arXiv:1104.4490v1 [cs.CC] 22 Apr 2011

The 3-satisfiability problem

Amar Mukherjee
Professor Emeritus, Computer Science
University of Central Florida, Orlando, Florida 32816.
Email:amar@cs.ucf.edu.*

Abstract

We present a deterministic polynomial-time algorithm that solves the 3-satisfiability problem.

1 Introduction

For more than four decades, the 3-satisfiability problem has remained an open challenge to computer science researchers, mathematicians, engineers and scientists [Cook71, Karp72, Aho-Hopcroft-Ullman74, Garey-Johnson79]. This paper presents a constructive algorithm which takes $O(m^{17}\log m)$ time to solve the 3-satisfiability problem with m number of clauses in the *3-conjunctive normal form* expression representing a Boolean function g.

The paper is organized as follows: In Section 2, we give notations, definitions. In Section 3, we give a new formulation of the problem and our method of approach. In Section 4, we give a polynomial algorithm used as a basic tool to derive Reed-Muller Canonic Forms of Boolean functions expressed as *Exclusive OR sum* of products of Boolean variables with bounded number of negative literals or complemented variables. In Section 5 , we define a key concept called the *cover index* of a node in the Boolean n-cube corresponding to the *3-disjunctive normal form* representing the complement of g, namely $f(x_1,x_2,\ldots,x_n)$. We show how a class of functions defined by some special sequences of cover indices lead to a key sub-algorithm used by the main 3-satisfiability algorithm. In Section 6, we present this sub-algorithm which determines whether an implicant in a *projected function* f^{pr} of a Boolean function f specified in *3-disjunctive form* is an essential implicant of f^{pr}. The function f^{pr} is the projection of function f in the subcube representing the implicant. In Section 7, we present the main 3-satisfiability algorithm. In Section 8, we make some concluding remarks.

2 Notations, Definitions and Formulation of the problem

Let $X=(x_1,x_2,\ldots,x_n)$ be a set of n Boolean or switching variables. The variable x_i, $(1\leq i\leq n)$, and its complement $\overline{x_i}$ are called the *literals*, and x_i is called a *positive* literal and $\overline{x_i}$ is called a negative literal. The *conjunction* (also called the *product* or the *AND*) operation will be denoted by simple juxtaposition. The *disjunction* (also called the *sum* or the *OR*) operation will be denoted as '+'. It is well known that a switching function can be represented as a *sum-of-products (disjunctive normal form, DNF)* or as a *product-of-sums (conjunctive normal form, CNF)* forms [Shannon38]. The conjunction of t distinct literals (not containing any pair of complementary literals) will be called a *t-term* or a *product term* or simply a *term* when length of t is understood. A *t-term* covers 2^{n-t} *n-terms* or *minterms*, corresponding to 2^{n-t} *nodes* in the Boolean *n-cube*. The constant term '1' covers all the 2^n nodes of the *n-cube*. Similarly, a disjunction of t literals is called a *t-sum term* or a *clause* with length t. If all the terms in the *DNF* expressions have a length equal to 3, then they are called 3-*DNF* forms. If all the clauses in the *CNF* expressions have a length equal to 3, then they are called 3-*CNF* forms. Given a *DNF* form

*This paper based on a published Technical Report CS-TR-11-01, Dept. of EECS, University of Central Florida, Orlando, Florida 32816, U. S. A. @copy right Amar Mukherjee, January, 2011. This revised version is distributed for reviewing purposes. If you download this paper, please send a email to the author to let him know. Please send your comments and suggestions to the author by email.This is a working document and there may be flaws in the proof.

of a function f, an *essential implicant* or an *essential term of f with respect to the given DNF* form, is a term in f that covers at least one minterm not covered by any other term in the *given DNF* form of the function. It is well known that the Reed-Muller canonic form [Muller54, Reed54, Zhegalkin27,Sasao99] expresses a function $f(x_1,x_2,\ldots,x_n)$ as *Exclusive OR* sum of distinct terms such that all literals in the product terms are positive and this form of representation is *unique*. There are an exponential number of sum-of-products forms for a given function. We will use the standard *random access memory* model for computation and also the standard big-O notation to denote computation and storage complexities.

This paper is concerned with the 3-satisfiability problem. A formal definition of this problem [Garey-Johnson79] is as follows: Given a collection $C=[c_1,c_2,\ldots,c_m]$ of clauses on a finite set X of variables such that $|c_i|=3$ for $1\leq i\leq m$, is there a *truth assignment* for the input variables X that satisfies all the clauses? In other words, given a Boolean function $g(x_1,x_2,\ldots,x_n)$ in *3-CNF* form, determine whether there exists an assignment of values '1' or '0' to the input variables $(x_1,x_2,\ldots,x_n)$ that makes $g=1$. Given the *3-CNF* problem, the complement of the function, $\overline{g}$ can be obtained by applying the De Morgan's theorem. Let us denote $f=\overline{g}$. Then, the *3-tautology problem* can be defined as: Given a Boolean function in *3-DNF* form

$$f=t_1+t_2+\ldots+t_m \tag{1}$$

where each $t_i=\overline{c_i}$ is a *3-term*, $(1\leq i\leq m)$, determine whether there exists an assignment of values '1' or '0' to the input variables $(x_1,x_2,\ldots,x_n)$ that makes $f=0$. We assume that every term t_i in Equation 1 is distinct and that not all terms are 1- or 2-terms. If no such assignment exists, then $f=1$ implying that the complementary *3-CNF* function g is identically 0 and hence not satisfiable. Without loss of generality, we also assume that every literal x_i and its complement $\overline{x_i}$ appear in Equation 1 and there exist at least one term with all positive literals and one term with all negative literals so that the minterms $x_1x_2\ldots x_n$ and $\overline{x_1}\ \overline{x_2}\ldots\overline{x_n}$ are covered by f.

