

# Homework Assignment 1

## Due: October 11, 2019 at 23:00

- Total points:** 100
- Deliverables:** `classify.rkt` containing your implementation for Problem 1.  
`k-coloring.rkt` containing your implementation for Problem 7.  
`hw1.pdf` containing typeset solutions to the remaining problems.
- Sources:** <https://gitlab.cs.washington.edu/cse507/hw19au>.

## 1 Propositional Logic and Normal Forms (30 points)

- (5 points) Use the solution skeleton in `classify.rkt`, write a `Rosette` procedure that takes as input a formula  $F$  in propositional logic and outputs
  - 'TAUTOLOGY if  $I \models F$  for every interpretation  $I$ ;
  - 'CONTRADICTION if  $I \not\models F$  for every interpretation  $I$ ; and,
  - 'CONTINGENCY if there are two interpretations  $I$  and  $I'$  such that  $I \models F$  and  $I' \not\models F$ .

Your procedure may contain at most two solver-aided queries (such as `solve`), and if it contains more than one query, then the two queries must be different (i.e., you cannot use `solve` twice).

- (5 points) Convert the following formula to an equisatisfiable one in CNF using Tseitin's encoding:

$$\neg(\neg r \rightarrow \neg(p \wedge q))$$

Write the final CNF as the answer. Use  $a_\phi$  to denote the auxiliary variable for the formula  $\phi$ ; for example,  $a_{p \wedge q}$  should be used to denote the auxiliary variable for  $p \wedge q$ . Your conversion should not introduce auxiliary variables for negations.

- (10 points) Let  $\phi$  be a propositional formula in NNF, and let  $I$  be an interpretation of  $\phi$ . Let the *positive set* of  $I$  with respect to  $\phi$ , denoted  $pos(I, \phi)$ , be the literals of  $\phi$  that are satisfied by  $I$ . As an example, for the NNF formula  $\phi = (\neg r \wedge p) \vee q$  and the interpretation  $I = [r \mapsto \perp, p \mapsto \top, q \mapsto \perp]$ , we have  $pos(I, \phi) = \{\neg r, p\}$ . Prove the following theorem about the monotonicity of NNF:

**Monotonicity of NNF:** For every interpretation  $I$  and  $I'$  such that  $pos(I, \phi) \subseteq pos(I', \phi)$ , if  $I \models \phi$ , then  $I' \models \phi$ .

(**Hint:** Use structural induction.)

- (10 points) Let  $\phi$  be an NNF formula. Let  $\hat{\phi}$  be a formula derived from  $\phi$  using a modified version of Tseitin's encoding in which the CNF constraints are derived from implications rather than bi-implications. For example, given the formula

$$a_1 \wedge (a_2 \vee \neg a_3),$$

the new encoding is the CNF equivalent of the following, where  $x_0, x_1, x_2$  are fresh auxiliary variables:

$$\begin{array}{l} x_0 \qquad \qquad \qquad \wedge \\ (x_0 \rightarrow a_1 \wedge x_1) \wedge \\ (x_1 \rightarrow a_2 \vee x_2) \wedge \\ (x_2 \rightarrow \neg a_3) \end{array}$$

Note that Tseitin's encoding to CNF starts with the same formula, except that  $\rightarrow$  is replaced with  $\leftrightarrow$ . As a result, the new encoding has roughly half as many clauses as the Tseitin's encoding.

Prove that  $\hat{\phi}$  is satisfiable if and only if  $\phi$  is satisfiable.

(**Hint:** Use the theorem from Problem 3.)

## 2 SAT solving (20 points)

5. (20 points) In this problem, you will trace the execution of [CaDiCaL](#), a high-performance SAT solver, on a sample CNF, and use this trace to reconstruct the abstract state transitions of the underlying CDCL algorithm ([Lecture 4](#)).

The [sample CNF](#) is given in the [DIMACS](#) format and represents the following clauses:

$$(\neg x_1 \vee x_2 \vee x_4) \wedge (x_1 \vee x_3) \wedge (\neg x_4 \vee \neg x_2) \wedge (\neg x_4 \vee \neg x_1 \vee x_2) \wedge (x_3 \vee \neg x_1) \wedge (\neg x_3 \vee \neg x_2 \vee x_4) \wedge (x_1 \vee x_4) \wedge (\neg x_2 \vee x_1)$$

To start, clone [CaDiCaL](#) from GitHub and checkout tag `sc18`. Next, follow the instructions in the included `README.md` file to configure and build the solver in logging mode using `./configure -l && make`. Finally, run the solver (in `build/cadical`) with the logging (`-l`) option on [sample.cnf](#), and the solver will output a detailed trace of its execution.

