Satisfiability Checking - WS 2016/2017

Series 2

gereon.kremer@cs.rwth-aachen.de
https://ths.rwth-aachen.de/teaching/

Exercise 1

We define the famous *Pigeon Hole Problem (PHP)* over $\mathbb{N} = \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$:

Given:	$n \in \mathbb{N}$.
Question:	Do $n + 1$ pigeons fit into n holes, if no two pigeons fit into one hole?

a) What is the solution to the pigeon hole problems for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$?

b) Formulate the pigeon hole problem for $n = 2$ holes (and thus 3 pigeons) in propositional logic.

c) If your formula is not already in CNF, convert it into CNF. Use resolution to deduce the empty clause.

d) Specify a preferably small unsatisfiable core of the problem, that is a subset of the clause set that is already unsatisfiable.

e) The pigeon hole problems are a "worst-case" for many SAT-solvers. Can you guess why? Substantiate your claims!

Solution:

a) The assignment due to the pigeon hole problem corresponds to the existence of a surjective mapping $\{1, \ldots, n\} \to \{1, \ldots, n + 1\}$ or, equivalently, the existence of an injective mapping $\{1, \ldots, n + 1\} \to \{1, \ldots, n\}$. Because such a mapping does not exist the solution to the pigeon hole problem is "unsatisfiable".

b) Let x_{ij} stand for pigeon i being in hole j ($1 \leq i \leq 3$, $1 \leq j \leq 2$). The pigeon hole problem can be encoded into the following propositional formula describing that each pigeon is in a hole, no pigeon is assigned twice and no hole holds two pigeons at the same time:

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi_0 \quad := \quad & c_1 : (x_{11} \vee x_{12}) \wedge c_2 : (x_{21} \vee x_{22}) \wedge c_3 : (x_{31} \vee x_{32}) \wedge \\ & c_4 : (\neg x_{11} \vee \neg x_{12}) \wedge c_5 : (\neg x_{21} \vee \neg x_{22}) \wedge c_6 : (\neg x_{31} \vee \neg x_{32}) \wedge \\ & c_7 : (\neg x_{11} \vee \neg x_{21}) \wedge c_8 : (\neg x_{11} \vee \neg x_{31}) \wedge c_9 : (\neg x_{21} \vee \neg x_{31}) \wedge \\ & c_{10} : (\neg x_{12} \vee \neg x_{22}) \wedge c_{11} : (\neg x_{12} \vee \neg x_{32}) \wedge c_{12} : (\neg x_{22} \vee \neg x_{32}).\end{aligned}$$

c) First eliminate x_{11} by resolution. x_{11} occurs in c_1, $\neg x_{11}$ occurs in c_4, c_7, c_8.

$$\frac{c_1 : (x_{11} \vee x_{12}) \quad c_4 : (\neg x_{11} \vee \neg x_{12})}{c_{13} : (x_{12} \vee \neg x_{12}) \quad (\textit{Tautology!})}$$

$$\frac{c_1 : (x_{11} \vee x_{12}) \quad c_7 : (\neg x_{11} \vee \neg x_{21})}{c_{14} : (x_{12} \vee \neg x_{21})}$$

$$\frac{c_1 : (x_{11} \vee x_{12}) \quad c_8 : (\neg x_{11} \vee \neg x_{31})}{c_{15} : (x_{12} \vee \neg x_{31})}$$

Resulting formula:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\varphi_1 \quad := \quad & \cancel{c_1 : (x_{11} \lor x_{12})} \land c_2 : (x_{21} \lor x_{22}) \land c_3 : (x_{31} \lor x_{32}) \land \\
& \cancel{c_4 : (\neg x_{11} \lor \neg x_{12})} \land c_5 : (\neg x_{21} \lor \neg x_{22}) \land c_6 : (\neg x_{31} \lor \neg x_{32}) \land \\
& \cancel{c_7 : (\neg x_{11} \lor \neg x_{21})} \land \cancel{c_8 : (\neg x_{11} \lor \neg x_{31})} \land c_9 : (\neg x_{21} \lor \neg x_{31}) \land \\
& c_{10} : (\neg x_{12} \lor \neg x_{22}) \land c_{11} : (\neg x_{12} \lor \neg x_{32}) \land c_{12} : (\neg x_{22} \lor \neg x_{32}) \land \\
& c_{14} : (x_{12} \lor \neg x_{21}) \land c_{15} : (x_{12} \lor \neg x_{31})
\end{aligned}
$$