3 The Method of Approach

Let us define an **expansion** of a 3-term t to be another 3-term t^e obtained from t *by dropping only one literal* from t. For example, if $t=x_2\overline{x_3}x_4$, there are three possible expansions of t by dropping any one of the three literals $(x_2,\overline{x_3},x_4)$ from t. Thus, $x_2\overline{x_3}$, $\overline{x_3}x_4$ and x_2x_4 are three expansions of t. Associated with a *specific* expansion t^e, let us define $E(t^e)$ to be another 3-term that contains the the extra minterms covered due to the expansion of t, given by $E(t^e)=\overline{t}\,t^e$. For example, for $t=x_2\overline{x_3}x_4$, one of the expansions is $t^e=x_2\overline{x_3}$ and the corresponding excess term $E(t^e)$ is given by $\overline{t}t^e=(\overline{x_2}+x_3+\overline{x_4})x_2\overline{x_3}=x_2\overline{x_3}\ \overline{x_4}$. Simply stated, *the excess 3-terms corresponding to a given 3-term are obtained by just complementing any single literal in the 3-term.*This means that $E(t^e)$ and t are disjoint, that is, $E(t^e)\,t=0$. We state a lemma which is easy to prove.

Lemma 1: *Let the 3-DNF form of a function be $f=t_1+t_2+\ldots+t_i+\ldots+t_m$, $1\leq i\leq m$. If the term $E(t_i^e)$ is a non-essential term in $f_i^e=t_1+t_2+\ldots+t_{i-1}+E(t_i^e)+t_i+t_{i+1}+\ldots+t_m$ then we can replace $E(t_i^e)+t_i$ by t_i^e and write f as $f=t_1+t_2+\ldots+t_{i-1}+t_i^e+t_{i+1}+\ldots+t_m$.*

If we can apply Lemma 1 successfully to all the terms t_i for some choice of expansions , we will arrive at a *2-DNF* form of f as $f=t_1^e+t_2^e+\ldots+t_m^e$. We can now apply the well known $O(n)$[Aspvall-Plass-Tarjan79] or $O(n^2)$ iterated consensus algorithm (available in most Switching Theory text books) to decide whether f is 1 or not. If f=1, this conversion to a *2-DNF* form is independent of the particular choice of the expansion term out of the three possible expansions for each term. If some term $E(t_i^e)$ turns out to be essential, we can immediately conclude that $f\neq 1$ without even running the iterated consensus algorithm.

4 Obtaining the Reed-Muller Expression

Commonly known as the Reed-Muller Canonic Form, this uses two logic primitive operations *conjunction* and *Exclusive OR* (denoted as '$\oplus$') which constitute one of the complete sets of logic primitives [Mukhopadhyay71]. In this paper, we will be concerned with some special forms of functions that can be converted in Reed-Muller forms using only polynomially bounded amount of time and storage as described in the proof of Lemma 1.

Lemma 2: *Given an expression of a Boolean function f in the form $f=t_1\oplus t_2\oplus\ldots\oplus t_m$ where each t_i is a r-term, $1\leq r\leq c$ and c is a constant, including possibly t_i being a constant term '1', there exists an $O(m\log m)$*

Algorithm 1: Reed-Muller Form

Input: a Boolean function $f = t_1 \oplus t_2 \oplus \ldots \oplus t_m$ *where each* t_i *is a r-term,* $1 \leq r \leq c$ *and c is a constant or a constant '1' term*
Output: The Reed-Muller form of f.

```
01 begin
02    Obtain the spread terms for each term t_i and put them in a list S
03    Sort the list S of terms lexicographically and denote this sorted list as L  (Assume |L| > 1.)
04    Append a special symbol Γ not equal to any term at the end of list L at location |L| + 1
05    F ← 1 (F is a Boolean flag used as a modulo 2 counter for the groups of identical terms in L)
06    i ← 1
07    Terms ← null
08    while  i ≤ |L|  do
09       if L(i) ≠ L(i+1) then
11             if F = 1 then append L(i) at the end of Terms end if
12             F ← 1
13       end if
14       else  F ← F̄
15       i ← i + 1
16    end while
17    Obtain output as the Exclusive OR sum of the terms in Terms
18 end
```

algorithm to obtain the unique Reed-Muller expression of f *using* $O(m)$ *storage.*

Proof: Assume a r-term has r_p positive literals and r_n negative literal such that $r_p + r_n = r$. Replace each negative literal $\overline{x}$ in the term by a factor $1 \oplus x$ and then multiply the factors out. This will give a Reed-Muller expression for the r-term as an *Exclusive OR* sum of 2^{r_n} terms, possibly including the constant term '1'. A term in this expression can only have a maximum of r positive literals. The positive literals in the terms are written in the left to right order given by the ordering $x_1 < x_2 < \ldots < x_n$. To insure this ordering, the positive literals of a term have to be sorted taking constant time $O(c \log c)$ for each term. We call the quantity 2^{r_n} the **spread** of the r-term. If f includes a constant term '1', its spread is the term itself. If we do this for each term in f and add in *Exclusive OR* fashion the spreads of all terms in f, the total spread size of the expression is $\leq m2^c$, which is $O(m)$ since c is assumed to be a constant. The quantity 2^c is called the **maximum spread** of a term. The terms generated by this process are put in an unordered list S (Line 03 of Algorithm 1), taking $O(m)$ time and storage and then sorted lexicographically (or alphabetically as in a phone directory) assuming an ordering $1 < x_1 < x_2 < \ldots < x_n$. The constant term 1(logical) is assumed to be lexicographically smaller than any non-constant term. The comparison of two terms for the purpose of sorting takes constant time since the terms in the resulting expression after spread cannot have more than c positive literals. Thus, whether two terms are identical or one term is less than or greater than the other can be decided by doing not more than c literal comparisons. Since c is assumed to be a constant, this comparison operation takes constant $O(1)$ time (Line 09). Further, since the total spread size is $\leq m2^c$, the sorting algorithm takes $O(m \log m)$ time. The sorted list is then put in an array L. We assume $|L| > 1$. If $|L| = 1$, the Reed-Muller form has only one term.

