

	\equiv	\equiv_V	\models
DHORN	PTIME	Σ_2^P , hardness is unknown	PTIME
HORN	PTIME	Σ_2^P -complete	NP-complete
CNF	$P^{NP[\log n]}$, hardness unknown	Σ_3^P -complete	Σ_2^P -complete

1 General Problems

Configuration and Specification (Sets)

Equivalence Configuration Problem

Input: $C = \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n\}$ and β
Query: Whether $\exists K \subseteq C : K \equiv \beta$

Let

$$\text{IMP}(C, \beta) := \{\alpha \mid \alpha \in C \text{ and } \beta \models \alpha\}$$

Then

$$\exists K \subseteq C (K \text{ is satisfiable and } K \equiv \beta) \iff \text{IMP}(C, \beta) \text{ is satisfiable and } \text{IMP}(C, \beta) \models \beta$$

So, equivalence problem is in $P^{NP[\log n]}$ which is the class of problems solvable in polynomial time with $O(\log n)$ queries to an NP oracle.

Next we show hardness. The problem $\text{SAT}_{\text{odd}}^n$ is complete for $P^{NP[\log n]}$. Where $\text{SAT}_{\text{odd}}^n$ is the problem of determining whether the number of satisfiable formulas among n given CNF formulas.

We shall construct a reduction from $\text{SAT}_{\text{odd}}^n$ to the equivalence configuration problem.

Suppose F_1, \dots, F_n are 3CNF formulas such that they have pairwise distinct variables. We assume n is even. Otherwise we add formula $p \wedge \neg p$.

We also assume each F_i is not tautological (otherwise consider $F_i \wedge p_i$).

We assume F_i is over variables \vec{x}_i . Pick new variables \vec{y}_i and \vec{z}_i . We form formulas $F_i(\vec{x}_i), F_i(\vec{y}_i), F_i(\vec{z}_i)$.

$$\psi := \bigwedge_{i=1}^n ((F_i(\vec{y}_i) \rightarrow \neg F_i(\vec{x}_i)) \wedge (\neg F_i(\vec{y}_i) \wedge \neg F_i(\vec{x}_i) \rightarrow \neg F_i(\vec{z}_i)))$$

$$C := \{\psi\} \cup \{F_1(\vec{y}_1) \vee F_1(\vec{x}_1), \dots, F_n(\vec{y}_n) \vee F_n(\vec{x}_n)\}$$

$$\beta := \psi \wedge ((F_1(\vec{y}_1) \vee F_1(\vec{x}_1)) \otimes \dots \otimes (F_n(\vec{y}_n) \vee F_n(\vec{x}_n)))$$

Suppose for some $K \subseteq C$ such that $K \equiv \beta$. Then it must be $\psi \in K$.

We claim that if F_i is satisfiable then $F(\vec{y}_i) \vee F_i(\vec{x}_i)$ must be in K .

Suppose

Retricted Equivalence Configuration(R-equivalence)

Input: $C = \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n\}$, β , and a set V of variables

Query: Whether $\exists K \subseteq C : K \equiv^V \beta$

the problem of determining whether $F \equiv_V G$ is in Π_2^P (for the complementary problem: we guess a clause γ over V , check that $G \models \gamma$ but $F \not\models \gamma$, or $G \not\models \gamma$ but $F \models \gamma$).

Thus, R-equivalence configuraton is Σ_3^P (guess a $K \subseteq C$, check that it is satisfiable and $K \equiv_V \beta$.)

Next we show the hardness.

Consider $\Phi := \exists \vec{x} \forall \vec{y} \exists \vec{z} \varphi$ where φ is a CNF formula.

We assume w.l.o.g. that φ contains a non-tautological clause over \vec{z} (otherwise, we pick new variable z' and consider $\exists \vec{x} \forall \vec{y} \exists \vec{z} \exists z' (\varphi \wedge z')$).

By this assumption, $\forall \vec{x} \exists \vec{y} \exists \vec{z} \neg \varphi$ is true

We assume that each clause contains a positive occurrence of a variable from $\vec{y} \cup \vec{z}$. If otherwise pick a new variable u , and consider $\exists \vec{x} \forall \vec{y} \forall u \exists \vec{z} \varphi^u$, where φ^u is obtained from φ by adding u to clauses containing no positive literal from $\vec{y} \cup \vec{z}$. Clearly, Φ and the resulting formula has the same truth.

