Logic and Mechanized Reasoning Using SAT Solvers

Marijn J.H. Heule

Carnegie
Mellon **University**

Logic and Mechanized Reasoning 1 / 30

[Solving 2-SAT](#page-2-0)

[SAT Solving First Steps](#page-10-0)

[DPLL](#page-15-0)

[Graph Coloring](#page-24-0)

Logic and Mechanized Reasoning 2 / 30

[Solving 2-SAT](#page-2-0)

[SAT Solving First Steps](#page-10-0)

[DPLL](#page-15-0)

[Graph Coloring](#page-24-0)

Logic and Mechanized Reasoning 3 / 30

Solving 2-SAT: Complexity

A *k*-SAT formula is a CNF formula such that each clause has a length of at most *k*.

Solving a *k*-SAT formula is NP-complete for *k* ≥ 3

However, 2-SAT can be solved in polynomial time using

- \blacktriangleright Unit propagation; and
- \blacktriangleright Autarky reasoning.

Logic and Mechanized Reasoning 4/30

Let Γ be a 2-SAT formula, *p* a propositional variable occurring in Γ , and τ the assignment with $\tau(p) = \top$.

Unit propagation on Γ using *τ* has two possible outcomes:

 \triangleright Unit propagation results in a conflict: All satisfying assignments of Γ assign *p* to false.

Let Γ be a 2-SAT formula, *p* a propositional variable occurring in Γ , and τ the assignment with $\tau(p) = \top$.

Unit propagation on Γ using *τ* has two possible outcomes:

- \triangleright Unit propagation results in a conflict: All satisfying assignments of Γ assign *p* to false.
- \blacktriangleright Unit propagation terminates without a conflict: Let τ' be the final assignment with unit propagation terminated. Now $τ'$ is an autarky for $Γ$. Why?

Solving 2-SAT: Autarky

Given a 2-SAT formula Γ and a non-empty truth assignment. If unit propagation terminates without a conflict, then the extended assignment is an autarky for Γ.

- **For a clause C and a non-conflicting assignment** τ **it holds** that i) τ does not touch C , ii) τ satisfies C , or iii) τ reduces *C* to a unit clause (by falsifying the other literal);
- \triangleright Unit clauses extend the assignment and maintain the above invariant;
- \blacktriangleright At the non-conflicting fixpoint, no touched clause is reduced in length; so
- \blacktriangleright All touched clauses are satisfied.

Solving 2-SAT: Decision Procedure

Given a 2-SAT formula Γ, the following procedure solves it in polynomial time:

- **I** Pick an arbitrary variable p and let τ be $\tau(p) = \top$
- \blacktriangleright Let τ' be the extended assignment after applying unit propagation on Γ starting with *τ*
- If $\llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket_{\tau'}$ does not contain \perp , continue with $\llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket_{\tau'}$ (autarky)
- **IO** Otherwise continue with $\llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket_{\tau''}$ with $\tau''(p) = ⊥$
- Stop if either $\llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket_{\tau'} = \top$ or $\llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket_{\tau'} = \bot$

Solving 2-SAT: Decision Procedure

Given a 2-SAT formula Γ, the following procedure solves it in polynomial time:

- **I** Pick an arbitrary variable *p* and let τ be $\tau(p) = \top$
- \blacktriangleright Let τ' be the extended assignment after applying unit propagation on Γ starting with *τ*
- If $\llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket_{\tau'}$ does not contain \perp , continue with $\llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket_{\tau'}$ (autarky)
- **IO** Otherwise continue with $\llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket_{\tau''}$ with $\tau''(p) = ⊥$
- Stop if either $\llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket_{\tau'} = \top$ or $\llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket_{\tau'} = \bot$

Tarjan's algorithm can be used to reduce it to linear runtime.

