

The Complexity of X3SAT: $P = NP = PSPACE$

Latif Salum 

Department of Industrial Engineering, Dokuz Eylül University, İzmir, Türkiye

Abstract

$C_k = (r_i \odot r_j \odot r_u)$ is a clause, an exactly-1 disjunction \odot of at least *two* literals $r_i \in X_i$, $X_i = \{x_i, \bar{x}_i\}$. C_k is true if $(r_i \wedge \bar{r}_j \wedge \bar{r}_u) \vee (\bar{r}_i \wedge r_j \wedge \bar{r}_u) \vee (\bar{r}_i \wedge \bar{r}_j \wedge r_u)$ is satisfiable, which leads to *collapse*, a reduction of C_k , e.g., $r_i \wedge C_k \vdash \bar{r}_j \wedge \bar{r}_u$. Also, $\bar{r}_i \wedge C_k \vdash (r_j \odot r_u)$, a shrinkage. Let $\phi = \bigwedge C_k$, an X3SAT formula. Let $\phi(r_i) := r_i \wedge \phi$, which leads to reductions over ϕ , viz., $r_i \wedge \phi \vdash \psi(r_i) \wedge \phi'(r_i)$. The reductions terminate iff $L(\psi(r_i)) \cap L(\phi'(r_i)) = \emptyset$, viz., $r_i \wedge \phi \rightarrow \psi(r_i) \wedge \phi'(r_i)$, in which $L(\cdot) \subseteq L'$, where $L' \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. That is, the reductions **terminate** iff $\psi(r_i)$ and $\phi'(r_i)$ are **properly disjoint** iff neither collapse nor shrinkage occurs between $\psi(r_i)$ and any C_k in $\phi'(r_i)$. In this case, unsatisfiability of the formula $\phi'(r_i)$ is **ignored** to check unsatisfiability of $\phi(r_i)$. Also, $\phi \supseteq \phi'(r_i)$, and $\psi(r_i) = r_i \wedge \bar{r}_j \wedge \dots \wedge \bar{r}_u$, which is **consistent**. Otherwise, $\psi(r_j)$ is inconsistent, thus $\phi(r_j)$ is unsatisfiable. Hence, r_j is removed from ϕ and j from L' . That is, if $\psi(r_j) \vdash x_i \wedge \bar{x}_i$, then $\not\models \phi(r_j)$, $\psi \leftarrow \psi \wedge \bar{r}_j$, and $L \leftarrow L \cup \{j\}$. Next, $\psi \wedge \phi \rightarrow \psi^* \wedge \phi^*$, and $\phi^*(r_i)$ is re-evaluated for all $i \in L'$ and $r_i \in X_i$, thus $\psi^* \leftarrow \psi^* \wedge r_a$. $\not\models \phi$ if ψ^* is inconsistent. Otherwise, $\phi \rightarrow \psi \wedge \phi'$, that is, ψ and ϕ' are properly disjoint, and $\forall i \in L' \forall r_i \in X_i [\psi(r_i) \text{ is consistent}]$. Claim: ϕ' is satisfiable. Proof sketch: Let $\phi \leftarrow \phi'$. Pick $r_{i_0} \in X_{i_0}$ in ϕ , thus $r_{i_0} \wedge \phi \rightarrow \psi(r_{i_0}) \wedge \phi'(r_{i_0})$. Hence, $\phi \supseteq \phi'(r_{i_0})$. Pick $r_{i_1} \in X_{i_1}$ in $\phi'(r_{i_0})$, thus $r_{i_1} \wedge \phi \rightarrow \psi(r_{i_1} | r_{i_0}) \wedge \phi'(r_{i_1} | r_{i_0})$. That is, $\phi \rightarrow \psi(r_{i_0}) \wedge \psi(r_{i_1} | r_{i_0}) \wedge \phi'(r_{i_1} | r_{i_0})$. Also, $r_{i_1} \wedge \phi \rightarrow \psi(r_{i_1}) \wedge \phi'(r_{i_1})$. Consequently, $\phi \supseteq \phi'(r_{i_0})$, $\phi \rightarrow \psi(r_{i_1})$ and $\phi'(r_{i_0}) \rightarrow \psi(r_{i_1} | r_{i_0})$. Thus, $\psi(r_{i_1}) \supseteq \psi(r_{i_1} | r_{i_0})$. As $\psi(r_{i_1})$ is consistent, $\psi(r_{i_1} | r_{i_0})$ is consistent. Since $L(\psi(r_{i_0})) \cap L(\phi'(r_{i_0})) = \emptyset$ and $\phi'(r_{i_0}) \rightarrow \psi(r_{i_1} | r_{i_0})$, $\psi(r_{i_0})$ and $\psi(r_{i_1} | r_{i_0})$ are *properly disjoint*. Then, $\psi(r_{i_1} | r_{i_0})$ can be appended to $\psi(r_{i_0})$, i.e., $(\psi(r_{i_0}) \wedge \psi(r_{i_1} | r_{i_0}))$ is consistent. Also, $\psi(r_{i_2} | r_{i_1})$ can be appended to $(\psi(r_{i_0}) \wedge \psi(r_{i_1} | r_{i_0}))$. Thus, $\hat{\psi} = \psi(r_{i_0}) \wedge \bigwedge_{k=1}^n \psi(r_{i_k} | r_{i_{k-1}})$, which is *consistent*. That is, construction of the next $\psi(r_{i_k} | r_{i_{k-1}})$ depends *only* upon the current $\phi'(r_{i_{k-1}} | r_{i_{k-2}})$. Thus, $\phi' \rightarrow \hat{\psi}$, and ϕ' is *satisfiable*. To tackle *TQBF*, the Prime Normal Form Ψ is constructed over a 3SAT β , in which $\beta = \bigwedge_{k=1}^m c_k$ and $\Psi = \bigwedge \delta_k$, where $\delta_k = (\psi_k^1 \vee \psi_k^2 \vee \dots \vee \psi_k^7)$ such that $\psi_k^i \wedge \beta$ is satisfiable. Also, $\psi_k^1 = r_i \wedge \bar{r}_j \wedge \bar{r}_u$, $\psi_k^2 = \bar{r}_i \wedge r_j \wedge \bar{r}_u$, \dots , $\psi_k^7 = r_i \wedge r_j \wedge r_u$, which denote the prime satisfying assignments for the clause $c_k = (r_i \vee r_j \vee r_u)$. The complexity of *X3SAT* is $O(mn^3)$, and of *TQBF* is $O(m^2n^3)$. Thus, **P = NP = PSPACE**. The paper also tackles Graph Isomorphism via *XSAT*.

2012 ACM Subject Classification Theory of computation \rightarrow Complexity theory and logic

Keywords and phrases P vs NP, NP-complete, One-in-three 3SAT, PSPACE, Graph Isomorphism

Acknowledgements I would like to thank Javier Esparza, Anuj Dawar, Avi Wigderson, Paul Spirakis, Éva Tardos, and Csongor Csehi, as well as every reviewer, for their valuable contributions to the paper throughout its development since 2008. I would like to thank my colleagues at Dokuz Eylül University. Last but not least, I would like to thank John Reidar Mathiassen for his sincere efforts in testing the proposed algorithm on real examples.

1 Introduction

If any **NP**-complete problem is in **P**, then **P = NP**. In this respect, there is no difference in proving that *3SAT* is in **P** and proving that *CLIQUE* is in **P**. Nevertheless, a particular problem may feature a property that leads to an efficient algorithm, which proves **P = NP**.


This paper shows **P = NP** via *One-in-Three 3SAT*, also called *Exactly-1 3SAT* or *X3SAT*, which is **NP**-complete [2]. *X3SAT* features XÖR (exactly-1 or), denoted by \odot . XÖR leads to an efficient algorithm that decides satisfiability of an X3SAT formula ϕ . The algorithm, called the (formula) ϕ scan, incorporates a proof theoretic approach. The following introduces the ϕ scan. See also this [reply](#) and [presentation](#).

$C_k = (r_i \odot r_j \odot r_u)$ denotes a clause, which involves at least *two* literals $r_i, r_i \in \{x_i, \bar{x}_i\}$. C_k is true iff *exactly one* of $\{r_i, r_j, r_u\}$ is true. Then, $\phi = \bigwedge C_k$ denotes an X3SAT formula.

Let $\phi(r_j) := r_j \wedge \phi$ for any $j \in L', L' \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. If $\phi(r_j)$ is unsatisfiable, viz., $\not\models \phi(r_j)$, then r_j is incompatible. Consider $\phi(x_j)$. Then, each C_k containing x_j or \bar{x}_j is reducible, viz., $x_j \wedge (x_j \odot \bar{x}_i \odot x_u) \wedge (\bar{x}_j \odot \bar{x}_u \odot x_v) \vdash x_i \wedge \bar{x}_u \wedge (\bar{x}_u \odot x_v)$. Hence, \bar{x}_u leads to the subsequent reduction, i.e., $\bar{x}_u \wedge (\bar{x}_u \odot x_v) \vdash \bar{x}_v$. Thus, $x_j \wedge \phi$ is reduced to $\psi(x_j) \wedge \phi'(x_j)$, i.e., $x_j \wedge \phi \vdash \psi(x_j) \wedge \phi'(x_j)$, where $\psi(x_j) = x_j \wedge x_i \wedge \bar{x}_u \wedge \bar{x}_v$. Note that $\psi(x_j)$ is a conjunction of literals, called a minterm. Next, x_i and \bar{x}_v proceed the reductions over $\phi'(x_j)$, and $\psi(x_j) \leftarrow \psi(x_j) \wedge r_a$.

If $\psi(x_j)$ is inconsistent, viz., $\psi(x_j) \vdash x_i \wedge \bar{x}_i$ for some i , then $\not\models \phi(x_j)$, hence x_j is removed from ϕ and j from L' , viz., $\psi \leftarrow \psi \wedge \bar{x}_j$ and $L \leftarrow L \cup \{j\}$. Otherwise, $x_j \wedge \phi \rightarrow \psi(x_j) \wedge \phi'(x_j)$. In this case, unsatisfiability of $\phi'(x_j)$ is *ignored* to check unsatisfiability of $\phi(x_j)$. Also, $\psi(x_j)$ and $\phi'(x_j)$ become *properly* disjoint. That is, if $i \in L(\psi(x_j))$, then $X_i \cap C_k = \emptyset$ for any C_k in $\phi'(x_j)$, and if $i \in L(\phi'(x_j))$, then $\psi(x_j) \cap X_i = \emptyset$, where $X_i = \{x_i, \bar{x}_i\}$ and $L(\cdot) \subseteq L'$.


Next, $\psi \wedge \phi \rightarrow \psi^* \wedge \phi^*$. Then, $\phi^*(r_i)$ is re-evaluated for all $i \in L'$ and $r_i \in X_i$. Thus, $\psi^* \leftarrow \psi^* \wedge r_a$, hence $\not\models \phi$ if ψ^* is inconsistent. Otherwise, the ϕ scan terminates, viz., $\phi \rightarrow \psi \wedge \phi'$ (see Figure 1). That is, ψ and ϕ' are *properly* disjoint, and $\forall i \in L' \forall r_i \in X_i [\psi(r_i) \text{ is consistent}]$.



■ **Figure 1** $\phi \rightarrow \psi \wedge \phi'$. $n = 9$, $\psi = \bar{x}_5 \wedge x_4 \wedge \bar{x}_3$, and $\phi' = C_1 \wedge \dots \wedge (x_8 \odot x_1) \wedge (\bar{x}_6 \odot x_9) \wedge \dots \wedge C_m$.

▷ **Claim.** ϕ is satisfiable iff $\phi \rightarrow \psi \wedge \phi'$, that is, ϕ is satisfiable iff the ϕ scan terminates.

Proof sketch. Since the ϕ scan terminates, $\psi(r_i)$ is consistent for any $i \in L'$ and $r_i \in X_i$. Let $\phi \leftarrow \phi'$. Then, $r_{i_0} \wedge \phi \rightarrow \psi(r_{i_0}) \wedge \phi'(r_{i_0})$, $r_{i_1} \wedge \phi'(r_{i_0}) \rightarrow \psi(r_{i_1} | r_{i_0}) \wedge \phi'(r_{i_1} | r_{i_0})$, \dots , $r_{i_{n-1}} \wedge \phi'(r_{i_{n-2}} | r_{i_{n-3}}) \rightarrow \psi(r_{i_{n-1}} | r_{i_{n-2}}) \wedge \phi'(r_{i_{n-1}} | r_{i_{n-2}})$, $r_{i_n} \wedge \phi'(r_{i_{n-1}} | r_{i_{n-2}}) \rightarrow \psi(r_{i_n} | r_{i_{n-1}})$, thus $L(\psi(r_{i_0})) \cap L(\phi'(r_{i_0})) = \emptyset$, and $L(\psi(r_{i_{k-1}} | r_{i_{k-2}})) \cap L(\phi'(r_{i_{k-1}} | r_{i_{k-2}})) = \emptyset$. Hence, $\psi(r_{i_0})$ and $\psi(r_{i_1} | r_{i_0})$ are *properly* disjoint by $\phi'(r_{i_0}) \rightarrow \psi(r_{i_1} | r_{i_0})$, and $\psi(r_{i_{k-1}} | r_{i_{k-2}})$ and $\psi(r_{i_k} | r_{i_{k-1}})$ are *properly* disjoint by $\phi'(r_{i_{k-1}} | r_{i_{k-2}}) \rightarrow \psi(r_{i_k} | r_{i_{k-1}})$. Also, $\psi(r_{i_k} | r_{i_{k-1}})$ is consistent, since $\psi(r_{i_k}) \supseteq \psi(r_{i_k} | r_{i_{k-1}})$. Thus, $\phi' \rightarrow \psi(r_{i_0}) \wedge \psi(r_{i_1} | r_{i_0}) \wedge \dots \wedge \psi(r_{i_{n-1}} | r_{i_{n-2}}) \wedge \psi(r_{i_n} | r_{i_{n-1}})$. That is, ϕ' is reducible to a minterm *consistent*. Therefore, ϕ' , hence ϕ , is *satisfiable*. See also Figure 2, in which $\phi = (x_1 \odot \bar{x}_2 \odot x_9) \wedge (x_7 \odot \bar{x}_2 \odot \bar{x}_8) \wedge (\bar{x}_6 \odot x_9)$, $\phi \subseteq \phi'$ from Figure 1. ◀



■ **Figure 2** $\phi \rightarrow \psi(x_1) \wedge \psi(x_7 | x_1)$, where $\psi(x_7 | x_1) = x_7 \wedge x_8$ due to $x_7 \wedge \phi'(x_1) \rightarrow \psi(x_7 | x_1)$. Also, $\phi \rightarrow \psi(x_2) \wedge \psi(x_1 | x_2) \wedge \psi(\bar{x}_7 | x_1)$, where $\psi(\bar{x}_7 | x_1) = \bar{x}_7 \wedge \bar{x}_8$ due to $\bar{x}_7 \wedge \phi'(x_1 | x_2) \rightarrow \psi(\bar{x}_7 | x_1)$.

2 Basic Definitions

X3SAT features XOR, which facilitates deciding unsatisfiability. A formula is *unsatisfiable* if it is reducible to a simple formula *inconsistent*, viz., $\not\models \phi$ if $\phi \vdash \psi$ such that $\psi \vdash x_i \wedge \bar{x}_i$.

► **Definition 1** (Literal). r_i denotes a Boolean variable x_i or its negation \bar{x}_i , that is, $r_i \in X_i$ for any $i \in \mathfrak{L}$, in which $X_i = \{x_i, \bar{x}_i\}$ and $\mathfrak{L} = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$.

► **Definition 2** (XOR). $r_i \odot r_j \odot \dots \odot r_u$ is true iff exactly one of $\{r_i, r_j, \dots, r_u\}$ is true iff δ is satisfiable, in which $\delta = \dot{\psi}(r_i) \vee \dot{\psi}(r_j) \vee \dots \vee \dot{\psi}(r_u)$, where $\dot{\psi}(r_i) = r_i \wedge \bar{r}_j \wedge \dots \wedge \bar{r}_u$.

► **Definition 3** (Clause). $C_k = (r_i \odot r_j \odot \dots \odot r_u)$, i.e., $C_k = \{r_i, r_j, \dots, r_u\}$, for any $k \in \mathfrak{C}$, where $\mathfrak{C} = \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$. Also, $|C_k| \in \{2, 3\}$ for *X3SAT* and $|C_k| \in \{2, 3, \dots, n\}$ for *XSAT*.

► **Definition 4** (Minterm/Simple formula). $\psi = r_i \wedge r_j \wedge \dots \wedge r_v$, i.e., $\psi = \{r_i, r_j, \dots, r_v\}$, in which a literal denotes a conjunct. Any conjunct is necessary for satisfying some formula.

► **Definition 5**. A simple formula ψ is inconsistent iff $\psi \vdash x_i \wedge \bar{x}_i$ for some i .

► **Definition 6** (Initial *X3SAT* formula). $\varphi = \psi \wedge \phi$, where $\phi = \bigwedge_{k \in \mathfrak{C}} C_k$ and $|C_k| \in \{2, 3\}$.

► **Definition 7**. $\mathfrak{L} = L \cup L'$, where $L = \{j \mid r_j \in \psi\}$ and $L' = \{i \mid r_i \in C_k \text{ for some } C_k \text{ in } \phi\}$.

► Note. $L \cap L' \neq \emptyset$, if $\psi \neq \emptyset$. $L \cap L' = \emptyset$, whenever the reductions due to ψ over ϕ terminate.

► **Definition 8**. $\phi(r_i) = r_i \wedge \phi$ for any $i \in L'$ and $r_i \in X_i$, $X_i = \{x_i, \bar{x}_i\}$, whenever $L \cap L' = \emptyset$.

► **Definition 9**. If \bar{r}_j is necessary, then r_j is incompatible trivially, and removed, viz., $\bar{r}_j \vdash \neg r_j$.

► **Definition 10**. If $\phi(r_j)$ is unsatisfiable, then r_j is incompatible nontrivially. As a result, it is removed from ϕ , thus \bar{r}_j is necessary for φ , viz., if $\not\models \phi(r_j)$, then $\neg r_j \vdash \bar{r}_j$, thus $\psi \leftarrow \psi \wedge \bar{r}_j$.

► **Definition 11**. The sets A and B are properly disjoint with respect to X_i iff $A \cap X_i = \emptyset$ for any $i \in L(B)$ and $X_i \cap B = \emptyset$ for any $i \in L(A)$, where $X_i = \{x_i, \bar{x}_i\}$ and $L(\cdot) \subseteq \mathfrak{L}$.

► **Lemma 12** (Collapse of a clause to a minterm). $r_i \wedge C_k \vdash \psi_k(r_i)$, thus C_k becomes empty, in which $\psi_k(r_i) = \bar{r}_j \wedge \dots \wedge \bar{r}_u$ for $C_k = (r_i \odot r_j \odot \dots \odot r_u)$, where $i \neq j, \dots, i \neq u$.

Proof. Follows directly from Definition 2. Note that $r_i \wedge C_k$ is true iff $\dot{\psi}_k(r_i)$ is true. ◀

► **Lemma 13** (Shrinkage of a clause). $\bar{r}_j \wedge C_k \vdash C_k(\neg r_j)$ such that if $C_k(\neg r_j) = (r_u)$, then (r_u) the unit clause becomes r_u the conjunct, that is, r_u becomes necessary for φ , or for $\phi(r_i)$.

Proof. Follows from Definitions 3, 4, and 9. Note that C_k contains at least two literals. ◀

► **Note 14**. Collapse (or shrinkage) denotes a reduction, a syntactic consequence. A reduction arises *firstly* by Definition 6, $\psi \wedge \phi \vdash \psi' \wedge \phi'$, or *secondly* by Definition 8, $r_i \wedge \phi \vdash \psi(r_i) \wedge \phi'(r_i)$.

► **Remark 15**. Reductions over ϕ are denoted by \vdash , and their termination is denoted by \rightarrow .

► **Example 16**. Let $\varphi = \bar{x}_1 \wedge (x_1 \odot \bar{x}_2 \odot x_3) \wedge (\bar{x}_3 \odot \bar{x}_4) \wedge (\bar{x}_3 \odot \bar{x}_2 \odot x_1)$. Hence, $\varphi \rightarrow \phi'$, where $\phi' = (\bar{x}_2 \odot x_3) \wedge (\bar{x}_3 \odot \bar{x}_4) \wedge (\bar{x}_3 \odot \bar{x}_2)$ (Note 14, the first case). Thus, $L = \{1\}$ and $L' = \{2, 3, 4\}$ by Definition 7. Let $\phi \leftarrow \phi'$. Consider $\phi(x_4)$ by Definition 8. Then, $x_4 \wedge \phi \vdash (\bar{x}_2 \odot x_3) \wedge \bar{x}_3 \wedge (\bar{x}_3 \odot \bar{x}_2) \vdash \bar{x}_2 \wedge x_2$ (Note 14, the second case). Hence, $\not\models \phi(x_4)$, thus $\neg x_4 \vdash \bar{x}_4$ and $\psi \leftarrow \psi \wedge \bar{x}_4$ by Definition 10. Also, $\not\models \phi(\bar{x}_4)$ and $\psi \leftarrow \psi \wedge x_4$. That is, $\not\models \phi$, because $\phi \vdash \psi$ and $\psi \vdash \bar{x}_4 \wedge x_4$.

Reductions underlie the φ scan, the algorithm that decides satisfiability of a formula φ (see Definition 6). Consider the formula $\phi(r_i)$ by Definition 8. Then, the reductions transform $r_i \wedge \phi$ into $\psi(r_i) \wedge \phi'(r_i)$, unless $\psi(r_i)$ is inconsistent, such that $\psi(r_i)$ and $\phi'(r_i)$ are *properly disjoint*. That is, $r_i \wedge \phi \rightarrow \psi(r_i) \wedge \phi'(r_i)$ (see Note 14 and Remark 15). In this case, it is *redundant* to check unsatisfiability of $\phi'(r_i)$ in order to decide unsatisfiability of $\phi(r_i)$. This redundancy facilitates deciding satisfiability of φ . Thus, *X3SAT* leads to proving **P = NP**.

3 Decision Procedures for (Quantified) Propositional Logic

This chapter addresses the reduction of φ to $\psi' \wedge \phi'$. Section 3.1 tackles unsatisfiability of φ and Section 3.2 tackles satisfiability of ϕ' . Section 3.3 addresses construction of a satisfying assignment for ϕ' . Section 3.4 tackles *TQBF* via “prime satisfying assignments”.

3.1 Unsatisfiability: Interruption of Scan

This section shows that inconsistency of a simple formula reduced from a formula is sufficient for the unsatisfiability of the formula. That is, $\not\models \varphi$ if $\varphi \vdash \psi' \wedge \phi'$ and $\psi' \vdash x_i \wedge \bar{x}_i$. Note that it is trivial to check *inconsistency*. Thus, it is easy to decide *unsatisfiability*. See Definitions 4–6.

► **Definition 17** (Special formula). ϕ denotes a special formula if $\{x_i, \bar{x}_i\} \subseteq C_k$ for some C_k .

► **Lemma 18** (Converting a special formula). \bar{r}_j the conjunct replaces $(r_j \odot x_i \odot \bar{x}_i)$ the clause.

Proof. $(r_j \odot x_i \odot \bar{x}_i)$ is true by Definition 2 iff $(r_j \wedge \bar{x}_i \wedge x_i) \vee (\bar{r}_j \wedge x_i \wedge x_i) \vee (\bar{r}_j \wedge \bar{x}_i \wedge \bar{x}_i)$ is satisfiable. Therefore, the clause $(r_j \odot x_i \odot \bar{x}_i)$ is true iff the literal \bar{r}_j becomes a conjunct. ◀

► **Definition 19.** $\phi^{r_i} = \bigwedge_{k \in \mathfrak{C}} C_k$ such that $r_i \in C_k$, which can be empty, thus $\mathfrak{C}^{r_i} \subseteq \mathfrak{C}$.

► **Example 20.** Let $\varphi = (x_2 \odot \bar{x}_1) \wedge (x_1 \odot \bar{x}_3 \odot x_4) \wedge (x_1 \odot \bar{x}_2 \odot x_2)$, i.e., $\psi = \emptyset$ and $\mathfrak{C} = \{1, 2, 3\}$. Then, $3 \in (\mathfrak{C}^{\bar{x}_2} \cap \mathfrak{C}^{x_2})$, where $\mathfrak{C}^{\bar{x}_2} = \{3\}$ and $\mathfrak{C}^{x_2} = \{1, 3\}$, i.e., C_3 is contained in $\phi^{\bar{x}_2}$ and ϕ^{x_2} . Hence, φ is converted by replacing C_3 with \bar{x}_1 . Thus, $\varphi \leftarrow \bar{x}_1 \wedge (x_2 \odot \bar{x}_1) \wedge (x_1 \odot \bar{x}_3 \odot x_4)$. Let $\varphi = (x_3 \odot \bar{x}_4 \odot x_4) \wedge (\bar{x}_3 \odot x_2 \odot \bar{x}_2) \wedge (x_2 \odot \bar{x}_1)$. Then, $\varphi \leftarrow \bar{x}_3 \wedge x_3 \wedge (x_2 \odot \bar{x}_1)$. Thus, $\not\models \varphi$.

► **Lemma 21** (Collapse of a formula). $r_i \wedge \phi^{r_i} \wedge \phi^{\bar{r}_i} \vdash \tilde{\psi}(r_i)$, that is, ϕ^{r_i} collapses and becomes empty, in which $\tilde{\psi}(r_i) = \bigwedge_{k \in \mathfrak{C}^{r_i}} \psi_k(r_i) \wedge \bigwedge_{k \in \mathfrak{C}^{\bar{r}_i}} C_k(\neg \bar{r}_i)$ such that $C_k(\neg \bar{r}_i)$ is a unit clause.

