



BITS Pilani
Pilani Campus



CS/IS F214 Logic in Computer Science

MODULE: PROPOSITIONAL LOGIC

Validity and Conjunctive Normal Form

Conjunctive Normal Form (CNF)

RECALL

- A propositional logic formula ϕ is said to be in **CNF** if the formula is a conjunction of sub-formulas (or **clauses**):
 i.e. it is of the form $C_1 \wedge C_2 \wedge \dots \wedge C_n$
 where each clause C_i is a disjunction of literals:
 i.e. it is of the form $L_{i1} \vee L_{i2} \vee \dots \vee L_{im}$
- where each literal L_{ij} is
 - either an atomic proposition (p) or the negation of an atomic proposition ($\neg p$) .
- In Boolean logic, the CNF is referred to as the **Product-of-Sums (POS)** form.



Validity and CNF

- Consider a formula ϕ in CNF:
 - Let ϕ be $C_1 \wedge C_2 \wedge \dots \wedge C_n$
 - Then ϕ is valid if and only if C_i is valid for all i
 - Let a given clause C_i be $L_{i1} \vee L_{i2} \vee \dots \vee L_{im}$
 - Then, under what conditions will C_i be valid?



Validity and CNF

- Consider a formula ϕ in CNF:
 - Let ϕ be $C_1 \wedge C_2 \wedge \dots \wedge C_n$
 - Then ϕ is valid if and only if C_i is valid for all i
- Let a given clause C_i be $L_{i1} \vee L_{i2} \vee \dots \vee L_{im}$
- Question:
 - Under what conditions will C_i be valid?
- Answer:
 - C_i will be valid only if it includes a proposition p and its negation i.e.:
 - there exist k and l such that L_{ik} is p and L_{il} is $\neg p$ for some propositional atom p



CNF – Algorithm for checking Validity

- **isValidCNF(ϕ)**

1. Let ϕ be $C_1 \wedge C_2 \wedge \dots \wedge C_n$
2. for each i :
 1. if not(isValidDisClause(C_i)) then return FALSE;
3. return TRUE;

- **isValidDisClause(C)**

1. Let C be $L_1 \vee L_2 \vee \dots \vee L_m$
2. for each i :
 1. if L_i is p { for each $j > i$: if L_j is $\neg p$ then return TRUE }
 else { for each $j > i$: if L_j is p then return TRUE }
3. return FALSE;



CNF – Algorithm for checking Validity

isValidCNF(ϕ)

Let ϕ be $C_1 \wedge C_2 \wedge \dots \wedge C_n$

for each i:

if not(isValidDisClause(C_i))
then return FALSE;

return TRUE;

isValidDisClause(C)

Let C be $L_1 \vee L_2 \vee \dots \vee L_m$

for each i:

if L_i is p { for each j>i: if L_j is
 $\neg p$ then return TRUE }

else { for each j>i: if L_j is
 p then return TRUE }

return FALSE;

CNF – Cost of checking Validity

Time taken by isValidCNF:

- ϕ has n clauses:
 - $n * (1 + (\text{time taken by } \text{isValidDisClause}))$
 - in the worst case

Time taken by isValidDisClause:

- The input clause has m literals:
 - $1 + m * (1 + (m * 1))$
 - in the worst case

Cost of checking Validity

- Given a formula in CNF with n clauses, and each clause with at most m literals:
 - the cost of checking whether the formula is valid:
 - $c * (n + m * n + m * m * n)$ in the worst case for some constant c
- Thus the cost of checking whether a formula in CNF is valid is at most:
 - $c * m^2 * n$ for a suitable constant c



Cost of checking Validity

- Compare the cost of checking validity of a formula in CNF with
 - the cost of checking validity of a formula using the truth table method (or equivalently, by testing a circuit):
 - (# rows in truth table) * (cost of evaluating the formula)
 - $2^k * (n * m)$
 - where k different propositional atoms are used in the formula.
- Is there a better way for checking validity of a propositional logic formula, if it is not known to be in CNF?