Logic and Mechanized Reasoning 7 / 30

Solving 2-SAT: The SAT Game

SAT Game

by Olivier Roussel

<https://www.cs.utexas.edu/~marijn/game/2SAT/>

Logic and Mechanized Reasoning 8 / 30

[Solving 2-SAT](#page-2-0)

[SAT Solving First Steps](#page-10-0)

[DPLL](#page-15-0)

[Graph Coloring](#page-24-0)

Logic and Mechanized Reasoning and all and the state of $\frac{9}{130}$

SAT Solving: Introduction

Dozens of (open source) SAT solvers have been developed.

International competition have been organized since 2002

- \triangleright Solvers are evaluated on a representative benchmark suite
- \blacktriangleright Practically every year clear progress is observed
- \triangleright Arguably one of the drivers that advances the technology

CaDiCaL by Armin Biere is one of the strongest solvers

- \triangleright Compiles easily on most operating systems
- \blacktriangleright Readable and understanable code and thus easy to modify
- \triangleright Works normally from the command line, but also in Lean

Logic and Mechanized Reasoning 10 / 30

SAT Solving: Demo in Lean

```
\sqrt{2}Examples of use of Cadical.
-1-- textbook: SAT example
def cadicalExample: IO Unit := dolet (s. result) \leftarrow callCadical exCnf0
  IO.println "Output from CaDiCaL :\n"
  --I0. println s
  --IO.println "\n\n"
  IO.println (formatResult result)
  pure ()
#eval cadicalExample
-- end textbook: SAT example
```
Logic and Mechanized Reasoning 11 / 30

SAT Solving: DIMACS Input Format

The DIMACS format for SAT solvers has three types of lines:

- \triangleright header: p cnf n m in which n denotes the highest variable index and m the number of clauses
- \triangleright clauses: a sequence of integers ending with "0"
- \triangleright comments: any line starting with "c"

$$
(p \lor q \lor \neg r) \land \text{C example} \quad p \text{ cnf } 4 \ 7 \\ (\neg p \lor \neg q \lor r) \land \text{1 } 2 \ -3 \ 0 \\ (q \lor r \lor \neg s) \land \text{2 } 3 \ -4 \ 0 \\ (p \lor r \lor s) \land \text{2 } 2 \ 3 \ -4 \ 0 \\ (p \lor r \lor s) \land \text{1 } 3 \ 4 \ 0 \\ (\neg p \lor \neg r \lor \neg s) \land \text{1 } 3 \ -1 \ -3 \ -4 \ 0 \\ (\neg p \lor q \lor s) \text{1 } 2 \ 4 \ 0
$$

Logic and Mechanized Reasoning 12 / 30

SAT Solving: DIMACS Output Format

The solution line of a SAT solver starts with "s" \cdot "

- \triangleright s SATISFIABLE: The formula is satisfiable
- \triangleright s UNSATISFIABLE: The formula is unsatisfiable
- \triangleright s UNKNOWN: The solver cannot determine satisfiability

In case the formula is satisfiable, the solver emits a certificate:

- \blacktriangleright lines starting with "v"
- \blacktriangleright a list of integers ending with 0
- \blacktriangleright e.g. v -1 2 4 0

In case the formula is unsatisfiable, then most solvers support emitting a proof of unsatisfiability to a separate file

[Solving 2-SAT](#page-2-0)

[SAT Solving First Steps](#page-10-0)

[DPLL](#page-15-0)

[Graph Coloring](#page-24-0)

Logic and Mechanized Reasoning 14 / 30

Davis Putnam Logemann Loveland [DP60,DLL62]

Recursive procedure that in each recursive call:

- \triangleright Simplifies the formula (using unit propagation)
- \triangleright Splits the formula into two subformulas
	- \triangleright Variable selection heuristics (which variable to split on)
	- \triangleright Direction heuristics (which subformula to explore first)

DPLL: Example

$\Gamma_{\text{DPLL}} := (p_1 \vee p_2 \vee \neg p_3) \wedge (\neg p_1 \vee p_2 \vee p_3) \wedge$ $(\neg p_1 \lor \neg p_2 \lor p_3) \land (p_1 \lor p_3) \land (\neg p_1 \lor \neg p_3)$

Logic and Mechanized Reasoning 16 / 30

DPLL: Example

$\Gamma_{\text{DPLL}} := (p_1 \vee p_2 \vee \neg p_3) \wedge (\neg p_1 \vee p_2 \vee p_3) \wedge$ $(\neg p_1 \lor \neg p_2 \lor p_3) \land (p_1 \lor p_3) \land (\neg p_1 \lor \neg p_3)$

Logic and Mechanized Reasoning 16 / 30

DPLL: Example

$\Gamma_{\text{DPLL}} := (p_1 \vee p_2 \vee \neg p_3) \wedge (\neg p_1 \vee p_2 \vee p_3) \wedge$ $(\neg p_1 \lor \neg p_2 \lor p_3) \land (p_1 \lor p_3) \land (\neg p_1 \lor \neg p_3)$

Logic and Mechanized Reasoning 16 / 30

DPLL: Slightly Harder Example

Construct a DPLL tree for:

$$
(p \lor q \lor \neg r) \land (\neg p \lor \neg q \lor r) \land (q \lor r \lor \neg s) \land (\neg q \lor \neg r \lor s) \land (p \lor r \lor s) \land (\neg p \lor \neg r \lor \neg s) \land (\neg p \lor q \lor s)
$$

What is a good heuristic?

Logic and Mechanized Reasoning 17 / 30

DPLL: Slightly Harder Example

Construct a DPLL tree for:

$$
(p \lor q \lor \neg r) \land (\neg p \lor \neg q \lor r) \land (q \lor r \lor \neg s) \land (\neg q \lor \neg r \lor s) \land (p \lor r \lor s) \land (\neg p \lor \neg r \lor \neg s) \land (\neg p \lor q \lor s)
$$

What is a good heuristic?

A cheap and reasonably effective heuristic is MOMS: Maximum Occurrence in clauses of Minimum Size

DPLL: Pseudocode

DPLL (*τ*, Γ) 1: τ' = Simplify (τ, Γ)

- 2: **if** $\llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket_{\tau'} = \top$ **then return** satisfiable
- 3: **if** $\llbracket \Gamma \rrbracket_{\tau'} = \bot$ **then return** unsatisfiable
- 4: *l*_{decision} := Decide (τ', Γ)
- 5: **if** $(DPLL($ $\tau' \cup l_{\text{decision}} := \top, \Gamma) =$ satisfiable) then
- 6: return satisfiable
- τ : return DPLL $(\tau' \cup l_{\text{decision}} := \bot, Γ)$

Logic and Mechanized Reasoning 18 / 30

DPLL: Demo in Lean

```
-- textbook: dpllSat
partial def dpllSatAux (\tau: PropAssignment) (\omega: CnfForm): Option (PropAssignment × CnfForm):=
  if \omega.hasEmpty then none
  else match pickSplit? o with
  -- No variables left to split on, we found a solution.
  \ln none => some (\tau, \phi)- Split on x.
  \left(-\right) \leq \left| \right| is the "or else" operator which tries one action, and if that failed tries the other.
  | some x \Rightarrow goWithNew x \neq 0 < | > goWithNew (-x) \neq 0where
  /- Assigns `x` to true and continues out DPLL. -/-goWithNew (x : Lit) (\tau : PropAssignment) (\varphi : CnfForm) : Option (PropAssignment x CnfForm) :=
    let (\tau', \omega') := propagateWithNew x \tau \omegadpllSatAux τ' φ'
/-- Solve `o' using DPLL. Return a satisfying assignment if found, otherwise `none'. -/
def def dpllSat (\omega: CnfForm) : Option PropAssignment :=
  let (\tau, \varphi) := propagateUnits [] \varphi(dpllSatAux \tau \varphi) map fun (\tau, ) => \tau-- end textbook: dpllSat
```
Logic and Mechanized Reasoning 19 / 30

[Solving 2-SAT](#page-2-0)

[SAT Solving First Steps](#page-10-0)

[DPLL](#page-15-0)

[Graph Coloring](#page-24-0)

Logic and Mechanized Reasoning 20 / 30

Graph Coloring: Introduction

Given a graph $G(V, E)$, can the vertices be colored with *k* colors such that for each edge $(v, w) \in E$, the vertices *v* and *w* are colored differently.

