EC4219: Software Engineering

Lecture 4 — Propositional Logic (2)
Normal Forms and DPLL

Sunbeom So
2024 Spring

Overview

- Goal: An algorithm called *DPLL* for determining satisfiability.
  - Many SAT solvers used today are based on DPLL.
  - SAT solver: software that solves the boolean satisfiability problem (theorem prover for propositional logic)
- DPLL requires converting formulas to a representation called *normal forms*.
- Thus, we will study normal forms first and then DPLL.

Normal Forms

- A normal form of formulas is a certain syntactic restriction such that there is an equivalent formula F' for every formula F of the logic.
- Three normal forms are particularly important for propositional logic.
  - Negation Normal Form (NNF)
  - Disjunctive Normal Form (DNF)
  - Conjunctive Normal Form (CNF)

Negation Normal Form (NNF)

- NNF requires that $\neg$, $\wedge$, and $\vee$ are the only connectives (i.e., no $\rightarrow$ and $\leftrightarrow$) and that negations appear only in literals (i.e., negations appear only in front of atoms).
  - Is $P \wedge Q \wedge (R \vee \neg S)$ in NNF?

Negation Normal Form (NNF)

- NNF requires that $\neg$, $\wedge$, and $\vee$ are the only connectives (i.e., no $\rightarrow$ and $\leftrightarrow$) and that negations appear only in literals (i.e., negations appear only in front of atoms).
  - Is $P \wedge Q \wedge (R \vee \neg S)$ in NNF? **O**
  - Is $\neg P \vee \neg(P \wedge Q))$ in NNF?

Negation Normal Form (NNF)

- NNF requires that $\neg$, $\wedge$, and $\vee$ are the only connectives (i.e., no $\rightarrow$ and $\leftrightarrow$) and that negations appear only in literals (i.e., negations appear only in front of atoms).
    - Is $P \wedge Q \wedge (R \vee \neg S)$ in NNF? **O**
    - Is $\neg P \vee \neg(P \wedge Q))$ in NNF? **X**
    - Is $\neg\neg P \wedge Q$ in NNF?

Negation Normal Form (NNF)

- NNF requires that $\neg$, $\wedge$, and $\vee$ are the only connectives (i.e., no $\rightarrow$ and $\leftrightarrow$) and that negations appear only in literals (i.e., negations appear only in front of atoms).
  - Is $P \wedge Q \wedge (R \vee \neg S)$ in NNF? **O**
  - Is $\neg P \vee \neg(P \wedge Q))$ in NNF? **X**
  - Is $\neg\neg P \wedge Q$ in NNF? **X**
- Transforming a formula F to an equivalent formula F' in NNF can be done by repeatedly applying the list of template equivalences below:

$$\begin{array}{rcl}
\neg\neg F_1 & \iff & F_1 \\
\neg\top & \iff & \bot \\
\neg\bot & \iff & \top \\
\neg(F_1 \wedge F_2) & \iff & \neg F_1 \vee \neg F_2 \\
\neg(F_1 \vee F_2) & \iff & \neg F_1 \wedge \neg F_2 \\
F_1 \rightarrow F_2 & \iff & \neg F_1 \vee F_2 \\
F_1 \leftrightarrow F_2 & \iff & (F_1 \rightarrow F_2) \wedge (F_2 \rightarrow F_1)
\end{array}$$

Example: NNF

Convert $F : \neg(P \to \neg(P \land Q))$ into NNF.

- By the template equivalence $F_1 \to F_2 \iff \neg F_1 \lor F_2$, we produce

$$F' : \neg(\neg P \lor \neg(P \land Q))$$

- Applying the template $\neg(F_1 \lor F_2) \iff \neg F_1 \land \neg F_2$, we produce

$$F'' : \neg\neg P \land \neg\neg(P \land Q)$$

- Finally, applying the template equivalence $\neg\neg F_1 \iff F_1$ to each conjunct produces

$$F''' : P \land P \land Q$$

F''' is in NNF and is equivalent to F.

Disjunctive Normal Form (DNF)

- A formula is in disjunctive normal form (DNF) if it is a disjunction of conjunctive clauses (conjunctions of literals):

$$\bigvee_i \bigwedge_j l_{i,j}$$

- To convert a formula F into an equivalent formula in DNF,
  (1) transform F into NNF, and then
  (2) distribute conjunctions over disjunctions:

$$\begin{array}{rcl} (F_1 \lor F_2) \land F_3 & \iff & (F_1 \land F_3) \lor (F_2 \land F_3) \\ F_1 \land (F_2 \lor F_3) & \iff & (F_1 \land F_2) \lor (F_1 \land F_3) \end{array}$$

Example: DNF

To convert

$$F : (Q_1 \vee \neg\neg Q_2) \wedge (\neg R_1 \rightarrow R_2)$$

into DNF,

- Transform F into NNF.

$$F' : (Q_1 \vee Q_2) \wedge (R_1 \vee R_2)$$

- Apply distributivity.

$$F'' : (Q_1 \wedge (R_1 \vee R_2)) \vee (Q_2 \wedge (R_1 \vee R_2)).$$

  Apply distributivity again.

$$F''' : (Q_1 \wedge R_1) \vee (Q_1 \wedge R_2) \vee (Q_2 \wedge R_1) \vee (Q_2 \wedge R_2)$$

F''' is in DNF and is equivalent to F.

Conjunctive Normal Form (CNF)

- A formula is in conjunctive normal form (CNF) if it is a conjunction of disjunctive clauses (disjunctions of literals):

$$\bigwedge_i \bigvee_j l_{i,j}$$

- To convert a formula F into an equivalent formula in CNF,
  (1) transform F into NNF, and then
  (2) distribute disjunctions over conjunctions:

$$\begin{array}{rcl} (F_1 \wedge F_2) \vee F_3 & \iff & (F_1 \vee F_3) \wedge (F_2 \vee F_3) \\ F_1 \vee (F_2 \wedge F_3) & \iff & (F_1 \vee F_2) \wedge (F_1 \vee F_3) \end{array}$$

Example: CNF

Convert $F : (Q_1 \wedge \neg\neg Q_2) \vee (\neg R_1 \rightarrow R_2)$ into CNF.

- Transform F into NNF.

$$F' : (Q_1 \wedge Q_2) \vee (R_1 \vee R_2)$$

- Apply distributivity.

$$F'' : (Q_1 \vee R_1 \vee R_2) \wedge (Q_2 \vee R_1 \vee R_2)$$

F'' is in CNF and is equivalent to F.

Dicision Procedures

- A *decision procedure* decides whether F is satisfiable after some finite steps of computation.
- Approaches for deciding satisfiability:
  - **Search**: exhaustively search for all possible assignments.
  - **Deduction**: deduce facts from known facts by iteratively applying proof rules.
  - **Combination**: Modern SAT solvers are based on *DPLL* that combines search and deduction in an effective way.
- Plan: we will first define the naive approach and extend it to DPLL, the basis for modern SAT solvers.

Exhaustive Search (Truth Table Method)

- The naive, recursive algorithm for deciding satisfiability.

Algorithm 1 SAT

```
Input: A PL formula $F$
Output: Satisfiability ($true$: SAT, $false$: UNSAT)
1: if $F = \top$ then return $\top$
2: else if $F = \bot$ then return $\bot$
3: else
4:     $P \leftarrow \mathbf{ChooseVar}(F)$
5:     return $\mathbf{SAT}(F\{P \mapsto \top\}) \vee \mathbf{SAT}(F\{P \mapsto \bot\})$
```

- When applying $F\{P \mapsto \top\}$ and $F\{P \mapsto \bot\}$, the resulting formulas should be simplified using template equivalences on PL.

$$\begin{array}{rcl@{\qquad}rcl@{\qquad}rcl}
\top & \iff & \neg\bot & \bot & \iff & \neg\top & \neg\neg F & \iff & F \\
F \wedge \top & \iff & F & F \wedge \bot & \iff & \bot & F \wedge F & \iff & F \\
F \vee \top & \iff & \top & F \vee \bot & \iff & F & F \vee F & \iff & F \\
 & \cdots & & & \cdots & & & \cdots &
\end{array}$$

Example 1: Exhaustive Search

Consider the formula $F : (P \to Q) \land P \land \neg Q$.

- Choose variable P and

$$F\{P \mapsto \top\} : (\top \to Q) \land \top \land \neg Q$$

  which simplifies to $F_1 : Q \land \neg Q$.
  - $F_1\{Q \mapsto \top\} : \bot$
  - $F_1\{Q \mapsto \bot\} : \bot$
- Recurse on the other branch for P in F.

$$F\{P \mapsto \bot\} : (\bot \to Q) \land \bot \land \neg Q$$

  which simplifies to $\bot$.

Since all branches end without finding a satisfying assignment, we conclude F is UNSAT.

Example 2: Exhaustive Search

Determine the satisfiability of $\boldsymbol{F : (P \rightarrow Q) \land \neg P}$.

Example 2: Exhaustive Search

Determine the satisfiability of $F : (P \rightarrow Q) \land \neg P$.

- Choose P and recurse on the first case:

$$F\{P \mapsto \top\} : (\top \rightarrow Q) \land \neg\top$$

  which is equivalent to $\bot$.

- Try the other case:

$$F\{P \mapsto \bot\} : (\bot \rightarrow Q) \land \neg\bot$$

  which is equivalent to $\top$.

We conclude F is SAT by the second case. Assigning any value to Q produces a satisfying interpretation:

$$I : \{P \mapsto \mathit{false}, Q \rightarrow \mathit{true}\}$$

Equisatisfiability

- SAT solvers convert a given formula F to CNF, and implement various CNF-based optimizations to speed up the solving process.
    - We will explore several optimizations for CNF formulas.

Equisatisfiability

- SAT solvers convert a given formula $\boldsymbol{F}$ to CNF, and implement various CNF-based optimizations to speed up the solving process.
  - We will explore several optimizations for CNF formulas.
- Issue: Conversion to an *equivalent* CNF incurs exponential blow-up in worst-case, resulting in increasing runtime. When?

Equisatisfiability

- SAT solvers convert a given formula F to CNF, and implement various CNF-based optimizations to speed up the solving process.
  - We will explore several optimizations for CNF formulas.
- Issue: Conversion to an *equivalent* CNF incurs exponential blow-up in worst-case, resulting in increasing runtime. When?
- Consider converting a formula in DNF into CNF.

$$\begin{array}{rl} & (F_1 \land F_2) \lor (F_3 \land F_4) \\ \iff & (F_1 \lor (F_3 \land F_4)) \land (F_2 \lor (F_3 \land F_4)) \\ \iff & (F_1 \lor F_3) \land (F_1 \lor F_4) \land (F_2 \lor F_3) \land (F_2 \lor F_4) \end{array}$$

- Another example

$$\begin{array}{rl} & (F_1 \land F_2) \lor (F_3 \land F_4) \lor (F_5 \land F_6) \\ \iff & (((F_1 \lor F_3) \land (F_1 \lor F_4)) \land ((F_2 \lor F_3) \land (F_2 \lor F_4))) \lor (F_5 \land F_6) \\ \iff & (F_1 \lor F_3 \lor F_5) \land (F_1 \lor F_4 \lor F_5) \land (F_2 \lor F_3 \lor F_5) \land (F_2 \lor F_4 \lor F_5) \\ & \land\ (F_1 \lor F_3 \lor F_6) \land (F_1 \lor F_4 \lor F_6) \land (F_2 \lor F_3 \lor F_6) \land (F_2 \lor F_4 \lor F_6) \end{array}$$

- n binary clauses (a disjunction of two literals) results in 2^n CNF clauses.

Conversion to an Equisatisfiable Formula in CNF

- Given a formula $\boldsymbol{F}$, we can convert it into an *equisatisfiable* CNF formula, which increases the size by only a constant factor.
  - Using the method called Tseitin's transformation.
- $\boldsymbol{F}$ and $\boldsymbol{F'}$ are *equisatisfiable* when $\boldsymbol{F}$ is satisfiable iff $\boldsymbol{F'}$ is satisfiable.
- Idea of Teitin's transformation:
  (1) introduce new variables to represent the subformulas of $\boldsymbol{F}$.
  (2) assert that these new variables are equivalent to the subformulas that they represent (to ensure that the subformulas and the corresponding new variables have the same truth values).

Conversion to an Equisatisfiable Formula in CNF

- Given a formula F, we can convert it into an *equisatisfiable* CNF formula, which increases the size by only a constant factor.
  - Using the method called Tseitin's transformation.
- F and F' are *equisatisfiable* when F is satisfiable iff F' is satisfiable.
- Idea of Teitin's transformation:
  (1) introduce new variables to represent the subformulas of F.
  (2) assert that these new variables are equivalent to the subformulas that they represent (to ensure that the subformulas and the corresponding new variables have the same truth values).

(Example) consider the conjunction case ($G : F_1 \land F_2$).

$$\begin{aligned}
&\textbf{En}(F_1 \land F_2) \\
&\quad = \ (P_G \leftrightarrow P_{F_1} \land P_{F_2}) \\
&\quad = \ (P_G \rightarrow P_{F_1} \land P_{F_2}) \land (P_{F_1} \land P_{F_2} \rightarrow P_G) \\
&\quad = \ (\neg P_G \lor (P_{F_1} \land P_{F_2})) \land (\neg(P_{F_1} \land P_{F_2}) \lor P_G) \\
&\quad = \ (\neg P_G \lor P_{F_1}) \land (\neg P_G \lor P_{F_2}) \land (\neg P_{F_1} \lor \neg P_{F_2} \lor P_G)
\end{aligned}$$

Conversion to an Equisatisfiable Formula in CNF

Now define the full procedure of Teitin's transformation.

- Let **Rep : PL** $\rightarrow \mathcal{V} \cup \{\top, \bot\}$ be the "representative function", where $\mathcal{V}$ denotes propositional variables.

$$\textbf{Rep}(\top) = \top, \quad \textbf{Rep}(\bot) = \bot, \quad \textbf{Rep}(P) = P, \quad \textbf{Rep}(F) = P_F$$

Conversion to an Equisatisfiable Formula in CNF

Let **En** be the function that asserts the equivalence between F and P_F as a CNF formula.

$\mathbf{En}(\top) = \top, \quad \mathbf{En}(\bot) = \top, \quad \mathbf{En}(P) = \top$ *Why* $\top$*?*

$\mathbf{En}(\neg F) =$
let $P = \mathbf{Rep}(\neg F)$ in
$(\neg P \lor \neg \mathbf{Rep}(F)) \land (P \lor \mathbf{Rep}(F))$

$\mathbf{En}(F_1 \land F_2) =$
let $P = \mathbf{Rep}(F_1 \land F_2)$ in
$(\neg P \lor \mathbf{Rep}(F_1)) \land (\neg P \lor \neg \mathbf{Rep}(F_2)) \land (\neg \mathbf{Rep}(F_1) \lor \neg \mathbf{Rep}(F_2) \lor P)$

$\mathbf{En}(F_1 \lor F_2) =$
let $P = \mathbf{Rep}(F_1 \land F_2)$ in
$(\neg P \lor \mathbf{Rep}(F_1) \lor \mathbf{Rep}(F_2)) \land (\mathbf{Rep}(F_1) \lor P) \land (\neg \mathbf{Rep}(F_2) \lor P)$

$\mathbf{En}(F_1 \rightarrow F_2) =$
let $P = \mathbf{Rep}(F_1 \rightarrow F_2)$ in
$(\neg P \lor \neg \mathbf{Rep}(F_1) \lor \mathbf{Rep}(F_2)) \land (\mathbf{Rep}(F_1) \lor P) \land (\neg \mathbf{Rep}(F_2) \lor P)$

$\mathbf{En}(F_1 \leftrightarrow F_2) =$
let $P = \mathbf{Rep}(F_1 \leftrightarrow F_2)$ in
$(\neg P \lor \neg \mathbf{Rep}(F_1) \lor \mathbf{Rep}(F_2)) \land (\neg P \lor \mathbf{Rep}(F_1) \lor \neg \mathbf{Rep}(F_2))$
$\land (P \lor \neg \mathbf{Rep}(F_1) \lor \neg \mathbf{Rep}(F_2)) \land (P \lor \mathbf{Rep}(F_1) \lor \mathbf{Rep}(F_2))$

Conversion to an Equisatisfiable Formula in CNF

Having defined **En**, we construct the full CNF formula F' that is equisatisfiable to F. Let S_F be the set of all subformulas of F (including F itself).

$$F' : \textbf{Rep}(F) \land \bigwedge_{G \in S_F} \textbf{En}(G)$$

- Suppose F has size n, where each instance of a logical connective or a propositional variable contributes one unit of size. Then, F' has a size at most $30n + 2$.

  The size of F' is linear in the size of F!

  - $|S_F|$ is bound by n.
  - The number of symbols from $\textbf{En}(F_1 \leftrightarrow F_2)$, which incurs the largest expansion, is 29.
  - Upto one additional conjunction is required per $G \in S_F$.
  - Finally, two extra symbols are required for asserting that $\textbf{Rep}(F)$ is true.

Example: Conversion to an Equisatisfiable Formula in CNF

Consider $F : x_1 \rightarrow (x_2 \wedge x_3)$

- Introduce two variables a_1 and a_2 with two equivalences:

$$\begin{aligned} G_1 : &\quad a_1 \leftrightarrow (x_1 \rightarrow a_2) \\ G_2 : &\quad a_2 \leftrightarrow (x_2 \wedge x_3) \end{aligned}$$

  We need to satisfy all the equivalences.

- Convert the equivalences to CNF:

$$\begin{array}{lcl} G_1 & \iff & (a_1 \rightarrow (x_1 \rightarrow a_2)) \wedge ((x_1 \rightarrow a_2) \rightarrow a_1) \\ & \iff & (\neg a_1 \vee (\neg x_1 \vee a_2)) \wedge (\neg(\neg x_1 \vee a_2) \vee a_1) \\ & \iff & (\neg a_1 \vee \neg x_1 \vee a_2) \wedge ((x_1 \wedge \neg a_2) \vee a_1) \\ & \iff & (\neg a_1 \vee \neg x_1 \vee a_2) \wedge (a_1 \vee x_1) \wedge (a_1 \vee \neg a_2) \\ G_2 & \iff & (a_2 \rightarrow (x_2 \wedge x_3)) \wedge ((x_2 \wedge x_3) \rightarrow a_2) \\ & \iff & (\neg a_2 \vee (x_2 \wedge x_3)) \wedge (\neg(x_2 \wedge x_3) \vee a_2) \\ & \iff & (\neg a_2 \vee x_2) \wedge (\neg a_2 \vee x_3) \wedge (a_2 \vee \neg x_2 \vee \neg x_3) \end{array}$$

- The final, equisatisfiable CNF formula F':

$$\begin{aligned} F' \;=\; & a_1 \wedge (a_1 \vee x_1) \wedge (a_1 \vee \neg a_2) \wedge (\neg a_1 \vee \neg x_1 \vee a_2) \wedge \\ & (\neg a_2 \vee x_2) \wedge (\neg a_2 \vee x_3) \wedge (a_2 \vee \neg x_2 \vee \neg x_3) \end{aligned}$$

The Resolution Procedure

- Applicable only to CNF formulas.
- Observation: to satisfy clauses $C_1[P]$ and $C_2[\neg P]$ that share the variable P but disagree on its value, either the rest of C_1 or the rest of C_2 must be satisfied. Why?
- The clause $C_1[\bot] \lor C_2[\bot]$ (with simplification) can be added as a conjunction to F to produce an equivalent formula still in CNF.
- The proof rule for *clausal resolution*:

$$\frac{C_1[P] \quad C_2[\neg P]}{C_1[\bot] \lor C_2[\bot]}$$

  The new clause $C_1[\bot] \lor C_2[\bot]$ is called the *resolvent*.
- If ever $\bot$ is deduced via resolution, F must be unsatisfiable. Otherwise, if no further resolutions are possible, F must be satisfiable.

Example 1: Resolution

Consider $F : (\neg P \lor Q) \land P \land \neg Q$.

- From the resolution

$$\frac{(\neg P \lor Q) \quad P}{Q}$$

  we can construct $F' : (\neg P \lor Q) \land P \land \neg Q \land Q$. From the resolution

$$\frac{\neg Q \quad Q}{\bot}$$

  we can deduce that F is unsatisfiable.

Example 2: Resolution

Consider $F : (\neg P \vee Q) \wedge \neg Q$.

- The resolution
$$\frac{(\neg P \vee Q) \quad \neg Q}{\neg P}$$
yields $F' : (\neg P \vee Q) \wedge \neg Q \wedge \neg P$.
- Since no further resolutions are possible, F is satisfiable. Indeed, we have a satisfying interpretation $I : \{P \mapsto \mathit{false}, Q \mapsto \mathit{false}\}$.

DPLL

- The Davis-Putnam-Logemann-Loveland algorithm (DPLL) combines the enumerative search and a restricted form of resolution, called *unit resolution*:

$$\frac{l \quad C[\neg l]}{C[\bot]}$$

  where l is a literal (i.e., $l = P$ or $l = \neg P$ for some propositional variable P).

- The process of applying this resolution as much as possible is called *Boolean constraint propagation (BCP)*.
- Like the resolution procedure, DPLL operates on PL formulas in CNF.

Example: BCP

Consider $F : P \wedge (\neg P \vee Q) \wedge (R \vee \neg Q \vee S)$ where P is a unit clause.

- Applying the unit resolution

$$\frac{P \quad (\neg P \vee Q)}{Q}$$

  yields $F' : Q \wedge (R \vee \neg Q \vee S)$.

- Again, applying the unit resolution

$$\frac{Q \quad (R \vee \neg Q \vee S)}{R \vee S}$$

  to F' produces $F'' : R \vee S$, ending the current round of BCP.

DPLL with BCP

DPLL is similar to SAT, except that it begins by applying BCP.

Algorithm 2 DPLL

Input: A PL formula F in CNF
Output: Satisfiability (true: SAT, false: UNSAT)

```
1: $F \leftarrow \mathrm{BCP}(F)$
2: if $F = \top$ then return $\top$
3: else if $F = \bot$ then return $\bot$
4: else
5:     $P \leftarrow \mathrm{ChooseVar}(F)$
6:     return $\mathrm{DPLL}(F\{P \mapsto \top\}) \vee \mathrm{DPLL}(F\{P \mapsto \bot\})$
```

Pure Literal Propagation (PLP)

- If variable P appears only positively or only negatively in F, remove all clauses containing an instance of P (since they are not key factors for determining satisfiability).
  - If P appears only positively (i.e., no $\neg P$ in F), replace P by $\top$.
  - If P appears only negatively (i.e., no P in F), replace P by $\bot$.
- The original formula F and the resulting formula F' are equisatisfiable.
- When only such pure variables remain, the formula must be satisfiable. A full interpretation can be constructed by setting each variable's value based on whether it appears only positively ($true$) or only negatively ($false$).

DPLL with BCP and PLP

Algorithm 3 DPLL

Input: A PL formula F in CNF
Output: Satisfiability ($true$: SAT, $false$: UNSAT)

```
1: $F \leftarrow \mathrm{BCP}(F)$
2: $F \leftarrow \mathrm{PLP}(F)$
3: if $F = \top$ then return $\top$
4: else if $F = \bot$ then return $\bot$
5: else
6:     $P \leftarrow \mathrm{ChooseVar}(F)$
7:     return $\mathrm{DPLL}(F\{P \mapsto \top\}) \lor \mathrm{DPLL}(F\{P \mapsto \bot\})$
```

Example 1: DPLL with BCP and PLP

Consider $F : P \land (\neg P \lor Q) \land (R \lor \neg Q \lor S)$ in our previous BCP example.

- Recall that applying BCP yields $F'' : R \lor S$, where the unit resolutions correspond to the partial interpretation $\{P \mapsto \mathit{true}, Q \mapsto \mathit{true}\}$.
- All variables occur positively, so F is satisfiable:

$$I : \{P \mapsto \mathit{true}, Q \mapsto \mathit{true}, R \mapsto \mathit{true}, S \mapsto \mathit{true}\}$$

- Branching (lines 6 and 7 in Algorithm 3) is not required in this example.

Example 2: DPLL with BCP and PLP

Consider

$$F : (\neg P \lor Q \lor R) \land (\neg Q \lor R) \land (\neg Q \lor \neg R) \land (P \lor \neg Q \lor \neg R)$$

Example 2: DPLL with BCP and PLP

Consider

$$F : (\neg P \lor Q \lor R) \land (\neg Q \lor R) \land (\neg Q \lor \neg R) \land (P \lor \neg Q \lor \neg R)$$

- No BCP and PLP are applicable.
- Choose Q on the true branch:

  $$F\{Q \mapsto \top\} : R \land (\neg R) \land (P \lor \neg R)$$

  We finish this branch, as the unit resolution with R and $\neg R$ deduces $\bot$.
- On the other branch for Q:

  $$F\{Q \mapsto \bot\} : (\neg P \lor R)$$

  P and R are pure, and thus F is satisfiable with the satisfying interpretation:

  $$I : \{P \mapsto \mathit{false}, Q \mapsto \mathit{false}, R \mapsto \mathit{true}\}$$

Summary

- Q. Why computational logic in software engineering?
  A. Mathematical basis for systemically analyzing software.
- Syntax and semantics of propositional logic
- Satisfiability and validity
- Equivalence, implications, and equisatisfiability
- Substitution
- Normal forms: NNF, DNF, CNF
- Decision procedures for satisfiability