Using this detailed trace, reconstruct the behavior of the underlying CDCL algorithm by filling out the following abstract trace template, given as a list of abstract trace entries:

- **Level  $i$**  *; decision level  $i$* 
  - **Decision:**  $d_i$  *; decision literal at level  $i$  or NA if level due to backtracking*
  - **BCP:**  $p_{i_0}, \dots, p_{i_n}$  *; literals inferred by BCP at level  $i$ , in the detailed trace order*
  - **Conflict Clause:**  $l_{i_0} \dots l_{i_k}$  *; conflict clause or NA if no conflict at level  $i$*
  - **Implication Graph:** `graph image` *; implication graph at level  $i$ , visualized with `GraphViz`*
- ...

To produce the abstract trace, create an abstract trace entry (“Level”) whenever the decision level changes in the detailed trace due to a new decision or backtracking. When filling out the entry template, use the literal names from the detailed trace. For example, the solver will represent the literal  $\neg x_1$  as `-1`. Use [GraphViz](#) to visualize the implication graph at a given level. The `impl-graph.dot` file shows an example of how to specify implication graphs with `GraphViz`. Use the LaTeX `\includegraphics` command to insert the resulting graph images into your `hw1.pdf` file.

### 3 Graph Coloring with SAT (40 points)

A graph is *k-colorable* if there is an assignment of  $k$  colors to its vertices such that no two adjacent vertices have the same color. Deciding if such a coloring exists is a classic NP-complete problem with many practical applications, such as register allocation in compilers. In this problem, you will develop a CNF encoding for graph coloring and apply them to graphs from various application domains, including course scheduling, N-queens puzzles, and register allocation for real code.

A finite graph  $G = \langle V, E \rangle$  consists of vertices  $V = \{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$  and edges  $E = \{\langle v_{i_1}, w_{i_1} \rangle, \dots, \langle v_{i_m}, w_{i_m} \rangle\}$ . Given a set of  $k$  colors  $C = \{c_1, \dots, c_k\}$ , the *k-coloring* problem for  $G$  is to assign a color  $c \in C$  to each vertex  $v \in V$  such that for every edge  $\langle v, w \rangle \in E$ ,  $\text{color}(v) \neq \text{color}(w)$ .

6. (10 points) Show how to encode an instance of a  $k$ -coloring problem into a propositional formula  $F$  that is satisfiable iff a  $k$ -coloring exists.
  - (a) Describe a set of propositional constraints asserting that every vertex is colored. Use the notation  $\text{color}(v) = c$  to indicate that a vertex  $v$  has the color  $c$ . Such an assertion is encodable as a single propositional variable  $p_v^c$  (since the set of vertices and colors are both finite).
  - (b) Describe a set of propositional constraints asserting that every vertex has at most one color.
  - (c) Describe a set of propositional constraints asserting that no two adjacent vertices have the same color.
  - (d) Identify a significant optimization in this encoding that reduces its size asymptotically. (**Hint:** Can any constraints be dropped? Why?)
  - (e) Specify your constraints in CNF. For  $|V|$  vertices,  $|E|$  edges, and  $k$  colors, how many variables and clauses does your encoding require?
7. (20 points) Implement the above encoding in [Racket](#), using the provided [solution skeleton](#). See the [README](#) file for instructions on obtaining solvers and the database of graph coloring problems. Your program should generate the encoding for a given graph (see [graph.rkt](#)), call a SAT solver on it ([solver.rkt](#)), and then decode the result into an assignment of colors to vertices (see [examples.rkt](#) and [k-coloring.rkt](#)).

