

Problem 1 (*Superposition*)

(8 points)

Show unsatisfiability of the below clauses via the superposition calculus based on the atom ordering $P2 \succ P1 \succ Q \succ R$:

(1) $\neg P1 \vee Q \vee R$

(2) $\neg P2 \vee P1 \vee R$

(3) $P2 \vee P1 \vee R$

(4) $\neg R \vee Q$

(5) $\neg P1 \vee R$

(6) $\neg P1 \vee \neg Q$

(7) $\neg R \vee P1$

Problem 2 (*Superposition Model Building*) (4 + 1 + 2 = 7 points)

Consider again the clause set N of Problem 1, containing the below clauses, but now with *different* atom ordering $P1 \succ P2 \succ Q \succ R$.

$$N = \{\neg P1 \vee Q \vee R, \neg P2 \vee P1 \vee R, P2 \vee P1 \vee R, \neg R \vee Q, \neg P1 \vee R, \neg P1 \vee \neg Q, \neg R \vee P1\}$$

- (a) Compute $N_{\mathcal{I}}$.
- (b) Determine the minimal false clause and its productive counterpart, producing the atom of the maximal negative literal in the false clause.
- (c) Compute the superposition inference out of (b), add it to N resulting in N' and compute $N'_{\mathcal{I}}$.

Problem 3 (*CDCL*)

(6 points)

Check via the rule-based CDCL calculus ($\Rightarrow_{\text{DPLL}}$ + learning rule) whether the following set of clauses is satisfiable or not. Learn backjump clauses.

$$N = \{\neg P1 \vee Q \vee P3, \neg P2 \vee P1 \vee R, P2 \vee P1 \vee R, \neg R \vee Q, \neg P3 \vee R, \neg P1 \vee \neg Q, \neg P3 \vee P1\}$$

Problem 4 (*CNF*)

(6 points)

Transform the formula

$$\neg((P \vee Q) \leftrightarrow (P \rightarrow (Q \wedge \top)))$$

into CNF using $\Rightarrow_{\text{OCNF}}$ without applying Step 2 (introduction of new propositional variables) of the procedure.

Problem 5 (*Validity*)

(4 points)

Let ϕ, ψ, χ be propositional formulas. Prove that the formula

$$(\psi \rightarrow \chi) \rightarrow [(\phi \vee \psi) \rightarrow (\phi \vee \chi)]$$

is valid.

Problem 6 (*Modularity*)

(2 + 2 = 4 points)

Prove or give a counter example for the following statements.

- (a) If for the formula $\phi_1 \vee \phi_2$ there is a valuation \mathcal{A} with $\mathcal{A}(\phi_1) = 1$ then $\phi_1 \vee \phi_2$ is satisfiable.
- (b) If for the formula $\phi_1 \wedge \phi_2$ there are two valuations $\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2$ with $\mathcal{A}_1(\phi_1) = 1$ and $\mathcal{A}_2(\phi_2) = 1$ then $\phi_1 \wedge \phi_2$ is satisfiable.

Problem 7 (*Clause Set Reduction*)

(1 + 4 = 5 points)

Consider a finite set N of propositional clauses and a propositional atom P occurring in N . Assume N contains no tautologies, i.e., no clauses of the form $Q \vee \neg Q \vee C$ for some propositional variable Q . Further, we assume that any resolvent on P with clauses from N is a tautology. Consider the partitioning

$$N = N' \uplus \{P \vee C_i \mid (P \vee C_i) \in N\} \uplus \{\neg P \vee D_j \mid (\neg P \vee D_j) \in N\}$$

Prove N is satisfiable iff N' is satisfiable. Note that N' does not contain P anymore.