Proof. Follows from Lemmas 12 and 13. Note that any unit clause becomes a conjunct. ◀

► **Lemma 22** (Shrinkage of a formula). $r_i \wedge \phi^{\bar{r}_i} \vdash \tilde{\phi}(\neg \bar{r}_i)$, and $\tilde{\phi}(\neg \bar{r}_i) = \bigwedge_{k \in \mathfrak{C}^{\bar{r}_i}} C_k(\neg \bar{r}_i)$.

Proof. Follows from Lemma 13 such that $C_k(\neg \bar{r}_i)$ contains at least two literals. ◀

► **Remark.** $\tilde{\psi}(r_i)$ is to be consistent, while $\tilde{\phi}(\neg \bar{r}_i)$ can be empty since $|C_k| \geq 2$ by Definition 3.

► **Lemma 23** (Reduction of a formula). $r_i \wedge \phi^{r_i} \wedge \phi^{\bar{r}_i} \vdash \tilde{\varphi}(r_i)$, and $\tilde{\varphi}(r_i) = \tilde{\psi}(r_i) \wedge \tilde{\phi}(\neg \bar{r}_i)$.

Proof. Follows from Lemmas 21 and 22. Note that $\mathfrak{C}^{r_i} \cap \mathfrak{C}^{\bar{r}_i} = \emptyset$ due to Lemma 18. ◀

► **Example 24.** Let $\phi = (x_1 \odot \bar{x}_3) \wedge (x_1 \odot \bar{x}_2 \odot x_3) \wedge (x_2 \odot \bar{x}_3)$ and $\psi = \emptyset$. Then, $L \cap L' = \emptyset$ by Definition 7. Thus, Definition 8 is applicable. Hence, $\bar{x}_i \wedge \phi \rightarrow \psi(\bar{x}_i) \wedge \phi'(\bar{x}_i)$ for all $i \in L'$ (see Note 14, the second case, and Remark 15). Next, consider $\phi(x_1)$. Because $x_1 \in (C_1 \cap C_2)$, $\phi^{x_1} = C_1 \wedge C_2$ by Definition 19. Then, $x_1 \wedge \phi^{x_1} \vdash \tilde{\psi}(x_1)$, and $x_1 \vdash x_3 \wedge x_2 \wedge \bar{x}_3$. Hence, $\not\models \phi(x_1)$, thus x_1 is *incompatible* (\bar{x}_1 is *necessary*), i.e., $\neg x_1 \vdash \bar{x}_1$ and $\psi \leftarrow \psi \wedge \bar{x}_1$ by Definition 10. Note that $\bar{x}_3 \vee x_3 \Rightarrow \bar{x}_1$. Consider $\phi(x_3)$. $\phi^{x_3} = C_2$, and $\phi^{\bar{x}_3} = C_1 \wedge C_3$. Then, $x_3 \wedge \phi^{x_3} \wedge \phi^{\bar{x}_3} \vdash \tilde{\psi}(x_3)$ by Lemma 21, and $x_3 \wedge \phi^{\bar{x}_3} \vdash \tilde{\phi}(\neg \bar{x}_3)$ by Lemma 22. As a result, $\tilde{\phi}(\neg \bar{x}_3)$ is empty and $\tilde{\psi}(x_3) \vdash \bar{x}_1 \wedge x_2 \wedge C_1(\neg \bar{x}_3) \wedge C_3(\neg \bar{x}_3)$, i.e., $\tilde{\psi}(x_3) \vdash \bar{x}_1 \wedge x_2 \wedge x_1 \wedge x_2$. Hence, $\not\models \phi(x_3)$, and $\psi \leftarrow \psi \wedge \bar{x}_3$. Consider $\phi(x_2)$. Then, $\tilde{\psi}(x_2) = x_3$, $\tilde{\phi}(\neg \bar{x}_2) = (x_1 \odot x_3)$, and $\tilde{\varphi}(x_2) = \tilde{\psi}(x_2) \wedge \tilde{\phi}(\neg \bar{x}_2)$. That is, $\tilde{\varphi}(x_2) = \bar{x}_1 \wedge x_3$. Then, $x_2 \wedge \phi \vdash \tilde{\varphi}(x_2) \wedge (x_1 \odot \bar{x}_3)$. Hence, $\not\models \phi(x_2)$, and $\psi \leftarrow \psi \wedge \bar{x}_2$. Therefore, $\psi = \bar{x}_1 \wedge \bar{x}_3 \wedge \bar{x}_2$, and $\varphi \leftarrow \psi \wedge \phi$. As a result, \bar{x}_1 leads to reductions (Note 14, the first case), i.e., $\bar{x}_1 \wedge \phi^{\bar{x}_1} \wedge \phi^{x_1} \vdash \tilde{\psi}(\bar{x}_1) \wedge \tilde{\phi}(\neg \bar{x}_1)$ by Lemma 23, where $\phi^{\bar{x}_1}$ is empty, $\tilde{\psi}(\bar{x}_1) = C_1(\neg x_1) = \bar{x}_3$, and $\tilde{\phi}(\neg \bar{x}_1) = C_2(\neg x_1) = (\bar{x}_2 \odot x_3)$. Hence, $\varphi \leftarrow \psi \wedge \tilde{\phi}(\neg \bar{x}_1) \wedge (x_2 \odot \bar{x}_3)$. Finally, \bar{x}_3 leads to reductions, i.e., $\bar{x}_3 \wedge \tilde{\phi}(\neg \bar{x}_1) \wedge (x_2 \odot \bar{x}_3) \vdash \bar{x}_2 \wedge \bar{x}_2$. Then, $\varphi \leftarrow \bar{x}_1 \wedge \tilde{\varphi}(\bar{x}_1) \wedge \bar{x}_3 \wedge \tilde{\varphi}(x_3)$. Thus, ϕ reduces to the *unique* satisfying assignment, viz., $\phi \rightarrow \bar{x}_1 \wedge \bar{x}_3 \wedge \bar{x}_2$, i.e., $x_1 = 0, x_2 = 0, x_3 = 0$.

The algorithm **Reduce** (ϕ, r_j) , specified below, constructs the reduction $\tilde{\varphi}(r_j)$. It is due to the collapse $\tilde{\psi}(r_j)$ (see Lines 1-8, or L1-8), or due to the shrinkage $\tilde{\phi}(\neg\bar{r}_j)$ (L9-16).

■ **Algorithm 1** **Reduce** $(\phi, r_j) \triangleright$ Construction of the reduction by Lemma 23, $r_j \wedge \phi^{r_j} \wedge \phi^{\bar{r}_j} \vdash \tilde{\varphi}(r_j)$

```

1: for all  $k \in \mathcal{C}^{r_j}$  do  $\triangleright |\mathcal{C}^{r_j}| \leq m$  by Definition 19
2:   for all  $r_{i \neq j} \in C_k$  do  $\triangleright |C_k| \leq 3$  for X3SAT and  $|C_k| \leq n$  for XSAT by Definition 3
3:      $\psi_k(r_j) \leftarrow \psi_k(r_j) \wedge \bar{r}_i \triangleright \psi_k(r_j) = \bar{r}_i \wedge \dots \wedge \bar{r}_u$  for  $C_k = (r_i \odot r_j \odot \dots \odot r_u)$  (see Lemma 12)
4:   end for  $\triangleright r_j \wedge C_k \vdash \psi_k(r_j)$  by Lemma 12—the clause  $C_k$  collapses to the minterm  $\psi_k(r_j)$ 
5:    $\tilde{\psi}(r_j) \leftarrow \tilde{\psi}(r_j) \wedge \psi_k(r_j) \triangleright$  Construction of the collapse by Lemma 21 due to  $\bigwedge_{k \in \mathcal{C}^{r_j}} \psi_k(r_j)$ 
6:   if  $\tilde{\psi}(r_j) \vdash x_i \wedge \bar{x}_i$  for some  $i$  then return  $\tilde{\psi}(r_j)$  is inconsistent  $\triangleright$  See also Definition 5
7:   Remove  $C_k$  from  $\phi^{r_j}$   $\triangleright$  The clause  $C_k$  collapsed in  $\phi^{r_j}$  becomes empty (see Lemma 12)
8: end for  $\triangleright r_j \wedge \phi^{r_j} \vdash \tilde{\psi}(r_j)$  by Lemma 21—the formula  $\phi^{r_j}$  collapsed becomes empty due to L7
9: for all  $k \in \mathcal{C}^{\bar{r}_j}$  do  $\triangleright |\mathcal{C}^{\bar{r}_j}| \leq m$  by Definition 19
10:  Remove  $\bar{r}_j$  from  $C_k \triangleright$  Construction of the shrinkage (Lemma 22),  $\tilde{\phi}(\neg\bar{r}_j) = \bigwedge_{k \in \mathcal{C}^{\bar{r}_j}} C_k(\neg\bar{r}_j)$ 
11:  if  $C_k = (r_i)$  and  $r_i \notin \tilde{\psi}(r_j)$  then  $\triangleright r_j \wedge C_k \vdash C_k(\neg\bar{r}_j)$  by Lemma 13, and  $C_k(\neg\bar{r}_j) = (r_i)$ 
12:     $\tilde{\psi}(r_j) \leftarrow \tilde{\psi}(r_j) \wedge r_i \triangleright$  Construction of the collapse by Lemma 21 due to  $\bigwedge_{k \in \mathcal{C}^{\bar{r}_j}} C_k(\neg\bar{r}_j)$ 
13:    if  $\tilde{\psi}(r_j) \vdash x_i \wedge \bar{x}_i$  then return  $\tilde{\psi}(r_j)$  is inconsistent
14:    Remove  $C_k$  from  $\phi^{\bar{r}_j}$   $\triangleright C_k$  becomes empty by Lemma 13 ( $|C_k| \geq 2$  by Definition 3)
15:  end if
16: end for  $\triangleright r_j \wedge \phi^{\bar{r}_j} \vdash \tilde{\phi}(\neg\bar{r}_j)$  by Lemma 22.  $\phi^{\bar{r}_j}$  becomes empty, or  $|C_k| \geq 2$  for each  $C_k$  in  $\phi^{\bar{r}_j}$ 
17: return  $\tilde{\psi}(r_j) \wedge \phi' \triangleright r_j \wedge \phi \vdash \tilde{\psi}(r_j) \wedge \phi', \phi \supseteq \phi', \text{ i.e., } \mathcal{C} \supseteq \mathcal{C}' \text{ by L7/14 \& } \forall k' \exists k C_k \supseteq C_{k'} \text{ by L10.}$ 
     $\phi' = \tilde{\phi}(\neg\bar{r}_j) \wedge \bar{\phi}, \tilde{\phi}(\neg\bar{r}_j) = \phi^{\bar{r}_j}, \bar{\phi} = \bigwedge_{k \in \bar{\mathcal{C}}} C_k, \bar{\mathcal{C}} = \mathcal{C} - (\mathcal{C}^{r_j} \cup \mathcal{C}^{\bar{r}_j}), \mathcal{C}^{r_j} \cap \mathcal{C}^{\bar{r}_j} = \emptyset$  by Lemma 18

```

Scope (r_j, ϕ) decides *nontrivial* incompatibility (L4,7). See also Lemma 25. Scope (r_i, ϕ) constructs the scope $\psi(r_i)$ (L9,12), and the beyond the scope $\phi'(r_i)$. See also Lemma 26.

■ **Algorithm 2** **Scope** $(r_j, \phi) \triangleright$ Inconsistency of $\psi(r_j)$ (Lemma 25)-Consistency of $\psi(r_i)$ (Lemma 26)

```

1:  $\psi(r_j) \leftarrow r_j; \phi'(r_j) \leftarrow \phi \triangleright \phi(r_j) = r_j \wedge \phi$  initially by Definition 8.  $\phi$  is nonempty by Scan L10
2: for all  $r_j \in \psi(r_j)$  do  $\triangleright$  Initiation of the reductions over  $\phi'(r_j)$ .  $|\psi(r_j)| \leq n$  by Definition 1
3:   Reduce  $(\phi'(r_j), r_j)$   $\triangleright$  Returns  $\tilde{\psi}(r_j)$  and  $\phi'$ . See Note 14, the second case
4:   if  $\tilde{\psi}(r_j)$  is inconsistent then return NULL  $\triangleright$  Lemma 25
5:   else if  $\tilde{\psi}(r_j)$  is nonempty then  $\triangleright$  It is empty if  $\phi^{r_j}$  is empty and  $|C_k| > 2$  for all  $C_k$  in  $\phi^{\bar{r}_j}$ 
6:      $\psi(r_j) \leftarrow \psi(r_j) \wedge \tilde{\psi}(r_j)$   $\triangleright$  Construction of the scope  $\psi(r_j)$ . It is to be consistent
7:     if  $\psi(r_j)$  is inconsistent then return NULL  $\triangleright$  Lemma 25.  $r_j \wedge \phi \vdash \psi(r_j) \wedge \phi'(r_j)$  and  $\not\models \phi(r_j)$ , thus  $r_j$  is incompatible for  $\phi$  and  $\bar{r}_j$  is necessary for  $\varphi$ .  $j \in \ell$  by Definitions 10 and 29
8:   end if
9:   if  $\phi'$  is empty then return  $\psi(r_i) \triangleright r_i \wedge \phi \rightarrow \psi(r_i)$  (cf. L12).  $i \in L'$  by Definition 31,  $i = j$ 
10:   $\phi'(r_j) \leftarrow \phi' \triangleright \phi'(r_j)$  is updated. It also involves the unreduced clauses, denoted by  $\bar{\phi}$ 
11: end for  $\triangleright$  Lemmas 26 and 28. Remark 27. Termination of the reductions over  $\phi'(r_i)$ .  $i \in L'$ 
12: return  $\psi(r_i) \wedge \phi'(r_i) \triangleright r_i \wedge \phi \rightarrow \psi(r_i) \wedge \phi'(r_i)$ .  $\phi \supseteq \phi'(r_i)$ .  $\psi(r_i) \& \phi'(r_i)$  are properly disjoint

```

► **Lemma 25** (Nontrivial incompatibility before the scan termination). *If $\psi(r_j)$ is inconsistent, then $\not\models \phi(r_j)$, thus $\psi \leftarrow \psi \wedge \bar{r}_j$, that is, r_j is incompatible for ϕ , thus \bar{r}_j is necessary for φ .*

Proof. $\phi(r_j) = r_j \wedge \phi$ by Definition 8. Hence, $r_j \wedge \phi \vdash \psi(r_j) \wedge \phi'(r_j)$ (see Scope L6,10). As a result, if $\psi(r_j)$ is inconsistent, then $\not\models \phi(r_j)$ (L4,7). Thus, $\psi \leftarrow \psi \wedge \bar{r}_j$ by Definition 10. ◀

Scan (φ) is specified below. As $\bar{r}_j \in \psi$, r_j is incompatible *trivially* by Definition 9, and ϕ is reduced by \bar{r}_j (L2-12). As $\not\models \phi(r_j)$, r_j is incompatible *nontrivially* by Definition 10 (L15-22).

■ **Algorithm 3** $\text{Scan}(\varphi) \triangleright \varphi = \psi \wedge \phi$ initially. $\text{Scan}(\varphi_s)$ runs over $s = 0, 1, \dots, n$ (L2-22) unless $\not\models \varphi$

```

1: repeat  $\triangleright \text{Scan}(\varphi_{s+1})$  runs whenever the empty  $\psi_s$  (see L13) becomes a nonempty  $\psi_{s+1}$  (L18)
2:   for all  $\bar{r}_j \in \psi$  do  $\triangleright \bar{r}_j$  initiates a new cycle of reductions over  $\phi$ .  $\bar{r}_j$  is in  $\psi_{s+1}$  by L18
3:     Reduce  $(\phi, \bar{r}_j)$   $\triangleright$  Returns  $\tilde{\psi}(\bar{r}_j)$  and  $\phi'$ . See Note 14, the first case
4:     if  $\tilde{\psi}(\bar{r}_j)$  is inconsistent then return UNSAT  $\triangleright \varphi \vdash \tilde{\psi}(\bar{r}_j) \wedge \phi'$ . See also Definition 5
5:     else if  $\tilde{\psi}(\bar{r}_j)$  is nonempty then
6:        $\psi \leftarrow \psi \wedge \tilde{\psi}(\bar{r}_j)$   $\triangleright$  Let  $\bar{r}_i \in \tilde{\psi}(\bar{r}_j)$ .  $\bar{r}_j \vdash \bar{r}_i$  ( $\bar{r}_i$  is trivially necessary by Definition 30)
7:        $\psi' \leftarrow \psi' \wedge \psi$   $\triangleright \psi'$  denotes the conjuncts that have already reduced the formula  $\phi$ 
8:       if  $\psi'$  is inconsistent then return UNSAT  $\triangleright \varphi \vdash \psi' \wedge \phi'$ . See also Definition 5
9:     end if
10:    if  $\phi'$  is empty then return  $\psi'$   $\triangleright$  Termination,  $\varphi \rightarrow \psi'$  (unique satisfying assignment)
11:     $\phi \leftarrow \phi' \triangleright \phi' = \tilde{\phi}(\neg r_j) \wedge \bar{\phi}$ .  $\bar{\phi} = \bigwedge_{k \in \bar{\mathcal{C}}} C_k$ ,  $\bar{\mathcal{C}} = \mathcal{C} - (\mathcal{C}^{\bar{r}_j} \cup \mathcal{C}^{r_j})$ .  $\mathcal{C}^{\bar{r}_j} \cap \mathcal{C}^{r_j} = \emptyset$  by Lemma 18
12:  end for  $\triangleright$  This cycle of the reductions over the current  $\phi$  terminates, i.e.,  $\psi \wedge \phi \rightarrow \psi' \wedge \phi'$ 
13:   $\psi \leftarrow \emptyset \triangleright \psi$  is reset and  $\phi'$  becomes the initial formula.  $\psi_0, \dots, \psi_n$  become properly disjoint
14:   $L' = \mathcal{L} - L \triangleright L = \{j \mid r_j \in \psi'\}$  by Definition 7.  $\psi'$  and  $\phi'$  are properly disjoint as  $\varphi \rightarrow \psi' \wedge \phi'$ 
15:  for all  $i \in L'$  do  $\triangleright$  A new cycle of incompatibility checking over  $\phi$  starts off by Definition 8
16:    for all  $r_i \in \{x_i, \bar{x}_i\}$  do
17:      if  $\text{Scope}(r_i, \phi)$  is NULL then  $\triangleright r_i$  is nontrivially incompatible by Definition 10
18:         $\psi \leftarrow \psi \wedge \bar{r}_i$   $\triangleright \neg r_i \vdash \bar{r}_i$  ( $\bar{r}_i$  is nontrivially necessary by Definitions 10 and 29)
19:        if  $\psi$  is inconsistent then return UNSAT  $\triangleright \varphi \vdash \psi \wedge \phi'$ . See also Definition 5
20:      end if
21:    end for
22:  end for  $\triangleright$  This cycle of the incompatibility checking over the current  $\phi$  terminates
23: until  $\psi = \emptyset \triangleright$  Reductions (L2-12) and incompatibility checking (L15-22) are mutually exclusive.
    Thus, they can be in an arbitrary order. Also,  $\text{Scan}(\varphi_0), \dots, \text{Scan}(\varphi_n)$  are mutually exclusive
24: return  $\varphi' \triangleright$  Termination,  $\varphi \rightarrow \psi' \wedge \phi'$  (cf. L10). Construction of a satisfying assignment over  $\phi'$ 

```

This section showed that φ is unsatisfiable if $\text{Scan}(\varphi)$ is interrupted (see L4,8,19).

3.2 Satisfiability: Termination of Scan

This section shows that φ is satisfiable if $\text{Scan}(\varphi)$ terminates due to L24. The proof is to show reducibility of ϕ' the formula to a minterm $\hat{\psi}$ consistent, i.e., $\phi' \rightarrow \hat{\psi}$. Let $\varphi \leftarrow \varphi'$.

► **Lemma 26** (Scope). *Termination of the reductions due to r_i over ϕ results in the scope $\psi(r_i)$, $\psi(r_i) = \bigwedge (r_i \wedge \tilde{\psi}(r_i))$, viz., $r_i \wedge \phi \rightarrow \psi(r_i) \wedge \phi'(r_i)$ for any $i \in L'$ and each $r_i \in X_i$.*

Proof. Follows from Scope L6,12. See also Definition 8 and Remark 15. ◀

► **Remark 27.** Lemma 26 also entails the reduction of ϕ to $\phi'(r_i)$, viz., $\phi \supseteq \phi'(r_i)$. That is, $\mathcal{C} \supseteq \mathcal{C}'$ and $\forall k' \exists k C_k \supseteq C_{k'}$, where \mathcal{C}' denotes the clauses C_k in $\phi'(r_i)$. See also **Reduce** (ϕ, r_i) .

Let $L(r_i) = L(\psi(r_i))$ and $L'(r_i) = L(\phi'(r_i))$, e.g., $L(x_3) = \{3, 4, 5\}$ and $L'(x_3) = \{1, 2, 6, 7\}$ due to $\psi(x_3) = x_3 \wedge \bar{x}_4 \wedge x_5$ and $\phi'(x_3) = (x_1 \odot \bar{x}_2 \odot \bar{x}_6) \wedge (x_6 \odot \bar{x}_7)$. Then, $L(x_3) \cap L'(x_3) = \emptyset$.

► **Lemma 28.** $L(r_i) \cap L'(r_i) = \emptyset$, that is, $\psi(r_i)$ and $\phi'(r_i)$ are properly disjoint.

Proof. Follows from Lemma 26. See Definition 11. Let $\phi := \phi'(r_i)$. Let $u \in (L(r_i) \cap L'(r_i))$. Then, $r_u \in \psi(r_i)$, which is a *conjunct* by Definition 4, thus $r_u \wedge \phi^{r_u} \vdash \tilde{\psi}(r_u)$ by Lemma 21 (see also **Reduce** L1-8) in order to construct the scope $\psi(r_i)$ (see Scope L6). Hence, ϕ^{r_u} becomes empty (see **Reduce** L7). Thus, $r_u \notin C_k$ for any clause C_k in $\phi'(r_i)$. Also, $r_u \wedge \phi^{\bar{r}_u} \vdash \tilde{\phi}(\neg \bar{r}_u)$ due to Lemma 22 (**Reduce** L9-16). Thus, $\bar{r}_u \notin C_k$ for any C_k in $\phi'(r_i)$. Therefore, $u \notin L'(r_i)$. ◀

► **Definition 29** (Nontrivial necessity). $\ell = \{j \in L \mid \psi(r_j) \text{ is inconsistent for some } r_j \in X_j\}$.

► **Definition 30** (Trivial necessity). $\bar{\ell} = \{j' \in L \mid j \in \ell \text{ but } j' \notin \ell \text{ and } \bar{r}_j \vdash r_{j'}\}$.

► **Definition 31** (Compatibility). $L' = \{i \in \mathfrak{L} \mid \psi(r_i) \text{ is consistent for each } r_i \in X_i\}$.

► **Note 32.** $L = \{j \mid r_j \in \psi\}$ and $L' = \{i \mid r_i \in C_k \text{ for some } C_k \text{ in } \phi\}$ by Definition 7. If $\psi(r_j)$ is inconsistent, then $\not\models \phi(r_j)$ and $\psi \leftarrow \psi \wedge \bar{r}_j$ by Lemma 25. Thus, $j \in \ell$ by Definitions 7 and 29. Also, if $\bar{r}_j \vdash r_{j'}$, then $\psi \leftarrow \psi \wedge r_{j'}$. Thus, $j' \in \bar{\ell}$ by Definition 30. Then, L (and ψ) is constructed either via Scan L17-18 or L2-6. On the other hand, if ψ is nonempty initially (see Definition 6), then $v \in \bar{\ell}$ such that $r_t \in \psi$ and $r_t \vdash r_v$. See also Definitions 9 and 10.

► **Lemma 33.** $L \cap L' = \emptyset$, as well as $\ell \cap \bar{\ell} = \emptyset$ and $\ell \cup \bar{\ell} = L$, when the φ scan terminates.

Proof. Follows directly from Definitions 29–31. Recall that $L \cup L' = \mathfrak{L}$ by Definition 7. ◀

► **Remark.** Lemma 33 entails that L' becomes the complement of L when the scan terminates.

If $\psi(r_j)$ is inconsistent, then $\not\models \phi(r_j)$ and r_j is removed from ϕ , before the termination of Scan (see Lemma 25). Thus, $\psi(r_i)$ is consistent and $\phi(r_i) = \psi(r_i) \wedge \phi'(r_i)$ for any $i \in L'$ and $r_i \in X_i$, after the termination (Lemma 26). Then, whether or not $\not\models \phi'(r_i)$ is to be checked in order to decide *nontrivial* incompatibility of r_i , i.e., to decide if $\not\models \phi(r_i)$ (see Lemma 34).

► **Lemma 34** (Nontrivial incompatibility after the scan termination). $\not\models \phi(r_i)$ iff $\not\models \phi'(r_i)$.

Proof. Follows directly from Lemma 26. See also Lemma 28. ◀

▷ **Claim 35** (Incompatibility assumption). It is *redundant* to check whether $\not\models \phi'(r_i)$ in order to decide incompatibility of r_i , i.e., to decide if $\not\models \phi(r_i)$. Thus, $\not\models \phi(r_j)$ iff $\psi(r_j)$ is inconsistent.

► **Remark.** Satisfiability of ϕ by Theorem 40 justifies Claim 35, thus Lemma 34 becomes *void*. Recall that $\psi \wedge \phi \rightarrow \psi' \wedge \phi'$ (see Scan L24), and that $\phi \leftarrow \phi'$. That is, ϕ' is the current formula after the termination. Also, it is *trivial* to check inconsistency of $\psi(r_j)$ by Definition 5.

► **Definition 36.** $\psi(r_{i_1} \mid r_{i_0})$ denotes a conditional scope due to r_{i_1} over $\phi'(r_{i_0})$, constructed via $\text{Scope}(r_{i_1}, \phi'(r_{i_0}))$. Likewise, $\psi(r_{i_k} \mid r_{i_{k-1}})$ is due to r_{i_k} over $\phi'(r_{i_{k-1}} \mid r_{i_{k-2}})$ for $k = 2, 3, \dots, n$.

► **Lemma 37** (Recursive reductions). $\phi \rightarrow \psi(r_{i_0}) \wedge \phi'(r_{i_0})$, $\phi'(r_{i_0}) \rightarrow \psi(r_{i_1} \mid r_{i_0}) \wedge \phi'(r_{i_1} \mid r_{i_0})$, \dots , $\phi'(r_{i_{n-1}} \mid r_{i_{n-2}}) \rightarrow \psi(r_{i_n} \mid r_{i_{n-1}})$, in which $\psi(\cdot)$ and $\phi'(\cdot)$ are properly disjoint, that is, $\phi \rightarrow \psi(r_{i_0}) \wedge \psi(r_{i_1} \mid r_{i_0}) \wedge \dots \wedge \psi(r_{i_n} \mid r_{i_{n-1}})$ and $\phi \supseteq \phi'(r_{i_0}) \supseteq \phi'(r_{i_1} \mid r_{i_0}) \supseteq \dots \supseteq \phi'(r_{i_{n-1}} \mid r_{i_{n-2}})$, for any $r_{i_k} \in X_{i_k}$, and $i_0 \in L'$, $i_1 \in L'(r_{i_0})$, \dots , $i_k \in L'(r_{i_{k-1}} \mid r_{i_{k-2}})$, where $L'(r_{i_n} \mid r_{i_{n-1}}) = \emptyset$.

Proof. Follows from Lemma 26 and Definition 36. See also Lemma 28, as well as Remark 27. Firstly, $r_{i_0} \wedge \phi \rightarrow \psi(r_{i_0}) \wedge \phi'(r_{i_0})$ and $r_{i_1} \wedge \phi'(r_{i_0}) \rightarrow \psi(r_{i_1} \mid r_{i_0}) \wedge \phi'(r_{i_1} \mid r_{i_0})$ via $\text{Scope}(r_{i_0}, \phi)$ and $\text{Scope}(r_{i_1}, \phi'(r_{i_0}))$, respectively. Likewise, $\phi'(r_{i_{k-1}} \mid r_{i_{k-2}}) \rightarrow \psi(r_{i_k} \mid r_{i_{k-1}}) \wedge \phi'(r_{i_k} \mid r_{i_{k-1}})$ for $k = 2, 3, \dots, n-1$. Finally, $\phi'(r_{i_{n-1}} \mid r_{i_{n-2}}) \rightarrow \psi(r_{i_n} \mid r_{i_{n-1}})$, that is, $\phi'(r_{i_n} \mid r_{i_{n-1}})$ is empty. Therefore, $\phi \supseteq \phi'(r_{i_0}) \supseteq \phi'(r_{i_1} \mid r_{i_0}) \supseteq \dots \supseteq \phi'(r_{i_{n-1}} \mid r_{i_{n-2}})$, in which $\phi'(r_{i_0}) \supseteq \phi'(r_{i_1} \mid r_{i_0})$ via $\text{Reduce}(\phi'(r_{i_0}), r_{i_1})$, and $\phi'(r_{i_{k-1}} \mid r_{i_{k-2}}) \supseteq \phi'(r_{i_k} \mid r_{i_{k-1}})$ via $\text{Reduce}(\phi'(r_{i_{k-1}} \mid r_{i_{k-2}}), r_{i_k})$. ◀

► **Lemma 38** (Any conditional scope is a syntactic consequence of its scope). For each $r_{i_k} \in X_{i_k}$, $\psi(r_{i_1}) \vdash \psi(r_{i_1} \mid r_{i_0})$ for all $i_1 \in L'(r_{i_0})$, and $\psi(r_{i_k}) \vdash \psi(r_{i_k} \mid r_{i_{k-1}})$ for all $i_k \in L'(r_{i_{k-1}} \mid r_{i_{k-2}})$.

Proof. Follows directly from Lemma 37. $\phi \supseteq \phi'(r_{i_0})$, $\phi \rightarrow \psi(r_{i_1})$, and $\phi'(r_{i_0}) \rightarrow \psi(r_{i_1} \mid r_{i_0})$. Thus, $\psi(r_{i_1}) \supseteq \psi(r_{i_1} \mid r_{i_0})$. Hence, $\psi(r_{i_1}) \vdash \psi(r_{i_1} \mid r_{i_0})$. Also, $\phi \supseteq \phi'(r_{i_1} \mid r_{i_0})$, $\phi \rightarrow \psi(r_{i_2})$, and $\phi'(r_{i_1} \mid r_{i_0}) \rightarrow \psi(r_{i_2} \mid r_{i_1})$. Thus, $\psi(r_{i_2}) \supseteq \psi(r_{i_2} \mid r_{i_1})$. Hence, $\psi(r_{i_2}) \vdash \psi(r_{i_2} \mid r_{i_1})$. Therefore, a conditional scope $\psi(r_{i_k} \mid r_{i_{k-1}})$ can be derived from its scope $\psi(r_{i_k})$, viz., $\psi(r_{i_k}) \vdash \psi(r_{i_k} \mid r_{i_{k-1}})$. That is, because $\psi(r_{i_k})$ is consistent, $\psi(r_{i_k} \mid r_{i_{k-1}})$ is consistent (cf. Definition 5). ◀

► **Note 39.** After the scan termination, φ reduces to φ' , i.e., $\varphi \rightarrow \varphi'$ (Scan L24). That is, $\phi \supseteq \phi'$, while $\psi \subseteq \psi'$. Let $\varphi \leftarrow \varphi'$. Then, $\varphi = \psi \wedge \phi$ such that ψ and ϕ are *properly disjoint*, in which ψ is consistent. L denotes the literals in ψ and L' denotes the literals in ϕ , $\phi = \bigwedge C_k$.

► **Theorem 40 (Satisfiability).** *The following statements are equivalent for any $\{i, j\} \subseteq L'$.*

p_1 : Before the termination, as $\psi(r_j)$ was inconsistent, $\psi \leftarrow \psi \wedge \bar{r}_j$ and $L \leftarrow L \cup \{j\}$, that is, r_j was removed from ϕ and j from L' . Otherwise, $r_i \wedge \phi \rightarrow \psi(r_i) \wedge \phi'(r_i)$, that is, $\psi(r_i)$ was consistent such that $\psi(r_i)$ and $\phi'(r_i)$ were properly disjoint. Then, it was redundant to check whether $\not\models \phi'(r_i)$ in order to decide if $\not\models \phi(r_i)$. Thus, $\not\models \phi(r_j)$ iff $\psi(r_j)$ was inconsistent.

p_2 : After the termination, $\phi \rightarrow \psi(r_i) \wedge \phi'(r_i)$ for each $r_i \in X_i$, where $X_i = \{x_i, \bar{x}_i\}$.

p_3 : $\phi \rightarrow \psi(r_{i_0}) \wedge \psi(r_{i_1}|r_{i_0}) \wedge \cdots \wedge \psi(r_{i_n}|r_{i_{n-1}})$, that is, ϕ the formula is reducible to a minterm consistent, thus ϕ is satisfiable. Then, α denotes a satisfying assignment such that $\alpha = \psi(r_{i_0}) \cup \psi(r_{i_1}|r_{i_0}) \cup \cdots \cup \psi(r_{i_n}|r_{i_{n-1}})$, in which $L(r_{i_0}) \cap L(r_{i_1}|r_{i_0}) \cap \cdots \cap L(r_{i_n}|r_{i_{n-1}}) = \emptyset$.

Proof. The proof is to show that $p_1 \Rightarrow p_2$, $p_2 \Rightarrow p_3$, and $p_3 \Rightarrow p_1$ (see pg. 88 in [1]).

It is obvious that $p_2 \iff p_1$ holds, which denotes a duality theorem (see pg. 34-36 in [4]). That is, $\psi(r_i)$ is consistent for any $i \in L'$ and each $r_i \in X_i$ iff $\psi(r_j)$ is inconsistent for any $j \in \ell$ and some $r_j \in X_j$, $\ell \subseteq L$, after $\text{Scan}(\varphi)$ terminates. In other words, each $r_i \in X_i$ is compatible for any $i \in L'$ iff some $r_j \in X_j$ is incompatible, thus \bar{r}_j is necessary, for any $j \in L$, after $\text{Scan}(\varphi)$ terminates. See also Definitions 29–31, as well as Note 32 and Lemma 33.

For $p_2 \Rightarrow p_3$, the proof is to show that the construction process of $\hat{\psi}$ the minterm, i.e., $\hat{\psi} = \psi(r_{i_0}) \wedge \psi(r_{i_1}|r_{i_0}) \wedge \cdots \wedge \psi(r_{i_n}|r_{i_{n-1}})$, exhibits the Markov property, which *preserves* consistency of $\hat{\psi}$. Then, production of the next minterm $\psi(r_{i_k}|r_{i_{k-1}})$ depends *only* upon the current formula $\phi'(r_{i_{k-1}}|r_{i_{k-2}})$, that is, it does not depend on the past $\phi'(r_{i_0})$, $\phi'(r_{i_1}|r_{i_0})$, \dots , $\phi'(r_{i_{k-2}}|r_{i_{k-3}})$. Hence, $\phi \rightarrow \psi(r_{i_0}) \wedge \phi'(r_{i_0})$, $\phi'(r_{i_0}) \rightarrow \psi(r_{i_1}|r_{i_0}) \wedge \phi'(r_{i_1}|r_{i_0})$, $\phi'(r_{i_1}|r_{i_0}) \rightarrow \psi(r_{i_2}|r_{i_1}) \wedge \phi'(r_{i_2}|r_{i_1})$, \dots , $\phi'(r_{i_{n-1}}|r_{i_{n-2}}) \rightarrow \psi(r_{i_n}|r_{i_{n-1}})$. Then, appending $\psi(r_{i_n}|r_{i_{n-1}})$ to $(\psi(r_{i_0}) \wedge \psi(r_{i_1}|r_{i_0}) \wedge \cdots \wedge \psi(r_{i_{n-1}}|r_{i_{n-2}}))$ *preserves* consistency of $\hat{\psi}$. Thus, $\phi \rightarrow \hat{\psi}$, and ϕ is satisfiable. The following steps specify the construction of $\hat{\psi}$ (see also Lemmas 37 and 38).

Step 0. Follows from the statement p_2 (see Lemmas 26 and 28 and Remark 27). Pick $i_0 \in L'$ and $r_{i_0} \in X_{i_0}$, thus $r_{i_0} \wedge \phi \rightarrow \psi(r_{i_0}) \wedge \phi'(r_{i_0})$, or $\phi \rightarrow \psi(r_{i_0}) \wedge \phi'(r_{i_0})$. Then, $\phi \supseteq \phi'(r_{i_0})$, $L' = L(r_{i_0}) \cup L'(r_{i_0})$, and $L(r_{i_0}) \cap L'(r_{i_0}) = \emptyset$, i.e., $\psi(r_{i_0})$ and $\phi'(r_{i_0})$ are properly disjoint.

Step 1. Pick any $i_1 \in L'(r_{i_0})$ and $r_{i_1} \in X_{i_1}$, thus $r_{i_1} \wedge \phi'(r_{i_0}) \rightarrow \psi(r_{i_1}|r_{i_0}) \wedge \phi'(r_{i_1}|r_{i_0})$, or $\phi'(r_{i_0}) \rightarrow \psi(r_{i_1}|r_{i_0}) \wedge \phi'(r_{i_1}|r_{i_0})$. That is, $\phi'(r_{i_0}) \supseteq \phi'(r_{i_1}|r_{i_0})$, and $\psi(r_{i_1}|r_{i_0})$ and $\phi'(r_{i_1}|r_{i_0})$ are properly disjoint. Then, $L'(r_{i_0}) = L(r_{i_1}|r_{i_0}) \cup L'(r_{i_1}|r_{i_0})$ and $L(r_{i_1}|r_{i_0}) \cap L'(r_{i_1}|r_{i_0}) = \emptyset$. Also, from step 0, $L' = L(r_{i_0}) \cup L'(r_{i_0})$ and $L(r_{i_0}) \cap L'(r_{i_0}) = \emptyset$. Because $L'(r_{i_0}) \supseteq L(r_{i_1}|r_{i_0})$, $L(r_{i_0}) \cap L(r_{i_1}|r_{i_0}) = \emptyset$. Because $L'(r_{i_0}) \supseteq L'(r_{i_1}|r_{i_0})$, $L(r_{i_0}) \cap L'(r_{i_1}|r_{i_0}) = \emptyset$. Consequently, $L' = L(r_{i_0}) \cup L(r_{i_1}|r_{i_0}) \cup L'(r_{i_1}|r_{i_0})$ and $L(r_{i_0}) \cap L(r_{i_1}|r_{i_0}) \cap L'(r_{i_1}|r_{i_0}) = \emptyset$. That is, L' is *partitioned* into $L(r_{i_0})$, $L(r_{i_1}|r_{i_0})$, and $L'(r_{i_1}|r_{i_0})$. Recall that $\phi \supseteq \phi'(r_{i_0})$ from step 0 and $\phi'(r_{i_0}) \rightarrow \psi(r_{i_1}|r_{i_0})$ from step 1. Also, $\phi \rightarrow \psi(r_{i_1})$ from step 0. Then, $\psi(r_{i_1}) \supseteq \psi(r_{i_1}|r_{i_0})$. Hence, $\psi(r_{i_1}) \vdash \psi(r_{i_1}|r_{i_0})$. Recall that $\psi(r_{i_0})$ is consistent and $L(r_{i_0}) \cap L(r_{i_1}|r_{i_0}) = \emptyset$. As a result, $(\psi(r_{i_0}) \wedge \psi(r_{i_1}|r_{i_0}))$ is consistent. Therefore, $\phi \rightarrow \psi(r_{i_0}) \wedge \psi(r_{i_1}|r_{i_0}) \wedge \phi'(r_{i_1}|r_{i_0})$.

Step 2. Pick any $i_2 \in L'(r_{i_1}|r_{i_0})$ and $r_{i_2} \in X_{i_2}$, thus $\phi'(r_{i_1}|r_{i_0}) \rightarrow \psi(r_{i_2}|r_{i_1}) \wedge \phi'(r_{i_2}|r_{i_1})$. Then, $L'(r_{i_1}|r_{i_0}) = L(r_{i_2}|r_{i_1}) \cup L'(r_{i_2}|r_{i_1})$ such that $L(r_{i_2}|r_{i_1}) \cap L'(r_{i_2}|r_{i_1}) = \emptyset$. Also, from step 1, $L' = L(r_{i_0}) \cup L(r_{i_1}|r_{i_0}) \cup L'(r_{i_1}|r_{i_0})$ such that $L(r_{i_0}) \cap L(r_{i_1}|r_{i_0}) \cap L'(r_{i_1}|r_{i_0}) = \emptyset$. As a result, $L(r_{i_0}) \cap L(r_{i_1}|r_{i_0}) \cap L(r_{i_2}|r_{i_1}) = \emptyset$. Hence, $(L(r_{i_0}) \cup L(r_{i_1}|r_{i_0})) \cap L(r_{i_2}|r_{i_1}) = \emptyset$. Note that $\psi(r_{i_2}) \vdash \psi(r_{i_2}|r_{i_1})$. Consequently, appending $\psi(r_{i_2}|r_{i_1})$ to $(\psi(r_{i_0}) \wedge \psi(r_{i_1}|r_{i_0}))$ preserves the consistency. That is, $(\psi(r_{i_0}) \wedge \psi(r_{i_1}|r_{i_0}) \wedge \psi(r_{i_2}|r_{i_1}))$ is consistent. Therefore, $\phi \rightarrow \psi(r_{i_0}) \wedge \psi(r_{i_1}|r_{i_0}) \wedge \psi(r_{i_2}|r_{i_1}) \wedge \phi'(r_{i_2}|r_{i_1})$.

Step 3. L' is partitioned into $(L(r_{i_0}) \cup L(r_{i_1}|r_{i_0}) \cup L(r_{i_2}|r_{i_1}))$, $L(r_{i_3}|r_{i_2})$, and $L'(r_{i_3}|r_{i_2})$.

Step n . $L'(r_{i_n} | r_{i_{n-1}}) = \emptyset$. L' is partitioned into $(L(r_{i_0}) \cup L(r_{i_1} | r_{i_0}) \cup \dots \cup L(r_{i_{n-1}} | r_{i_{n-2}}))$ and $L(r_{i_n} | r_{i_{n-1}})$. That is, $(\psi(r_{i_0}) \wedge \psi(r_{i_1} | r_{i_0}) \wedge \dots \wedge \psi(r_{i_{n-1}} | r_{i_{n-2}}))$ and $\psi(r_{i_n} | r_{i_{n-1}})$ are properly disjoint, which are consistent as well. Thus, $\hat{\psi} = \psi(r_{i_0}) \wedge \bigwedge_{k=1}^n \psi(r_{i_k} | r_{i_{k-1}})$, which is *consistent*. Since $\phi \rightarrow \hat{\psi}$, ϕ is *satisfiable* and $\models_{\alpha} \phi$ by $\alpha = \psi(r_{i_0}) \cup \bigcup_{k=1}^n \psi(r_{i_k} | r_{i_{k-1}})$, which denotes a satisfying assignment. Recall that $\phi \leftarrow \phi'$ (see Note 39). Therefore, $p_2 \Rightarrow p_3$ holds.

Finally, we show $p_3 \Rightarrow p_1$. $\phi \supseteq \phi'(r_i)$ (from the statement p_2). ϕ is satisfiable (from step n). Thus, $\phi'(r_i)$ becomes satisfiable, *after Scan* terminates. As a result, it is *redundant* to check unsatisfiability of $\phi'(r_i)$ in order to decide unsatisfiability of $\phi(r_i)$, where $\phi(r_i) = \psi(r_i) \wedge \phi'(r_i)$ such that $\psi(r_i)$ and $\phi'(r_i)$ are properly disjoint. Therefore, inconsistency of $\psi(r_j)$ the minterm, which is sufficient, becomes necessary also for the unsatisfiability of $\phi(r_j)$, thus $\not\models \phi(r_j)$ iff $\psi(r_j)$ is inconsistent, *before Scan* terminates. See also Definition 5 and Claim 35. ◀

► **Corollary 41** (Prime Normal Form). $\Psi = \bigwedge_{i \in L'} (\psi(x_i) \vee \psi(\bar{x}_i))$, as $r_i \rightarrow \psi(r_i)$ for all $r_i \in X_i$.

Proof. Follows from Theorem 40. Note that Ψ denotes the semantics and ϕ the syntax. ◀

► **Proposition 42.** The complexity of *X3SAT* is $O(mn^3)$, and of *XSAT* is $O(mn^4)$.

Proof. The proof is obvious (see Scan). Note that $|C_k| \leq 3$, or $|C_k| \leq n$ by Definition 3. ◀

3.3 Construction of a Satisfying Assignment

Let (i_0, i_1, \dots, i_n) be a literal ordering such that $i_0 \in L', i_1 \in L'(r_{i_0}), \dots, i_n \in L'(r_{i_{n-1}} | r_{i_{n-2}})$. Then, $\alpha = \psi(r_{i_0}) \cup \psi(r_{i_1} | r_{i_0}) \cup \dots \cup \psi(r_{i_n} | r_{i_{n-1}})$. Also, $\alpha = \psi(r_{i_0}) \cup \psi(r_{i_1} | r_{i_0}) \cup \dots \cup \psi(r_{i_n} | r_{i_{n-1}})$, in which $\psi(r_{i_0}), \psi(r_{i_1} | r_{i_0}), \dots, \psi(r_{i_n} | r_{i_{n-1}})$ are properly disjoint (see Definition 11), where $\psi(r_{i_1} | r_{i_0}) = \psi(r_{i_1}) - \psi(r_{i_0})$ and $\psi(r_{i_k} | r_{i_{k-1}}) = \psi(r_{i_k}) - (\psi(r_{i_0}) \cup \bigcup_{l=2}^k \psi(r_{i_{l-1}} | r_{i_{l-2}}))$.

► **Example 43.** Let $\phi = (x_1 \odot \bar{x}_2 \odot x_6) \wedge (x_3 \odot x_4 \odot \bar{x}_5) \wedge (x_3 \odot x_6 \odot \bar{x}_7) \wedge (x_4 \odot x_6 \odot \bar{x}_7)$. Then, $\psi = \bar{x}_3 \wedge \bar{x}_4 \wedge \bar{x}_5$ and $\phi' = (x_1 \odot \bar{x}_2 \odot x_6) \wedge (x_6 \odot \bar{x}_7)$. Thus, $L' = \{1, 2, 6, 7\}$. Consider the ordering (\bar{x}_7, x_2, x_1) . Note that $7 \in L', 2 \in L'(\bar{x}_7)$, and $1 \in L'(x_2 | \bar{x}_7)$. Then, $\models_{\alpha} \phi'$ by $\alpha = \psi(\bar{x}_7) \cup \psi(x_2) \cup \psi(x_1)$, where $\psi(\bar{x}_7) = \{\bar{x}_7, \bar{x}_6\}$, $\psi(x_2) = \{x_2\}$, and $\psi(x_1) = \{x_1, x_2, \bar{x}_7, \bar{x}_6\}$. Also, $(\bar{x}_7, x_2, x_1) \rightarrow \psi(\bar{x}_7) \wedge \psi(x_2 | \bar{x}_7) \wedge \psi(x_1 | x_2)$, in which $\psi(x_2 | \bar{x}_7) = \psi(x_2) - \psi(\bar{x}_7)$, and $\psi(x_1 | x_2) = \psi(x_1) - (\psi(x_2 | \bar{x}_7) \cup \psi(\bar{x}_7))$. Then, $\models_{\alpha} \phi'$ by $\alpha = \{\bar{x}_7, \bar{x}_6\} \cup \{x_2\} \cup \{x_1\}$. That is, $x_7 = 0, x_6 = 0, x_2 = 1, x_1 = 1$ for satisfying ϕ' . Also, $x_3 = 0, x_4 = 0, x_5 = 0$ by ψ , fixed for ϕ .

3.4 Quantified Propositional Logic: *TQBF*

TQBF is **PSPACE**-complete (see pg. 339 in [3]). Let $\beta = \bigwedge c_k$ be a 3SAT formula, where $c_k = (r_i \vee r_j \vee r_u)$. Let $\phi = \bigwedge C_k$ be an X3SAT formula transformed from β . Let ϕ be satisfiable.

► **Definition 44** (Quantified Boolean Formula). $Q_1 r_1 Q_2 r_2 \dots Q_n r_n \beta$, where $Q_i \in \{\exists, \forall\}$.

► **Note.** The QBF in Definition 44 is conventionally expressed by $Q_1 x_1 Q_2 x_2 \dots Q_n x_n \beta$, in which $x_i \in \{0, 1\}$. Thus, $r_i = x_i$ iff $x_i = 1$, and $r_i = \bar{x}_i$ iff $x_i = 0$ iff $\bar{x}_i = 1$, since $r_i \in \{x_i, \bar{x}_i\}$.

Firstly, prime assignments of each clause c_k are determined, which are denoted by ψ_k^i . Next, the Prime Normal Form (PNF) is constructed based on the prime assignments.

► **Definition 45** (Prime assignments). $r_i \wedge \bar{r}_j, \bar{r}_i \wedge r_j$ and $r_i \wedge r_j$ are the prime assignments for $c_k = (r_i \vee r_j)$, in which $\psi_k^1 = r_i \wedge \bar{r}_j$. Likewise, $r_i \wedge \bar{r}_j \wedge \bar{r}_u, \bar{r}_i \wedge r_j \wedge \bar{r}_u, \dots, r_i \wedge r_j \wedge r_u$ are the prime assignments for $c_k' = (r_i \vee r_j \vee r_u)$, in which $\psi_k^7 = r_i \wedge r_j \wedge r_u$.

► **Definition 46** (Prime clause). δ_k is a disjunction of prime assignments such that either $\delta_k = (\psi_k^1 \vee \psi_k^2 \vee \psi_k^3)$, or $\delta_k = (\psi_k^1 \vee \psi_k^2 \vee \dots \vee \psi_k^7)$. Thus, δ_k denotes a Disjunction Normal Form.

► **Definition 47** (PNF). $\Psi = \bigwedge_{k=1}^m \bigvee_{i=1}^n \psi_k^i$ such that $\psi_k^i \wedge \beta$ is satisfiable, $n \in \{1, 2, \dots, 7\}$.

Note that $\psi_k^i \wedge \beta$ is satisfiable iff $\psi_k^i \wedge \phi$ is satisfiable, because β and ϕ are equisatisfiable. Note also that β denotes the syntax and Ψ denotes the semantics (cf. Corollary 41).

► **Lemma 48** (Collapse of a prime clause to a prime satisfying assignment). $\psi_k^i \wedge \delta_k \vdash \psi_k^i$.

Proof. Follows directly from Definitions 45–47. ◀

► **Note 49.** Because β is satisfiable, there exists $(\psi_1^i \wedge \psi_2^j \wedge \dots \wedge \psi_m^u)$ consistent with Ψ .

► **Definition 50** (Legal moves). $\tilde{\beta} = \bigwedge \tilde{c}_k$, a 2SAT formula, in which $\tilde{c}_k = \bar{r}_i \vee \bar{r}_u$ such that $r_i \wedge r_u \wedge \Psi$ is inconsistent or $r_i \wedge r_u \wedge \beta$ leads to a conjunct r_j for some $j \in A$, $A = \{2, 4, \dots, n\}$, for any (i, u) in $\{(1, 3), (1, 5), \dots, (1, n-1), (3, 5), \dots, (3, n-1), (5, 7), \dots, (n-3, n-1)\}$.

► **Theorem 51** (True QBF). $\exists r_1 \forall r_2 \exists r_3 \forall r_4 \dots \exists r_{n-1} \forall r_n \beta$ is true iff the following statement is true, in which $c.\psi(r_i, r_j)$ denotes that $\psi(r_i, r_j) \wedge \Psi \wedge \tilde{\beta}$ is consistent.

$$\begin{array}{llllllll}
 c.\psi(x_1, x_2) & \text{and} & c.\psi(x_1, \bar{x}_2) & \text{OR} & c.\psi(\bar{x}_1, x_2) & \text{and} & c.\psi(\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2) & \text{AND} & 1 \\
 c.\psi(x_1, x_4) & \text{and} & c.\psi(x_1, \bar{x}_4) & \text{OR} & c.\psi(\bar{x}_1, x_4) & \text{and} & c.\psi(\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_4) & \text{AND} & \\
 & & & & \vdots & & & & \\
 c.\psi(x_1, x_n) & \text{and} & c.\psi(x_1, \bar{x}_n) & \text{OR} & c.\psi(\bar{x}_1, x_n) & \text{and} & c.\psi(\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_n) & \text{AND} & \\
 c.\psi(x_2, x_3) & \text{or} & c.\psi(x_2, \bar{x}_3) & \text{AND} & c.\psi(\bar{x}_2, x_3) & \text{or} & c.\psi(\bar{x}_2, \bar{x}_3) & \text{AND} & 4 \\
 c.\psi(x_2, x_5) & \text{or} & c.\psi(x_2, \bar{x}_5) & \text{AND} & c.\psi(\bar{x}_2, x_5) & \text{or} & c.\psi(\bar{x}_2, \bar{x}_5) & \text{AND} & \\
 & & & & \vdots & & & & \\
 c.\psi(x_2, x_{n-1}) & \text{or} & c.\psi(\bar{x}_2, x_{n-1}) & \text{AND} & c.\psi(x_2, \bar{x}_{n-1}) & \text{or} & c.\psi(\bar{x}_2, \bar{x}_{n-1}) & \text{AND} & \\
 c.\psi(x_3, x_4) & \text{and} & c.\psi(x_3, \bar{x}_4) & \text{OR} & c.\psi(\bar{x}_3, x_4) & \text{and} & c.\psi(\bar{x}_3, \bar{x}_4) & \text{AND} & \\
 c.\psi(x_3, x_6) & \text{and} & c.\psi(x_3, \bar{x}_6) & \text{OR} & c.\psi(\bar{x}_3, x_6) & \text{and} & c.\psi(\bar{x}_3, \bar{x}_6) & \text{AND} & \\
 & & & & \vdots & & & & \\
 c.\psi(x_{n-1}, x_n) & \text{and} & c.\psi(x_{n-1}, \bar{x}_n) & \text{OR} & c.\psi(\bar{x}_{n-1}, x_n) & \text{and} & c.\psi(\bar{x}_{n-1}, \bar{x}_n) & \text{AND} &
 \end{array}$$

Proof sketch. Let $\Phi := \Psi \wedge \tilde{\beta}$, $\Phi(r_i, r_j) := \psi(r_i, r_j) \wedge \Phi$, and $\psi(r_i, r_j) := r_i \wedge r_j$. Recall that $A = \{2, 4, \dots, n\}$, which denotes the universally quantified literals. Consider the evaluation of $\Phi(x_1, x_2)$. \bar{r}_i is removed from any \tilde{c}_k such that $r_i \in \psi(x_1, x_2)$, thus $\psi(x_1, x_2) \leftarrow \psi(x_1, x_2) \wedge \tilde{c}_k$ and any \tilde{c}_k is removed from $\tilde{\beta}$. Every δ_k is removed from Ψ such that $\psi_k^i \subseteq \psi(x_1, x_2)$ (see also Lemma 48). Every ψ_k^i containing ψ_k^j is removed from any δ_k such that $\psi(x_1, x_2) \wedge \psi_k^j$ is inconsistent. If $\delta_k = \psi_k^u$ also, then $\psi(x_1, x_2) \leftarrow \psi(x_1, x_2) \wedge \psi_k^u$, and δ_k is removed from Ψ . If $\psi(x_1, x_2)$ becomes inconsistent, or $r_j \in \psi(x_1, x_2)$ for some $j \in (A - \{2\})$, then “ $c.\psi(\bar{x}_1, x_2)$ and $c.\psi(\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2)$ ” holds (cf. L1). As a result, $\psi \wedge \forall r_2 \exists r_3 \dots \exists r_{n-1} \forall r_n \Phi$ holds, where $\psi \leftarrow \psi \wedge \bar{x}_1$. Therefore, x_1 is removed from each \tilde{c}_k , $\psi \leftarrow \psi \wedge \tilde{c}_k$, and \tilde{c}_k is removed from $\tilde{\beta}$. Also, any ψ_k^i containing x_1 is removed from each δ_k . If $\delta_k = \psi_k^u$ also, then $\psi \leftarrow \psi \wedge \psi_k^u$, and δ_k is removed from Ψ . Consider the evaluation of $\Phi(x_2, \bar{x}_3)$. If $\psi(x_2, \bar{x}_3)$ is inconsistent, or $r_j \in \psi(x_2, \bar{x}_3)$ for some $j \in (A - \{2\})$, then “ $c.\psi(x_2, x_3)$ AND $c.\psi(\bar{x}_2, x_3)$ or $c.\psi(\bar{x}_2, \bar{x}_3)$ ” holds (cf. L4), i.e., $x_2 \Rightarrow x_3$. Thus, $\Phi \leftarrow \Phi \wedge (\bar{x}_2 \vee x_3)$. If some $\psi(r_u, r_v)$ becomes inconsistent, or $r_j \in \psi(r_u, r_v)$ for some $j \in (A - \{v\})$, then each $\Phi(r_i, r_j)$ is re-evaluated. Consequently, if ψ or Φ becomes inconsistent, or if $r_j \in \psi$ for some $j \in A$, then the QBF is false. Otherwise, the QBF is true. In this case, $\Phi(r_i, r_j) = \psi(r_i, r_j) \wedge \Phi'(r_i, r_j)$, in which $\Phi'(r_i, r_j)$ is contained by Φ . Note that there exists $(\psi(r_i, r_j) \wedge \psi(r_j, r_k) \wedge \dots \wedge \psi(r_u, r_v))$ consistent with Φ (see also Note 49). ◀

► **Note 52.** The QBF is false if $r_j \in \psi'$ for some $j \in A$ when $\text{Scan}(\varphi)$ terminates due to L24.

► **Note.** The QBF is false if β contains a clause $(r_i \vee r_j \vee r_u)$ such that $\{i, j, u\} \subseteq A$. Note that $\bar{r}_i \wedge \bar{r}_j \wedge \bar{r}_u \wedge \beta$ is unsatisfiable. Recall that A denotes the universally quantified literals.

► **Remark 53.** Let $\hat{\Phi}$ be constructed by removing $\{r_1, r_3, \dots, r_{n-1}\}$ from Φ if the QBF is true. Then, $\hat{\Phi}$ is valid. Recall that any $r_i \in \{x_i, \bar{x}_i\}$ is compatible for all $i \in L'$ by Theorem 40.

► **Example 54.** Let $\beta = (0 \vee x_3 \vee \bar{x}_2) \wedge (\bar{x}_1 \vee 1 \vee \bar{x}_3)$. Then, $\psi^1 = x_3 \wedge x_2$, $\psi^2 = \bar{x}_3 \wedge \bar{x}_2$, and $\psi^3 = x_3 \wedge \bar{x}_2$. Also, $\psi^4 = \bar{x}_1 \wedge x_3$, $\psi^5 = x_1 \wedge \bar{x}_3$, $\psi^6 = \bar{x}_1 \wedge \bar{x}_3$, and $\psi^7 = x_1 \wedge x_3$. Hence, $\Psi = (\psi^1 \vee \psi^2 \vee \psi^3) \wedge (\psi^4 \vee \dots \vee \psi^7)$, in which $\psi^1 \wedge \psi^7$ denotes a satisfying assignment (see Note 49).

► **Example 55.** Let $\beta = (x_1 \vee x_2) \wedge (x_2 \vee x_3) \wedge (x_2 \vee \bar{x}_3)$. Consider $\exists r_1 \forall r_2 \exists r_3 \beta$ (cf. Example 8.10 on pg. 342 in [3]). Then, $\tilde{\Psi} = [(x_1 \wedge x_2) \vee (x_1 \wedge \bar{x}_2) \vee (\bar{x}_1 \wedge x_2)] \wedge [(x_2 \wedge x_3) \vee (x_2 \wedge \bar{x}_3) \vee (\bar{x}_2 \wedge x_3)] \wedge [(x_2 \wedge \bar{x}_3) \vee (x_2 \wedge x_3) \vee (\bar{x}_2 \wedge \bar{x}_3)]$ by Definition 45. Consider $(x_1 \wedge \bar{x}_2) \wedge \tilde{\Psi}$. Since $(\bar{x}_2 \wedge x_3) \wedge (\bar{x}_2 \wedge \bar{x}_3)$ is inconsistent, $(x_1 \wedge \bar{x}_2)$ is removed from $\tilde{\Psi}$. Also, $(\bar{x}_2 \wedge r_3) \wedge \tilde{\Psi}$ leads to inconsistency for each $r_3 \in X_3$. Hence, $\Psi = [(x_1 \wedge x_2) \vee (\bar{x}_1 \wedge x_2)] \wedge [(x_2 \wedge x_3) \vee (x_2 \wedge \bar{x}_3)]$, in which $\delta_2 = \delta_3$. Because $2 \in A$ and $\bar{x}_2 \notin \psi^i$ for any i , the QBF is false. Note that \bar{x}_2 is already incompatible for ϕ by Lemma 25. Hence, $x_2 \in \psi'$, thus the QBF is false (see Note 52).

► **Example 56.** Ψ is constructed as in Table 1 for $c_1 = (x_1 \vee x_3 \vee \bar{x}_2)$ and $c_2 = (\bar{x}_1 \vee x_2 \vee \bar{x}_4)$.

■ **Table 1** $\beta = c_1 \wedge c_2$ and $\Psi = \delta_1 \wedge \delta_2$, where $\delta_1 = (\psi^1 \vee \psi^2 \vee \dots \vee \psi^7)$ and $\delta_2 = (\psi^8 \vee \psi^9 \vee \dots \vee \psi^{14})$

$\psi^1 = (x_1 \wedge \bar{x}_3 \wedge x_2)$	$\psi^4 = (x_1 \wedge x_3 \wedge x_2)$	$\psi^8 = (\bar{x}_1 \wedge \bar{x}_2 \wedge x_4)$	$\psi^{11} = (\bar{x}_1 \wedge x_2 \wedge x_4)$
$\psi^2 = (\bar{x}_1 \wedge x_3 \wedge x_2)$	$\psi^5 = (x_1 \wedge \bar{x}_3 \wedge \bar{x}_2)$	$\psi^9 = (x_1 \wedge x_2 \wedge x_4)$	$\psi^{12} = (\bar{x}_1 \wedge \bar{x}_2 \wedge \bar{x}_4)$
$\psi^3 = (\bar{x}_1 \wedge \bar{x}_3 \wedge \bar{x}_2)$	$\psi^6 = (\bar{x}_1 \wedge x_3 \wedge \bar{x}_2)$	$\psi^{10} = (x_1 \wedge \bar{x}_2 \wedge \bar{x}_4)$	$\psi^{13} = (x_1 \wedge x_2 \wedge \bar{x}_4)$
	$\psi^7 = (x_1 \wedge x_3 \wedge \bar{x}_2)$		$\psi^{14} = (\bar{x}_1 \wedge x_2 \wedge \bar{x}_4)$

Consider $\exists r_1 \forall r_2 \exists r_3 \forall r_4 \beta$. Firstly, $\tilde{\beta}$ is determined by Definition 50: $r_1 \wedge r_3 \wedge \Psi$ is consistent for any $r_1 \in X_1$ and $r_3 \in X_3$, while $\bar{x}_1 \wedge \bar{x}_3 \wedge \beta \vdash \bar{x}_2$. Hence, $\tilde{\beta} = x_1 \vee x_3$. Then, $\Phi(x_1, \bar{x}_2) = \psi(x_1, \bar{x}_2) \wedge \Phi'(x_1, \bar{x}_2)$, where $\psi(x_1, \bar{x}_2) = x_1 \wedge \bar{x}_2 \wedge \psi^{10}$ and $\Phi'(x_1, \bar{x}_2) = (\psi^5 \vee \psi^7) \wedge \tilde{\beta}$. Since $\bar{x}_4 \in \psi(x_1, \bar{x}_2)$, x_1 is incompatible, i.e., \bar{x}_1 is necessary, thus $\Phi \leftarrow \bar{x}_1 \wedge \Phi$, and $\Phi = \bar{x}_1 \wedge x_3 \wedge \Psi$. Note that \bar{x}_1 in c_2 is already decided to be necessary for Φ , since $L(c_2) - A = \{1\}$. Thus, the QBF is true by Theorem 51, that is, $\forall x_2 \forall x_4 [(x_3 \vee \bar{x}_2) \wedge (\bar{x}_1 \vee x_2 \vee \bar{x}_4)]$ is true for $x_1 = 0, x_3 = 1$. Then, $\hat{\Phi} = (x_2 \vee \bar{x}_2) \wedge [(\bar{x}_2 \wedge x_4) \vee (x_2 \wedge x_4) \vee (\bar{x}_2 \wedge \bar{x}_4) \vee (x_2 \wedge \bar{x}_4)]$, constructed by removing \bar{x}_1 and x_3 from Φ (see Remark 53). Note that $\Phi \leftarrow \bar{x}_1 \wedge x_3 \wedge (\psi^2 \vee \psi^6) \wedge (\psi^8 \vee \psi^{11} \vee \psi^{12} \vee \psi^{14})$.

4 Conclusion

Let $\phi(r_j) := r_j \wedge \phi$. Then, $r_j \wedge \phi$ reduces to $\psi(r_j) \wedge \phi'(r_j)$ via XOR unless $\psi(r_j)$ is inconsistent such that $\psi(r_j)$ and $\phi'(r_j)$ are properly disjoint. That is, **if $\psi(r_j)$ is inconsistent, then $\not\models \phi(r_j)$** , hence r_j is removed from ϕ and $\psi \leftarrow \psi \wedge \bar{r}_j$. Thus, ϕ reduces to $\psi \wedge \phi'$ unless ψ is inconsistent. Also, ψ and ϕ' are properly disjoint. Claim: ϕ' is satisfiable. Note that there is no difference in proving that ϕ' is satisfiable and proving that the inconsistency of the minterm $\psi(r_j)$ is necessary also for the unsatisfiability of the formula $\phi(r_j)$. Proof sketch: $\psi \leftarrow \psi \wedge \bar{r}_j$ and $\ell \leftarrow \ell \cup \{j\}$ if $\psi(r_j)$ is inconsistent, where $\ell = L - \bar{\ell}$. Thus, $\psi(r_i)$ is consistent for all $i \in L'$ and each $r_i \in X_i$. As a result, if $i \notin (L' \cup \bar{\ell})$, then $\psi(r_i)$ is inconsistent. That is, if $j \in \ell$, then $\psi(r_j)$ is inconsistent. Also, $j \in \ell$ iff $\not\models \phi(r_j)$. Therefore, **if $\not\models \phi(r_j)$, then $\psi(r_j)$ is inconsistent**.

References

- 1 Kenneth H. Rosen. *Discrete Mathematics and its Applications*. McGraw-Hill, seventh edition, 2012.
- 2 Thomas J. Schaefer. The complexity of satisfiability problems. In *Proceedings of the Tenth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, STOC '78, pages 216–226, 1978.
- 3 Michael Sipser. *Introduction to the Theory of Computation*. Cengage Learning, third edition, 2012.
- 4 Avi Wigderson. *Mathematics and Computation: A Theory Revolutionizing Technology and Science*. Princeton University Press, 2019.

A Graph Isomorphism

Let $f: V \rightarrow \tilde{V}$ and $g: E \rightarrow \tilde{E}$. An isomorphism of graphs G and \tilde{G} is a bijection between V and \tilde{V} such that any two vertices v_i and v_j are adjacent iff $f(v_i)$ and $f(v_j)$ are adjacent.

► **Definition 57.** The Boolean variable x_{ij} denotes that v_i is paired with \tilde{v}_j , hence v_i and \tilde{v}_j are similar, viz., if $v_i \leftrightarrow \tilde{v}_j$, then $v_i \sim \tilde{v}_j$. Likewise, y_{ij} denotes that if $e_i \leftrightarrow \tilde{e}_j$, then $e_i \sim \tilde{e}_j$. Hence, \bar{x}_{ij} denotes that $v_i \nleftrightarrow \tilde{v}_j$ and \bar{y}_{ij} denotes that $e_i \nleftrightarrow \tilde{e}_j$.

Graph Isomorphism is tackled via an example (see Figure 3).



■ **Figure 3** Graphs $G = (V, E)$ and $\tilde{G} = (\tilde{V}, \tilde{E})$.

Firstly, φ_f is defined as follows with respect to the *degrees* of the vertices in V and \tilde{V} .

$$\varphi_f = (x_{11} \odot x_{13}) \wedge (x_{21} \odot x_{23}) \wedge (x_{32} \odot x_{34} \odot x_{35}) \wedge (x_{42} \odot x_{44} \odot x_{45}) \wedge (x_{52} \odot x_{54} \odot x_{55}).$$

Note that x_{52} denotes that $v_5 \leftrightarrow \tilde{v}_2$. Note also that $v_3 \sim \tilde{v}_1$, i.e., $d(v_3) \neq d(\tilde{v}_1)$.

Because f is a bijection, f^{-1} can be defined by means of φ_f . Then, $x_{11} \Rightarrow \bar{x}_{21}$, $x_{13} \Rightarrow \bar{x}_{23}$, $x_{32} \Rightarrow \bar{x}_{42} \wedge \bar{x}_{52}$, $x_{34} \Rightarrow \bar{x}_{44} \wedge \bar{x}_{54}$, $x_{35} \Rightarrow \bar{x}_{45} \wedge \bar{x}_{55}$, $x_{42} \Rightarrow \bar{x}_{52}$, $x_{44} \Rightarrow \bar{x}_{54}$, and $x_{45} \Rightarrow \bar{x}_{55}$. That is, $\varphi_{f^*} = (\bar{x}_{11} \vee \bar{x}_{21}) \wedge (\bar{x}_{13} \vee \bar{x}_{23}) \wedge (\bar{x}_{32} \vee \bar{x}_{42}) \wedge (\bar{x}_{32} \vee \bar{x}_{52}) \wedge (\bar{x}_{34} \vee \bar{x}_{44}) \wedge (\bar{x}_{34} \vee \bar{x}_{54}) \wedge (\bar{x}_{35} \vee \bar{x}_{45}) \wedge (\bar{x}_{35} \vee \bar{x}_{55}) \wedge (\bar{x}_{42} \vee \bar{x}_{52}) \wedge (\bar{x}_{44} \vee \bar{x}_{54}) \wedge (\bar{x}_{45} \vee \bar{x}_{55})$.

Next, φ_g is defined as follows with respect to the degrees of the vertices in V and \tilde{V} .

$\varphi_g = y_{13} \wedge y_{31} \wedge (y_{22} \odot y_{24} \odot y_{25} \odot y_{26}) \wedge (y_{42} \odot y_{44} \odot y_{45} \odot y_{46}) \wedge (y_{52} \odot y_{54} \odot y_{55} \odot y_{56}) \wedge (y_{62} \odot y_{64} \odot y_{65} \odot y_{66})$. Note that y_{13} denotes that $e_1 \leftrightarrow \tilde{e}_3$. Note also that $e_1 \sim \tilde{e}_1$, because the degrees of $\{v_1, v_2\}$ are not paired with the degrees of $\{\tilde{v}_4, \tilde{v}_5\}$, that is, $d(v_1) \neq d(\tilde{v}_4)$ and $d(v_1) \neq d(\tilde{v}_5)$, and $d(v_2) \neq d(\tilde{v}_4)$ and $d(v_2) \neq d(\tilde{v}_5)$. Likewise, $e_1 \sim \tilde{e}_2$.

Because g is a bijection, g^{-1} can be defined by means of φ_g . Then, $y_{2j} \Rightarrow \bar{y}_{4j} \wedge \bar{y}_{5j} \wedge \bar{y}_{6j}$, $y_{4j} \Rightarrow \bar{y}_{5j} \wedge \bar{y}_{6j}$, and $y_{5j} \Rightarrow \bar{y}_{6j}$ for any $j \in \{2, 4, 5, 6\}$. That is, $\varphi_{g^*} = \bigwedge_{j \in \{2, 4, 5, 6\}} (\bar{y}_{2j} \vee \bar{y}_{4j}) \wedge (\bar{y}_{2j} \vee \bar{y}_{5j}) \wedge (\bar{y}_{2j} \vee \bar{y}_{6j}) \wedge (\bar{y}_{4j} \vee \bar{y}_{5j}) \wedge (\bar{y}_{4j} \vee \bar{y}_{6j}) \wedge (\bar{y}_{5j} \vee \bar{y}_{6j})$.

Finally, x_{ij} and y_{ij} are related by means of $\varphi_{x_{ij}}$ and $\varphi_{y_{ij}}$, some of which are specified below. Note that $\varphi_{x_{ij}}$ is defined over φ_f , and $\varphi_{y_{ij}}$ is defined over φ_g . For example, if $e_2 \leftrightarrow \tilde{e}_2$, then $v_2 \leftrightarrow \tilde{v}_3$ and $v_4 \leftrightarrow \tilde{v}_5$. Note that $d(v_4) = d(\tilde{v}_5)$ and $d(v_2) = d(\tilde{v}_3)$, where $d(v_4) = 2$ and $d(v_2) = 3$. Also, if $v_5 \leftrightarrow \tilde{v}_5$, then $e_5 \leftrightarrow \tilde{e}_2$ or $e_6 \leftrightarrow \tilde{e}_2$.

$$\varphi_{x_{11}} = \bar{x}_{11} \vee y_{13} \vee y_{44} \vee y_{45} \vee y_{54} \vee y_{55}.$$

$$\varphi_{x_{13}} = \bar{x}_{13} \vee y_{13} \vee y_{42} \vee y_{46} \vee y_{52} \vee y_{56}.$$

$$\varphi_{x_{21}} = \bar{x}_{21} \vee y_{13} \vee y_{24} \vee y_{25} \vee y_{64} \vee y_{65}.$$

$$\varphi_{x_{55}} = \bar{x}_{55} \vee y_{52} \vee y_{62}.$$

$$\varphi_{y_{13}} = \bar{y}_{13} \vee x_{11} \vee x_{13} \vee x_{21} \vee x_{23}.$$

$$\varphi_{y_{31}} = \bar{y}_{31} \vee x_{34} \vee x_{35} \vee x_{44} \vee x_{45}.$$

$$\varphi_{y_{22}} = (\bar{y}_{22} \vee x_{23}) \wedge (\bar{y}_{22} \vee x_{45}).$$

$$\varphi_{y_{66}} = (\bar{y}_{66} \vee x_{23}) \wedge (\bar{y}_{66} \vee x_{52}).$$

Let $\varphi = \varphi_f \wedge \varphi_{f^*} \wedge \varphi_g \wedge \varphi_{g^*} \wedge \varphi_{x_{11}} \wedge \varphi_{x_{13}} \wedge \cdots \wedge \varphi_{x_{55}} \wedge \varphi_{y_{13}} \wedge \varphi_{y_{31}} \wedge \cdots \wedge \varphi_{y_{66}}$, which denotes an XSAT formula, after φ_{f^*} , φ_{g^*} , $\varphi_{x_{ij}}$ and $\varphi_{y_{ij}}$ are transformed into an X3SAT formula. As a result, G and \tilde{G} are isomorphic iff φ is satisfiable. Therefore, a satisfying assignment (see Section 3.3) denotes an isomorphism. Note that $\varphi = \psi \wedge \phi$, where $\psi = y_{13} \wedge y_{31}$. Note also that $\phi = \varphi_f \wedge \varphi_{f^*} \wedge (y_{22} \odot y_{24} \odot y_{25} \odot y_{26}) \wedge (y_{42} \odot y_{44} \odot y_{45} \odot y_{46}) \wedge (y_{52} \odot y_{54} \odot y_{55} \odot y_{56}) \wedge (y_{62} \odot y_{64} \odot y_{65} \odot y_{66}) \wedge \varphi_{g^*} \wedge \varphi_{x_{11}} \wedge \varphi_{x_{13}} \wedge \cdots \wedge \varphi_{x_{55}} \wedge \varphi_{y_{13}} (\neg \bar{y}_{13}) \wedge \varphi_{y_{31}} (\neg \bar{y}_{31}) \wedge \cdots \wedge \varphi_{y_{66}}$, in which $\varphi_{y_{13}} (\neg \bar{y}_{13}) = x_{11} \vee x_{13} \vee x_{21} \vee x_{23}$. Note that y_{13} is necessary for φ , i.e., $y_{13} \in \psi$. Next, incompatibility of x_{ij} and y_{ij} are checked by means of Lemma 25.