Logic and Mechanized Reasoning 21 / 30

Graph Coloring: Introduction

Given a graph $G(V, E)$, can the vertices be colored with *k* colors such that for each edge $(v, w) \in E$, the vertices *v* and *w* are colored differently.

Possible problem: symmetries!

Logic and Mechanized Reasoning 21 / 30

Graph Coloring: Format

- \blacktriangleright Header starts with p edge
- \blacktriangleright Followed by number of vertices and number of edges
	- p edge 8 13 e 1 2 e 1 3 e 2 3 e 2 4 e 3 5 e 3 6 e 3 8 e 4 5 e 5 6 e 5 7 e 6 7 e 6 8 e 7 8

Logic and Mechanized Reasoning 22 / 30

Graph Coloring: Encoding

Logic and Mechanized Reasoning 23 / 30

Graph Coloring: Lean Demo

```
def main (args : List String) : IO Unit := do
  let graphFrame : nColours : - argsdo
      IO.println "Usage: <graph.edge> <colors>"
      return ()let some nColours \leftarrow nColours toNat?
    | throwThe IO.Error s!"Invalid colour count: {nColours}"
  let g \leftarrow \text{readEdgeFile graphFrame}match (← checkColourable q nColours) with
  | some vs \RightarrowIO.println s!"The graph is {nColours}-colourable! Satisfying assignment: {vs}"
    none \RightarrowIO.println s!"The graph is not {nColours}-colourable."
```
Logic and Mechanized Reasoning 24 / 30

Graph Coloring: Sudoku

Sudoku can be viewed as a graph coloring problem:

- \blacktriangleright Each cell is a vertex
- \blacktriangleright Vertices are connected if they occur in the same row / column / square
- \blacktriangleright There are 9 colors

The solution must be unique

 \blacktriangleright At least 17 givens

Who can solve this sudoku?

Logic and Mechanized Reasoning 25 / 30

Graph Coloring: Sudoku

Sudoku can be viewed as a graph coloring problem:

- \blacktriangleright Each cell is a vertex
- \blacktriangleright Vertices are connected if they occur in the same row / column / square
- \blacktriangleright There are 9 colors

The solution must be unique

 \blacktriangleright At least 17 givens

Who can solve this sudoku?

Graph Coloring: Sudoku in Lean

Logic and Mechanized Reasoning 26 / 30

Graph Coloring: Chromatic Number of the Plane

The Hadwiger-Nelson problem:

How many colors are required to color the plane such that each pair of points that are exactly 1 apart are colored differently?

The answer must be three or more because three points can be mutually 1 apart—and thus must be colored differently.

Logic and Mechanized Reasoning 27 / 30

Graph Coloring: Bounds since the 1950s

 \triangleright The Moser Spindle graph shows the lower bound of 4 \triangleright A coloring of the plane showing the upper bound of 7 Logic and Mechanized Reasoning 28 / 30

Graph Coloring: First progress in decades

Recently enormous progress:

- ▶ Lower bound of 5 [DeGrey '18] based on a 1581-vertex graph
- \blacktriangleright This breakthrough started a polymath project
- \blacktriangleright Improved bounds of the fractional chromatic number of the plane

Graph Coloring: First progress in decades

Recently enormous progress:

- ▶ Lower bound of 5 [DeGrey '18] based on a 1581-vertex graph
- \blacktriangleright This breakthrough started a polymath project
- \blacktriangleright Improved bounds of the fractional chromatic number of the plane

Marijn Heule, a computer scientist at the Uni Texas, Austin, found one with just 874 vertices. Yesterday he lowered this number to 826 vertices.

We found smaller graphs with SAT:

- \triangleright 874 vertices on April 14, 2018
- \triangleright 803 vertices on April 30, 2018
- \triangleright 610 vertices on May 14, 2018

Logic and Mechanized Reasoning 29 / 30

Record by Proof Minimization: 510 Vertices [Heule 2021]

Logic and Mechanized Reasoning