## Assignment 2

Name: Adharsh Kamath UIN: 671259918 NetID: ak128

## Problem 1

#### Soln:

Let us use the symbol  $\psi$  to refer to the given formula.

$$\psi = (p \land (p \Rightarrow q)) \Rightarrow q$$

In order to show that  $\psi$  is valid, we can show that

$$\neg \psi = \neg \left( (p \land (p \Rightarrow q) \Rightarrow q) \right)$$

is unsatisfiable. Rewriting the above formula:

$$\neg \psi = \neg ((p \land (p \Rightarrow q) \Rightarrow q))$$

$$\equiv \neg ((p \land (\neg p \lor q)) \Rightarrow q)$$

$$\equiv \neg (\neg (p \land (\neg p \lor q)) \lor q)$$

$$\equiv (p \land (\neg p \lor q)) \land \neg q$$

The last step is due to De Morgan's Law. We can now convert this to CNF, and construct a resolution refutation to show that it is unsatisfiable. To convert to CNF, we use the Tseitin transformation. We only need three new propositional variables,  $x_{\psi}$ ,  $x_1$ ,  $x_2$ , where  $x_{\psi}$  corresponds to  $\psi$ ,  $x_1$  corresponds to  $(\neg p \lor q)$  and  $x_2$  corresponds to  $(p \land x_1)$ . This gives us the following set of clauses:

$$\begin{cases}
\{\neg x_{\psi}\}, \\
\{\neg \neg x_{\psi}, x_{2}\}, \{\neg \neg x_{\psi}, \neg q\}, \{\neg x_{\psi}, \neg x_{2}, \neg \neg q\} \\
\{\neg x_{2}, p\}, \{\neg x_{2}, x_{1}\}, \{x_{2}, \neg p, \neg x_{1}\}, \\
\{x_{1}, \neg \neg p\}, \{x_{1}, \neg q\}, \{\neg x_{1}, \neg p, q\},
\end{cases}$$

Simplifying the set by replacing  $\neg \neg p$  with p for all propositional variables, we get:

$$\begin{cases}
\{\neg x_{\psi}\}, \\
\{x_{\psi}, x_{2}\}, \{x_{\psi}, \neg q\}, \{\neg x_{\psi}, \neg x_{2}, q\} \\
\{\neg x_{2}, p\}, \{\neg x_{2}, x_{1}\}, \{x_{2}, \neg p, \neg x_{1}\}, \\
\{x_{1}, p\}, \{x_{1}, \neg q\}, \{\neg x_{1}, \neg p, q\},
\end{cases}$$

We can now create a resolution refutation to show that this set is unsatisfiable:

```
1.\{\neg x_{\psi}\}
2.\{x_{\psi}, x_{2}\}
3.\{x_{2}\} Resolvent of 1 and 2
4.\{\neg x_{2}, p\}
5.\{p\} Resolvent of 3 and 4
6.\{\neg x_{1}, \neg p, q\}
7.\{\neg x_{1}, q\} Resolvent of 5 and 6
8.\{x_{\psi}, \neg q\}
9.\{x_{\psi}, \neg x_{1}\} Resolvent of 7 and 8
10.\{\neg x_{1}\} Resolvent of 1 and 9
11.\{\neg x_{2}, x_{1}\}
12.\{\neg x_{2}\} Resolvent of 3 and 11
13.\{\} Resolvent of 10 and 12
```

By creating this resolution refutation, we have shown that there is no valuation that can satisfy  $\neg \psi$ . Since  $\neg \psi$  is unsatisfiable, we can conclude that  $\psi$  is valid.

The above proof can be validated using the resolution tool provided as a part of the assignment. The beginning set of clauses in the tool's syntax, and the resulting resolution proof object can be found at https://github.com/adharshkamath/cs474-hw/tree/main/resolution\_proofs/p1

#### Problem 2

### Soln:

We are given the formula:

$$\psi = (q \vee \neg r) \wedge (\neg p \vee r) \wedge (\neg q \vee r \vee p) \wedge (p \vee q \vee \neg q) \wedge (\neg r \vee q)$$

We can find resolvents in the following way: (Only resolutions that lead to clauses that do not already exist in the set of clauses are considered. Resolutions that result in "trivial" clauses are

also considered.)

```
\begin{aligned} &1.\{q\vee\neg r\}\\ &2.\{\neg p\vee r\}\\ &3.\{q\vee\neg p\} \quad \text{Resolvent of 1 and 2}\\ &4.\{\neg q\vee r\vee p\}\\ &5.\{r\vee\neg r\vee p\} \quad \text{Resolvent of 1 and 4}\\ &6.\{p\vee q\vee\neg q\}\\ &7.\{p\vee q\vee\neg r\} \quad \text{Resolvent of 1 and 6}\\ &8.\{r\vee\neg q\} \quad \text{Resolvent of 2 and 4}\\ &9.\{r\vee\neg r\} \quad \text{Resolvent of 2 and 5}\\ &10.\{r\vee p\vee\neg p\} \quad \text{Resolvent of 2 and 5}\\ &11.\{r\vee q\vee\neg q\} \quad \text{Resolvent of 2 and 6}\\ &12.\{r\vee q\vee\neg r\} \quad \text{Resolvent of 2 and 7}\\ &12.\{p\vee q\vee\neg p\} \quad \text{Resolvent of 2 and 7}\\ &13.\{\}\end{aligned}
```

# Problem 3

### Soln: