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Clause-sets

- Let $\mathcal{V}A$ be the set of variables.
- Let $\mathcal{L}IT$ be the set of literals, which are either variables or complemented variables, i.e., $\mathcal{L}IT = \mathcal{V}A \cup \overline{\mathcal{V}A}$.
- A clause is a finite and complement-free subset of $\mathcal{L}IT$, the set of all clauses is $\mathcal{C}L$.
- Let $\mathcal{C}LS$ be the set of clause-sets, finite subsets of $\mathcal{C}L$.

\[
\bot := \emptyset \in \mathcal{C}L \\
\top := \emptyset \in \mathcal{C}LS.
\]
SAT Knowledge Compilation

We have only a very scant understanding of “SAT encoding”. These are fragments of a theory.

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{hd} & : \mathcal{CLS} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_0 \\
\text{phd} & : \mathcal{CLS} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_0 \\
\text{awid} & : \mathcal{CLS} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_0.
\end{align*} \]

“Hardness” for historical reasons; \( \text{hd} = \text{thd} \).

A Framework

hd, phd, awid are **Target-Parameters** for “SAT KC”:

1. “Hardness” concerns very simple, oblivious SAT algorithms.
2. SAT-measurement by worst-case from UNSAT.
3. UNSAT-measurements as stable versions of resolution complexity.
What’s the SAT solver to do?

The idea of

\[ \text{hd}(F) = k, \text{phd}(F) = k \]

resp.

\[ \text{awid}(F) = k \]

is:

With a generic, oblivious algorithm using time \( n^{O(k)} \)
and space \( n^{O(1)} \) resp. \( n^{O(k)} \)
all “implicit information” of \( F \) can be uncovered.

\( k \) is a structural parameter of \( F \), measuring at which maximal “level”
we can extract prime implicates from \( F \).

That “extraction” is implicitly and partially done
by the SAT solver, who makes the “queries”.
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Resolution efforts

We have \( \text{hd}(F) \leq k \) resp. \( \text{awid}(F) \leq k \) iff for all prime implicates \( C \) of \( F \) there is a resolution derivation of \( C \) from \( F \) such that

from all nodes there exists a path to some leaf of length at most \( k \) resp.

after removal of the literals of \( C \) from the derivation, for every resolution step at least one of the parent clauses has length at most \( k \).

Examples for the audience: \( k = 0, 1 \).
Hierarchies

For $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$:

\[ \mathcal{UC}_k := \{ F \in \mathcal{CLS} : \text{hd}(F) \leq k \} \]
\[ \mathcal{PC}_k := \{ F \in \mathcal{CLS} : \text{phd}(F) \leq k \} \]
\[ \mathcal{WC}_k := \{ F \in \mathcal{CLS} : \text{awid}(F) \leq k \} \]
\[ \mathcal{WC}_0 = \mathcal{UC}_0 : \text{clause-sets which contain all their prime implicants}. \]
\[ \mathcal{UC} := \mathcal{UC}_1 = \mathcal{WC}_1 \text{ showed up in two different contexts:} \]

1. $\mathcal{UC}$ was introduced in del Val [6] for the purpose of Knowledge Compilation (KC).

2. In [7, 9] we showed $\mathcal{UC} = \mathcal{SLUR}$, continuing Čepek, Kučera, and Vlček [5], for the umbrella class $\mathcal{SLUR}$ for polytime SAT decision as introduced in Schlipf, Annexstein, Franco, and Swaminathan [15].

More generally we have $\mathcal{UC}_k = \mathcal{SLUR}_k$ for $k \geq 0$. 
Propagation hardness

\( \mathcal{PC} := \mathcal{PC}_1 \) was introduced by Bordeaux and Marques-Silva [4]. We have

\[
\mathcal{PC}_0 \subset \mathcal{UC}_0 \subset \mathcal{PC}_1 \subset \mathcal{UC}_1 \subset \mathcal{PC}_2 \subset \mathcal{UC}_2 \ldots
\]

We introduced the \( \mathcal{PC}_k \) classes in [10, 11]. Roughly:

\[
\text{phd}(F) = k \text{ refines } \text{hd}(F) = k
\]

by a strengthened derivation condition — prime implicates must be derivable by weaker means (which can not be given by the geometry of the resolution refutation).
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From USAT to SAT

- Let $\overline{USAT} := \overline{CLS} \setminus SAT$.
- Let $PASS$ be the set of partial assignments.
- For $\varphi \in PASS$ and $F \in CLS$ let $\varphi \ast F \in CLS$ be the result of applying $\varphi$ to $F$.

In Beyersdorff and Kullmann [3] the following approach was formally introduced:

Consider $h_0 : \overline{USAT} \to \mathbb{N}_0$.

We extend to $h : CLS \to \mathbb{N}_0$ by

$$h(F) := \max\{h_0(\varphi \ast F) : \varphi \in PASS \land \varphi \ast F \in \overline{USAT}\}.$$  

If we assume that applying partial assignments does no increase $h_0$ (and this we always do), then this holds also for $h$. 
Many characterisations of hardness's I

We characterise $\text{hd}(F)$ and $\text{awid}(F)$ (indeed for arbitrary $F \in \mathcal{CLS}$) by games in [3], extending

- Pudlák and Impagliazzo [14]
- and Atserias and Dalmau [1].

Since the hardness-game can be simulated by the asymmetric-width game, we obtain

$$\forall F \in \mathcal{CLS} : \text{awid}(F) \leq \text{hd}(F).$$

Algorithmically appealing are the characterisations of $\text{hd}$, $\text{phd}$ via generalised UCP.
Generalised UCP

Let $r_k : \mathcal{CLS} \to \mathcal{CLS}$ denote generalised unit-clause propagation.

- $r_1$ is UCP.
- $r_2$ is (complete) failed literal elimination.

Now for $F \in \mathcal{USAT}$:

$$\text{hd}(F) = \min\{k \in \mathbb{N}_0 : r_k(F) = \{\bot\}\}$$

So $\text{hd}(F)$ is the minimal level where $r_k$ detects unsatisfiability. Via the general extension follows for $F \in \mathcal{CLS}$:

$$\text{hd}(F) = \min\{k \in \mathbb{N}_0 \mid \forall \varphi \in \mathcal{PASS} : \varphi \ast F \in \mathcal{USAT} \Rightarrow r_k(F) = \{\bot\}\}.$$
Characterising p-hardness

phd on $USAT$ is just hd, so this special measure is not defined by the general extension process.

Instead we have for $F \in CLS$:

$$\text{phd}(F) = \min \left\{ k \in \mathbb{N}_0 \mid \forall \varphi \in Pass : r_k(\varphi \ast F) = r_\infty(F) \right\},$$

where $r_\infty : CLS \to CLS$ is the complete elimination of forced literals (forced assignments, implied units, backbone literals).
Relations to resolution complexity

For $F \in USAT$ holds:

$$2^{\text{hd}(F)} \leq \text{Comp}_R^*(F) \leq (n(F) + 1)^{\text{hd}(F)}$$

$$\exp\left(\frac{1}{8} \frac{\text{awid}(F)^2}{n(F)}\right) < \text{Comp}_R(F) < 6 \cdot n(F)^{\text{awid}(F)+2}$$

where

- $\text{Comp}_R^*(F)$ is the minimal number of leaves in a tree resolution refutation of $F$;
- $\text{Comp}_R(F)$ is the minimal number of nodes in a dag resolution refutation of $F$. 
Basic relations

\[
\mathcal{P}C_0 \subset \mathcal{U}C_0 \subset \mathcal{P}C_1 \subset \mathcal{U}C_1 \subset \mathcal{P}C_2 \subset \mathcal{U}C_2 \ldots \\
\mathcal{W}C_0 \subset \mathcal{W}C_1 \subset \mathcal{W}C_2 \subset \ldots \\
\mathcal{U}C_0 = \mathcal{W}C_0 \\
\mathcal{U}C_1 = \mathcal{W}C_1 \\
\mathcal{U}C_k \subset \mathcal{W}C_k \text{ for } k \geq 2 \\
\mathcal{P}C_{k+1} \not\subset \mathcal{W}C_k \text{ for } k \geq 0 \\
\mathcal{W}C_3 \not\subset \mathcal{U}C_k \text{ for } k \geq 0.
\]

Open Problem

For the last relation, can we use \( \mathcal{W}C_2 \)?
Decision complexity

\[ \mathcal{PC}_0 = \{ \top \} \cup \{ F \in \mathcal{CLS} : \bot \in F \}. \]

(\( \mathcal{PC}_0 \) is the only functionally incomplete level.)

\[ \mathcal{UC}_0 = \mathcal{WC}_0 \] is decidable in polynomial time.
(These are the primal clause-sets (modulo subsumption).)

All \( \mathcal{UC}_k, \mathcal{PC}_k, \mathcal{WC}_k \) for \( k \geq 1 \) are coNP-complete.
(Via simple reductions to the first level, applying \( \check{C}epek \) et al. [5] (SLUR) and Babka, Balyo, \( \check{C}epek \), \( \check{S}tefan Gurský \), Kučera, and Vlček [2].)
In Gwynne and Kullmann [8] we show:

**Theorem**

For all $k \geq 0$ there are (sequences of) short clause-sets in $\mathcal{UC}_{k+1}$, where all (sequences of) equivalent clause-sets in $\mathcal{WC}_k$ are of exponential size.

**Conjecture**

This strong separation holds between classes $\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D} \in \{\mathcal{UC}_p, \mathcal{PC}_p, \mathcal{WC}_q\}$ iff it is not trivially false, i.e., iff $\mathcal{C} \nsubseteq \mathcal{D}$. 
Allowing auxiliary variables

Consider $F, G \in \mathcal{CLS}$ with $\text{var}(F) \subseteq \text{var}(G)$.

**Definition**

*G represents* $F$ if the satisfying assignments of $G$ projected to $\text{var}(F)$ are precisely the satisfying assignments of $F$.

**Conjecture**

For all $k \geq 0$ there are (sequences of) short clause-sets in $\mathcal{UC}_{k+1}$, where all (sequences of) representing clause-sets in $\mathcal{WC}_k$ are of exponential size.

More generally, such a separation holds between classes $C, D \in \{\mathcal{UC}_p, \mathcal{Propc}_q, \mathcal{WC}_q\}$ iff it is not trivially false.
The “relative condition”

If $G$ represents $F$, then the **absolute condition** for $G$ is a requirement
- $G \in \mathcal{UC}_k$ or
- $G \in \mathcal{WC}_k$

for some suitable $k$.

So the requirements on prime implicates also concern prime implicates containing auxiliary variables (i.e., variables in $G$ but not in $F$).

Now the **relative condition** considers only prime implicates with variables from $F$.

We then speak of **relative hardness**.

This is, when using auxiliary variables, a weaker requirement.
Separations

Collapse under the relative condition

In [13] we show:

**Theorem**

Allowing representations with auxiliary variables, under the relative condition all classes $\mathcal{UC}_k$, $\mathcal{PC}_k$, $\mathcal{WC}_k$ collapse in polynomial time to $\mathcal{UC}_0$ or $\mathcal{PC}_1$.

“Relative $\mathcal{PC}_1$” is indeed what nearly everybody uses for SAT representations, typically called “generalised arc-consistency”.

**Conjecture**

There are (sequences of) clause-sets which have short representations of relative hardness 1, but for each $k$ have only (sequences of) superpolynomial / exponential size representations in $\mathcal{WC}_k$. 
The terminology “strongly forcing” has been developed in collaboration with Donald Knuth (for his forthcoming fascicle on satisfiability).
Summary and outlook

I Hopefully a theory of “good SAT representations” will emerge.
II The translation of XOR-systems is a good first test-case: Despite the bad news “no poly-size good representation” ([10, 11]), there seem to be a lot of opportunities for good representations (under various circumstances).
III Fascinating connections to space-measurements for resolution (which also yield target classes!).
IV By [12]: For $F \in \mathcal{CLS}$ holds $\text{wid}(F) \leq \text{tw}(F) + 1$ (symmetric width vs. primal treewidth). We believe the Conjecture ([11]): $\text{awid}(F) \leq \text{tw}^*(F)$ (asymmetric width vs. incidence treewidth).
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