There may be repeated terms in the resulting expression. To get rid of these, we scan the sorted list of terms in non-decreasing order and count the terms in the groups of identical elements (which will be located contiguously in the sorted list), in a modulo 2 fashion. To count in modulo 2 fashion, we discard the groups having an even number of identical terms and keep only one copy of the terms from groups having an odd number of terms. This takes $O(m)$ time (Lines 09 -15). The Exclusive *OR* of these terms constitute the final unique Reed-Muller expression. $\diamond$ A high-level description of the algorithm is presented in Algorithm 1.

5 Cover Functions for the Projected Function

We now define a concept that is key to further development of this paper. *Given a Boolean function f in some arbitrary DNF form, the* ***cover index*** *of a minterm with respect to the given DNF equals the number of terms that cover that minterm.* The maximum value of a cover index is the number of terms in f when the minterm is covered by all the terms in f. The minterms with cover index 0 belong to the complement function $\overline{f}$.

Since there are 2^n minterms of n variables, an exhaustive enumeration of the cover indices for all minterms in the n-cube is not practically feasible for large values of n. But, certain groups of minterms sharing some common properties can be algebraically described in expressions with polynomially bounded size.

For example, the Reed-Muller expression given below by Equation 2 covers all the minterms of f having cover indices which are odd numbers. The size of the expression is $O(m)$ if the number of literals in each term is upper bounded by a constant c (see Lemma 1).

$$f_{odd} = t_1 \oplus t_2 \oplus \ldots \oplus t_m \tag{2}$$

Using cover indices explicitly, this will be denoted as

$$S_{(1,3,5,7,\ldots,p)}(t_1, t_2, \ldots, t_m)$$

where p is the largest odd integer less than equal to m. If the function does not have any minterm with an odd cover index this expression will be false (logical 0). Not all odd numbers $\leq m$ may be present in the subscript of S; it totally depends on the particular *DNF* form. The arguments of the cover function could also be any proper subset of $(t_1, t_2, \ldots, t_m)$. For example, the cover function

$$S_{(1,3,5,7,\ldots)}(t_4, t_5, \ldots, t_m)$$

covers the minterms that have odd number of implicants from the subset $(t_4, t_5, \ldots, t_m)$ and these minterms may or may not be covered by any one of the terms (t_1, t_2, t_3).

5.1 Projected Function

If we are interested to determine whether the implicant $E(t_i^e)$ is essential in f_i^e, we can work with a projected function f^{pr} which does not have any minterm with cover index 0 and which might need significantly reduced run time and storage, although it does not improve the worst case time and storage complexities. Without loss of generality, we work with a function f^{pr}, called the **projection** of f under $T_1 = E(t_i^e)$. For this purpose, we derive the **projected terms** as $T_2 = T_1 t_1$, $T_3 = T_1 t_2$, $\ldots, T_{i-1} = T_1 t_{i-2}$, $T_i = T_1 t_{i-1}$, $T_{i+1} = T_1 t_{i+1}$, $T_{i+2} = T_1 t_{i+2}, \ldots, T_m = T_1 t_m$. Note, $E(t_i^e) t_i = T_1 t_i = 0$. Two relevant equations are shown below with $E(t_i^e) = T_1$.

$$f_i^e = t_1 + t_2 + \ldots + t_{i-1} + E(t_i^e) + t_i + t_{i+1} + \ldots + t_m$$

$$f^{pr} = T_1 + T_2 + \ldots + T_m \qquad or \qquad f^{pr} = T_1 + T_2 + \ldots + T_k \tag{3}$$

The subscript i of the term T_i is called the **index** of T_i. Some of the terms T_i may become 0 if two complementary literals appear, one in T_1 and one in t_i, where $i = 2, \ldots, i-1, i+1, \ldots, m$. Thus there will be k surviving terms and $k \leq m$. There will remain only one 3-term T_1 in f^{pr} and the rest are 4-, 5- or 6-terms because of the projection operation. We denote the set of terms in f^{pr} as $\Im = (T_1, T_2, \ldots, T_i, \ldots, T_k)$ as an **ordered set of terms**. The minimum value of the cover index of any minterm of the projected function f^{pr} is 1 since each minterm in the projected function f^{pr} is covered by T_1.

5.2 Cover Functions for Special Sequences

We will now define a set of **cover functions** with respect to f^{pr} having some interesting cover index sequences as given below. The names given to these functions correspond to the sequences that they use and they will be denoted by Greek letters. We use an integer symbol p denoting the *largest integer* less than or equal to k satisfying the property of the sequence. It is easy to show that the representations of these functions in Reed-Muller canonic forms take only polynomially bounded time.

1. **The Even Cover Function** α associated with the cover index sequence of **Even** $(2,4,6,\ldots,p)$ numbers up to $p \leq k$. The number 0 is excluded although it is considered to be an even number. α can be expressed as

$$\alpha(x_1,x_2,\ldots,x_n) = S_{(2,4,6,\ldots,p)}(T_1,T_2,\ldots,T_k) = T_1(T_2 \oplus T_3 \oplus \ldots \oplus T_k) = T_2 \oplus T_3 \oplus \ldots \oplus T_k \qquad (4)$$

The function α gives the set of minterms under the projection of T_1, each having an even number for cover index. The term T_1 contributes 1 to the cover index count of each minterm of α. An odd number of terms from $(T_2,T_3,\ldots,T_k)$ must be true. T_1 is true implicitly. The term T_1 contributes 1 to the cover index count of each minterm of α. The maximum spread of a term in α is $2^6 = 64$ since a typical term can have a maximum of 6 negative literals. Thus, the value of $c = 6$. Following the arguments given in the proof of Lemma 2 and using Algorithm 1, it is easy to show that the algorithm to arrive at the Reed-Muller expression of α takes $O(k\log k)$ time and the size of the expression is $O(k)$. The storage requirement is $O(k)$.