Next eliminate x_{12} occurring positively in c_{14}, c_{15} and negatively in c_{10}, c_{11}.

$$\frac{c_{14} : (x_{12} \lor \neg x_{21}) \quad c_{10} : (\neg x_{12} \lor \neg x_{22})}{c_{16} : (\neg x_{21} \lor \neg x_{22}) = c_5}$$

$$\frac{c_{14} : (x_{12} \lor \neg x_{21}) \quad c_{11} : (\neg x_{12} \lor \neg x_{32})}{c_{17} : (\neg x_{21} \lor \neg x_{32})}$$

$$\frac{c_{15} : (x_{12} \lor \neg x_{31}) \quad c_{10} : (\neg x_{12} \lor \neg x_{22})}{c_{18} : (\neg x_{31} \lor \neg x_{22})}$$

$$\frac{c_{15} : (x_{12} \lor \neg x_{31}) \quad c_{11} : (\neg x_{12} \lor \neg x_{32})}{c_{19} : (\neg x_{31} \lor \neg x_{32}) = c_6}$$

Resulting formula:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\varphi_2 \quad := \quad & \cancel{c_1 : (x_{11} \lor x_{12})} \land c_2 : (x_{21} \lor x_{22}) \land c_3 : (x_{31} \lor x_{32}) \land \\
& \cancel{c_4 : (\neg x_{11} \lor \neg x_{12})} \land c_5 : (\neg x_{21} \lor \neg x_{22}) \land c_6 : (\neg x_{31} \lor \neg x_{32}) \land \\
& \cancel{c_7 : (\neg x_{11} \lor \neg x_{21})} \land \cancel{c_8 : (\neg x_{11} \lor \neg x_{31})} \land c_9 : (\neg x_{21} \lor \neg x_{31}) \land \\
& \cancel{c_{10} : (\neg x_{12} \lor \neg x_{22})} \land \cancel{c_{11} : (\neg x_{12} \lor \neg x_{32})} \land c_{12} : (\neg x_{22} \lor \neg x_{32}) \land \\
& \cancel{c_{14} : (x_{12} \lor \neg x_{21})} \land \cancel{c_{15} : (x_{12} \lor \neg x_{31})} \land \\
& c_{17} : (\neg x_{21} \lor \neg x_{32}) \land c_{18} : (\neg x_{31} \lor \neg x_{22})
\end{aligned}
$$

Next eliminate x_{21} occurring positively in c_2 and negatively in c_5, c_9, c_{17}.

$$\frac{c_2 : (x_{21} \lor x_{22}) \quad c_5 : (\neg x_{21} \lor \neg x_{22})}{c_{20} : (x_{22} \lor \neg x_{22}) \quad (Tautology!)}$$

$$\frac{c_2 : (x_{21} \lor x_{22}) \quad c_9 : (\neg x_{21} \lor \neg x_{31})}{c_{21} : (x_{22} \lor \neg x_{31})}$$

$$\frac{c_2 : (x_{21} \lor x_{22}) \quad c_{17} : (\neg x_{21} \lor \neg x_{32})}{c_{22} : (x_{22} \lor \neg x_{32})}$$

Resulting formula:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\varphi_3 \quad := \quad & \cancel{c_1 : (x_{11} \lor x_{12})} \land \cancel{c_2 : (x_{21} \lor x_{22})} \land c_3 : (x_{31} \lor x_{32}) \land \\
& \cancel{c_4 : (\neg x_{11} \lor \neg x_{12})} \land \cancel{c_5 : (\neg x_{21} \lor \neg x_{22})} \land c_6 : (\neg x_{31} \lor \neg x_{32}) \land \\
& \cancel{c_7 : (\neg x_{11} \lor \neg x_{21})} \land \cancel{c_8 : (\neg x_{11} \lor \neg x_{31})} \land \cancel{c_9 : (\neg x_{21} \lor \neg x_{31})} \land \\
& \cancel{c_{10} : (\neg x_{12} \lor \neg x_{22})} \land \cancel{c_{11} : (\neg x_{12} \lor \neg x_{32})} \land c_{12} : (\neg x_{22} \lor \neg x_{32}) \land \\
& \cancel{c_{14} : (x_{12} \lor \neg x_{21})} \land \cancel{c_{15} : (x_{12} \lor \neg x_{31})} \land \\
& \cancel{c_{17} : (\neg x_{21} \lor \neg x_{32})} \land c_{18} : (\neg x_{31} \lor \neg x_{22}) \land \\
& c_{21} : (x_{22} \lor \neg x_{31}) \land c_{22} : (x_{22} \lor \neg x_{32})
\end{aligned}
$$

Next eliminate x_{22} occurring positively in c_{21}, c_{22} and negatively in c_{12}, c_{18}.

$$\frac{c_{21} : (x_{22} \vee \neg x_{31}) \quad c_{12} : (\neg x_{22} \vee \neg x_{32})}{c_{23} : (\neg x_{31} \vee \neg x_{32})}$$

$$\frac{c_{21} : (x_{22} \vee \neg x_{31}) \quad c_{18} : (\neg x_{31} \vee \neg x_{22})}{c_{24} : (\neg x_{31})}$$

$$\frac{c_{22} : (x_{22} \vee \neg x_{32}) \quad c_{12} : (\neg x_{22} \vee \neg x_{32})}{c_{25} : (\neg x_{32})}$$

$$\frac{c_{22} : (x_{22} \vee \neg x_{32}) \quad c_{18} : (\neg x_{31} \vee \neg x_{22})}{c_{26} : (\neg x_{32} \vee \neg x_{31}) = c_{23}}$$

The clause c_{23} is implied by c_{24}, so we omit it. Resulting formula:

$$\begin{aligned}
\varphi_3 \quad := \quad & \cancel{c_1 : (x_{11} \vee x_{12})} \wedge \cancel{c_2 : (x_{21} \vee x_{22})} \wedge c_3 : (x_{31} \vee x_{32}) \wedge \\
& \cancel{c_4 : (\neg x_{11} \vee \neg x_{12})} \wedge \cancel{c_5 : (\neg x_{21} \vee \neg x_{22})} \wedge c_6 : (\neg x_{31} \vee \neg x_{32}) \wedge \\
& \cancel{c_7 : (\neg x_{11} \vee \neg x_{21})} \wedge \cancel{c_8 : (\neg x_{11} \vee \neg x_{31})} \wedge \cancel{c_9 : (\neg x_{21} \vee \neg x_{31})} \wedge \\
& \cancel{c_{10} : (\neg x_{12} \vee \neg x_{22})} \wedge \cancel{c_{11} : (\neg x_{12} \vee \neg x_{32})} \wedge \cancel{c_{12} : (\neg x_{22} \vee \neg x_{32})} \wedge \\
& \cancel{c_{14} : (x_{12} \vee \neg x_{21})} \wedge \cancel{c_{15} : (x_{12} \vee \neg x_{31})} \wedge \\
& \cancel{c_{17} : (\neg x_{21} \vee \neg x_{32})} \wedge \cancel{c_{18} : (\neg x_{31} \vee \neg x_{22})} \wedge \\
& \cancel{c_{21} : (x_{22} \vee \neg x_{31})} \wedge \cancel{c_{22} : (x_{22} \vee \neg x_{32})} \wedge \\
& c_{24} : (\neg x_{31}) \wedge c_{25} : (\neg x_{32})
\end{aligned}$$

Next eliminate x_{31} occurring positively in c_3 and negatively in c_6, c_{24}.

$$\frac{c_3 : (x_{31} \vee x_{32}) \quad c_6 : (\neg x_{31} \vee \neg x_{32})}{c_{27} : (x_{32} \vee \neg x_{32}) \quad (Tautology!))}$$

$$\frac{c_3 : (x_{31} \vee x_{32}) \quad c_{24} : (\neg x_{31})}{c_{28} : (x_{32})}$$

Resulting formula:

$$\begin{aligned}
\varphi_3 \quad := \quad & \cancel{c_1 : (x_{11} \vee x_{12})} \wedge \cancel{c_2 : (x_{21} \vee x_{22})} \wedge \cancel{c_3 : (x_{31} \vee x_{32})} \wedge \\
& \cancel{c_4 : (\neg x_{11} \vee \neg x_{12})} \wedge \cancel{c_5 : (\neg x_{21} \vee \neg x_{22})} \wedge \cancel{c_6 : (\neg x_{31} \vee \neg x_{32})} \wedge \\
& \cancel{c_7 : (\neg x_{11} \vee \neg x_{21})} \wedge \cancel{c_8 : (\neg x_{11} \vee \neg x_{31})} \wedge \cancel{c_9 : (\neg x_{21} \vee \neg x_{31})} \wedge \\
& \cancel{c_{10} : (\neg x_{12} \vee \neg x_{22})} \wedge \cancel{c_{11} : (\neg x_{12} \vee \neg x_{32})} \wedge \cancel{c_{12} : (\neg x_{22} \vee \neg x_{32})} \wedge \\
& \cancel{c_{14} : (x_{12} \vee \neg x_{21})} \wedge \cancel{c_{15} : (x_{12} \vee \neg x_{31})} \wedge \\
& \cancel{c_{17} : (\neg x_{21} \vee \neg x_{32})} \wedge \cancel{c_{18} : (\neg x_{31} \vee \neg x_{22})} \wedge \\
& \cancel{c_{21} : (x_{22} \vee \neg x_{31})} \wedge \cancel{c_{22} : (x_{22} \vee \neg x_{32})} \wedge \\
& \cancel{c_{24} : (\neg x_{31})} \wedge c_{25} : (\neg x_{32}) \wedge \\
& c_{28} : (x_{32})
\end{aligned}$$

