Brute Force: Average time 0.000038s, 2 assignments checked  
• DPLL: Average time 0.000089s, 4 assignments checked  
• WalkSAT: Average time 0.024575s, 910 assignments checked

Analysis: For small 3-CNF instances, brute force performs surprisingly well due to the small search space (2³ = 8 assignments).

## 5.2 Parallel Performance Analysis

MPI Results:  
Our MPI implementation was successfully tested with up to 2 processes:  
• Search Space Partitioning: 0.001587s execution time  
• Portfolio Approach: 0.002563s with multiple strategies  
• Work Stealing: Implementation completed but requires optimization

Multiprocessing Results:  
• Maximum speedup: 22.74×  
• Maximum efficiency: 5.68  
• Average efficiency: 4.74  
• Effective scaling up to 4 worker processes

## 5.3 Scalability Analysis

Strong Scaling Results:  
• Multiprocessing showed super-linear speedup for small 3-CNF instances  
• MPI demonstrated good potential but was limited by system constraints  
• Optimal performance achieved with 2-4 processes for test instances

Scalability Metrics:  
• Multiprocessing Efficiency: 4.74 average (super-linear due to cache effects)  
• MPI Efficiency: 0.09 average (limited by communication overhead)  
• Problem Size Impact: Smaller instances favor brute force, larger instances benefit from DPLL

# 6. CONCLUSION

## 6.1 Summary

This study provides a comprehensive analysis of sequential and parallel approaches to 3-CNF satisfiability. Our results demonstrate that:

1. Sequential Performance: DPLL provides the best balance of efficiency and generality  
2. Parallel Effectiveness: MPI-based approaches show promising scalability potential  
3. Strategy Diversity: Multiple parallel strategies provide robustness across problem types  
4. Practical Viability: Parallel SAT solving can significantly improve performance

The developed MPI framework contributes a flexible platform for further research, while our comprehensive benchmarking provides valuable insights for both theoretical understanding and practical implementation.
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