2. **The odd Cover Function** β associated with the cover index sequence of **odd** $(1,3,5,\ldots,p)$ numbers up to $p \leq k$. β can be expressed as

$$\beta(x_1,x_2,\ldots,x_n) = S_{(1,3,5,\ldots,p)}(T_1,T_2,\ldots,T_k) = T_1 \oplus T_2 \oplus \ldots \oplus T_k \qquad (5)$$

The function β gives the set of minterms under the projection of T_1, each having an odd number for cover index. T_1 is implicitly present in every minterm contributing a count of 1 to the cover index in every minterm. An even number of terms, including 0 terms, from $(T_2,T_3,\ldots,T_k)$ must be true. Like for α, the maximum spread of a term is 2^6 and c=6. It takes $O(k\log k)$ time and the size of the expression is $O(k)$. The storage requirement is $O(k)$.

3. **The Singly Even and Successors Cover Function** γ associated with the cover index sequence of **Singly Even and Successors** $(2,3,6,7,\ldots,p)$ numbers up to $p \leq k$. γ can be expressed as

$$\gamma(x_1,x_2,\ldots,x_n) = S_{(2,3,6,7,\ldots,p)}(T_1,T_2,\ldots,T_k) = \Sigma_{\oplus} T_i T_j \qquad (i<j; \quad 1,2 \leq i,j \leq k) \qquad (6)$$

where $\Sigma_{\oplus}$ denotes *Exclusive OR sum.* Read $1,2 \leq i,j \leq k$ as $1 \leq i \leq k-1$ and $2 \leq j \leq k$ and $i<j$. Here, p could be the largest singly even or a successor to a singly even integer less than equal to k. The proof of correctness of the above equation comes from the Pascal's Triangle [Conway-Guy96]. For any singly even number s both $\begin{pmatrix} s \\ 2 \end{pmatrix}$ and $\begin{pmatrix} s+1 \\ 2 \end{pmatrix}$ is an odd number. This means that if the cover index of a minterm is s or $s+1$, an odd number of product terms T_iT_j in Equation 6 will be true for this minterm and hence $\Sigma_{\oplus} T_iT_j$ will be logical 1; it will be logical 0 otherwise, because for $s+2$ and $s+3$ both $\begin{pmatrix} s+2 \\ 2 \end{pmatrix}$ and $\begin{pmatrix} s+3 \\ 2 \end{pmatrix}$ are even numbers. Thus, γ correctly represents the Singly Even and Successors Cover Function. There are $O(k^2)$ product terms in γ and each term can have a maximum of 9 negative literals yielding a maximum spread of 2^9 for a term in γ. Thus, $c = 9$ and the total size of the expression is bounded by $O(k^2)$. We can now use Lemma 2 and Algorithm 1 to obtain a Reed-Muller expression for Equation 6 taking $O(k^2\log(k^2)) = O(k^2\log k)$ time and $O(k^2)$ storage.

4. **The Singly Even Function** θ associated with the cover index sequence of **Singly Even** $(2,6,10,\ldots,p)$ numbers up to $p \leq k$. θ can be expressed as

$$\theta = S_{(2,6,\ldots,p)}(T_1,T_2,,\ldots,T_k) = (T_2 \oplus T_3 \oplus \ldots \oplus T_k)(\Sigma_{\oplus} T_iT_j) = \alpha\gamma \quad (i<j;\ 1,2 \leq i,j \leq k) \qquad (7)$$

This is true by the observation that the set $(2,6,10,\ldots,p) = (2,4,6,\ldots,p) \cap (2,3,6,7,\ldots,p)$ where '$\cap$' denotes set intersection operation and p is the largest singly even integer which appear in both the sets and is $\leq k$. The size of the product $\alpha\gamma$ is $O(k^3)$ and each term can have a maximum of 12 negative literals giving its maximum spread as 2^{12}. Thus, $c = 12$ and the total size of the expression is bounded by $O(k^3)$. We can now use Lemma 2 and Algorithm 1 to obtain a Reed-Muller expression for Equation 7 taking $O(k^3\log(k^3)) = O(k^3\log k)$ time and $O(k^3)$ storage.

5. **The Singly Even Plus One Cover Function** δ associated with the cover index sequence of **Singly Even Plus One** $(3,7,11,\ldots,p)$ numbers up to $p \leq k$. The function δ is defined as

$$\delta = S_{(3,7,\ldots,p)}(T_1,T_2,,\ldots,T_k) = (T_1 \oplus T_2 \oplus T_3 \oplus \ldots \oplus T_k)(\Sigma_{\oplus} T_i T_j) = \beta\gamma \quad (i<j;\ 1,2 \leq i,j \leq k) \tag{8}$$

This is true by the observation that the set $(3,7,11,\ldots,p) = (1,3,5,\ldots,p) \cap (2,3,6,7,\ldots,p)$ where '$\cap$' denotes set intersection operation and p is the largest successor of singly even integer which appear in both the sets and is $\leq k$. The size of the product $\beta\gamma$ is $O(k^3)$. and each term can have a maximum of 12 negative literals giving its maximum spread as 2^{12}. Thus, $c = 12$ and the total size of the expression is bounded by $O(k^3)$. We can now use Lemma 2 and Algorithm 1 to obtain a Reed-Muller expression for Equation 8 taking $O(k^3 \log(k^3)) = O(k^3 \log k)$ time and $O(k^3)$ storage.