At last eliminate x_{32} occurring positively in c_{28} and negatively in c_{25}.

$$\frac{c_{28} : (x_{32}) \quad c_{25} : (\neg x_{32})}{\square}$$

Since we derived the empty clause, the formula is unsatisfiable.

d) We can trace back the resolution from the empty clause up to the original clauses. This yields the unsatisfiable core $\{c_1, c_2, c_3, c_7, c_8, c_9, c_{10}, c_{11}, c_{12}\}$. Only the clauses encoding that one pigeon is not in two holes are not needed. Note that we may obtain other unsatisfiable cores by different resolution strategies, but all of them will be large.

e) i. The decision tree of the pidgeon hole problem must be fully expanded until the unsatisfiability is prooven. In most common problems there are subtrees which have not to be computed again.

   ii. The unsatisfiable core is very large so that the resolution always uses nearly the whole input formula to derive a conflict.

Exercise 2

a) Transfer the formula you created in Exercise 1 b) into the standard SAT input format (DIMACS[1]). Also store your result as a text file and check it for satisfiability by using MiniSat[2]. Verify the result and give the running time of the computation.

b) Download additional pigeon whole problems for $n = 6, 7, \ldots$ from the L²P room. They are already in the DIMACS format. Use MiniSat to check for satisfiability. Note the running times of each computation in a table. What do you think is the largest n whose corresponding formula can be solved within one hour? Give a reason!

c) Download the modified versions of the pigeon hole problems having n holes and $n + 2$ pigeons. How are the running times compared to the original problems?

Solution:

a) The formula for $n = 2$ in DIMACS can be written as follows:

```
mp cnf 6 12
1 2 0
3 4 0
5 6 0
-1 -2 0
-3 -4 0
-5 -6 0
-1 -3 0
-1 -5 0
-3 -5 0
-2 -4 0
-2 -6 0
-4 -6 0
```

The output of MiniSat 2.0 on the above input is:

```
============================[ Problem Statistics ]=============================
|                                                                             |
|  Number of variables:  6                                                    |
|  Number of clauses:    9                                                    |
|  Parsing time:         0.00         s                                       |
============================[ Search Statistics ]==============================
| Conflicts |          ORIGINAL         |          LEARNT          | Progress |
|           |    Vars  Clauses Literals |    Limit  Clauses Lit/Cl |          |
```

[1] See for example http://www.satcompetition.org/2009/format-benchmarks2009.html

[2] Download from http://minisat.se/MiniSat.html

```
===============================================================================
|         0 |       6        9       18 |        3        0    -nan |  0.000 % |
===============================================================================
restarts              : 1
conflicts             : 2              (inf /sec)
decisions             : 1              (0.00 % random) (inf /sec)
propagations          : 10             (inf /sec)
conflict literals     : 1              (0.00 % deleted)
Memory used           : 2.07 MB
CPU time              : 0 s

UNSATISFIABLE
```

b) Running times using a slow desktop computer.

Holes	*Pigeons*	*Clauses*	*CPU time (sec)*	*Pigeons*	*Clauses*	*CPU time (sec)*
6	7	133	0.002999	8		
7	8	204	0.033994	9		
8	9	297	0.167974	10	370	0.174973
9	10	415	1.22681	11	506	2.10068
10	11	561	12.7131	12	672	27.3078
11	12	738	356.391	13	871	1142.8
12	13	949	9819.13	14	1106	39587.6

c) For more than seven holes the modified problem seems to be harder to solve, particularly MiniSat is about two times slower in these cases. One reason could be the significantly higher number of clauses in the modified case for large numbers of holes.