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#### Abstract

We propose a polynomially bounded, in time and space, method to decide whether a given 3 -sat formula is satisfiable or not.

The tools we use here are, in fact, very simple. We first decide satisfiability for a particular $\mathbf{3}$-sat formula, called pivoted 3 -sat and, after a plain transformation, still keeping the polynomial boundaries, it is shown that 3-sat formulas can be written as pivoted formulas.


## 1 Introduction

After the preliminary definitions that establish a common language, we define a Pivoted 3 -sat formula, the main subject we deal with. After that, we show that any 3 -sat formula has a stronger version in the format of a Pivoted 3 -satin the sense that a Pivoted 3 -sat formula is unsatisfiable if and only if the original 3 -sat formula is unsatisfiable and, if the original 3 -sat formula is a theorem (true under any valuation), its pivoted version is not a theorem

Secondly, we show that we can solve, that is, we can decide if the pivoted formula is Satisfiable or Unsatisfiable, in a polynomial use of space and time. Our resolution methods will require no more than basic knowledge of Boolean Logic and some basic skills.

An excellent way to start on the Complexity topic is by reading Scott Aaronson breathtaking survey,
https://www.scottaaronson.com/papers/pnp.pdf
The question is, "What is computing?". What kind of reasoning, operation, can be performed using an algorithm" and how fast the operation can be performed. See [2] for a general overview, or consult the roots, [12], 10], [11, [5, 1], 7, 8, [9].

A precise definition of algorithm was given by Alan Turing in 1937 (see [13]). The natural question that arises is: What is the computational difficulty of performing such an algorithm? See, in chronological order, [11,
[10], [7], 5], [2]. Classification of complexity is found in [6], 4] and [2]. We aim to open a new trail to understand complexity questions on polynomially solving our problem that obviously can be solved in exponential time and space and draw new lines on the complexity classification.

In Section 2, we provide classical definitions of valuation over Boolean Logic, define SAT, pose some more standard definitions, and introduce Pivoted 3-sat the special kind of 3 -sat we focus on. To solve the central problem, decide satisfiability or unsatisfiability, of Pivoted 3-sat we write all the conjunctions of formulas as labeled edges of a digraph, the cylindrical digraph. We show how can we rewrite any 3 -sat formula as a pivoted $\mathbf{3}$-sat.

In Section 3, we fully describe the algorithms we use in the process of deciding whether the closed digraph represents all $2^{m}$ combinations of valuation over the conjugated literals of a Pivoted 3-sat. We will not write down all possible combinations to have a polynomial bound in our solution. Rather, we analyze the plain question of whether there is a satisfiable combination by generating a digraph.

Section 4 is the connecting link between a 3-sat formula and a pivoted 3-sat formula. We demonstrate that given a $\mathbf{3}$-sat formula $\Psi$, then there exists a strong version of $\Psi, \Psi_{T}$, so that $\Psi$ is unsatisfiable if and only if $\Psi_{T}$ is unsatisfiable.

Section 5 is quite a technical section and, as usual, a profound and critical reading follows after unraveling the basic Section, 2 and the foundation part, Section 3 .

Finally, a very long part of this paper is devoted to the examples, Section 6. This section can be regarded as a companion section.

This work presents a short version, revisited and with shorter proofs of a previuous published "A Polynomial Decision for 3-SAT", submited to arrxiv, [14].

## 2 Basic Definitions

We work with a Boolean Language whose basic symbols are $\vee, \wedge, \neg$ endowed with a finite set of atoms $\mathcal{A}$. The set of literals, $\mathcal{L}$, is the set $\mathcal{A} \cup\{\neg p \mid p \in \mathcal{A}\}$. A pair formed by a literal together with its negation is called a conjugated pair. Besides a finite set of atoms, we have the symbols $T$ and $\perp$.

Here we give the (classical) valuation definition over a Boolean formula. That is the definition we will use henceforth.

Definition 2.1. Given a finite set of atoms, $\mathcal{A}, \psi$ belongs to the set of Boolean formulas F if

1. $\psi \in \mathcal{A}$;
2. $\psi=\chi \wedge \phi$ and both $\chi$ and $\phi$ belong to F ;
3. $\psi=\chi \vee \phi$ and both $\chi$ and $\phi$ belong to F ;
4. $\psi=\neg \chi$ and $\chi$ belongs to F ;
5. $\psi$ is either $\top$ or $\perp$.

We use the symbols

1. $\psi \Longrightarrow \chi$ to denote $\neg \psi \vee \chi$;
2. $\psi \equiv \chi$ to denote $(\psi \Longrightarrow \chi) \wedge(\chi \Longrightarrow \psi)$.

Definition 2.2. A valuation over a set of atoms $\mathcal{A}$ is a mapping $v$ from $\mathcal{A}$ to the set $\{T r u e, F a l s e\}$ and, as usual, we extend the mapping $v$ from a formula $\psi$ to by reducing the complexity of writing a formula. Define the extension mapping $v$ to a mapping $v^{\prime}$ from the formulas into the set $\{$ True, False $\}$ as above,

1. If $\psi \in \mathcal{A}, v^{\prime}(\psi)=$ True if $v(\psi)=$ True;
2. $\psi=\chi \wedge \phi, v^{\prime}(\psi)=$ True if $v^{\prime}(\chi)=$ True and $v^{\prime}(\phi)=$ True;
3. $\psi=\chi \vee \phi, v^{\prime}(\psi)=$ True if $v^{\prime}(\chi)=$ True or $v^{\prime}(\phi)=$ True;
4. $\psi=\neg \chi, v^{\prime}(\psi)=$ False if and only if $v^{\prime}(\chi)=$ True;
5. $v^{\prime}(\perp)=$ False and $v^{\prime}(\mathrm{T})=$ True.

If we do not have $v^{\prime}(\psi)=$ True, then $v^{\prime}(\psi)=$ False.
Definition 2.3 (SAT). A formula $\chi$ in Boolean Logic is said satisfiable if there is a valuation $v$ from the set $\{$ True, False $\}$ onto the set of atoms of $\chi$ so that $v(\chi)$ is True. If no such valuation exists, that is $v(\chi)$ is False for any valuation, then we say that $\chi$ is unsatisfiable.

Any formula in the Boolean Logic is decidable, that is, given a formula $\chi$, we can decide if $\chi$ is satisfiable (True for some valuation) or unsatisfiable (False for any valuation). The complexity problem consists of deciding between the values, True or False in the most optimal way, see [4].

We use the symbols: $A N D, O R, N O T$ and $I M P L I E S$ to denote external logical symbols.

Definition 2.4. A 2-sat formula $\Psi$ is a conjunction of a finite number of a disjunction of at most two literals. We write

$$
\Psi \equiv\left(l_{1}^{1} \vee l_{1}^{2}\right) \wedge \cdots \wedge\left(l_{\mathbf{s}}^{1} \vee l_{\mathbf{s}}^{2}\right) \equiv C_{1} \wedge \cdots \wedge C_{\mathbf{s}}
$$

A subformula $C_{k} \equiv l_{k}^{1} \vee l_{k}^{2}, 1 \leq k \leq \mathbf{s}$ of $\Psi$ is called a clause.
A 3-sat formula $\Psi$ is a conjunction of a finite number of a disjunction of at most three literals. We write

$$
\Psi \equiv\left(l_{1}^{1} \vee l_{1}^{2} \vee l_{1}^{3}\right) \wedge \cdots \wedge\left(l_{\mathbf{s}}^{1} \vee l_{\mathbf{s}}^{2} \vee l_{\mathbf{s}}^{5}\right) \equiv C_{1} \wedge \cdots \wedge C_{\mathbf{s}}
$$

A subformula $C_{k} \equiv l_{k}^{1} \vee l_{k}^{2} \vee l_{k}^{3}, 1 \leq k \leq \mathbf{s}$ of $\Psi$ is called a clause.
Define pivoted 3-sat formulas,
Definition 2.5. A Pivoted 3-sat formula is a 3-sat formula of the form,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left(a_{1} \vee p_{1}^{1} \vee q_{1}^{1}\right) \wedge \cdots \wedge\left(a_{1} \vee p_{k_{a_{1}}}^{1} \vee q_{k_{a_{1}}}^{1}\right) \wedge \\
& \left(\neg a_{1} \vee r_{1}^{1} \vee s_{1}^{1}\right) \wedge \cdots \wedge\left(\neg a_{1} \vee r_{k_{\neg a_{1}}}^{1} \vee s_{k_{\neg a_{1}}}^{1}\right) \wedge \cdots \wedge \\
& \left(a_{\mathbf{m}} \vee p_{1}^{\mathbf{m}} \vee q_{1}^{\mathbf{m}}\right) \wedge \cdots \wedge\left(a_{\mathbf{m}} \vee p_{k_{a_{\mathbf{a}}}}^{\mathbf{m}} \vee q_{k_{a_{\mathbf{m}}}}^{\mathbf{m}}\right) \wedge \\
& \left(\neg a_{\mathbf{m}} \vee r_{1}^{\mathbf{m}} \vee s_{1}^{\mathbf{m}}\right) \wedge \cdots \wedge\left(\neg a_{\mathbf{m}} \vee r_{k_{a \neg \mathbf{m}}}^{\mathbf{m}} \vee s_{k_{\neg a_{\mathbf{m}}}^{\mathbf{m}}}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

or, in factorized form,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left(a_{1} \vee\left(\left(p_{1}^{1} \vee q_{1}^{1}\right) \wedge \cdots \wedge\left(p_{k a_{1}}^{1} \vee q_{k_{a_{1}}}^{1}\right)\right) \wedge\right. \\
& \left(\neg a_{1} \vee\left(\left(r_{1}^{1} \vee s_{1}^{1}\right) \wedge \cdots \wedge\left(r_{k_{\neg a_{1}}}^{1} \vee s_{k_{\neg a_{1}}}^{1}\right)\right) \wedge \cdots \wedge\right. \\
& \left(a_{\mathbf{m}} \vee\left(\left(p_{1}^{\mathbf{m}} \vee q_{1}^{\mathbf{m}}\right) \wedge \cdots \wedge\left(p_{k_{a_{\mathbf{m}}}}^{\mathbf{m}} \vee q_{k_{a_{\mathbf{m}}}^{\mathbf{m}}}^{\mathbf{m}}\right)\right) \wedge\right. \\
& \left(\neg a_{\mathbf{m}} \vee\left(\left(r_{1}^{\mathbf{m}} \vee s_{1}^{\mathbf{m}}\right) \wedge \cdots \wedge\left(r_{k_{a \neg \mathbf{m}}}^{\mathbf{m}} \vee s_{k_{\neg a_{\mathbf{m}}}^{\mathbf{m}}}\right)\right)\right.
\end{aligned}
$$

where the set of pivots, $\left\{a_{1}, \neg a_{1}, \ldots, a_{\mathbf{m}}, \neg a_{\mathbf{m}}\right\}$ has no intersection with the set of entries,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left\{p_{1}^{1}, q_{1}^{1}, \ldots, p_{k a_{1}}^{1}, q_{k_{a_{1}}}^{1}, r_{1}^{1}, s_{1}^{1}, \ldots, r_{k_{\neg a_{1}}}^{1}, s_{k_{\neg a_{1}}}^{1}, \ldots,\right. \\
& \left.p_{1}^{\mathbf{m}}, q_{1}^{\mathbf{m}}, p_{k_{\mathbf{m}}}^{\mathbf{m}}, q_{k_{\mathbf{m}}}^{\mathbf{m}}, r_{1}^{\mathbf{m}}, s_{1}^{\mathbf{m}}, \ldots, r_{k_{\mathbf{m}}}^{\mathbf{m}}, s_{k_{\mathbf{m}}^{\mathbf{m}}}\right\}
\end{aligned}
$$

Denote the pivot $a_{i}$ by $1 i$ and its conjugated pair $\neg a_{i}$ by $2 i$
Call the set of entries of $a_{i}$ the set of conjunctions,

$$
\left(p_{1}^{i} \vee q_{1}^{i}\right) \wedge \cdots \wedge\left(p_{k a_{1}}^{i} \vee q_{k_{a_{1}}}^{i}\right)
$$

and the set of entries of $\neg a_{i}$ the set of conjunctions,

$$
\left(r_{1}^{i} \vee s_{1}^{i}\right) \wedge \cdots \wedge\left(r_{k_{\neg a_{1}}}^{i} \vee s_{k_{\neg a_{1}}}^{i}\right)
$$

We show, in Appendix 4 that any 3 -sat formula can be rewritten as a logically equivalent Pivoted 3-sat formula.

Definition 2.6. Given a Pivoted formula $\Psi$, replace any clause of the form $a_{i} \vee p$, where $a_{i}$ is a pivot, by the clauses $\left(a_{i} \vee p \vee q_{p}\right) \wedge\left(a_{i} \vee p \vee \neg q_{p}\right)$, where the pairs of conjugated, $q_{p}$ and $\neg q_{p}$ are fresh new literals.

A pivoted $\mathbf{3}$-sat formula is said complete if all of its clauses contain three literals.

Lemma 2.7. Any pivoted 2-sat formula is logically equivalent to its complete version.

From now on, we work with complete 3 -sat pivoted formulas.
It is well known that 2-sat formulas can be polynomially solved, a result originally shown in [3]. See [4]. We will store unsatisfiable groups of pivoted 3 -sat formulas in groups of 2 -sat.

Proposition 2.8. Given 2-sat formula $\Psi$,

$$
\left(p_{1} \vee q_{1}\right) \wedge \cdots \wedge\left(p_{k} \vee q_{k}\right)
$$

then, $\phi$ is unsatisfiable if and only if it there is a pair of conjugated literals, $\{a, \neg a\}$ and a set of conjugated literals

$$
\left\{b_{1}, \neg b_{1} \ldots, b_{r}, \neg b_{r}, c_{1}, \neg c_{1}, \ldots, c_{s}, \neg c_{s}\right\}
$$

so that

$$
\left(a \vee b_{1}\right) \wedge\left(\neg b_{1} \vee b_{2}\right) \wedge \cdots \wedge\left(\neg b_{r} \vee a\right)
$$

and

$$
\left(\neg a \vee c_{1}\right) \wedge\left(\neg c_{1} \vee c_{2}\right) \wedge \cdots \wedge\left(\neg c_{s} \vee \neg a\right)
$$

are subformulas of $\Psi$.
Explore the above result as a support tool to achieve our claim. We store the data contained in a pivoted 3 -sat formula in a cylindrical digraph.

Definition 2.9. Let $\Psi$ be a pivoted (complete) 3 -sat formula. The cylindrical digraph associated to $\mathcal{P}, \mathbb{C} \operatorname{lndr}=\langle V, E$, label $\rangle$, where $V$ is a set of vertices, $E$ is a set of edges and label is a mapping from $E$ to the set of parts of the set of entries is,

1. The set of vertices is the set of literals together with their negations;
2. If $a \vee b$ belongs to the set of entries $\left\{i_{1} j_{1}, i_{2} j_{2}, \ldots, i_{k} j_{k}\right\}$, then,
(a) $\neg a \Rightarrow b$ and $\neg b \Rightarrow a$ belong to the set edges, $E$;
(b) $i_{1} j_{1}, i_{2} j_{2}, \ldots, i_{k} j_{k}$ is the label of both edges $\neg a \Rightarrow b$ and $\neg b \Rightarrow a$.

Sequences of vertices connected by $\Rightarrow$ are a path, as we define below,
Definition 2.10. Let $a$ and $b$ be two literals, there is a path from $a$ to $b$ if there is a subdigraph of $\mathbb{C}$ lndr the form

$$
\begin{equation*}
a \stackrel{l_{1}}{\Rightarrow} c^{1} \stackrel{l_{2}}{\Rightarrow} c^{2} \stackrel{l_{3}}{\Rightarrow} \ldots \stackrel{l_{k-1}}{\Rightarrow} c^{k-1} \stackrel{l_{k}}{\Rightarrow} b \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Some subgraphs of the cylindrical digraph will be associated to unsatisfiable formulas and we keep track of these subgraphs and, thus, we can decide, in an optimal way whether they represent or not all possible combinations.

We search for sequences of the form,

$$
\begin{array}{r}
\neg a \Rightarrow b^{1} \Rightarrow b^{2} \Rightarrow \cdots \Rightarrow b^{t_{1}} \Rightarrow a \\
\text { and }  \tag{2}\\
a \Rightarrow c^{1} \Rightarrow c^{2} \Rightarrow \cdots \Rightarrow c^{t_{2}} \Rightarrow \neg a
\end{array}
$$

We conclude that a Pivoted 3 -sat formula $\Psi$ has an unsatisfiable combination, with the entries chosen among the set of labels over sequences depicted in Equation 2.

Notation 2.11. Let $\mathbf{2}^{\mathbf{m}}$, the set of all mappings from $\mathbf{m}$ to $\mathbf{2}=\{1,2\}$. Write an element of $\mathbf{2}^{\mathbf{m}}$ as $\left\{1 j_{1}, 2 j_{2}, \ldots, \mathbf{m} j_{\mathbf{m}}\right\}$, that is, the above set represents the graphic of a mapping $f: \mathbf{m} \mapsto \mathbf{2}$ and an entry, ij has the meaning that $f(i)=j$.

We identify an entry $a_{p}$ with $\mathbf{p} 1$ and an entry $\neg a_{p}$ with $\mathbf{p} 2,1 \leq \mathbf{p} \leq \mathbf{m}$.
Definition 2.12. Given a Pivoted $\mathbf{3}$-sat formula, $\mathcal{C}$, our task is to verify, in the most efficient way, regarding the use of time and space, whether for all all combinations $\sigma$ in $\mathbf{2}^{\mathbf{m}}$, for all literals in $\sigma$ regarded as False whether the resulting $\mathbf{2}$-sat formula is unsatisfiable. That is, we verify whether there is an element $\sigma=\left\{1 j_{1}, 2 j_{2}, \ldots, \mathbf{m} j_{\mathbf{m}}\right\}$ in $\mathbf{2}^{\mathbf{m}}$, in which the combination,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\bigwedge_{1 \leq r \leq \mathbf{m}}\left\{\wedge\left(p^{r j_{r}} \vee q^{r j_{r}}\right) \mid\left(p^{r j_{r}} \vee q^{r j_{r}}\right) \in \text { contents } r j_{r}\right\} \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

is satisfiable.
In short, we ask if the Pivoted 3 -sat formula is unsatisfiable or satisfiable, by first making valuations ranging over the set of pivots. Using Proposition [2.8, we search the sequences that lead to unsatisfiable formulas
and, thereafter, we decide whether we wrote all possible combinations or not.

We set the keystones by defining the cylindrical digraph associated with a given pivoted sat formula. Any disjunction contained in an entry plays the role of a vertex in a cylindrical digraph.
Definition 2.13. Given a Pivoted Formula $\Psi$, an interval $[p, q]$ is the subdigraph that contains all sequences in between $p$ and $q$ and contains no loops, that is there is not a vertex $r$ so that a sequence

$$
r \Rightarrow \cdots \Rightarrow r
$$

belongs to $[p, q]$ and the set of necessarily true literals, $\mathcal{N E C}$, is the set of all pair of conjugated literals so that the intervals $[\neg a, a]$ and $[a, \neg a]$ are non-empty.

Definition 2.14. A pair of necessarily true literals is a conjugated pair of literals of a given pivoted formula so that the sequences from $\neg a$ to $a$ and from $a$ to $\neg a$ are non empty.

The set of necessarily true literals is denoted by $\mathcal{N E C}$.
For each pair of conjugated literals, $\{a, \neg a\} \subseteq \mathcal{N E C}$, we write distinct copies of $[\neg a, a]$ and $[a, \neg a]$. As usual, distinct copies are fabricated using Cartesian Products to differentiate intervals.

Definition 2.15. Given a cylindrical digraph, suppose that the cardinality of $\mathcal{N E C}$ is an even number $r \geq 2$. Enumerate the set of necessarily true literals as $\left\{p_{1}, \neg p_{1}, \ldots, p_{r / 2}, \neg p_{r / 2}\right\}$.

For each digraph, consider the product,

1. $\left[p_{l}, \neg p_{l}\right] \times\{2 l\}, 1 \leq l \leq r / 2$;
2. $\left[\neg p_{l}, p_{l}\right] \times\{2 l-1\}, 1 \leq l \leq r / 2$.

Define the edges and labels as the edges and labels inherited by the projection to the interval. Define a closed digraph as a digraph obtained with the union of intervals $\left[p_{2 l-1}, \neg p_{2 l-1}\right] \cup\left[\neg p_{2 l}, p_{2 l}\right], 1 \leq l \leq r / 2$, endowed with the following identification $\left(p_{2 l-1}, 2 l-1\right) \sim\left(p_{2 l}, 2 l\right)$

The set of closed digraph, $\mathcal{C S D}$ is the union of all closed digraphs
Definition 2.16. A chain is a sequence contained in the set of closed digraphs,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& (\neg a, 2 l-1) \stackrel{l_{0}}{\Rightarrow}\left(c^{1}, 2 l-1\right) \stackrel{l_{1}}{\Rightarrow}\left(c^{2}, 2 l-1\right) \stackrel{l_{2}}{\Rightarrow} \ldots \stackrel{l_{k-1}}{\Rightarrow}\left(c^{k}, 2 l-1\right) \stackrel{l_{k}}{\Rightarrow} \\
& (a, 2 l-1) \sim(a, 2 l) \\
& \stackrel{l_{k+1}}{\Rightarrow}\left(c^{k+1}, 2 l\right) \stackrel{l_{k+2}}{\Rightarrow}\left(c^{k+2}, 2 l\right) \stackrel{l_{k+2}}{\Rightarrow} \ldots \stackrel{l_{t-1}}{\Rightarrow}\left(c^{t+1}, 2 l\right) \stackrel{l_{t}}{\Rightarrow}(\neg a, 2 l)
\end{aligned}
$$

The set of all chains is denoted by $\mathcal{P}$.
Consider the set of all chains in a closed digraph. Enumerate them by $\{1, \ldots, s\}$. To each chain $C h_{t}$ enumerated by $t$, consider the Cartesian Product $C h_{t} \times\{t\}$, labels, edges inherited by the labels and edges in $C h$.

Definition 2.17. The mapping

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
C h: & \mathcal{P} \mapsto \mathcal{C S D} \\
& (v, i) \rightarrow v
\end{array}
$$

is the projection of vertices of $\mathcal{P}$ onto $\mathcal{C S D}$.
The expansion to $\mathcal{P}$ is the fixed (exponential) writing of all maximal chains contained in a closed digraph. The enumeration of the chains is arbitrary and, from now on, remains fixed.

Given the set of chains, if $(v, t)$ belongs to a chain in $\mathcal{P}$, then $v$ is a vertex in the cylindrical digraph and $(u, v)$ is an edge of the cylindrical digraph if there is a chain $B r_{t}$ and two arrows $(u, t) \Rightarrow(v, t)$ in $B r_{t}$, in $B r_{t}$.

Definition 2.18. Consider the edge $e=((u, t) \Rightarrow(v, t))$ in $\mathcal{P}$. Define $C h(e)$ as

$$
C h(u, t) \Rightarrow C h(v, t)
$$

Definition 2.19. $A$ compatible set of entries is a set $U=\left\{i_{1} j_{1}, \ldots, i_{n} j_{n}\right\}$ so that for all pair $i_{r}$ and $i_{s}$, if $i_{r}=i_{s}$ then $j_{r}=j_{s}$. If a set of entries is not compatible, it is said an incompatible set.
$A$ set of edges $\mathbb{E}=\left\{e_{1}, e_{2}, \ldots, e_{k}\right\}$ is said incompatible if the union of it set of labels, $U=\left\{i_{1} j_{1}, \ldots, i_{n} j_{n}\right\}$ is an incompatible set of entries. If a set of edges is not incompatible, we say that $\mathbb{V}$ is compatible.

We wrote digraphs that encode all unsatisfiable choices. We must decide whether we have, in fact, the set of all unsatisfiable choices. Again, we will not spell all the compatible, if any, choices. It is an expsize task.

Any chain $B r$ and a compatible choice in $B r$ is an unsatisfiable combination. After writing all unsatisfiable combinations we must decide whether we wrote all possible combinations (we have an unsatisfiable formula) or not (the pivoted formula is satisfiable).

Definition 2.20. Given a chain in $\mathcal{P}$,

$$
\mathbf{p}=c^{0} \stackrel{l_{1}}{\Rightarrow} c^{1} \stackrel{l_{2}}{\Rightarrow} c^{2} \stackrel{l_{3}}{\Rightarrow} \ldots \stackrel{l_{k-1}}{\Rightarrow} c^{k-1} \stackrel{l_{k}}{\Rightarrow} c^{k}
$$

$a$ compatible choice in $\mathbf{p}$ is a set of compatible entries $\mathcal{E}=\left\{j_{1} i_{1}, \ldots, j_{l} i_{l}\right\}$, so that for each edge $e_{i}=c^{i} \Rightarrow c^{i+1}, 0 \leq i<k$, there is an entry $i j \in \mathcal{E}$ so that $i j \in \operatorname{label}\left(e_{i}\right)$.

If one casts a tableau where all combinations of pivots, $\sigma \in \mathbf{2}^{\mathrm{m}}$ labeled as False and there is a sequence

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \neg a \stackrel{q_{0}}{\Rightarrow} c^{1} \stackrel{q_{1}}{\Rightarrow} c^{2} \stackrel{q_{2}}{\Rightarrow} \ldots \stackrel{q_{k-2}}{\Rightarrow} c^{k-1} \stackrel{q_{k-1}}{\Rightarrow} \\
& a \stackrel{q_{k}}{\Rightarrow} c^{k+1} \stackrel{q_{k+1}}{\Rightarrow} c^{k+2} \stackrel{q_{k+2}}{\Rightarrow} \ldots \stackrel{q_{t-2}}{\Rightarrow} c^{t-1} \stackrel{q_{t-1}}{\Rightarrow} \neg a=c^{t}
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\left\{q_{0}, q_{1}, q_{2}, \ldots, q_{k-1}, q_{k}, q_{k+1}, \ldots, q_{t-1}, q_{t}\right\} \subseteq \sigma$ and each $q_{j}$ belongs to the label of the label $l_{j}, 0 \leq j \leq t-1$, then the branch that falsifies the elements of $\sigma$ closes. So, the next question is whether all possible sequences appear in $\mathcal{P}$ and, therefore the pivoted formula is unsatisfiable or not, that is, the pivoted formula is satisfiable.

Given a Pivoted 3 -sat formula $\Psi$, the set of all compatible choices in $\mathcal{P}$ is the set of all unsatisfiable combinations we can perform in $\Psi$. We now ask how one can decide whether the set of all compatible choices entails all possible combinations, thus, the Pivoted 3 -sat is unsatisfiable.

Define the set of vertices orthogonal to the set of chains.
Definition 2.21. A set of edges sẽ $q=\left\{e_{0}, \ldots, e_{n}\right\}$ is called an antichain if for all seq $\in \mathcal{P}$, there is an element $e \in$ sẽq so that $e$ is an edge of seq.

We do not focus on the set of vertices any more. Instead, focus on the set of edges, or, more specifically, on all the compatible choices of labels in $\mathcal{P}$. If all possible combinations were written, the formula would be unsatisfiable. Otherwise, the formula is satisfiable. Do all possible choices encompass all the possible combinations?

Definition 2.22 (ENTAILS). Let $T\left(\mathbf{2}^{\mathbf{m}}\right)$ be a set of partial mappings of $\mathbf{m}$ into $\{1,2\}$. We say that $T\left(\mathbf{2}^{\mathbf{m}}\right)$ entails $\mathbf{2}^{\mathbf{m}}$ if for all $\gamma \in \mathbf{2}^{\mathbf{m}}$, there is an $\eta \in T\left(\mathbf{2}^{\mathbf{m}}\right)$ so that $\eta$ is a restriction of $\gamma$, that is, $\eta$ is a subset of some $\gamma=\left\{i_{1} 1, i_{2} 2, \ldots, i_{\mathbf{m}} \mathbf{m}\right\}$.

We search for chains in $\mathcal{C S D}$. Writing all the paths is a expsize long task. Recall that in Definition 2.15, $\mathcal{P}$ denotes the set of all chains in $\mathcal{C S D}$.

Definition 2.23. Let $\tau$ be the set of all entries $\eta=\left\{1 j_{1}, \ldots, \mathbf{m} j_{\mathbf{m}}\right\}$ contained in $\mathbf{2}^{\mathbf{m}}$ so that

$$
\exists s e q \in \mathcal{P} \quad \forall e \in \operatorname{seq} \quad \exists 1 \leq l \leq \mathbf{m}\left(i_{l} j_{l} \in \operatorname{label}(e)\right)
$$

Let $\tilde{\tau}$ be the complementary of $\tau$, that is, the set of all entries $\tilde{\eta}=$ $\left\{1 j_{1}, \ldots, \mathbf{m} j_{\mathbf{m}}\right\}$ so that

$$
\forall s e q \in \mathcal{P} \quad \exists e \in \operatorname{seq} \quad \forall 1 \leq l \leq \mathbf{m}\left(i_{l} j_{l} \notin \operatorname{label}(e)\right)
$$

Proposition 2.24 below marks a decisive step to build our theoremhood. After building the closed digraphs, and applying Proposition [2.24, our search is focused on looking for compatible antichains. Again, we emphasize that our answer is a plain output, YES or NO, without naming the compatible antichains if any. In other words, we have a plain program and we expect an answer YES or NO regarding the possibility of the existence of some kind of input.

Proposition 2.24. The following assertions are equivalent,

1. There is no compatible set of entries in $\tilde{\tau}$;
2. $\tau$ entails $\mathbf{2}^{\mathrm{m}}$;
3. There is no compatible antichain in $\mathcal{P}$.

Proof. Clearly 1 and 2 are equivalent. If seq is a compatible set of entries in $\tilde{\tau}$, then, seq $\notin \tau$ for the sets are complementary.

1 and 2 imply 3. Suppose that there is a compatible antichain in $\mathcal{P}$, Ach $=\left\{e_{1}, \ldots, e_{k}\right\}$. Let $l b(A c h)$ be the union of the set of labels of each vertex of Ach. As Ach is compatible, $l b(A c h)$ has the form

$$
\left\{t_{1} r_{1}, t_{2} r_{2}, \ldots, t_{l} r_{l}\right\}
$$

where $1 \leq t_{1}<t_{2}<\ldots<t_{l} \leq \mathbf{m}$ and $r_{i}$ is either 1 or 2 . That is, for all $1 \leq n \leq l$ we have only one choice, either $r_{n}=1$ or $r_{n}=2$. So, for all $1 \leq s \leq \mathbf{m}$, we can choice a $\tilde{t}_{s} s$ so that $\tilde{t}_{s} \notin a c h$.

Therefore, there is a non-empty set

$$
\operatorname{Comp}=\left\{\tilde{t_{1}} 1, \tilde{t_{2}} 2, \ldots, \tilde{t_{m}} \mathbf{m}\right\}
$$

that is compatible and $\operatorname{Comp} \cap A c h=\varnothing$. Conclude that $\operatorname{Comp}$ belongs to $\tilde{\tau}$ and, thus, there is a compatible array in $\tilde{\tau}$.

Suppose that 1 is false and $s=\left\{t_{1} r_{1}, t_{2} r_{2}, \ldots, t_{\mathbf{m}} r_{\mathbf{m}}\right\}$ is a compatible set of entries in $\tilde{\tau}$ and, then, for all sequence $s_{r} \in \mathcal{P}$, there is an edge $e_{r}$ so that $\operatorname{label}\left(e_{r}\right) \cap s=\varnothing$. Let $A=\left\{e_{r} \mid e_{r} \in s_{r} A N D\left(\operatorname{label}\left(e_{r}\right) \cap s=\varnothing\right)\right\}$. As $s$ is compatible, $A$ is compatible, so, $A$ is compatible antichain in $\mathcal{P}$.

Due to Theorem 2.24, we can solve our game by deciding whether all antichains are incompatible or if there is a compatible antichain. Bear in mind that the word "entails 2 " " encodes the fact that all the combinations in the pivoted 3 -sat formula are unsatisfiable.

## 3 The Search For Compatible Antichains

In this section, we develop the tools we use for deciding whether a closed digraph entails $2^{m}$. Using Proposition 2.24, we search for compatible antichains in the closed digraph.

There is no need to search for unsatisfiable combinations. Using Proposition 2.24 , we search compatible antichains, that is, we deal with pivots. Sequences of vertices were used to build the closed digraph. By using Proposition 2.24, our attention goes to the question of whether there is a compatible antichain in the closed digraphs and, thus, the set of closed digraphs do not entail $2^{\mathrm{m}}$. Again, we stress that we do not develop tools to write out all the antichains and, therefore, spell out all the possible compatible combinations which is an expsize problem. The polysize problem consists of the search for a plain output YES, there are antichains or NO, there is no antichain.

The set of all chains stores all possible unsatisfiable combinations one can perform in a card. We already wrote the closed digraph and, now, our attention is devoted to the search for compatible antichains, a search we perform in the set of labels. Each edge of a digraph has a label that will be used to point out the relevant parts that weigh in our search for antichains.

Given a closed digraph, we first modify the shape of the digraph to avoid exponential branching, the subject of the first Subsection 3.1. We must show that the reshaping, the Linearized Digraph does not change the set of compatible antichains.

In the second step, Subsection 3.2, after modifying the closed digraph we write a digraph that marks the compatible antichains orthogonal to the chains of the Linearized Digraph. A result of an empty digraph signalizes no compatible antichains in the Linearized Digraphs and, as we show in this Section, no compatible antichain in $\mathcal{P}$. Proposition 2.24 below marks a decisive step to build our theoremhood. After building the closed digraphs, and applying Proposition 2.24, our search is focused on looking for compatible antichains. Again, we emphasize that our answer is a plain output, YES or NO, without naming the compatible antichains, if any. In other words, we have a plain program and we expect an answer YES or NO regarding the possibility of the existence of some kind of input.

### 3.1 A Simpler Digraph

Here, we work to give a new shape to the set of closed digraphs. To avoid an exponential search, and keeping in mind that the search for compatible
antichains has to be unchanged, we prove that there is a digraph, the Linearized Digraph less complex than the closed digraph. Moreover, we show there are compatible antichains in the Linearized Digraph if and only if there are compatible antichains in the closed digraph. Thereafter, we show that the search for compatible antichains over the Linearized Digraph is polynomial in time and space.

In this section, we develop the tools we use for deciding whether a closed digraph entails $2^{\mathrm{m}}$. Using Proposition 2.24, we can search for compatible antichains in the closed digraph but, instead of searching for unsatisfiable combinations, we search for compatible antichains, that is, we deal with pivots, subject of Subsection 3.2. The set of vertices, sequences of vertices, played the main role in building closed digraphs. Guided by Proposition 2.24, our attention goes to the question of whether the labels contain a compatible antichain and, thus, the set of closed digraphs do not entail $\mathbf{2}^{\mathrm{m}}$. Again, we stress that we do not develop tools to write out all the antichains and, therefore, spell out all the possible compatible combinations which is, clearly, an expsize problem. The polysize problem consists of the search for a plain output YES, there are antichains or NO, there is no antichain.

The set of all chains stores all possible unsatisfiable combinations one can perform in a card and we already wrote the closed digraph.

Given a closed digraph, we first modify the shape of the digraph to avoid exponential branching, the subject of the first Subsection 3.1. We must show that the reshaping, the Linearized Digraph does not change the set of compatible antichains.

Our proof strategy, schematized to avoid exponential multiplication on writing the set of chains, is the transformation of closed digraphs into linear digraphs, that is, digraphs with no source or drain beside the top and root. Using Lifting, Multiplication of Branches and the Addition of Labels, we define next, we modify the branching to focus on the question: "Are there compatible antichains?" instead of asking: "Can we name all of them?".

Definition 3.1. Given a closed digraph, define,

1. R , the set of roots is $\{a \in V \mid \nexists b \in V((a \Rightarrow b) \in E)\}$;
2. T , the set of tops is $\{a \in V \mid \nexists b \in V((b \Rightarrow a) \in E\}$;
3. If there are at least two edges

$$
\begin{aligned}
& a \Rightarrow b_{1} \\
& a \Rightarrow b_{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

or

$$
\begin{aligned}
& b_{1} \Rightarrow a \\
& b_{2} \Rightarrow a
\end{aligned}
$$

where $b_{1} \neq b_{2}$, then $a$ is a branching.
Definition 3.2. A sequence of labeled edges in a closed digraph is called a maximal branch if seq is of the form

$$
\begin{equation*}
c^{0} \stackrel{l_{1}}{\Rightarrow} c^{1} \stackrel{l_{2}}{\Rightarrow} c^{2} \stackrel{l_{3}}{\Rightarrow} c^{3} \ldots c^{k-1} \stackrel{l_{k}}{\Rightarrow} c^{k} \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $c^{k}$ is either a root or a branching and $c^{0}$ is either a top or a branching and no other branching belongs to the sequence.

If an interval $[a, b]$ contains no branching besides $a$ and $b$, then it is called a linear interval.

A linear interval $[a, b]$ where $b$ is a root, is called a root interval.
Definition 3.3. We use the term branch to design a linear sequence

$$
c^{0} \Rightarrow c^{1} \Rightarrow \cdots \Rightarrow c^{k-1} \Rightarrow c^{k}
$$

where except by, perhaps, $c^{0}$ and $c^{k}$, no other vertex is a branching.
We will define the operations over the closed digraphs, Lifting, Multiplication of Branches and the Addition of Labels, the operations, 3.4, 3.5 and 3.7 and, without any loss in our search for compatible antichains, the given closed digraph is reshaped into a simpler digraph, the Linearized Digraph. Of course, we have to show that we do not lose or gain information about compatible antichains. Examples of the operations and more explanations can be found in the institutional page,
www.ime.usp.br/~weiss

In addition, Example 6.1 illustrates the use of all operations defined next.
Definition 3.4 (Lifting). Given a closed digraph $G r$,

- If $B$ and $R$ are two consecutive linear intervals, that is, they share a common branching, $v$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& b r_{11}=v_{11} \Rightarrow \cdots \Rightarrow v_{1 t_{11}} \Rightarrow v \\
& \cdots \\
& b r_{1 k}=v_{1 k} \Rightarrow \cdots \Rightarrow v_{k t_{1 k}} \Rightarrow v
\end{aligned}
$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
& b r_{21}=v \Rightarrow v_{21} \Rightarrow \cdots \Rightarrow v_{2 t_{21}} \\
& \cdots \\
& b r_{2 k}=v \Rightarrow v_{2 k} \Rightarrow \cdots \Rightarrow v_{2 t_{2 k}}
\end{aligned}
$$

the Lifting of $G r$ by $B$ and $R$ is $\operatorname{Gr}(B \star R)=\left\langle V_{B \star R}, E_{B \star R}\right.$, label $\rangle$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
V_{B \star R}= & \left(V_{G} \backslash\{v\}\right) \cup(\{v\} \times\{1, \ldots, k\} \\
E_{B \star R}= & \left(E_{G r} \backslash\left\{v_{1 t_{11}} \Rightarrow v, \ldots, v_{k t_{i k}} \Rightarrow v, \ldots, v \Rightarrow v_{21}, \ldots, v \Rightarrow v_{2 k}\right\}\right) \\
& \cup\left\{v_{1 t_{11}} \Rightarrow(v, 1), \ldots, v_{k t_{1 k}} \Rightarrow(v, k),\right. \\
& \left.\ldots,(v, 1) \Rightarrow v_{21}, \ldots,(v, k) \Rightarrow v_{2 k}\right\}
\end{aligned}
$$

The labels of each $w \Rightarrow(v, j)$ and $(v, j) \Rightarrow w$ are the same labels associated with $w \Rightarrow v$ and $v \Rightarrow w$, respectively.

- If $R$ is of the form

$$
\begin{aligned}
& b r_{1}=v_{1} \Rightarrow \cdots \Rightarrow v_{t_{1}} \Rightarrow r \\
& \cdots \\
& b r_{n}=v_{n} \Rightarrow \cdots \Rightarrow v_{t_{n}} \Rightarrow r
\end{aligned}
$$

where $r$ is a root, the Lifting of $G r$ by $R$ is $G r(R)=\left\langle V_{R}, E_{R}, l a b e l\right\rangle$ given by,

$$
\begin{aligned}
V_{R}= & (V \backslash\{r\}) \cup(\{r\} \times\{1, \ldots, n\}) \\
E_{R}= & \left(E \backslash\left\{v_{t_{1}} \Rightarrow r, \ldots, v_{t_{n}} \Rightarrow r\right\}\right) \cup \\
& \left\{v_{t_{1}} \Rightarrow(r, 1), \ldots, v_{t_{n}} \Rightarrow(r, n)\right\}
\end{aligned}
$$

The labels of each $v_{t_{j}} \Rightarrow(r, j)$ are the same labels of $v_{t_{j}} \Rightarrow r$,

- If $B$ is of the form

$$
\begin{aligned}
& b r_{11}=a \Rightarrow v_{1} \Rightarrow \cdots \Rightarrow v_{t_{1}} \\
& \cdots \\
& b r_{1 k}=a \Rightarrow v_{m} \Rightarrow \cdots \Rightarrow v_{t_{m}}
\end{aligned}
$$

where $a$ is a top, the Lifting of $G r$ by $B$ is $G r(B)=\left\langle V_{B}, E_{R}\right.$, label $\rangle$ given by,

$$
\begin{aligned}
V_{B}= & (V \backslash\{a\}) \cup(\{a\} \times\{1, \ldots, m\}) \\
E_{B}= & \left(E \backslash\left\{a \Rightarrow v_{1}, \ldots, a \Rightarrow v_{m}\right\}\right) \cup \\
& \left\{(a, 1) \Rightarrow v_{1}, \ldots,(a, m) \Rightarrow v_{m}\right\}
\end{aligned}
$$

The labels of each $(a, j) \Rightarrow\left(v_{j}\right)$ are the labels of $a \Rightarrow v_{j}$

Definition 3.5 (Multiplication of a branch). Let

$$
b r=v \Rightarrow v_{1} \Rightarrow \cdots \Rightarrow v_{j} \Rightarrow u
$$

be a maximal branch contained in a linear interval $[v, u]=\langle V, E, l a b e l\rangle$, $\mathrm{m}=\{1, \ldots, m\}$ a finite set and $M=\left\{v_{1}, \ldots, v_{j}\right\} \times\{1, \ldots, m\}$.

The Multiplication of the branch $b r$ is the the interval $[v, u]^{\prime}$, where the vertices are given by the set $\left(V \backslash\left\{v_{1}, \ldots, v_{j}\right\}\right) \cup M$ and the edges of $V \backslash\left\{v_{1}, \ldots, v_{j}\right\}$ plus the edges in the new sequences,

$$
v \Rightarrow\left(v_{1}, i\right) \Rightarrow \cdots \Rightarrow\left(v_{j}, i\right) \Rightarrow u
$$

$1 \leq i \leq m$.
As one cannot form edges among vertices in distinct linear sequences, the definition is consistent.

Definition 3.6. Given a closed digraph and a vertex a, define $U p_{a}$ and $D_{0} n_{a}$, respectively as sets of vertices,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left\{v \in V\left|\exists n \in \mathbb{N} \exists\left\{v_{1}, v_{2}, \ldots, v_{n}\right\} \subseteq V\right|\left(v \Rightarrow v_{1} \Rightarrow v_{2} \Rightarrow \cdots \Rightarrow v_{n} \Rightarrow a\right\}\right. \\
& \left\{w \in V\left|\exists n \in \mathbb{N} \exists\left\{w_{1}, w_{2}, \ldots, w_{n}\right\} \subseteq V\right|\left(a \Rightarrow w_{n} \Rightarrow \cdots \Rightarrow w_{2} \Rightarrow w_{1} \Rightarrow w\right\}\right.
\end{aligned}
$$

An edge $v_{1} \Rightarrow v_{2}$ belongs to $U p_{a}$ if $v_{1}$ belongs to $U p_{a}$. An analogous definition is given to Downa, that is, $v_{2}$ belongs to Downa.

Next, we present a tool to avoid the creation of new compatible antichains in the linearized digraph. Suppose there is no addition of new labels. In that case, the Linearized Digraph we build next as a simpler digraph will present new compatible antichains with no corresponding, under a suitable mapping, antichain in $\mathcal{P}$.

Definition 3.7 (Adding a Label). Let the set of the branching in a closed digraph be $B=\left\{a_{1}, \ldots, a_{t}\right\}$. Consider a set of conjugated pairs of literals, $B=\left\{p_{a_{1}}, p_{\neg a_{1}}, \ldots, p_{a_{t}}, p_{\neg a_{t}}\right\}$ that are all distinct from the literals we have been using. The addition of the new pair of literals to the set of branching is the new set of labels, label' defined by,

$$
\operatorname{label}^{\prime}(e)=\operatorname{label}(e) \cup\left\{p_{a_{i}} \mid e \in \operatorname{Down}\left(a_{i}\right)\right\} \cup\left\{\neg p_{a_{i}} \mid e \in U p\left(a_{i}\right)\right\}
$$

We do not overload our manuscript, so we drop the prime symbol, label ${ }^{\prime}$ and write only label,

In Example 6.1, we emphasize the role of adding a pair of conjugated literals that work to prevent the creation of a new antichain that never existed in the originally set $\mathcal{P}$.

To perform Lifting, Multiplication of Branches and Addition of a Label to obtain a simpler digraph, we must show that there will be no prejudice in counting antichains. We cannot create or erase antichains.

Reshape a closed digraph into a set of linear intervals on Procedure 3.8, The mainstay to sustain our construction is that, after writing Procedure 3.8, we obtain a linear digraph that is equivalent to the originally closed digraph. We show that our remodeling will not impair the preexisting antichains or create new antichains.

Lifting, Multiplying Branches and Adding labels in a closed digraph are operations used to generate linear digraphs with no branching and, mainly, no loss of information about compatible antichains stored in $\mathcal{P}$ with no exponential multiplication of branches. The operations are illustrated in Example 6.1

Procedure 3.8 (Changing a Closed Digraph into a Linear Digraph). Given a closed digraph $\mathcal{C S D}$, and a set of conjugated literals distinct of any literals from the set of labels of $\mathcal{C S D}, S=\left\{p_{1}, \neg p_{1}, \ldots, p_{r}, \neg p_{r}\right\}$, where $V$ is the cardinality of literals (vertices). First, we transform the closed digraph, by Multiplying branches, into a digraph whose intervals, from branching to a root, are maximal linear sequences. After we obtain a digraph whose intervals, from branching to a root, are maximal linear sequences, we multiply branches, add suitable labels, and perform lifting.

1. Let the roots of the closed digraph be $\left\{e_{1}, \ldots, e_{n}\right\}$ and let the set of all root intervals be

$$
\begin{aligned}
& r_{11} \Rightarrow \cdots \Rightarrow e_{1} \\
& \vdots \\
& r_{l_{1} 1} \Rightarrow \cdots \Rightarrow e_{1} \\
& \vdots \\
& r_{1 s} \Rightarrow \cdots \Rightarrow e_{n} \\
& \vdots \\
& r_{l_{s}} \Rightarrow \cdots \Rightarrow e_{n}
\end{aligned}
$$

lift each maximal branch. Obtain the digraph Modf,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& r_{11} \Rightarrow \cdots \Rightarrow\left(e_{1}, 1\right) \\
& \vdots \\
& r_{l_{1} 1} \Rightarrow \cdots \Rightarrow\left(e_{1}, l_{1}\right) \\
& \vdots \\
& r_{1 s} \Rightarrow \cdots \Rightarrow\left(e_{r}, 1\right) \\
& \vdots \\
& r_{l_{s} s} \Rightarrow \cdots \Rightarrow\left(e_{r}, l_{r}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

2. Suppose we obtain sets of root intervals of the form,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& u \Rightarrow \cdots \Rightarrow v_{1} \\
& \vdots \\
& u \Rightarrow \cdots \Rightarrow v_{n}
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\left\{v_{1}, \ldots, v_{n}\right\}$ are roots in the digraph.
Let all the maximal branches ending on $u$ be,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& w_{1} \Rightarrow \cdots \Rightarrow u \\
& \vdots \\
& w_{t} \Rightarrow \cdots \Rightarrow u
\end{aligned}
$$

Multiply the branches by $m=\max \{n, t\}$ and lift. Add to the set of labels a pair of conjugated literals $p_{u_{i}}$ and $\neg p_{u_{i}}$ never used in our process, to, respectively the edges in Down $n_{u_{i}}$ and $U p_{u_{i}}$. Rewrite Modf as,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& w_{1} \Rightarrow \cdots \Rightarrow(u, 1) \Rightarrow \cdots \Rightarrow v_{1} \\
& \vdots \\
& w_{m} \Rightarrow \cdots \Rightarrow(u, m) \Rightarrow \cdots \Rightarrow v_{m}
\end{aligned}
$$

Proceed until all intervals are lifted.
3. Finally, we have sets of maximal branches of the form,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& v \Rightarrow \cdots \Rightarrow u \Rightarrow \cdots \Rightarrow t_{1} \\
& \vdots \\
& v \Rightarrow \cdots \Rightarrow u \Rightarrow \cdots \Rightarrow t_{o}
\end{aligned}
$$

where $v$ is a top and $\left\{t_{1}, \ldots, t_{o}\right\}$ are roots. Lift all the branches and obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
& (v, 1) \Rightarrow \cdots \Rightarrow u \Rightarrow \cdots \Rightarrow t_{1} \\
& \vdots \\
& (v, o) \Rightarrow \cdots \Rightarrow u \Rightarrow \cdots \Rightarrow t_{o}
\end{aligned}
$$

Call the Linearized Closed Digraph to the linear digraphs obtained after the successive applications of Lifting, Multiplication and Addition of a label Denote the Linearized Closed Digraph by Linclsd.

Suppose that each linear branch has the cardinality $k$ and write each linear branch in Linclsd as $B r_{i}$ as a short for $B r_{i} \times\{i\}$. Define the edges whose arrow is inherited by $v \Rightarrow u$.

We show that a Linearized Digraph, despite being simpler than the set of chains, preserves compatible antichains in the sense that we do not create nor erase information about compatible antichains, Lemma3.17. Recall that the vertices of either $\mathcal{P}$ and Linclsd are pairs, a vertex in the closed digraph and a number.

Definition 3.9. The mapping

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { Proj: } & \text { Linclsd } \rightarrow \mathcal{C S D} \\
& (v, j) \mapsto v
\end{array}
$$

is the projection of vertices of Linclsd onto $\mathcal{C S D}$.
Definition 3.10. Consider the edge $e^{\prime}=\left(u^{\prime} \Rightarrow v^{\prime}\right)$ in Linclsd. Define $\operatorname{Proj}\left(e^{\prime}\right)$ as the edge,

$$
\operatorname{Proj}\left(u^{\prime}\right) \Rightarrow \operatorname{Proj}\left(v^{\prime}\right)
$$

Definitions 3.10 and 2.18 are well posed for if $u^{\prime} \Rightarrow v^{\prime}$ and $u^{\prime \prime} \Rightarrow v^{\prime \prime}$ are two edges, respectively in Linclsd and in $\mathcal{P}$, then $\operatorname{Proj}\left(u^{\prime}\right) \Rightarrow \operatorname{Proj}\left(v^{\prime}\right)$ and $C h\left(u^{\prime \prime}\right) \Rightarrow C h\left(v^{\prime \prime}\right)$ are, equally, edges in $\mathcal{C S D}$.

Lemma 3.11. Let ach be an antichain in the Linearized Digraph. Then, for all branching a, either $\operatorname{Proj}(A c h) \cap U p(a)$ or $\operatorname{Proj}(A c h) \cap \operatorname{Down}(a)$ is empty.

Proof. Due to the addition of labels, there is no branching $a \in \mathcal{C S D}$ so that two edgers $e_{1} \in U p(a)$ and $e_{2} \in \operatorname{Down}(a)$ belong to a compatible antichain ach in the Linearized Digraph because both are incompatible.

Definition 3.12. The set of all antichains in $\mathcal{P}$ is denoted by $\Sigma$ and the set of all antichains in Linclsd is denoted by $\Theta$.

Lemma 3.13. The mapping Proj: $\Theta \mapsto \mathcal{P}$ (Linclsd), where $\mathcal{P}($ Linclsd $)$ is the set of parts of Linclsd, given by

$$
\operatorname{Proj}(\sigma)=\{v \in \operatorname{Linclsd} \mid \exists w \in \sigma \operatorname{Proj}(w)=v\}
$$

is an injective mapping.

Have we created or erased antichains? As the relevant antichains are kept, we search for compatible antichains in Linclsd. We show that there are compatible antichains in Linclsd if and only if there are compatible antichains in $\mathcal{P}$.

Given a branching $a$, recall the definition of a branch in $U p(a)$ is a linear sequence, in $\mathcal{P}$ of the form,

$$
v_{1} \Rightarrow v_{2} \Rightarrow \cdots \Rightarrow a
$$

Definition 3.14. For all set of edges $Z$ in $\mathcal{P}$ and branching $a$, we say that $Z$ represents $U p(a)$ if for all branching $B r$ in $U p(a)$, there is a $z \in C h(Z)$ so that $z$ belongs to Br. A symmetric definition applies to Down(a), that is, for all branching $\operatorname{Br}$ in $\operatorname{Down}(a)$, there is a $z \in C h(Z)$ so that $z$ belongs to Br .

For all set of edges $Z$ in $\mathcal{P}, Z$ involves a set of branching $\mu$ if for all branching $a \in \mu$, either $Z$ represents $U p(a)$ or $Z$ represents Down $(a)$.

Proposition 3.15. Given an antichain $\sigma$ in $\mathcal{P}$, for all branching a, $\sigma$ represents $U p(a)$ or $\operatorname{Down}(a)$.

Proof. Let $\sigma$ be an antichain in $\mathcal{P}$. The antichain $U p(a)$ or $\operatorname{Down}(a)$ where "or" is not exclusive.

Suppose otherwise. Let the branches of $U p(a)$ and $\operatorname{Down}(a)$ as, respectively,

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
u_{11} & \ldots & u_{r 1} \\
\vdots & \ldots & \vdots \\
u_{1 j_{1}} & \ldots & u_{r j_{r}} \\
a & \ldots & a
\end{array}
$$

and

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
a & \ldots & a \\
v_{11} & \ldots & v_{t 1} \\
\vdots & \ldots & \vdots \\
v_{1 j_{1}} & \ldots & v_{t j_{t}}
\end{array}
$$

Combine the above chains and obtain the chains in $\mathcal{P}$,

$$
\begin{array}{llll}
u_{11} & \ldots u_{11} & \ldots u_{r 1} & \ldots u_{r 1} \\
\vdots & \ldots \vdots & \ldots \vdots & \ldots \vdots \\
u_{1 j_{1}} & \ldots u_{1 j_{1}} & \ldots u_{r j_{r}} & \ldots u_{r j_{r}} \\
(a, 1,1) & \ldots(a, 1, t) & \ldots(a, r, 1) & \ldots(a, r, 1)  \tag{5}\\
v_{11} & \ldots v_{t 1} & \ldots v_{11} & \ldots v_{t 1} \\
\vdots & \ldots \vdots & \ldots \vdots & \ldots \vdots \\
v_{1 j_{1}} & \ldots v_{t j_{t}} & \ldots v_{1 j_{1}} & \ldots v_{t j_{t}}
\end{array}
$$

If the antichain $\sigma$ has no edges in columns, say $r$ and $s$ in, respectively $U p(a)$ and $\operatorname{Down}(a)$, then the combination of the two columns $r \times s$, does not contain any edge of the antichain.

In conclusion, for any antichain $\sigma$, for any branching $a$, either all edges of $C h(\sigma)$ are a member of one edge in $U p(a)$ or all edges of $C h(\sigma)$ belong to Down(a).

Proposition 3.16. Given an antichain $\sigma$ in $\mathcal{P}, \sigma$ involves the set of branching.

Proof. Let $a_{1}<\cdots<a_{s}$ be an arbitrary ordering of all branches in the closed digraph.

Use Proposition 3.15 to $a_{1}$. If $\sigma$ represents $U p\left(a_{1}\right)$, obtain a new antichain $\sigma_{1}$ by defining,

1. Let $B r_{11}, \ldots, B r_{1 s_{1}}$ be the set of branches in $U p\left(a_{1}\right)$, still in the closed digraph. For all $1 \leq i \leq s_{1}$, choose a $x_{i} \rightarrow y_{i} \in B r_{1 i} \cap C h(\sigma)$. Erase any edge whose projection via $C h$ in $B r_{1 i}$ is different from $x_{i} \rightarrow y_{i}$ and add to $\sigma_{1}$ all $\left(x_{i}, t\right) \rightarrow\left(y_{i}, t\right)$ whose projection is $x_{i} \rightarrow y_{i}$.

Otherwise, $\sigma$ represents $\operatorname{Down}\left(a_{1}\right)$ and proceed similarly.
Obtain a new antichain $\sigma_{1}$. Notice that $\operatorname{Ach}\left(\sigma_{1}\right) \subseteq \operatorname{Ach}(\sigma)$. Suppose that we obtained $\sigma_{i}, 1 \leq i \leq t<r$ and that $\operatorname{Ach}\left(\sigma_{t}\right) \subseteq \cdots \subseteq \operatorname{Ach}\left(\sigma_{1}\right) \subseteq \operatorname{Ach}(\sigma)$.

Suppose that $\sigma_{t}$ represents $U p\left(a_{t+1}\right)$.

1. Let $B r_{t+11}, \ldots, B r_{t+1 s_{t+1}}$ be the branches in $U p\left(a_{t+1}\right)$. For all $1 \leq$ $i \leq s_{t+1}$, choose a $x_{i} \rightarrow y_{i} \in B r_{t+1 i} \cap C h\left(\sigma_{t}\right)$. Erase any edge whose projection via $C h$ in $B r_{1 t+i}$ is different from $x_{i} \rightarrow y_{i}$ and add to $\sigma_{t+1}$ all $\left(x_{i}, t\right) \rightarrow\left(y_{i}, t\right)$ whose projection is $x_{i} \rightarrow y_{i}$.

Otherwise, $\sigma_{t}$ represents $\operatorname{Down}\left(a_{t+1}\right)$ and a mirror reasoning applies.
As a result, obtain a series of nested antichain that we build (can build in several random ways), $\operatorname{Ach}(\sigma) \supseteq \cdots \supseteq \operatorname{Ach}\left(\sigma_{t}\right)$, where the cardinality of $t$ does not exceed the cardinality of the set of branching. Given the already chosen ordering, for all branching $a$, we choose preferentially $U p(a)$, if possible, and, if we do not have this choice, we have the choice $\operatorname{Down}(a)$.

We have that $\operatorname{Ach}\left(\sigma_{t}\right)$ cannot be reduced and, using Proposition 3.15 represents any branching in the set of branches, thus, $\sigma$, as well as its reduction, involves the set of branching.

Lemma 3.17. There is an onto mapping Eq from $\Sigma$ to $\Theta$.

Proof. The operations of Lifting, Multiplying and Adding Labels are fixed, so, after reducing an antichain $\sigma$ to its minimal version $\sigma_{t}$, we obtain, in the Linearized Digraph, an antichain $\overline{\sigma_{t}}$, the result of the fixed operation over $\sigma_{t}$ in the Linearized Digraph. The onto mapping is given by $E q(\sigma)$ is the expansion of $C h\left(\sigma_{t}\right)$.

In short, our quest is whether there is a compatible antichain in a closed digraph is equivalent to the quest whether there is a compatible antichain in a linearized digraph.

### 3.2 Digraph of Compatible Antichains

Now, our attention is devoted to the search for compatible antichains, which we perform in the set of labels. Each edge of a digraph has a label that will be used to point out the relevant parts that weigh in our search for antichains.

In outline, once we have linear digraphs, $k$ linear digraphs, each linear digraph in the column $r$ endowed $l_{r}$ vertices. To decide the existence of compatible antichains in the Linearized Digraph, we start with all the vertices in the first column in interaction with each vertex from the second column to the $k^{\text {th }}$ column, We obtain, after performing over all vertices in the first label, a nested compatible digraph of depth 1, We proceed column by column. In the $h^{t h}$, each vertex $v_{i}^{h}, 1 \leq i \leq l_{h}$ visits all vertex $v_{j}^{n}, n>h$, $1 \leq j \leq l_{n}$, and built a nested digraph with dept $h$ whose root is $v_{j}^{n}$ that encodes compatible antichains that passes through each $v_{i}^{h}$ and $v_{j}^{n}$.

We introduce Nested Digraphs, the tool to find out compatible antichains in the linearized digraphs. In the world of Nested Digraphs, the set of labels plays the role of vertices. To avoid a heavy load, we discard unnecessary elements. Labels are the only fundamental elements and, as we advance our search, labels play the role of vertices and the connection if given by compatibility.

Up to now, we no longer need the set of literals, that played the role of vertices in the Linearized Digraph and whose sequences encode unsatisfiable combinations. We pursued for new strategy for solving a card, once we cleaned new paths. The maximal chains in the Closed Digraph were used to mark the unsatisfiable combinations and our search is centered on the search for a compatible antichain. So, we are dealing only with the set of labels.

It is time to discharge vertices and edges in the Linearized Digraph because these elements were used to mark unsatisfiable choices and we no
longer use them. We use lighter gadgets ruling out the set of vertices, the set of literals.

A sequence of linear digraphs of the form,

$$
a \stackrel{l_{1}}{\Rightarrow} b_{1} \stackrel{l_{2}}{\Rightarrow} \ldots \stackrel{l_{t}}{\Rightarrow} b_{t} \stackrel{l_{t+1}}{\Rightarrow} c
$$

corresponds to the sequence of edges

$$
l_{1} \rightarrow l_{2} \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow l_{t} \rightarrow l_{t+1}
$$

After modifying the closed digraph we write a digraph that marks the compatible antichains orthogonal to the chains of the Linearized Digraph. A result of an empty digraph signalizes no compatible antichains in the Linearized Digraphs and, as we show in this Section, no compatible antichain in $\mathcal{P}$.

Let $(r, s)$ be a enumeration of the pair column and location in the array of $k$ columns each with $m_{k}$ elements. Write the pair edge together with the enumeration. An edge $(p, i, j) \Rightarrow(q, i, j+1) \Rightarrow(r, i, j+2)$ belongs to column $i$ and the vertices belong to, respectively, the $j, j+1$ and $j+2$ places. Define,

Definition 3.18. Given a Linearized Digraph, define its Companion Digraph as the digraph whose vertices are the set of indexes associated with each edge of the linearized digraph. Define an edge $\left(l_{1}, i, j\right) \rightarrow\left(l_{2}, i, j+1\right)$ if there is a sequence $(p, i, j) \stackrel{l_{1}}{\Rightarrow}(q, i, j+1) \stackrel{l_{2}}{\Rightarrow}(r, i, j+2)$ in the linearized digraph.

If $(p, i, j) \stackrel{l_{1}}{\Rightarrow}(q, i, j+1) \stackrel{l_{2}}{\Rightarrow}(r, i, j+2)$ and $\left(p^{\prime}, i^{\prime}, j^{\prime}\right) \stackrel{l_{1}}{\Rightarrow}\left(q^{\prime}, i^{\prime}, j^{\prime}+1\right) \stackrel{l_{2}}{\Rightarrow}$ $\left(r^{\prime}, i^{\prime}, j^{\prime}+2\right)$ we have two distinct edges $\left(l_{1}, i, j\right) \rightarrow\left(l_{2}, i, j+1\right)$ and $\left(l_{1}, i^{\prime}, j^{\prime}\right) \rightarrow$ $\left(l_{2}, i^{\prime}, j^{\prime}+1\right)$, spite labels are the same.

We will not overload our manuscript. Distinct edges are originated from distinct columns and places. From now on we omit all extra notation and drop the pair column location.

Now, set the scene for building nested digraphs associated with each vertex (a label). We expect that a $k^{t h}$-interaction to generate an output satisfiable. We set the necessary definitions.

Definition 3.19. Let Lab be a Digraph and $v$ a vertex of Lab. An edgelabeled digraph for $v$ is a closed rooted digraph whose edges are labeled and whose root is $v$. We label the edges with a set of vertices, that is, there is a mapping from the set of edges of $\operatorname{Gr}(v)$ into sets of vertices.

$$
G(v)=\left\langle E_{v}, V_{v}, \text { label }_{v}: E_{v} \mapsto \mathcal{P}\left(E_{v}\right)\right\rangle
$$

The mapping labels $s_{v}$ associate to each edge a set of vertices and labels(v) is called the label of the vertex $v$.

We require, moreover, that all maximal sequences in $G$ length $p$ have length $p$.

Define the basic operations over labeled digraphs we perform to obtain a simpler digraph and, without altering the the state of the closed digraph concerning the question there are compatible antichains or not.

Definition 3.20. Given two labeled digraphs whose root is $v$,

$$
G r_{v}=\left\langle V_{v}, E_{v}, \text { labelsv }: V_{v} \mapsto \mathcal{P}\left(E_{v}\right)\right\rangle
$$

and

$$
G r_{v}^{\prime}=\left\langle V_{v}^{\prime}, E_{v}^{\prime}, \text { labelsv}{ }^{\prime}: E_{v}^{\prime} \mapsto \mathcal{P}\left(E_{v}\right)\right\rangle
$$

their union, $G r_{v} \cup G r_{v}^{\prime}$ is given by

$$
\left\langle V \cup V^{\prime}, E \cup E^{\prime}, \text { labels }{ }_{v}^{\prime \prime}: E \cup E^{\prime} \mapsto \mathcal{P}\left(V \cup V^{\prime}\right)\right\rangle
$$

where labels ${ }_{v}^{\prime \prime}: E \cup E^{\prime} \mapsto \mathcal{P}\left(V \cup V^{\prime}\right)$ is given by

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { labels } v_{v}^{\prime \prime}=\operatorname{label}(v), \text { if } v \in E_{v} \backslash E_{v}^{\prime} \\
& \operatorname{labels}_{v}^{\prime \prime}(v)=\operatorname{label}(v), \text { if } v \in E_{v}^{\prime} \backslash E_{v} \\
& \operatorname{labels}_{v}^{\prime \prime}(v)=\operatorname{label}(v) \cup \operatorname{label}^{\prime}(v), \text { if, } v \in E_{v} \cap E_{v}^{\prime}
\end{aligned}
$$

Their intersection is given by,

$$
\left\langle E_{v} \cap E_{v}^{\prime}, E_{v} \cap E_{v}^{\prime}, \text { labels }{ }^{\prime \prime}: E_{v} \cap E_{v}^{\prime} \mapsto \mathcal{P}\left(E_{v} \cap E_{v}^{\prime}\right)\right\rangle
$$

where labels ${ }^{\prime \prime}$ is given by labels ${ }^{\prime \prime}(v)=\operatorname{label}(v) \cap \operatorname{label}^{\prime}(v)$, if $v \in E_{v} \cap E_{v}^{\prime}$.
Definition 3.21 (Nested Digraph). A rooted edge-labeled digraph, $G r_{v}=$ $\left\langle V_{v}, E_{v}\right.$, labelsv : $\left.E_{v} \mapsto \mathcal{P}\left(E_{v}\right)\right\rangle$ is a nested digraph of length $p$ if $G r_{v}$ is the union of a number $s$ of linear digraphs of a fixed dept $p \geq 1$,

$$
v \leftarrow a_{i}^{2} \leftarrow a_{i}^{3} \leftarrow \cdots \leftarrow a_{i}^{p}
$$

so that for each linear digraph, we have label $\left(a_{i}^{i-1} \leftarrow a_{i}^{i}\right)=\left\{a_{i}^{p}, a_{i}^{p-1}, \ldots, a_{i}^{i}\right\}$, $1 \leq i \leq s$.

Notice that not necessarily vertices at each level $j, 1 \leq j \leq p$ are distinct but, at each distinct level, the vertex are pairwise distinct.

A compatible nested digraph of length $p$ is the union of linear digraphs of length $p$ whose labels are compatible sets.

Lemma 3.22. The union of two nested digraphs of depth $p, G(v)$ and $G(v)^{\prime}$ is a nested digraph.

The intersection of two nested digraphs of depth $p$ is not necessarily a nested digraph but we can select the maximal nested digraph contained in the intersection. Uniqueness follows from the fact that, given two nested maximal digraphs, $G(v)$ and $G(v)^{\prime}$, then the union of a nested digraph is nested and, therefore, we cannot have two distinct maximal nested digraphs contained in $G(v) \cap G(v)^{\prime}$.

The maximal nested digraph contained in the intersection of two nested digraphs, $G(v)$ and $G(v)^{\prime}$, contains the set of all compatible antichains contained in both $G(v)$ and $G(v)^{\prime}$.

Definition 3.23. Let $G(v)$ and $G(v)^{\prime}$ be two nested digraphs of depth $p$. Denote by $\max G(v)$ the Maximal Nested Subdigraph contained in $G(v) \cap$ $G(v)^{\prime}$.

Write an algorithm to obtain $\max G(v)$, the maximal nested digraph contained in an intersection of two nested digraphs. The idea behind the two algorithms is, first, from the lower level to the last level, to select nested linear branches. Thereafter, select nested linear branches of level $k$.

We present two algorithms we perform to obtain the maximal nested digraph contained in the intersection of two nested digraphs that share the same root.

Consider two nested digraphs and their intersection given by, respectively,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& G(v)^{\prime}=\left\langle V^{\prime}(v), E^{\prime}(v), \text { label }^{\prime}(v): E^{\prime}(v) \mapsto \mathcal{P}(V(v))\right\rangle \\
& G(v)^{\prime \prime}=\left\langle V^{\prime \prime}(v), E^{\prime \prime}(v), \text { label }{ }^{\prime \prime}(v): E^{\prime \prime}(v) \mapsto \mathcal{P}(V(v))\right\rangle \\
& G(v)=G(v)^{\prime} \cap G(v)^{\prime \prime}=\langle V(v), E(v), \operatorname{label}(v): E(v) \mapsto \mathcal{P}(V(v))\rangle
\end{aligned}
$$

There is an algorithm to write $\max G(v)$. Written below into two pseudo codes,

Pseudocode 3.24. Given a digraph $G(v)=\langle V, E$, label $\rangle$, intersection of two nested digraphs, using the first pseudocode obtain a new rooted digraph in which, using the second pseudocode we obtain $\max G(v)$.

We denote the vertices of the intersection by $v_{i}^{m}$, where $m$ is a level and $i$ is the position of the vertex in the level $m$ and $v=v_{1}^{0}$.

First Pseudocode: From $m:=0$, step 1 , to $k-2$, do:
For all edges $u_{i}^{m} \leftarrow v_{j}^{m+1}$, consider the vertices that form an ascending sequence of length 2 with $u_{i}^{m} \leftarrow v_{j}^{m+1}$, say, the set $\left\{w_{1}^{m+2}, \ldots, w_{l}^{m+2}\right\}$. For $s$
ranging from 1 to $l$, consider as provisional labels,

$$
\operatorname{lbl_{i,j,s}}\left(w_{s}^{m+2} \rightarrow v_{j}^{m+1}\right)=\operatorname{label}\left(w_{s}^{m+2} \rightarrow v_{j}^{m+1}\right) \cap \operatorname{label}\left(u_{j}^{m+1} \rightarrow v_{i}^{m}\right)
$$

Define,

$$
\operatorname{label}^{\prime}\left(u_{j}^{m+1} \rightarrow v_{i}^{m}\right)=\cup_{s} l b l_{i, j, s}\left(w_{l}^{m+2} \rightarrow v_{j}^{m+1}\right) \cup\left\{v_{j}^{m+1}\right\}
$$

Once we defined all labels, label $\left(u_{j}^{m+1} \rightarrow v_{i}^{m}\right)$, define

$$
\operatorname{label}\left(w_{s}^{m+2} \rightarrow v_{j}^{m+1}\right)=\cup_{i} l b l_{i, j, s}\left(w_{s}^{m+2} \rightarrow v_{j}^{m+1}\right)
$$

and, finally, label $\left(u_{j}^{m+1} \rightarrow v_{i}^{m}\right) \leftarrow \operatorname{label}^{\prime}\left(u_{j}^{m+1} \rightarrow v_{i}^{m}\right)$.
The final result of applying the first pseudocode is the union of linear digraphs ordered by $\supseteq$.

Second Pseudocode: The second pseudocode is summarized below. We search backwards, for $m:=k$ STEP - 1 UNTIL 2 .

For all edges $\left(u_{i}^{m} \rightarrow v_{j}^{m-1}\right)$ so that $u_{i}^{m} \in \operatorname{label}\left(u_{i}^{m} \rightarrow v_{j}^{m-1}\right)$, define $G_{u_{i}^{m} v_{j}^{m-1}}$ as the union of all linear sequences

$$
w_{r_{k}}^{k} \rightarrow w_{r_{k-1}}^{k-1} \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow u_{i}^{m} \rightarrow v_{j}^{m-1} \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow v
$$

where $\left\{u_{i}^{m}, v_{j}^{m-1}\right\}$ is contained in all labels of degree lower than $m-1$.
For all $e$ in $G r_{u_{i}^{m} v_{j}^{m-1}}$, define,

$$
\operatorname{label}(e)=\left(\operatorname{label}(e) \backslash\left\{u_{p}^{m}, v_{q}^{m-1} \mid p \neq i A N D q \neq j\right\}\right.
$$

Define $G(v)$ as the union of all digraphs $G r_{u_{i}^{m} v_{j}^{m-1}}$ and proceed to the preceding level.

In the second procedure, we rule out all edges whose labels do not comply with the rules of nested digraphs. Indeed, for all edge $v_{i}^{k} \rightarrow v_{j}^{k-1}$ so that $v_{i}^{k} \in \operatorname{label}\left(v_{i}^{k} \rightarrow v_{j}^{k-1}\right)$, select all linear digraphs whose label contain $\left\{v_{i}^{k}, v_{j}^{k-1}\right\}$ and let label ${v_{i}^{k}, v_{j}^{k-1}}(e)$ be label $(e) \backslash\left\{v \mid v \neq v_{i}^{k}\right.$ OR $\left.v_{j}^{k-1}\right\}$. Let $G(v)$ be the union of all linear digraphs for all edges $v_{i}^{k} \rightarrow v_{j}^{k-1}$. Obtain the union of all nested linear sequences at level $k$. As we descend levels, obtain a nested digraph.

We show that we obtain a nested digraph that is the maximal nested digraph contained in the intersection of two nested digraphs that share the same root.

Proposition $3.25(\max G(v))$. Using Pseudocodes 3.24, given two nested digraphs, $G(v)^{\prime}$ and $G(v)^{\prime \prime}$, obtain $\max G(v)$.

Proof. Define,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& l b l_{i, j, s}\left(w_{s}^{m+2} \rightarrow v_{j}^{m+1}\right)=\operatorname{label}\left(w_{s}^{m+2} \rightarrow v_{j}^{m+1}\right) \cap \operatorname{label}\left(u_{j}^{m+1} \rightarrow v_{i}^{m}\right) \\
& \operatorname{label}\left(w_{s}^{m+2} \rightarrow v_{j}^{m+1}\right)=\cup_{i} l b l_{i, j, m}\left(w_{s}^{m+2} \rightarrow v_{j}^{m+1}\right) \\
& \operatorname{label}\left(u_{j}^{m+1} \rightarrow v_{i}^{m}\right)=\cup_{l} l b l\left(w_{l}^{m+2} \rightarrow v_{j}^{m+1}\right) \cup\left\{v_{j}^{m+1}\right\}
\end{aligned}
$$

Deduce from the previous sentences that $\operatorname{label}\left(u_{j}^{m+1} \rightarrow v_{i}^{m}\right)$ is the union, ranging over all $s$, of $l b l\left(w_{l}^{m+2} \rightarrow v_{j}^{m+1}\right)$ and $\operatorname{label}\left(w_{s}^{m+2} \rightarrow v_{j}^{m+1}\right)$ is the union of all temporally labels $l b l\left(w_{l}^{m+2} \rightarrow v_{j}^{m+1}\right)$ and, thus, we obtain, using the first algorithm, the union of linear digraphs whose labels are ordered by $\subseteq$ as follows,

$$
u_{i}^{m} \rightarrow v_{i}^{m-1} \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow v
$$

with label $\left(u_{i}^{r} \rightarrow v_{i}^{r-1}\right) \subseteq \operatorname{label}\left(u_{i}^{r-1} \rightarrow v_{i}^{m r-2}\right)$.
Using the second pseudocode, each $G_{u_{i}^{m} v_{j}^{m-1}}$ is built after a selection of all linear chains so that $\left\{u_{i}^{m}, v_{j}^{m-1}\right\}$ is contained in the label of all edges of dept lower than $m-1 . G_{u_{i}^{m} v_{j}^{m-1}}$ is modified by ruling out all labels of the form $\left\{w_{s}^{r} \mid(r=m\right.$ IMPLIES $s \neq i)$ AND $(r=m-1$ IMPLIES $s \neq j\}$. In this way, we keep only the linear arrays of depth $k$ so that it its edges of length less than $m$ contain $\left\{u_{i}^{m}, v_{j}^{m-1}\right\}$ in their label, and, in that way, $G_{u_{i}^{m} v_{j}^{m-1}}$ agree to the rules of a nested digraph regarding the edges in a level lower than $m-1$.

Define $G(v)$ as the union of all $G_{u_{i}^{m} v_{j}^{m-1}}$. Conclude that, as we work backward, from $k=m$, each step negative, and conclude, as we work at steps -1 that we obtain a nested digraph.

The search for $\max G(v)$ is polynomially bounded, as we show in the analysis of computational boundaries in Proposition 5.6.

After writing the Linearized Digraph, we must filter all compatible antichains. We write a nested compatible digraph associated with each vertex $v$.

These digraphs associated with root $v_{j}^{m}$ are recursively created in iteration with each vertex $v_{i}^{n}$, for 1 to $m-1$, for $1 \leq i \leq k_{m}$. A non-empty final result generates an output there are compatible antichains and, otherwise, there are no compatible antichains. Any path in the digraph is an antichain in the linearized digraph and, reciprocally, any antichain is a path in the Linearized digraph. Write a nested digraph associated with each edge of this digraph from the Linearized Digraph. Edges will play the role of vertices and the arrows connecting the vertices are labeled. We will obtain labeled digraphs whose labels are the pointers of compatible antichains.

We will, from the first column act from the second column until depth $k^{t h}$ and obtain a nested digraph, whose root is the vertex associated with the $v_{i}^{r}$ vertex, $2 \leq r \leq m$ and $1 \leq i \leq l_{r}$.

In the $h^{t h}$ iteration, we associate to each vertex $v_{i}^{h}, h+1 \leq r \leq m$ and $1 \leq i \leq l_{h}$, a nested digraph of depth $h$.

The search for $\max G(v)$ is polynomially bounded, as we show in the analysis of computational boundaries in Proposition 5.6.

Procedure 3.26 (Linear Digraphs). Given a linearized digraph endowed with $p$ branches, $B r=\left\{B_{1}, \ldots, B_{k}\right\}$, for all $1<i \leq l$, we will write a set of nested digraphs for each vertex $e_{j}^{t}, 1<t \leq k$ and $1 \leq j \leq l_{t}$. The $k^{t h}$ step generates either:
Empty digraphs and an output, there are no compatible antichains or Non empty digraphs and an output, there are compatible antichains.

Step 1: For all $e_{i}^{1}$ in the first branch, $B r_{1}$, for all $e_{j}^{r}, 2 \leq r \leq l$, if $e_{i}^{1}$ and $e_{r}^{j}$ are compatible, write the digraph,

$$
G\left(e_{j}^{r}, e_{i}^{1}\right)=\left\langle\left\{e_{i}^{1}, e_{j}^{r}\right\},\left\{e_{j}^{r} \rightarrow e_{i}^{1}\right\},\left(\text { label }^{1}\right)_{j}^{r}\left(e_{j}^{r} \rightarrow e_{j}^{1}\right)=\left\{e_{i}^{1}\right\}\right\rangle
$$

Define $G\left(e_{j}^{r}\right)$ as the union of all $G\left(e_{j}^{r}, e^{1 i}\right), 1 \leq i \leq k_{1}$.
All vertices in the columns $i, 2 \leq i \leq k$ are form an edge with the compatible vertices in the first column.

Step r: Suppose we performed all steps from 1 to $r-1$ and obtained nested digraphs.

Let $G\left(v_{j}^{s}\right)=\left\langle V_{v_{j}^{s}}, E_{v_{j}^{s}}\right.$, label $\left._{v_{j}^{s}}\right\rangle$ be nested rooted digraph of depth $r-1$, associated to the vertices $v_{j}^{s}, r \leq s \leq k, 1 \leq j \leq l_{s}$.

For all $G\left(v_{i}^{r}\right), 1 \leq i \leq l_{r}$, for all $v_{j}^{s}, s>r, 1 \leq j \leq k_{s}$, if $v_{i}^{r}$, and $v_{j}^{s}$ are compatible, replace the (root) vertex $v_{i}^{r}$ in $G\left(v_{i}^{r}\right)$ by $v_{j}^{s}$. Obtain the digraph $G\left(v_{i}^{r} / v_{j}^{s}\right)$.

1. Let $G\left(v_{j}^{s}, v_{i}^{r}\right)^{\prime \prime \prime}$ be the intersection of $G\left(v_{i}^{r} / v_{j}^{s}\right)$ and $G\left(v_{j}^{s}\right)$;
2. Let $\max G\left(v_{j}^{s}, v_{i}^{r}\right)=\left\langle\left(V_{j}^{\prime \prime s}\right)_{i}^{r},\left(E_{j}^{\prime \prime s}\right)_{i}^{r},\left(\text { label } l_{j}^{s}\right)_{i}^{r}\right\rangle$ be the maximal nested digraph contained in $G\left(v_{j}^{s}, v_{i}^{r}\right)^{\prime \prime \prime}$;
3. Define $G\left(v_{j}^{s}, v_{i}^{r}\right)^{\prime}=\left\langle\left(V_{j}^{\prime s}\right)_{i}^{r},\left(E_{j}^{\prime s}\right)_{i}^{r}\right.$, label $\left.l_{0}^{s j r i}\right\rangle$ as

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\left(V_{j}^{\prime s}\right)_{i}^{r}= & \left(V_{j}^{\prime \prime s}\right)_{i}^{r} \cup\left\{v_{i}^{r}\right\} \\
\left(E_{j}^{\prime s}\right)_{i}^{r}= & \left(E_{j}^{\prime \prime s}\right)_{i}^{r} \cup\left\{v \leftarrow v_{i}^{r} \mid v \text { belongs to level } r-1\right\} \\
\left(\text { label } j_{i}^{r}(e)=\right. & \text { label } l_{i}^{r} v_{j}^{s}(e) \cup\left\{v_{i}^{r}\right\} \\
\left.(\text { label })_{j}^{s}\right)_{i}^{r}\left(v_{i}^{r} \rightarrow v\right)= & \left\{v_{i}^{r}\right\}
\end{array}
$$

Define $G\left(v_{j}^{s}\right)$ as the union of all $G\left(v_{j}^{s}, v_{i}^{r}\right)^{\prime}$.
Call the set of nested antichains to the set of digraphs obtained at each vertex of level $p$.

Theorem 3.27. For all vertex $v$, the digraph $G(v)$, 3.26, is a compatible nested digraph.

Proof. In the first step, the sequences have the form $e \rightarrow v_{i}^{1}$, if both edges are compatible. The label associated to the sequences $e \rightarrow v_{i}^{1}$ is $v_{i}^{1}$. The union of such digraphs is a compatible nested digraph.

At the step $r$, we replace the vertex $G\left(v_{r i}\right)$ by $v_{s j}$, intersect $G\left(v_{i}^{r} / v_{j}^{s}\right)$ and $G\left(v_{j}^{s}\right)$. By construction, $\max \left(G\left(v_{i}^{r} / v_{j}^{s}\right) \cap G\left(v_{j}^{s}\right)\right)$ is the biggest compatible nested digraph contained in $G\left(v_{i}^{r} / v_{j}^{s}\right) \cap G\left(v_{j}^{s}\right)$.

The digraph $G\left(v_{j}^{s}, v_{i}^{r}\right)^{\prime}$ was obtained by adding the vertex $v_{i}^{r}$, compatible with all vertices in $G\left(v_{i}^{r} / v_{j}^{s}\right) \cap G\left(v_{j}^{s}\right)$.

Lastly, the union all $G\left(v_{j}^{s}, v_{i}^{r}\right)$ is compatible because it is the union of compatible digraphs.

Finally, highlight that we reached our claim. We show that the nested digraphs, if non-empty, contain all compatible antichains.

Definition 3.28. Call a maximal nested path over a nested digraph to any maximal path

$$
v^{k} \rightarrow v^{k-1} \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow v^{2} \rightarrow v
$$

so that for all $1 \leq i \leq k-2, \operatorname{label}\left(v^{i}, v^{i+1}\right) \subseteq \operatorname{label}\left(v^{i+1}, v^{i+2}\right)$.
Identify the set of all maximal nested paths over a nested digraph with the set of maximal compatible antichains. Conclude,

Theorem 3.29. A pivoted 3-sat $\Psi$ is unsatisfiable if and only if the $k^{t h}$ iteration of nested antichains are empty.

## 4 A Pivoted Strong Version of a 3-sat Formula

Arbitrarily choose pairs of literals $S^{0}=\left\{p_{01}, \neg p_{01}, \ldots, p_{0 k}, \neg p_{0 k}\right\}$ and factorize $\Psi$.

$$
\left(p_{01} \vee S_{p_{01}}\right) \wedge\left(\neg p_{01} \vee S_{\neg p_{01}}\right) \wedge \cdots \wedge\left(p_{0 k} \vee S_{p_{0 k}}\right) \wedge\left(\neg p_{0 k} \vee S_{\neg p_{0 k}}\right) \wedge S_{3}^{1}
$$

so that none of the literals of $S^{0}$ appears in any formula in the set of formulas $\left\{S_{p_{01}}, S_{\neg p_{01}}, \ldots, S_{p_{0 k}}, S_{\neg p_{0 k}}, S_{3}^{1}\right\}$.

Successively, do the partitions:

$$
\begin{aligned}
S_{3}^{1} \equiv & \left(p_{11} \vee S_{p_{11}}\right) \wedge\left(\neg p_{11} \vee S_{\neg p_{11}}\right) \wedge \cdots \wedge\left(p_{1 k_{1}} \vee S_{p_{1 k_{1}}}\right) \wedge\left(\neg p_{1 k_{1}} \vee S_{\neg p_{1 k_{1}}}\right) \\
& \wedge S_{3}^{2} \\
S_{3}^{2} \equiv & \left(p_{21} \vee S_{p_{21}}\right) \wedge\left(\neg p_{21} \vee S_{\neg p_{21}}\right) \wedge \cdots \wedge\left(p_{2 k_{2}} \vee S_{p_{2 k_{2}}}\right) \wedge\left(\neg p_{2 k_{2}} \vee S_{\neg p_{2 k_{2}}}\right) \\
& \wedge S_{3}^{3} \\
\ldots & \\
S_{3}^{h} \equiv & \left(p_{h 1} \vee S_{p_{h 1}}\right) \wedge\left(\neg p_{h 1} \vee S_{\neg p_{h 1}}\right) \wedge \ldots \wedge\left(p_{h k_{h}} \vee S_{p_{h k_{h}}}\right) \wedge\left(\neg p_{h k_{h}} \vee S_{\neg p_{h k_{h}}}\right) \\
& \wedge S_{\top}
\end{aligned}
$$

where $S_{\mathrm{T}}$ is either a $\mathbf{2}$ - sat formula or the formula T .
Finally, obtain the below partition:


We show that there is a modified pivoted 3 -sat, $\Psi_{T}$ so that $\Psi_{T}$ is unsatisfiable if and only if $\Psi$ is unsatisfiable.

Let

$$
\left\{r_{21}, \neg r_{21}, \ldots, r_{1 k_{1}}, \neg r_{1 k_{1}}, \ldots, r_{h 1}, \neg r_{h 1}, \ldots, r_{h k_{h}}, \neg r_{h_{h}}\right\}
$$

be a set of literals disjoint from the set $\operatorname{Letter}(\Psi)$. Let $\Psi_{T}$ be,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left(p_{11} \vee S_{p_{11}}\right) \wedge\left(\neg p_{11} \vee S_{\neg p_{11}}\right) \wedge \cdots \wedge\left(p_{1 k_{1}} \vee S_{p_{1 k_{1}}}\right) \wedge\left(\neg p_{1 k_{1}} \vee S_{\neg p_{1 k_{1}}}\right) \wedge \\
& \left(r_{21} \vee\left(S_{p_{21}} \wedge \neg p_{21}\right)\right) \wedge\left(\neg r_{21} \vee\left(S_{\neg p_{21}} \wedge p_{21}\right)\right) \wedge \cdots \wedge \\
& \left(r_{2 k_{2}} \vee\left(S_{p_{2 k_{2}}} \wedge \neg p_{2 k_{2}}\right)\right) \wedge\left(\neg r_{2 k_{2}} \vee\left(S_{\neg p_{2 k_{2}}} \wedge p_{2 k_{2}}\right)\right) \wedge \cdots \wedge \\
& \left(r_{h 1} \vee\left(S_{p_{h 1}} \wedge \neg p_{h 1}\right)\right) \wedge\left(\neg r_{h 1} \vee\left(S_{\neg p_{h 1}} \wedge p_{h 1}\right)\right) \wedge \cdots \wedge \\
& \left(r_{h k_{h}} \vee\left(S_{p_{h 1}} \wedge \neg p_{h 1}\right)\right) \wedge\left(\neg r_{h k_{h}} \vee\left(S_{\neg p_{h 1}} \wedge p_{h 1}\right)\right) \wedge\left(t \vee S_{T}\right) \wedge\left(\neg t \vee S_{T}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

Write $\Psi$ as its factorized version,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left(p_{11} \vee S_{p_{11}}\right) \wedge\left(\neg p_{11} \vee S_{\neg p_{11}}\right) \wedge \cdots \wedge\left(p_{1 k_{1}} \vee S_{p_{1 k_{1}}}\right) \wedge\left(\neg p_{1 k_{1}} \vee S_{\neg p_{1 k_{1}}}\right) \\
& \left(p_{21} \vee S_{p_{21}}\right) \wedge\left(\neg p_{21} \vee S_{\neg p_{21}}\right) \wedge \cdots \wedge\left(p_{2 k_{2}} \vee S_{p_{2 k_{2}}}\right) \wedge\left(\neg p_{2 k_{2}} \vee S_{\neg p_{2 k_{2}}}\right) \\
& \wedge\left(\neg p_{2 k_{2}} \vee S_{\neg p_{2 k_{2}}}\right) \\
& \cdots \\
& \left(p_{h 1} \vee S_{p_{h 1}}\right) \wedge\left(\neg p_{h 1} \vee S_{\neg p_{h 1}}\right) \wedge . \wedge\left(p_{h k_{h}} \vee S_{p_{h k_{h}}}\right) \wedge\left(\neg p_{h k_{h}} \vee S_{\neg p_{h k_{h}}}\right) \\
& \wedge S_{\top}
\end{aligned}
$$

We show that $\Psi_{T}$ is unsatisfiable if and only if $\Psi$ is unsatisfiable.
Let $\Sigma$ be the set of all mappings from $\left\{11, \ldots, 1 k_{1}, \ldots, h 1, \ldots, h k_{h}\right\}$ onto $\{$ True, false $\}$. Note that $\Sigma$ has $2^{k_{1}+\cdots+k_{h}}$ elements.

For $/ \sigma \in / \sigma$, for all conjugated pair $\left\{p_{u v}, \neg p_{u v}\right\}, 1 \leq u \leq h$ and $1 \leq v \leq k_{v}$, let $\epsilon_{u v}=p_{u v}$, if $/ \sigma\left(p_{u v}\right)=$ True and, otherwise, $\epsilon_{u v}=\neg p_{u v}$. Let $v_{u v}$ be $r_{u v}$ if $\epsilon_{u v}=\neg p_{u v}$ and, othervise $v_{u v}=\neg r_{u v}$. Take the notation $F / / \sigma$ as the substituition of all literals in $F$ by its value over $/ \sigma$.

Using the valuation $/ \sigma$, we have, respectively, for $\Psi$ and $\Psi_{T}$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& S_{\neg \epsilon_{11}} / \sigma \wedge \cdots \wedge S_{\neg \epsilon_{1 k_{1}}} / \sigma \wedge S_{\neg \epsilon_{21}} / \sigma \wedge \cdots \wedge S_{\neg \epsilon_{2 k_{2}}} / \sigma \wedge \cdots \wedge \\
& S_{\neg \epsilon_{h 1}} / \sigma \wedge \cdots \wedge S_{\neg \epsilon_{h k_{h}}} / \sigma \wedge S_{\top} \\
& S_{\neg \epsilon_{11}} / \sigma \wedge \cdots \wedge S_{\neg \epsilon_{1 k_{1}}} / \sigma \wedge \neg v_{21} \wedge\left(v_{21} \vee S_{\neg \epsilon_{21}} / \sigma\right) \wedge \cdots \wedge \\
& \neg v_{2 k_{2}} \wedge\left(v_{2 k_{2}} \vee S_{\neg \epsilon_{2 k_{2}}} / \sigma\right) \wedge \neg v_{h 1} \wedge\left(v_{h 1} \vee S_{\neg \epsilon_{h 1}} / \sigma\right) \wedge \cdots \wedge \\
& \neg v_{h k_{h}} \wedge\left(v_{h k_{h}} \vee S_{\neg \epsilon_{h 1}} / \sigma\right) \wedge S_{\top}
\end{aligned}
$$

Whether at least one $\neg v_{l m}$ is false then, $\Psi_{T}$ is false,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& S_{\neg \epsilon_{11}} / \sigma \wedge \cdots \wedge S_{\neg \epsilon_{1 k_{1}}} / \sigma \wedge \neg v_{21} \wedge\left(v_{21} \vee S_{\neg \epsilon_{21}} / \sigma\right) \wedge \cdots \wedge \\
& \neg v_{2 k_{2}} \wedge\left(v_{2 k_{2}} \vee S_{\neg \epsilon_{2 k_{2}}} / \sigma\right) \wedge \neg v_{h 1} \wedge\left(v_{h 1} \vee S_{\neg \epsilon_{h 1}} / \sigma\right) \wedge \cdots \wedge \\
& \neg v_{h k_{h}} \wedge\left(v_{h k_{h}} / \sigma \vee S_{\neg \epsilon_{h 1}} / \sigma\right) \wedge S_{\mathrm{T}}
\end{aligned}
$$

Otherwise, all $\neg v_{l m}$ is true and $\Psi_{T}$ is

$$
\begin{aligned}
& S_{\neg \epsilon_{11}} / \sigma \wedge \cdots \wedge S_{\neg \epsilon_{1 k_{1}}} / \sigma \wedge S_{\neg \epsilon_{21}} / \sigma \wedge \cdots \wedge \\
& S_{\neg \epsilon_{2 k_{2}}} / \sigma \wedge S_{\neg \epsilon_{h 1}} / \sigma \wedge \cdots \wedge S_{\neg \epsilon_{h 1}} / \sigma \wedge S_{\top}
\end{aligned}
$$

and, under this conitions of valuation, $\Psi$ is unsatisfiable if and only if $\Psi_{T}$ is unsatisfiable.

## 5 Bounds on Computation

Open this section with the study of the bounds in Space, $\operatorname{SPACE}(f(n))$ and in time, $\mathcal{O}(f(n))$. Both bounds ensure that we do not trade space by time or vice-versa in our considerations.

Given a card $\mathcal{C}$, we follow the polynomially bounded steps

1. Write the cylindrical digraph;
2. Write the closed digraphs;
3. Write the linearized digraph;
4. Write the maximal nested digraphs. A special care has to be taken on writing the maximal nested digraph contained in an intersection.

We prove less straightforward bounds in time and space.
Lemma 5.1. The cylindrical digraph, $\mathbb{C} l n d r=\langle V, E, l a b e l\rangle$ is written in polynomial time and space.

Proof. The size of $\mathbb{C l n d r}$-graph is given by

1. The size of $V$, the set of vertices is the size of literals, $L$;
2. The size of $E$ is bounded by the square of the number of literals, $L$ $|E| \leq|L|^{2}$. Indeed, the arrows are bounded by the number of arrows in a polyhedron with $|L|$ sides.

There is an algorithm polynomially bounded in time to write a closed digraph. We describe the polynomial in time search for nonempty intervals $[a, \neg a]$. Recall that no loops are allowed. Indeed, if we write a loop, that means that if an incompatible combination $\operatorname{Inc}=i j_{1}, \ldots, i j_{r}$, any combination that contains Inc is likewise incompatible.

Divide the search algorithm into two procedures,

1. Write $[a, q[$, the subdigraph of $\mathcal{C S D}$ of all sequences connected to $a$ (no specified end, just source, $a$ );
2. If $[a, q[\neq \varnothing$, from $[a, q[$, write $[a, \neg a]$, the subdigraph of paths between $a$ and $\neg a$ contained in $[a, q[$.

Part I, write an Interval $[a, q[$

Input cylindrical digraph $C y l=\langle V, E, l a b e l\rangle$.
$\left[a, q\left[=\langle\{a\}, \varnothing, \varnothing\rangle=\left\langle V_{[a, q[ }, E_{[a, q[ }\right.\right.\right.$, label $\left._{[a, q[ }\right\rangle$
$E_{a u x}=E \backslash E_{[a, q[ } \quad$ \# No loops
while $E_{a u x} \neq \varnothing$ do

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \quad E_{[a, q[ } \leftarrow E_{[a, q[ } \cup\left\{c \Rightarrow b \mid c \in V_{[a, q[ } A N D c \Rightarrow b \in E\right. \\
& V_{[a, q[ } \leftarrow V_{[a, q[ } \cup\left\{b \mid \exists c \in V_{[a, q[ }\left(c \Rightarrow b \in E_{a u x}\right)\right\} \\
& \quad l_{a b e l_{[a, q[ }} \leftarrow \operatorname{label}_{[a, q[ } \cup\left\{\operatorname{label}(c \Rightarrow b) \mid \exists c \in V_{[a, q[ }\left(c \Rightarrow b \in E_{a u x}\right)\right\} \\
& E_{a u x}=E \backslash E_{[a, q[ } \\
& \text { end while }
\end{aligned}
$$

Once we obtain $\left[a, q\left[=\left\langle V_{[a, q[ }, E_{[a, q[ }\right.\right.\right.$, label $\left._{[a, q[ }\right\rangle$, if $\neg a \in V_{[a, q[ }$, we perform the above algorithm to $[a, q[$, taking care to search over arrows $b \Rightarrow \neg a$ and obtain $[a, \neg a]$.

The set of digraphs $[a, \neg a]$ is bounded by the number of vertexes in the cylindrical digraph and each $[a, \neg a]$ has its set of vertices and labels bounded by the number of vertices and labels in the cylindrical digraph and, therefore, we wrote no more than $|E|$ digraphs that are bounded by $|E|$ vertices and $|E|^{2}$ edges.

Observation 5.2. Once we work iteratively with $E \backslash E_{[a, q[ }$, we avoid sequences of the form,

$$
r \Rightarrow q_{1} \Rightarrow \cdots \Rightarrow r
$$

that is, we do not have loops.
Let us scrutinize the size of the closed digraph.
Lemma 5.3. The set of closed digraphs is the union of at most $|L|$ digraphs with $|L|^{2}$ vertices and $|L|^{2}$ edges.
Proof. The set of necessarily true pairs has, at most, the size of $|L|$, the number of literals. Each interval $[\neg p, p]$ has its size bounded by the size of the closed digraphs, that is, at most $|L|$ vertices and $|L|^{2}$ edges.

Obtain the union of, at most, $|L|$ digraphs with $|L|$ vertices and $|L|^{2}$ edges, SPACE $\left(|L|^{3}\right)$.

Lemma 5.4. The search for the set of closed digraphs is polynomial in time and space.
Proof. We perform at most $|L|$ searches, one to each interval $[p, \neg p]$ for $p \in L$.
Our search goes over the number of vertices

$$
\begin{aligned}
& |V|-1 \\
& |V|-1-r_{1} \\
& \vdots \\
& |V|-1-r_{1}-\cdots-r_{q}
\end{aligned}
$$

under the conditioning $1+r_{1}+\cdots+r_{q}=V$, which leads to a maximum $r_{1}=\cdots=r_{q}=V / q$ and the search goes to a top of $|V|^{2}$ searches over $|V|$ vertices and the search is bonded by $|V|^{3}$ both in time and space.

Our process continues analyzing the effort to Lift, Multiply Branches and the Addition of Label. After that, we must analyze the whole process of writing the nested digraphs associated with each edge.

Proposition 5.5. Given a closed digraph, the operations of Lifting, Adding Labels and Multiplying Branches are linearly bounded.

Proof. Lifting together with Multiplication of branches multiply the number of any branching $a$ accordingly to the maximum of branches in $U p(a)$ or Down(a).

Adding Label adds several new labels to, at most the number of edges in the closed digraph its addition is bounded by the number of branching and Multiplication of branches is bounded by the maximum number of branches.

Proposition 5.6. Given two nested rooted digraphs, the operation of writing the maximal nested digraph contained in their intersection is linearly bounded.

Proof. In the first algorithm, the union of linear digraphs whose labels are ordered by $\subseteq$. We operate over a maximum of $|V|^{2}$ edges in a level $m$ and each edge can interact with $|V|^{2}$ edges in a level $m+1$. Obtain at most $|V|^{2} \times|V|^{2}$ interactions over at most $\mid V$ levels, that is, a maximum of $|V|^{5}$ interactions.

The worst bound in the above operation will cost us a visit in at most $|V|$ edges where we use simple operations to obtain $l b l\left(v_{j}^{m+1} \rightarrow v_{i}^{m}\right)$ and the intersection of the labels (in the intersection) of $\operatorname{label}\left(v_{j}^{m+1} \rightarrow v_{i}^{m}\right)$ and label $\left(v_{j}^{m+2} \rightarrow v_{j}^{m * 1}\right)$,

In the second pseudocode, we write, for any edge $u_{i}^{m} \rightarrow v_{j}^{m-1}$ the tree of all edges starting with edges $\left.v_{j}^{m-1}\right) \rightarrow v_{s}^{m-2}$ that have $\left\{u_{i}^{m}, v_{j}^{m-1}\right.$ in their label. Proceed in descending order until reaching the root. Prune edges that don't reach the root, that is, edges of the form $v \rightarrow w$ so that there is no edge $w \rightarrow u$.

Each edge visits, in a maximum of $|V|^{2}$ edges. We have, in the worse case, are bounded by the number of closed digraphs, an use of dimension $|L|^{3}$. so, we search $|V|^{5}$ in time.

## 6 Examples

Example 6.1. Consider the $\mathcal{C S D}$,


We do not focus on the compatibility among vertices. It is not relevant for this analysis.

The task of writing the chains is clearly expsize, as we show below

| $p_{1}$ | $p_{1}$ | $p_{1}$ | $p_{1}$ | $p_{1}$ | $p_{1}$ | $p_{1}$ | $p_{1}$ | $p_{2}$ | $p_{2}$ | $p_{2}$ | $p_{2}$ | $p_{2}$ | $p_{2}$ | $p_{2}$ | $p_{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $p_{3}$ | $p_{3}$ | $p_{3}$ | $p_{3}$ | $p_{4}$ | $p_{4}$ | $p_{4}$ | $p_{4}$ | $p_{3}$ | $p_{3}$ | $p_{3}$ | $p_{3}$ | $p_{4}$ | $p_{4}$ | $p_{4}$ | $p_{4}$ |
| $p_{5}$ | $p_{5}$ | $p_{6}$ | $p_{6}$ | $p_{5}$ | $p_{5}$ | $p_{6}$ | $p_{6}$ | $p_{5}$ | $p_{5}$ | $p_{6}$ | $p_{6}$ | $p_{5}$ | $p_{5}$ | $p_{6}$ | $p_{6}$ |
| $p_{7}$ | $p_{8}$ | $p_{7}$ | $p_{8}$ | $p_{7}$ | $p_{8}$ | $p_{7}$ | $p_{8}$ | $p_{7}$ | $p_{8}$ | $p_{7}$ | $p_{8}$ | $p_{7}$ | $p_{8}$ | $p_{7}$ | $p_{8}$ |
| Solve using our method. Multiply roots, |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



Add labels, obtain,


Lifting,


Add labels, obtain,


## Lifting,



Lifting,

| $p_{1}$ | $p_{1}$ | $p_{2}$ | $p_{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| " | " | " | " |
| $\neg a \neg b \neg c$ | $\neg a \neg b \neg d$ | $\neg a \neg b \neg c$ | $\neg a \neg b \neg d$ |
| $p_{3}$ | $p_{4}$ | $p_{3}$ | $p_{4}$ |
| $\neg$ - ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | $\neg b d$ | $\neg b c$ | $\neg$ ad |
| $p_{5}$ | $p_{6}$ | $p_{6}$ | $p_{5}$ |
| ${ }^{\prime \prime}$ | " | " | " |
| $\stackrel{a c}{\text { ¢ }}$ | ${ }^{\text {b }}$, | $\stackrel{\text { b }}{ }$ | $\stackrel{\text { ad }}{ }$ |
| $p_{7}$ | $p_{7}$ | $p_{8}$ | $p_{8}$ |

The only possible compatible combinations, accordingly to compatibility of labels we added, besides computing original compatibility, is,

$$
\begin{aligned}
p_{5} & \Rightarrow p_{7}, p_{5} \Rightarrow p_{8}, p_{6} \Rightarrow p_{7}, p_{6} \Rightarrow p_{8} \\
p_{5} & \Rightarrow p_{7}, p_{4} \Rightarrow p_{6}, p_{3} \Rightarrow p_{6}, p_{5} \Rightarrow p_{8} \\
p_{3} & \Rightarrow p_{5}, p_{6} \Rightarrow p_{7}, p_{6} \Rightarrow p_{8}, p_{4} \Rightarrow p_{5} \\
p_{3} & \Rightarrow p_{5}, p_{4} \Rightarrow p_{6}, p_{3} \Rightarrow p_{6}, p_{4} \Rightarrow p_{5} \\
p_{1} & \Rightarrow p_{3}, p_{1} \Rightarrow p_{4}, p_{2} \Rightarrow p_{3}, p_{2} \Rightarrow p_{4}
\end{aligned}
$$

Example 6.2. Consider the two pivoted formulas,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Psi_{1}= & a_{1} \vee\left(\left(p_{1} \vee q_{1}\right) \wedge\left(p_{1} \vee \neg q_{1}\right)\right) \wedge \neg a_{1} \vee\left(\left(p_{1} \vee q_{1}\right) \wedge\left(p_{1} \vee \neg q_{1}\right)\right) \wedge \\
& a_{2} \vee\left(\left(\neg p_{1} \vee q_{2}\right) \wedge\left(\neg p_{1} \vee \neg q_{2}\right)\right) \wedge \neg a_{2} \vee\left(\left(p_{1} \vee q_{2}\right) \wedge\left(p_{1} \vee \neg q_{2}\right)\right) \\
\Psi_{2}= & a_{1} \vee\left(\left(p_{1} \vee q_{1}\right) \wedge\left(\neg p_{1} \vee q_{2}\right)\right) \wedge \neg a_{1} \vee\left(\left(p_{1} \vee q_{1}\right) \wedge\left(\neg p_{1} \vee q_{2}\right)\right) \wedge \\
& a_{2} \vee\left(\left(p_{1} \vee \neg q_{1}\right) \wedge\left(\neg p_{1} \vee \neg q_{2}\right)\right) \wedge \neg a_{2} \vee\left(\left(p_{1} \vee \neg q_{1}\right) \wedge\left(\neg p_{1} \vee q_{2}\right)\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

The formulas $\Psi_{1}$ and $\Psi_{2}$ are, respectively, unsatisfiable and satisfiable. Write a fragment of the closed digraph,


In the case of $\Psi_{1}$, the labels in $A, B, C$ and $D$ are $a_{1}, \neg a_{1}$ and $E, F, G$ and $H$, are $a_{2}, \neg a_{2}$.

In the case of $\Psi_{2}$, the labels in are shown below, $A=a_{1}, \neg a_{1}, B=a_{2}, \neg a_{2}$, $C=a_{2}, \neg a_{2}, D=a_{1}, \neg a_{1} E=a_{1}, \neg a_{1}, a_{2}, \neg a_{2}, F=a_{2} G=a_{2} H=a_{1}, \neg a_{1}, \neg a_{2}$.

After lifting and adding labels, we obtain,


Case $\Psi_{2}$, there are compatible combinations and, in the case of $\Psi_{1}$, there is no compatible combination. We can infer $\Psi_{1}$ is not satisfiable and, in the case of $\Psi_{2}$, the conclusion is based in writing all combinations.
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