

Formal Methods in Software Engineering

Normal Forms — Spring 2025

Konstantin Chukharev

§1 Normal Forms

Normal Forms in Propositional Logic

Definition 1 (Normal form): A *normal form* is a standardized syntactic representation of logical formulas with a *restricted* structure.

Normal forms enable efficient reasoning, simplification, and decision procedures, making them essential in automated theorem proving, model checking, and logic synthesis.

There are several *normal forms* commonly used in propositional logic:

- Negation normal form (NNF)
- Conjunctive normal form (CNF)
- Disjunctive normal form (DNF)
- Algebraic normal form (ANF)
- Binary decision diagram (BDD)

Each normal form has its own advantages and disadvantages, and is used in different contexts.

Every propositional formula can be converted to an *equivalent* formula in any of these normal forms.

Negation Normal Form

Definition 2 (Negation Normal Form (NNF)): A formula is in *negation normal form* if the negation operator (\neg) is only applied to variables, and the only allowed logical connectives are \wedge and \vee .

Example: The formula $(p \wedge q) \vee (\neg p \wedge \neg q)$ is in NNF.

Example: The formula $\neg(p \wedge q) \vee (\neg p \wedge \neg q)$ is *not* in NNF due to $\neg(\dots)$.

Grammar for NNF formulas:

$$\langle \text{Atom} \rangle ::= \top \mid \perp \mid \langle \text{Variable} \rangle$$
$$\langle \text{Literal} \rangle ::= \langle \text{Atom} \rangle \mid \neg \langle \text{Atom} \rangle$$
$$\langle \text{Formula} \rangle ::= \langle \text{Literal} \rangle \mid \langle \text{Formula} \rangle \wedge \langle \text{Formula} \rangle \mid \langle \text{Formula} \rangle \vee \langle \text{Formula} \rangle$$

Literals

Definition 3 (Literal): A *literal* is a propositional variable or its negation.

- p is a *positive literal*.
- $\neg p$ is a *negative literal*.

Definition 4 (Complement): The *complement* of a literal p is denoted by \bar{p} .

$$\bar{p} = \begin{cases} \neg p & \text{if } p \text{ is positive} \\ p & \text{if } p \text{ is negative} \end{cases}$$

Note: *complementary* literals p and \bar{p} are each other's complement.

NNF Transformation

Any propositional formula can be converted to NNF by the repeated application of the following rewriting rules (\implies) to the formula and its sub-formulas, to completion (until none apply):

Description	Rewrite rule
Eliminate implications	$(A \rightarrow B) \implies (\neg A \vee B)$
Eliminate bi-implications	$(A \leftrightarrow B) \implies (\neg A \vee B) \wedge (A \vee \neg B)$
Push negation inside conjunctions	$\neg(A \wedge B) \implies (\neg A \vee \neg B)$
Push negation inside disjunctions	$\neg(A \vee B) \implies \neg A \wedge \neg B$
Eliminate double negations	$\neg\neg A \implies A$

Theorem 1: Every well-formed formula not containing \leftrightarrow can be converted to an *equivalent* NNF with a *linear increase* in the size¹ of the formula.

¹For example, number of variable occurrences, or number of sub-formulas.

Exponential Blowup of NNF

The NNF of formulas containing \leftrightarrow can grow *exponentially* in size.

Example: Let's convert the following formula to NNF...

$$\begin{aligned} F &= a \leftrightarrow (b \leftrightarrow (c \leftrightarrow d)) \implies \\ &= a \leftrightarrow (b \leftrightarrow ((c \rightarrow d) \wedge (d \rightarrow c))) \implies \\ &= a \leftrightarrow ((b \rightarrow ((c \rightarrow d) \wedge (d \rightarrow c))) \wedge (((c \rightarrow d) \wedge (d \rightarrow c)) \rightarrow b)) \implies \\ &= a \leftrightarrow ((b \vee (\dots)) \wedge (\neg(\dots) \vee b)) \implies \\ &= (\neg a \vee (\dots)) \wedge (a \vee \neg(\dots)) \implies \\ &= (\neg a \vee ((b \vee (\dots)) \wedge (\neg(\dots) \vee b))) \wedge \\ &\quad (a \vee \neg((b \vee (\dots)) \wedge (\neg(\dots) \vee b))) \end{aligned}$$

The original F contains only 4 variable occurrences, while the NNF of F contains 16 variable occurrences.

Disjunctive Normal Form

Definition 5 (Disjunctive Normal Form (DNF)): A formula is said to be in *disjunctive normal form* if it is a disjunction of *cubes* (conjunctions of literals).

$$A = \bigvee_i \bigwedge_j p_{ij}$$

Example: $A = (p \wedge q) \vee (\neg p \wedge q \wedge r) \vee \neg q$

Grammar for DNF formulas:

$\langle \text{Atom} \rangle ::= \top \mid \perp \mid \langle \text{Variable} \rangle$

$\langle \text{Literal} \rangle ::= \langle \text{Atom} \rangle \mid \neg \langle \text{Atom} \rangle$

$\langle \text{Cube} \rangle ::= \langle \text{Literal} \rangle \mid \langle \text{Literal} \rangle \wedge \langle \text{Cube} \rangle$

$\langle \text{Formula} \rangle ::= \langle \text{Cube} \rangle \mid \langle \text{Cube} \rangle \vee \langle \text{Formula} \rangle$

Cubes and Clauses

Definition 6 (Cube): A *cube* is a conjunction of literals.

Definition 7 (Clause): A *clause* is a disjunction of literals.

- An *empty clause* is a clause with no literals, commonly denoted by \square .
- A *unit clause* is a clause with a single literal, that is, just a literal itself.
- A *Horn clause* is a clause with at most one positive literal.

Note: \square is *false in every interpretation*, that is, unsatisfiable.

Conjunctive Normal Form

Definition 8 (Conjunctive Normal Form (CNF)): A formula is said to be in *conjunctive normal form* if it is a conjunction of *clauses*.

$$A = \bigwedge_i \bigvee_j p_{ij}$$

Example: $A = (\neg p \vee q) \wedge (\neg p \vee q \vee r) \wedge \neg q$

Satisfiability on CNF

An interpretation ν satisfies a clause $C = p_1 \vee \dots \vee p_n$ if it satisfies some (at least one) literal p_k in C .

An interpretation ν satisfies a CNF formula $A = C_1 \wedge \dots \wedge C_n$ if it satisfies every clause C_i in A .

A CNF formula A is *satisfiable* if there exists an interpretation ν that satisfies A .

The **SAT problem** is about determining whether a given CNF formula is satisfiable.

CNF Transformation

Any propositional formula can be converted to CNF by the repeated application of these rewriting rules:

- Any NNF transformation rules.
- Distribute \vee over \wedge (another source of exponential blowup):
 - ▶ $A \vee (B \wedge C) \implies (A \vee B) \wedge (A \vee C)$
 - ▶ $(A \wedge B) \vee C \implies (A \vee C) \wedge (B \vee C)$
- Normalize nested \wedge and \vee operators:
 - ▶ $A \wedge (B \wedge C) \implies (A \wedge B \wedge C)$
 - ▶ $A \vee (B \vee C) \implies (A \vee B \vee C)$

Theorem 2: Every well-formed formula α can be converted to an *equivalent* CNF α' with a *potentially exponential increase* in the size of the formula.

Exponential Blowup of CNF

Distributive law is the main source of the exponential blowup in CNF conversion:

$$n \text{ cubes} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} (x_1 \wedge y_1) \vee \\ (x_2 \wedge y_2) \vee \\ \dots \\ (x_n \wedge y_n) \vee \end{array} \right. \xRightarrow{\text{CNF}} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} (x_1 \vee x_2 \vee \dots \vee x_n) \wedge \\ (y_1 \vee x_2 \vee \dots \vee x_n) \wedge \\ \dots \\ (x_1 \vee y_2 \vee \dots \vee y_n) \wedge \\ (y_1 \vee y_2 \vee \dots \vee y_n) \end{array} \right\} 2^n \text{ clauses}$$

Is there a way to avoid the exponential blowup? *Yes!*

Tseitin Transformation

A space-efficient way to convert a formula to CNF is the *Tseitin transformation*, which is based on so-called “*naming*” or “*definition introduction*”, allowing to replace subformulas with the “*fresh*” (new) variables.

1. Take a subformula A of a formula F .
2. Introduce a new propositional variable n .
3. Add a *definition* for n , that is, a formula stating that n is equivalent to A .
4. Replace A with n in F .

Overall, construct $S := F[n/A] \wedge (n \leftrightarrow A)$

$$\begin{aligned} F &= p_1 \leftrightarrow (p_2 \leftrightarrow (p_3 \leftrightarrow (p_4 \leftrightarrow \overbrace{(p_5 \leftrightarrow p_6)}^A))) \implies \\ S &= p_1 \leftrightarrow (p_2 \leftrightarrow (p_3 \leftrightarrow (p_4 \leftrightarrow n))) \wedge \\ &\quad n \leftrightarrow (p_5 \leftrightarrow p_6) \end{aligned}$$

Note: The resulting formula is, in general, **not equivalent** to the original one, but it is *equisatisfiable*, i.e., it is satisfiable iff the original formula is satisfiable.

Equisatisfiability

Definition 9 (Equisatisfiability): Two formulas A and B are *equisatisfiable* if A is satisfiable *if and only if* B is satisfiable.

The set S of clauses obtained by the Tseitin transformation is *equisatisfiable* with the original formula F .

- Every model of S is a model of F .
- Every model of F can be extended to a model of S by assigning the values of fresh variables according to their definitions.

Avoiding the Exponential Blowup

Example: $F = p_1 \leftrightarrow (p_2 \leftrightarrow (p_3 \leftrightarrow (p_4 \leftrightarrow (p_5 \leftrightarrow p_6))))$

Applying the Tseitin transformation gives us:

$$\begin{aligned} S = & p_1 \leftrightarrow (p_2 \leftrightarrow n_3) \wedge \\ & n_3 \leftrightarrow (p_3 \leftrightarrow n_4) \wedge \\ & n_4 \leftrightarrow (p_4 \leftrightarrow n_5) \wedge \\ & n_5 \leftrightarrow (p_5 \leftrightarrow p_6) \end{aligned}$$

The equivalent CNF of F consists of $2^5 = 32$ clauses, and grows exponentially with number of variables.

The equisatisfiable CNF of F consists of 16 clauses, yet introduces 3 fresh variables, and grows linearly with the number of variables.

Clausal Form

Definition 10 (Clausal form): A *clausal form* of a formula F is a set S_F of clauses which is satisfiable iff F is satisfiable.

A clausal form of a *set* of formulas S is a set S' of clauses which is satisfiable iff S is satisfiable.

Even stronger requirement:

- F and S_F have the same models in the language of F .
- S and S' have the same models in the language of S .

The main advantage of the clausal form over the equivalent CNF is that we can convert any formula into a set of clauses in *almost linear time*.

1. If F is a formula which has the form $C_1 \wedge \dots \wedge C_n$, where $n > 0$ and each C_i is a clause, then its clausal form is $S \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{C_1, \dots, C_n\}$.
2. Otherwise, apply Tseitin transformation: introduce a name for each subformula A of F such that A is not a literal and use this name instead of a subformula A .

TODO

- ☐ Exercises
- ☐ Example: convert formula to clausal form
- ☐ DNF vs CNF satisfiability