By this assumption, $\forall \vec{x} \exists \vec{y} \exists \vec{z} \phi$ is true. (we will use this later).

φ can be written as $(c'_1 \vee c''_1) \wedge \cdots \wedge (c'_n \vee c''_n)$ in which c'_i is over \vec{x} , while c''_i is over $\vec{y} \cup \vec{z}$.

Pick new variables w_1, \dots, w_n, w . Let

Let

$$\psi := \left(\bigwedge_{i=1}^n (c'_i \rightarrow w_i) \right) \wedge \left(\bigwedge_{i=1}^n (\neg c'_i \wedge \neg c''_i \rightarrow \neg w_i) \right)$$

Let

$$C_0 := \{\psi \wedge \neg c'_1 \wedge (c''_1 \rightarrow w_1), \dots, \psi \wedge \neg c'_n \wedge (c''_n \rightarrow w_n)\}$$

$$C_1 = \{c'_1, \dots, c'_n, \}$$

$$C_2 = \{x_1, \neg x_1, \dots, x_n, \neg x_n\}$$

$$C_3 = \{(w \rightarrow (c'_1 \vee c''_1) \wedge \cdots \wedge (c'_n \vee c''_n))\}$$

Now let

$$C := C_0 \cup C_1 \cup C_2 \cup C_3 \cup \{w\}$$

Let β be

$$w_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge w_n \wedge w$$

Let $V := \vec{y} \cup \{w_1, \dots, w_n, \} \cup \{w\}$

(Lemma: $F \models_V G$ iff for any truth assignment t on V , if it can be extended to a satisfying truth assignment for F , it can be extended to a satisfying truth assignment for G .)

We shall show Φ is true if and only if there is satisfiable $K \subseteq C$ s.t. $K \equiv_V \beta$

From right to left:

Given a such $K \equiv_V \beta$. Clearly, $K \cap C_0$ is non-empty.

It must be that $w \in K$. Let t satisfy K . By our assumption we know $t \upharpoonright \vec{x}$ can be extended to s which falsifies φ . Now we assign truth values

to w_i according to the truth values $s(c'_i)$ and $s(c''_i)$ to make formulas ψ and $(c''_i \rightarrow w_i)$ to be true. There must be some w_i which is false. Then if we set w to be false, K is still satisfied by s (because clauses in C_3 are satisfied). This contradicts the V -equivalence.

It must be that $C_3 \subseteq K$, i.e., $w \rightarrow (c'_1 \vee c''_1) \wedge \cdots \wedge (c'_n \vee c''_n)$ is in K . Suppose it is not the case. Similar as above, there would be a satisfying truth assignment of K which makes some w_i false, contradicts the V -equivalence.

Suppose $K \not\models c'_i$. Then $\psi \wedge \neg c'_i \wedge (c''_i \rightarrow w_i)$ must be in K . Otherwise, $K \cup \{\neg c'_i\}$ is consistent, then there is a satisfying truth assignment t for K such that $t(c'_i) = 0, t(w) = 1, t(w_i) = 0$. (In fact by our assumption, t can be assumed to satisfy $(c'_1 \vee c''_1) \wedge \cdots \wedge (c'_n \vee c''_n)$ because every clause contains positive literal from $\vec{y} \cup \vec{z}$). This contradicts the fact that $K \equiv_V \beta$.

Now we can see for each i , either $K \models \neg c'_i$ or $K \models c'_i$. That is, for any two satisfying truth assignments t_1, t_2 of K , each c'_i has the same truth under $t_1 \upharpoonright \vec{x}$ and $t_2 \upharpoonright \vec{x}$.

Now fix a truth assignment e on \vec{x} which can be extended to a satisfying truth assignment of K .

Consider any truth assignment s on \vec{y} . Since s can be extended to satisfy β , it can be extended to a truth assignment t which satisfies K . Please note we can assume that $t \upharpoonright \vec{x}$ is e . Since w and $w \rightarrow (c'_1 \vee c''_1) \wedge \cdots \wedge (c'_n \vee c''_n)$ are in K . We can see t satisfy φ .

Consequently, for any truth assignment s on \vec{y} , $e * s$ can be extended to a satisfying truth assignment of φ . Thus, Φ is true.

From left to right.

Suppose $\Phi = \exists \vec{x} \forall \vec{y} \exists \vec{z} \varphi$ is true.

Let e be a truth assignment on \vec{x} such that $\forall \vec{y} \exists \vec{z} \varphi[x/e]$ is true

Let

$$K_0 := \{\psi \wedge \neg c'_i \wedge (c''_i \rightarrow w_i) \mid e(c'_i) = 0, i = 1, \dots, n\}$$

$$K_1 := \{c'_i \mid e(c'_i) = 1, i = 1, \dots, n\}$$

$$K_2 := \{x_i \mid e(x_i) = 1, i = 1, \dots, n\} \cup \{\neg x_i \mid e(x_i) = 0, i = 1, \dots, n\}$$

$$K := K_0 \cup K_1 \cup K_2 \cup C_3 \cup \{w\}$$

Consider any truth assignment s on V .

Suppose s can be extended to satisfy K . Say the extension is t . Since $w \in K$, $(c'_1 \vee c''_1) \wedge \cdots \wedge (c'_n \vee c''_n)$ be true under t . By formulas in K_0 , we can see each w_i is true under t . That means s make β true. Thus, $K \models_V \beta$.

Now suppose s satisfies β . Since Φ is true, $e * (s \upharpoonright \vec{y})$ can be extended to satisfy Φ . Let t be such an extension. Next we show t can be extended to satisfies K . Since t makes φ true, either c'_i is true or c''_i is true. We set each w_i to be true. Then all clauses in K_0 are true. Set w to be true. Then clauses in C_3 are true. Please note formulas in $K_1 \cup K_2$ are already satisfied by e . Consequently, s can be extended to satisfy K . Hence, $\beta \models_V K$.

Altogether we obtain $K \equiv_V \beta$.

Implication Problem

Input: $C = \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n\}, \beta$

Query: Whether $\exists K \subseteq C : K \models \beta$

Clearly in Σ_2^P . We shall the hardness

Consider $\Phi = \exists x_1, \dots, x_n \forall y_1, \dots, y_m \varphi$ where φ is a DNF formula. Pick a new variable z .

Let $C := \{\varphi \rightarrow z, x_1, \neg x_1, \dots, x_n, \neg x_n\}, \beta := z$

Clearly, Φ is true if and only if $\exists K \subseteq C$ such that K is satisfiable and $K \models \beta$.

Note: In all problems K is demanded satisfiable.

$$\alpha \equiv_V \beta \iff \forall \gamma \text{ over } V, (\alpha \models \gamma \iff \beta \models \gamma)$$

$$\alpha \models_V \beta \iff \forall \gamma \text{ over } V, (\beta \models \gamma \implies \alpha \models \gamma)$$

2 Restricted to DHORN

C : set of DHORN, β : DHORN

Equivalence problem is in PTIME

Idea: just checked $\text{IMP}(C, \beta) \equiv \beta$.

Implication problem is trivial

The existence of K is equivalent to $C \models \beta$

The V -equivalence problem

we guess it seems Σ_2^P -complete.

See Hans's book page 251

3 Restricted to HORN

Equivalence Problem: same as the DHORN case (PTIME).

Desired K exists iff $\text{IMP}(C, \beta)$ is satisfiable and $\text{IMP}(C, \beta) \models \beta$

V-Equivalence Configuration Problem : Σ_2^P -complete

$$\Phi := \exists y_1, \dots, y_k \forall x_1, \dots, x_m (c_1 \vee \dots \vee c_n)$$

Where c_i is a conjunction of literals.

for each variable z , introduce a new variable $\pi(\neg z)$. Let $\pi(z) = z$.

introduce U .

Let

$$\psi_0 := \left(\bigwedge_{j=1}^m (\neg\pi(\neg x_j) \vee \neg x_j) \right), \quad \psi_1 := \left(\bigwedge_{i=1}^k (\neg\pi(\neg y_i) \vee \neg y_i) \right)$$

$$\theta := \left(\bigvee_{i=1}^m (\neg x_i \wedge \neg\pi(\neg x_i)) \right)$$

Please note that θ is not HORN when $n > 1$. Fortunately, by using Tseiting algorithm, one can transform θ to an equivalent HORN formula when restricted to old variables.

For a conjunction $c = L_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge L_s$, we write $\pi(c) := \pi(L_1) \wedge \cdots \wedge \pi(L_s)$

$$\begin{aligned} C_0 &:= \{ \psi_0 \wedge \psi_1 \wedge (\bigwedge_{i=1}^n (\pi(c_i) \rightarrow U \vee \theta)) \} \\ C &:= C_0 \cup \{ y_i, \pi(\neg y_i) \mid i = 1, \dots, k \} \\ \beta &:= (U \vee \theta) \wedge \psi_0 \\ V &:= \{ U \} \cup \{ x_1, \dots, x_m, \pi(\neg x_1), \dots, \pi(\neg x_m) \} \end{aligned}$$

We shall show

$$(\exists K \subseteq C \text{ such that } K \equiv_V \beta) \text{ if and only if } \Phi \text{ is true.}$$

!!!! I suddenly find that $U \vee \theta$ may not be HORN. Fortunately we can change U to $\neg U$ in C and β . Then the following proof should be changed accordingly

Suppose Φ is true. There is truth assignment e on $\{y_1, \dots, y_m\}$ such that $\forall x_1, \dots, x_m \varphi[\vec{y}/e]$ is true, where $\vec{y} = y_1 \cdots, y_k$. Define

$$K = C_0 \cup \{ y_i \mid t(y_i) = 1, 1 \leq i \leq k \} \cup \{ \pi(\neg y_i) \mid t(y_i) = 0, 1 \leq i \leq k \}$$

For any satisfying truth assignment t for K , if it makes θ true then β is true under t . Suppose t makes θ false, then t corresponds a truth assignment on x_1, \dots, x_n accoding the truth of x_i and $\pi(\neg x_i)$. Since Φ is true, some $\pi(c_i)$ must be true under t , then $T(U) = 1$. Therefore, $t(\beta) = 1$.

Suppose s is a satisfying truth assignment for β . Then $s * e$ satisfies $\psi_0 \wedge \psi_1$. If s makes θ true, then $s * e$ satisfies K . Suppose $s(\theta) = 0$. Then $s(U) = 1$, hence K is still satisfied by $s * e$.

Altogether, we have $K \equiv_V \beta$.

For the inverse direction, suppose there is satisfiable $K \subseteq C$ such that $K \equiv_V \beta$.

Clearly, the formula in C_0 must be in K . Then by formula ψ_1 , either y_i or $\pi(\neg y_i)$ is not in K .

Pick a truth assignment e on $\{y_1, \dots, y_k\}$ such that if $y_i \in K$ then $e(y_i) = 1$, and $e(y_i) = 0$ if else.

We need to show $\forall x_1, \dots, x_m (c_1 \vee \dots \vee c_n)$ is true.

Consider any truth assignment s on $\{x_1, \dots, x_m\}$. Let s' be the assignment defined by $s'(\pi(\neg x_i)) = 1$ iff $s(x_i) = 0$. Then $e' * s'$ satisfies $\psi_0 \wedge \psi_1$, where e' is obtained from e in the same way as s' . We claim that, $(e' * s')$ makes $\pi(c_i)$ true for some i . Otherwise, we could set U to be false, and get a truth assignment satisfying K but not satisfying β (please note that $s'(\theta) = 0$), contradict the V -equivalence.

Consequently, Φ is true.

Implication Problem

NP-complete

Given a 3CNF F

$$\bigwedge_{i=1}^m (L_{i,1} \vee L_{i,2} \vee L_{i,3}) \quad \text{over } x_1, \dots, x_n$$

For each $i = 1, \dots, m$, pick a new variable z_i . For each $j = 1, \dots, n$ we pick a new variable $\pi(\neg x_j)$. For convenience, we also write x_j as $\pi(x_j)$.

Define C

$$C := \bigcup_{i=1}^m \{\pi(L_{i,1}) \rightarrow z_i, \pi(L_{i,2}) \rightarrow z_i, \pi(L_{i,3}) \rightarrow z_i\} \cup \bigcup_{j=1}^n \{\rightarrow x_j, \rightarrow \pi(\neg x_j)\} \cup \{z_1 \wedge \dots \wedge z_m \rightarrow z\}$$

Define

$$\beta := z \wedge \bigwedge (\neg \pi(\neg x_j) \vee \neg x_j)$$

Implication problem iff F is satisfiable

Specification Problem

Given a partial configuration K , demand β , a set of variables V, W
Looking for σ over W such that

1. $K \wedge \sigma(W) \equiv \beta$
2. $K \wedge \sigma(W) \equiv_V \beta$
3. $K \wedge \sigma(W) \models \beta$

Query Learning

black box α

equivalence query. Guess a β ask whether $\alpha \equiv \beta$. If the answer is no, output a truth assignment satisfying α and $\neg\beta$ or satisfying $\neg\alpha$ and β .

membership query

guess a truth assignment v answer $v(\alpha) = 0$ or 1 .

4 Configuration with constraints

$C = \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n\}, \beta$, D is set of formulas over A_1, \dots, A_n which are propositional atoms. Whether there is $K \subseteq C$ such that

- K is satisfiable,
- $K \equiv \beta$, and
- the truth assignment v_K satisfies D , where $v_K(A_i) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \alpha_i \in K \\ 0 & \text{if } \alpha_i \notin K \end{cases}$

Duppose D, β are DHORN, D is 2HORN, then NP-complete.

Let F be an arbitrary 3CNF formula $c_1 \wedge \dots \wedge c_n$ with $c_i := l_{i,1} \vee l_{i,2} \vee l_{i,3}$ over $\{x_1, \dots, x_m\}$

pick new variable $\pi(\neg x_i)$ for $\neg x_i$. $\pi(x_i)$ is x_i .

introduce new variables w_1, \dots, w_n . Let

$$\begin{aligned} H_0 &= \{\pi(l_{i,j}) \rightarrow w_i \mid 1 \leq i \leq n, j = 1, 2, 3\} \\ D &:= \{\neg x_1 \vee \neg \pi(\neg x_1), \dots, \neg x_m \vee \neg \pi(\neg x_m)\} \\ H &:= H_0 \cup D \end{aligned}$$

,

Let $\beta := w_1 \wedge \dots \wedge w_n$. $V = \{x_1, \pi(\neg x_1), \dots, x_m, \neg x_m\}$.

Clearly F is satisfiable iff there is $s \subseteq V$ such that $s \wedge H \models \beta$.

Next we transform H to the constraint configuration problem for DHORN.

For each literal L over $\{x_1, \dots, x_m\}$, define

$$\alpha_i(\pi(L)) := \{w_j \mid \pi(L) \rightarrow w_j \in H_0\}$$

Let

$$K := \{\alpha(\pi(L)) \mid L \in \{x_1, \neg x_1, \dots, x_m, \neg x_m\}\}$$

Now we can consider $\pi(L)$ the name of $\alpha(\pi(L))$. So, let

$$D := \{\neg x_1 \vee \neg \pi(\neg x_1), \dots, \neg x_m \vee \neg \pi(\neg x_m)\}$$

Clearly $K \equiv \beta$.

Clearly, there is $s \subseteq V$ such that $v \wedge H \models \beta$ if and only if

there is $s \subseteq V$ such that s satisfies D when s is considered as a truth assignment and $\{\alpha(L) \mid L \in s\} \equiv \beta$.

Thus the constraint configuration problem for this case is NP-complete.

However, if $C := \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n\}, \beta$ and D are all DHORN, then it is polynomially solvable.

IMP(C, β). Suppose it is satisfiable. (otherwise return no)

Please note that for any $\alpha \in C - \text{IMP}(C, \beta)$, $\alpha \wedge \text{IMP} \not\models \beta$

Let $D' := D \cup \{\neg A_i \mid \alpha_i \notin \text{IMP}(C, \beta)\}$.

If D' is not satisfiable, then return no.

Suppose D' is sat.

Check that $\text{IMP}(C, \beta) \equiv \beta$. if not return no. Suppose it is the case.

Let $\text{IMP}_1 := \text{IMP}() - \{\alpha_i \mid D' \models \neg A_i\}$

Check that IMP_1 equivalent to β . If it is the case then return yes, return no else.