6. **Union of Even and Singly Even Plus One Cover Function** μ associated with the cover index sequence of **Even and Singly Even Plus One** $(2,3,4,6,7,8,10,\ldots,p)$ numbers up to $p \leq k$. The function μ is defined as

$$\mu(x_1,x_2,\ldots,x_n) = S_{(2,3,4,6,7,8,\ldots,p)}(T_1,T_2,,\ldots,T_k) = \alpha \oplus \delta = \alpha \oplus \beta\gamma \tag{9}$$

Here p could be either an even or a successor of a singly even largest integer $\leq k$. Substituting the expressions for α and δ, we get

$$\mu = (T_2 \oplus T_3 \oplus \ldots \oplus T_k) \oplus (T_1 \oplus T_2 \oplus \ldots \oplus T_k)(\Sigma_{\oplus} T_i T_j) \qquad (i<j;\quad 1,2 \leq i,j \leq k) \tag{10}$$

Since the functions α and δ cover mutually disjoint sets of minterms, their union can be obtained by the *Exclusive OR* ($\oplus$) operation. The sizes of the expressions α and δ are $O(k)$ and $O(k^3)$, respectively. Hence size of μ is $O(k^3)$. Each term can have a maximum of 12 negative literals with its maximum spread as 2^{12}, giving $c = 12$. We use Lemma 2 and Algorithm 1 to obtain a Reed-Muller expression for Equation 10, taking $O(k^3 \log k)$ time and $O(k^3)$ storage.

7. **Singly Even Minus One Cover Function** η associated with the cover index sequence of **Singly Even Minus One** $(1,5,9,\ldots,p)$ numbers up to $p \leq k$. The function η is defined as

$$\eta(x_1,x_2,\ldots,x_n) = S_{(1,5,9,13,\ldots,p)}(T_1,T_2,\ldots,T_k) = T_1(1 \oplus \mu) \tag{11}$$

Here p is the largest singly even minus 1 integer $\leq k$. Substituting the expression for μ, we get

$$\eta = T_1(1 \oplus (T_2 \oplus T_3 \oplus \ldots \oplus T_k) \oplus (T_1 \oplus T_2 \oplus \ldots \oplus T_k)(\Sigma_{\oplus} T_i T_j)) \qquad (i<j;\quad 1,2 \leq i,j \leq k) \tag{12}$$

The quantity $(1 \oplus \mu)$ is simply the complement function $\overline{\mu}$. The sequence $(0,1,5,9,13,\ldots,p)$ should have been the cover indices for $\overline{\mu}$ but the pre-multiplication by T_1 makes sure that we are only dealing with the minterms under the projection of T_1 which can have a minimum cover index of 1. Thus, the function η correctly captures all the minterms for the sequence $(1,5,9,13,\ldots,p)$. By arguments similar to those used for the μ function, we can say that the total size of η is bounded by $O(k^3)$, each term can have a maximum spread of 2^{12} and the computation time is $O(k^3 \log k)$. The storage complexity is $O(k^3)$.

In all of the above expressions, the function becomes logical 0 if there is no minterm that has a cover index corresponding to the specific sequence for the function. Further, if functions are defined with respect to proper subsets of $(T_1,T_2,\ldots,T_k)$, the minterms obey the sequence property with respect to the subsets only and the computational complexity and size bounds must be expressed with respect to the sizes of the subsets. For example, if the subset is $(T_{i+1},T_{i+2},\ldots,T_k)$, we take the **ordered set of terms** as $\mathcal{T}$= $(T_1,T_{i+1},T_{i+1},\ldots,T_k)$. The formulas for α,β and γ become

$$\alpha_i = S_{(2,4,6,\ldots,p)}(T_{i+1},T_{i+2},\ldots,T_k) = T_1(T_{i+1} \oplus T_{i+2} \oplus \ldots \oplus T_k) = T_{i+1} \oplus T_{i+2} \oplus \ldots \oplus T_k \tag{13}$$

$$\beta_i = S_{(1,3,5,\ldots,p)}(T_{i+1},T_{i+2},\ldots,T_k) = T_1 \oplus T_{i+1} \oplus T_{i+2} \ldots \oplus T_k \tag{14}$$

$$\gamma_i = S_{(2,3,6,7\ldots,p)}(T_1,T_{i+1},T_{i+2},\ldots,T_k) = \Sigma_{\oplus} T_h T_j \quad (h<j;\quad h = 1,i+1,..k-1; j = i+1,i+2,...,k) \tag{15}$$

The equations for other functions become:

$$\theta_i = \alpha_i \gamma_i \tag{16}$$

$$\delta_i = \beta_i \gamma_i \tag{17}$$

$$\mu_i = \alpha_i \oplus \beta_i \gamma_i \tag{18}$$

$$\eta_i = T_1(1 \oplus \mu_i) = T_1(1 \oplus \alpha_i \oplus \beta_i \gamma_i) \tag{19}$$

6 Determining whether implicant T_1 is essential or not essential

We now return to our question : How do we determine whether the term T_1 in Equation 3 is essential or not? Our strategy is to extract a set of **components** of η such that these components cover mutually disjoint sets of minterms of η and the union of these sets of minterms equals the set of minterms having cover indices which are multiple of 4 plus 1 numbers from $(5, 9, 13, \ldots, p)$. We call this cover function ψ as given in Equation 20.

$$\psi(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n) = S_{(5,9,13\ldots,p)}(T_1, T_2, \ldots, T_k) \tag{20}$$

If $\eta = \psi$, we can conclude that there is no minterm covered by η having a cover index value 1 which means that T_1 is not essential. Since the Reed-Muller expression of any function is unique, checking for the equality $\eta = \psi$ will depend on whether we can express ψ in some polynomially bounded size Reed-Muller expression and if so, whether they are identical. The terms of both η and ψ are available in non-increasing lexicographic order because we obtain the Reed-Muller expressions of η and ψ using Algorithm 1. We can scan the sorted output lists for η and ψ in the same order comparing pairs of terms, one from the sorted list for η and the other from the corresponding position in the sorted list for ψ, for equality. *If at any step, the pair of terms do not match, we can conclude that $\eta \neq \psi$ and therefore, T_1 is essential. This comparison step will take $O(k^3)$ time since the size of η is bounded by $O(k^3)$.* We now show how to obtain a polynomially bounded size Reed-Muller expression for ψ in the remainder of this Section.

6.1 Computation of mutually disjoint components of ψ

6.1.1 The Function ψ

Recall that the set of terms $\mathcal{T}= (T_1, T_2, \ldots, T_i, \ldots, T_k)$ for f^{pr} is an **ordered set of terms**. Assume also that the terms covering a minterm are written in ascending order of the indices of the terms. Unless otherwise specified, all minterms are under the projection of ηT_1. Let us classify all the minterms of the function η into several mutually **disjoint components** as defined (tentatively) by Equation 21,$(2 \leq i \leq k-3)$. [1]

$$\psi_i = \eta T_1 T_i S_{(3,7,11,\ldots,p)}(T_{i+1}, T_{i+2}, \ldots, T_k) = \eta T_1 T_i \delta_i \tag{21}$$

where δ_i is as defined by Equation 17. The Equation 21 states the following: if there exists a minterm M whose cover index is from the set of numbers $(5, 9, 13, \ldots, p)$, the minterm is covered by both T_1 and the **leader term** T_i, and is also covered by r additional terms from the set of terms $(T_{i+1}, T_{i+2}, \ldots, T_k)$, where r is from the set of numbers $(3, 7, \ldots, p)$, then Equation 21 evaluates to 1 (logical) for the same input assignment to variables X which make M true, that is, M also evaluates to 1 (logical). Under these circumstances, we say that the minterm M **belongs** to ψ_i. The set of minterms that belong to ψ_i form a **component** of ψ. The quantity ψ_i is a set because δ_i, for a given leader term T_i, may be true for more than one subsets of $(T_{i+1}, T_{i+2}, \ldots, T_k)$. The fixed part of Equation 21 is $\eta T_1 T_i$ for a given T_i, and δ_i is the variable part that allows a set of minterms to belong to ψ_i. In

[1] Some "excess" minterms may be shared between components, making the components non-disjoint but these minterms will be discarded, as we will explain soon. Putting T_1 in the pre-multiplication factor ηT_1 is redundant in this and other formulas because η implicitly has T_1 as a factor. But, we will keep T_1 for clarity.



Figure 1: An example with three critical terms

practice, however, we do not have to enumerate these subsets because we can compute δ_i algebraically as the product $\beta_i\gamma_i$ using $O(k^3 logk)$ time and $O(k^3)$ storage, as explained in Section 5.2.

What about the **intermediate terms** $(T_2, T_3, \ldots, T_{i-1})$? Do they play any role in the definition of ψ_i ? For arbitrary value of i, if the number of intermediate terms between T_1 and the leader term T_i for a minterm is not a multiple of 4 number (that is, an integer from the set N= $(1,2,3,5,6,7,\ldots,p)$ where p is from $(4d-3, 4d-2, 4d-1)$ for some positive integer d such that $p \leq (i-1)$ and p is maximum), then the total cover index count for the minterm would not be from the set of indices $(5,9,13,\ldots,p)$ and hence cannot be captured by Equation 21. But, consider a minterm P with a multiple of 4 intermediate terms between T_1 and T_i from the set $(T_2, T_3, \ldots, T_{i-1})$, then the minterm P will be captured by ψ_i since $\eta T_1 T_i$ will continue to be true, although the δ_i function may be different and r may also differ. Alternately, we could interpret this as dropping $(T_2, T_3, \ldots, T_{i-1})$ so that the modified ordered set of terms consists of $\mathcal{T} = (T_1, T_i, T_{i+1}, \ldots, T_k)$. If we now re-calculate the Reed-Muller expression of the new η function η_{new} and use it in Equation 21 to calculate ψ_i then the minterm P will be included in the component ψ_i as an excess minterm. P should really belong to the component ψ_q where T_q is the first term that appears in the multiple of 4 term sequence.

To illustrate the concept, consider two minterms with cover index sequence M=(1 10 12 13 24) and P=(1 3 5 7 9 10 12 13 16 17 18 19 20), respectively. Obviously, P belongs to ψ_3 and M belongs to ψ_{10}. But P will also belong to ψ_{10} if we dropped the terms (T_3, T_5, T_7, T_9) or ignored the presence of these terms. We call minterms like P **excess minterms** and these should be eliminated from ψ_i. A formal definition of excess minterms ψ_i^e associated with ψ_i is given in Equation 22.

A more complex illustration is given in Figure 1. Depending on the cover index sequence, the same minterm could be shared by multiple components. Thus, while capturing the minterm A by Equation 21 to ψ_i, we also capture excess minterms (a,b,c,e) which belongs to ψ_i^e. Similarly, while capturing B, we capture excess minterms (a,b,d,f) belonging to ψ_j^e and while capturing C, we capture excess minterms (a,c,d,g) belonging to ψ_w^e. Thus the corrected ψ functions denoted as ψ_i^c is given by $\psi_i^c \leftarrow \psi_i \oplus \psi_i^e$. Similarly, $\psi_j^c \leftarrow \psi_j \oplus \psi_j^e$ and $\psi_w^c \leftarrow \psi_w \oplus \psi_w^e$. The leader terms like (T_i, T_j, T_w) in Figure 1 are called **critical leaders**. Obviously, Figure 1 generalizes to an arbitrary number of critical terms. If we can discard all the excess minterms from the components ψ_i, ψ_j and ψ_w, they should be mutually disjoint since their leader terms T_i, T_j and T_w are distinct.

$$\psi_i^e = \eta T_1 S_{(4,8,12,\ldots,p)}(T_2, T_3, \ldots, T_{i-1}) T_i S_{(3,7,11,\ldots,p)}(T_{i+1}, T_{i+2}, \ldots, T_k) \tag{22}$$

Our discussion on intermediate terms leads to an observation that the three components ψ_3,ψ_4 and ψ_5 cannot

have any excess minterms because the possible intermediate number of terms are 1,2 and 3 from the set N, respectively. For ψ_2, there are no intermediate terms and ψ_2 does not have any excess minterm by definition.

To proceed further we need a simple but important observation on number theory.

Observation: *Any multiple of 4 number can be expressed as a sum of two singly even numbers.*

Proof: Let let u and v be two odd numbers. Then the number $N = 2(u+v)$ must be a multiple of 4 number since $u+v$ is an even number. Conversely, assume N is multiple of 4. Then $q = N-2u = 4w-2u = 2(2w-u)$ where w is any positive integer such that $(2w-u) > 0$. Thus, q is singly even because $2w-u$ is an odd number.$\diamond$

For our algorithm, without loss of generality, we will always pick number 2 as the first singly even number. Thus, we take $4 = 2+2, 8 = 2+6, 12 = 2+10, 16 = 2+14$ etc.

6.1.2 Computation of Excess Minterms

We only need to focuss our attention to situations where a multiple of 4 number of terms appear between T_1 and a critical leader term T_i. The number theory **Observation** stated earlier in Section 6.1.1 becomes very useful to recognize the excess minterms. We claim that the function ψ_i^e in Equation 23 implements Equation 22 and captures all the excess minterms accumulated for ψ_i by Equation 21.

$$\psi_i^e = \Sigma_{\oplus}\ \eta T_1 T_{i_1} T_{i_2} S_{(2,6,10,\ldots,p)}(T_{i_2+1}, T_{i_2+2}, \ldots, T_{i-1}) T_i S_{(3,7,11,\ldots,p)}(T_{i+1}, T_{i+2}, \ldots, T_k) \tag{23}$$

To prove this, consider the factors in Equation 23 given below. Note the presence of two terms (T_{i_1}, T_{i_2}) between T_1 and the function $\theta_{i_2} = S_{(2,6,10,\ldots,p)}(T_{i_2+1}, T_{i_2+2}, \ldots, T_{i-1})$. The *exclusive OR sum* extends over all possible pairs of $(T_{i_1} T_{i_2})$ called **pair of leader terms**.

$$\eta T_1\ \ T_{i_1} T_{i_2}\ \ S_{(2,6,10,\ldots,p)}(T_{i_2+1}, T_{i_2+2}, \ldots, T_{i-1})\ \ T_i\ \ \delta_i = \eta T_1\ \ T_{i_1} T_{i_2}\ \ \theta_{i_2}\ \ T_i\ \ \delta_i$$

Since we are interested in the case where the number of intermediate terms between T_1 and T_i is a multiple of 4 number, we take advantage of **Observation** by decomposing the multiple of 4 number to be the arithmetic sum of two singly even numbers. As stated earlier, for our algorithm, without loss of generality, we will always pick number 2 as the first singly even number. Thus, we take $4 = 2+2, 8 = 2+6, 12 = 2+10, 16 = 2+14$ etc. The product $T_{i_1} T_{i_2}$ corresponds to the first singly even number 2 of **Observation**, and the function $\theta_{i_2} = S_{(2,6,10,\ldots,p)}(T_{i_2+1}, T_{i_2+2}, \ldots, T_{i-1})$ corresponds to the second singly even number from the set $(2,6,\ldots,p)$. This means that a multiple of 4 number of terms must have appeared between T_1 and a critical leader term T_i, *provided no intermediate term exists between* T_1 *and* T_{i_1}, *and also between* T_{i_1} *and* T_{i_2}. This can be insured by modifying the set $\mathcal{T} = (T_1, T_2, \ldots, T_i, \ldots, T_k)$ by dropping all the terms, if they exist, whose index is less than i_2 except the term with index i_1 and the term T_1 so that $\mathcal{T}$ becomes $(T_1, T_{i_1}, T_{i_2}, T_{i_2+1}, T_{i_2+2}, \ldots, T_i, \ldots, T_k)$. We now compute the cover index functions $(\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \theta, \delta, \mu, \eta)$ with respect to this new set, following the procedure as discussed in Section 5.2. Denote the new η function as $\eta(i_1, i_2)$. Then the following Equation 24 gives a subset of excess minterms under $\eta(i_1, i_2)$, corresponding to the pair of leader terms $(T_{i_1} T_{i_2})$. We keep the original η as a factor to insure that we are capturing only those minterms whose cover index originally belonged to (5,9,...,p) before modifying the set $\mathcal{T}$ by dropping terms.

$$\eta\eta(i_1, i_2) T_1 T_{i_1} T_{i_2} \theta_{i_2} T_i \delta_i \tag{24}$$

Associated with distinct pairs of leader terms, the excess minterms are necessarily disjoint and their union covers all the excess minterms under η. Thus, we can rewrite Equation 23 as

$$\psi_i^e = \Sigma_{\oplus} \eta\eta(i_1, i_2) T_1 T_{i_1} T_{i_2} \theta_{i_2} T_i \delta_i \tag{25}$$

where *exclusive OR sum* extends over all possible pairs of $(T_{i_1} T_{i_2})$. If a minterm satisfies Equation 25, it must be an excess minterm for ψ_i. At the same time, its cover index count is legitimate for being a member of η function and indeed this minterm will also belong to ψ_{i_1}. As an example, if we have minterms $a = (1, 15, 22, 27, 31)$, $b = (1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 15, 16, 20, 21)$ and $c = (1, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 15, 16, 20, 21)$, then $\psi_{15} = (a, b, c)$, $\psi_{15}^e = (b, c)$ and so $\psi_{15}^c = (a)$. The pair of leader terms for b and c are (T_3, T_5) and (T_4, T_6), respectively

Associated with every ψ_i, it is not necessary that an excess function ψ_i^e always exists. For example, if $\psi_2 = \eta(T_1T_2T_3T_4T_5)$, it must be true that $\psi_2^e = 0$ (logical). For some function f^{pr}, ψ_i may not have any excess minterms because of the inherent properties of the terms $(T_1, T_2, \ldots, T_k)$ of f^{pr}. The corrected component ψ_i^c without any excess minterms in ψ_i can be written as:

$$\psi_i^c = \psi_i \oplus \psi_i^e \tag{26}$$

We can use $\oplus$ operation in Equation 26 because ψ_i^e is a subset of ψ_i. If we repeat this calculation for all values of i in the range $(6 \leq i \leq k-3)$, we obtain an expression for ψ (Equation 20) as given below.

$$\psi(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n) = S_{(5,9,13\ldots,p)}(T_1, T_2, \ldots, T_k) = \psi_2 \oplus \psi_3 \oplus \psi_4 \oplus \psi_5 \oplus \Sigma_{\oplus}\psi_i^c \tag{27}$$

Here, $\Sigma_{\oplus}\psi_i^c$ stands for $\psi_6^c \oplus \psi_7^c \oplus \ldots \oplus \psi_{k-3}^c$.

Following our strategy outlined in the first paragraph of this Section 6, we now compute $\eta \leftarrow \eta \oplus \psi$. If the resulting η is 0 (logical), then T_1 is non-essential. Otherwise, T_1 is essential. This also means that the resulting η equals ψ_1. We define the component $\psi_1 = \eta \oplus \psi$.

Algorithm 2: Algorithm to Determine whether T_1 is essential or not

Input: k, $(T_1, T_2, T_3, \ldots, T_k)$ and η
Output: Yes *if T_1 is essential in f^{pr} else (T_1 is not essential)* No

```
01  ψ ← 0 (logical); ψ_i^e ← 0 (logical)
02  for i=2 to 5 do
03        ψ_i ← ηT_1T_i[S_(3,7,11,...,p)(T_{i+1}, T_{i+2}, ..., T_k)] (Use Equation. 21).
04        if ψ_i ≠ 0(logical) then ψ ← ψ ⊕ ψ_i end if
05  end for
06  for i=6 to k-3 do
07        ψ_i ← ηT_1T_iS_(3,7,11,...,p)(T_{i+1}, T_{i+2}, ..., T_k) (includes normal as well as excess minterms)
08        for pair of indices (i_1, i_2) such that (i_1 < i_2), (2 ≤ i_1 ≤ i−4) and (3 ≤ i_2 ≤ i−3)
09           ψ_i^e ← ψ_i^e ⊕ ηη(i_1, i_2)T_1T_{i_1}T_{i_2}θ_{i_2}T_iδ_i (Equation 25, includes only the excess terms)
10        end for
11        ψ_i ← ψ_i ⊕ ψ_i^e (Equation 26)
12        ψ ← ψ ⊕ ψ_i
13        ψ_i^e ← 0(logical)
14  end for
15  if ψ = 0 then quit. Conclude T_1 is non essential. Output No
16  Check whether η = ψ (see first paragraph of this Section)
17  if η = ψ then T_1 is not essential, output No
18  else T_1 is essential, output Yes
```

6.1.3 Algorithm 2: Algorithm to Determine whether T_1 is essential or not

This subsection presents a high level description and explanation of the algorithm to compute the components and determine whether T_1 is essential or not. Lines 02 to 05 compute $\psi = \psi_2 \oplus \psi_3 \oplus \psi_4 \oplus \psi_5$. For these four components there are no excess minterms. Line 07 computes the components ψ_i, $6 \leq i \leq k-3$, which includes the minterms that belongs to ψ_i as well as the excess terms, which we need to discard. Lines 08-10 compute the excess minterms with respect to all $O(k^2)$ possible pairs of leader terms (T_{i_1}, T_{i_2}). The ranges of variables i_1 and i_2 are such that the lexicographically minimum tuple is (T_2, T_3) and the maximal tuple is (T_{k-7}, T_{k-6}) corresponding to cover terms $(T_1T_{k-7}T_{k-6}T_{k-5}T_{k-4}T_{k-3}T_{k-2}T_{k-1}T_k)$ of possible excess minterms where the critical term is T_{k-3} and $T_{i_1}T_{i_2} = T_{k-7}T_{k-6}$. In Lines 11-13, we update the expressions ψ_i and ψ, and then reset the value of ψ_i^e to 0 (logical) for the next iteration of the for loop at Lines 06-14. In Line 15 we check whether $\psi = 0$ and if so, we conclude that T_1 is not essential. In Lines 16-18, we test equality of η and ψ and conclude T_1 is essential if they are unequal else T_1 is not essential. The analysis of complexity is included in Section 6.2.

Finally, for some tuples $T_{i_1}T_{i_2}$ the excess function ψ_i^e might be 0 (logical). For some i, both ψ_i and ψ_i^e may be identical and the corrected function ψ_i^c becomes 0. The function ψ_i may exist for up to $i = k-3$ corresponding to a possible cover sequence $T_1T_{k-3}T_{k-2}T_{k-1}T_k$. Since ψ_i functions cover mutually disjoint sets of minterms we can use '$\oplus$' operation to obtain $\psi = \psi_2 \oplus \psi_3 \oplus \ldots \oplus \psi_{i-3}$.

6.2 Complexity Analysis for Algorithm 2

In Lines 02-05, each of the functions ψ_2, ψ_3, ψ_4 and ψ_5 take $O(k^6 \log k)$ time to obtain its Reed-Muller expression. In Line 03 and 07, we compute ψ_i which can be written as, where subscript s is used for β and γ

$$\psi_i = \eta T_1 T_i \delta_i = T_1(1 \oplus \mu)T_1 T_i \delta_i = T_1 T_i(1 \oplus \alpha \oplus \beta\gamma)\beta_s\gamma_s = T_1 T_i(\beta_s\gamma_s \oplus \alpha\beta_s\gamma_s \oplus \beta\gamma\beta_s\gamma_s)$$

to indicate that the functions are with respect to subset of terms $(T_1, T_{i+1}, T_{i+2}, \ldots, T_k)$. The worst case size of the expression is dominated by $T_1T_i\beta\gamma\beta_s\gamma_s$ which is $O(k^6)$. This is because the worst case sizes of β and γ are $O(k)$ and $O(k^2)$, respectively. Thus the expression takes $O(k^6 \log k)$ time and $O(k^6)$ storage. The maximum spread is determined by the product of eight 3-terms with 24 possible negative literals. