



Uwe Waldmann

May 27, 2022

Tutorials for “Automated Reasoning II”
Exercise sheet 4

Exercise 4.1:

In many applications of CDCL or CDCL(T), one does not only want a yes/no answer, but also an explanation for it. In the case of an unsatisfiable input, this explanation is an “unsatisfiable core”, i.e., a (small) subset of the input clauses that is already sufficient to show \mathcal{T} -inconsistency. How can we get an unsatisfiable core from a CDCL(T) proof?

Exercise 4.2:

Prove that the multiset extension of a reduction ordering is stable under substitutions (which implies that the literal ordering defined on page 48 of the script is stable under substitutions). Note: There are several ways to characterize a multiset ordering, see e.g. the lecture notes from the previous semester or the book by Baader and Nipkow. You may pick the most convenient one for this purpose.

Exercise 4.3:

Prove that the Equality Factoring rule is sound:

$$\text{Equality Factoring: } \frac{C' \vee s' \approx t' \vee s \approx t}{(C' \vee t \not\approx t' \vee s \approx t')\sigma}$$

where $\sigma = \text{mgu}(s, s')$.

Exercise 4.4:

Refute the following set of equational clauses by superposition:

$$f(x) \not\approx a \vee f(x) \approx b \quad (1)$$

$$f(f(x)) \approx x \quad (2)$$

$$a \not\approx b \quad (3)$$

Choose an appropriate ordering and perform only inferences that satisfy the ordering restrictions.

Bring your solution (or solution attempt) to the tutorial on June 3.