Your implementation should be able to solve all of the easy and medium instances in under 15 minutes on an ordinary laptop. (The reference implementation does so in about 7 minutes.)
8. (5 points) Describe a CNF encoding for  $k$ -coloring that uses  $O(|V| \log k + |E| \log k)$  variables and clauses.
9. (5 points) Most modern SAT solvers support *incremental solving*—that is, obtaining a solution to a CNF, adding more constraints, obtaining another solution, and so on. Because the solver keeps (some) learned clauses between invocations, incremental solving is generally the fastest way to solve a series of related CNFs. How would you apply incremental solving to your encoding from Problem 7 to find the smallest number of colors needed to color a graph (i.e., its chromatic number)?

## 4 Optimal Graph Coloring with Variations on SAT (10 points)

Consider the following variations on the propositional satisfiability (SAT) problem discussed in [Lecture 5](#):

**Partial Weighted MaxSAT** Given a CNF formula  $\phi_H = \bigwedge_{c \in H} c$  corresponding to a set of *hard* clauses  $H$ , and a CNF formula  $\phi_S = \bigwedge_{c \in S} c$  corresponding to a set of *soft* CNF clauses  $S$  with weights  $w : S \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^+$ , the Partial Weighted MaxSAT problem is to find an assignment  $A$  to the problem variables that satisfies all the hard clauses and that maximizes the weight of the satisfied soft clauses. That is,  $A \models \bigwedge_{c \in H} c$ , and if we let  $C = \{c \in S \mid A \models c\}$ , then there is no  $C' \subseteq S$  such that  $H \cup C'$  is satisfiable and  $\sum_{c' \in C'} w(c') > \sum_{c \in C} w(c)$ .

**Pseudo-Boolean Optimization** Let  $B$  be a set of *pseudo-boolean constraints* of the form  $\sum a_{ij} x_j \geq b_i$ , where  $x_j$  is a variable over  $\{0, 1\}$  and  $a_{ij}, b_i, c_j$  are integer constants. The Pseudo-Boolean Optimization problem is to satisfy all constraints in  $B$  while minimizing a linear function  $\sum c_j \cdot x_j$ .

Let  $G = \langle V, E \rangle$  be a finite graph and  $C_k = \{c_1, \dots, c_k\}$  a set of  $k$  colors. Let  $P(G, C_k)$  be the CNF formula produced by applying your encoding from Problems 6-7 to the graph  $G$  and the coloring  $C_k$ . As before, we use  $p_v^c$  to denote the propositional variable indicating that the vertex  $v \in V$  has the color  $c \in C_k$ .

10. (5 points) Explain how to create a Partial Weighted MaxSAT instance  $P_{\text{opt}}(G)$  such that every solution to  $P_{\text{opt}}(G)$  represents a valid  $\chi$ -coloring of  $G$  where  $\chi$  is the chromatic number of  $G$  (i.e., the smallest possible number of colors needed to color  $G$ ).

Your encoding of  $P_{\text{opt}}(G)$  may use  $P(G, C_k)$  for at most one  $k$  of your choosing. So,  $P_{\text{opt}}(G)$  cannot use, for example, both  $P(G, C_1)$  and  $P(G, C_2)$ .

Write down  $P_{\text{opt}}(G)$  by specifying the set  $H$  of hard clauses, the set  $S$  of soft clauses, and the function  $w : S \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^+$  that assigns a positive weight to each soft clause in  $S$ .

$$\begin{aligned} H &= \bigwedge \dots \\ S &= \bigwedge \dots \\ w(s) &= \dots \text{ for each clause } s \in S \end{aligned}$$

11. (5 points) Explain how to create a Pseudo-Boolean Optimization instance  $P_{\text{opt}}(G)$  such that every solution to  $P_{\text{opt}}(G)$  represents a valid  $\chi$ -coloring of  $G$  where  $\chi$  is the chromatic number of  $G$  (i.e., the smallest possible number of colors needed to color  $G$ ).

To create  $P_{\text{opt}}(G)$ , observe that every CNF instance can be transformed into a set of equivalent pseudo-boolean constraints. To apply this observation, explain how to do the transformation.

As before, your encoding of  $P_{\text{opt}}(G)$  may use the pseudo-boolean equivalent of  $P(G, C_k)$  for at most one  $k$  of your choosing.

Write down  $P_{\text{opt}}(G)$  by specifying the pseudo-boolean constraints to solve and the linear function to minimize:

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{minimize } \sum \dots \\ &\text{subject to } \bigwedge \dots \end{aligned}$$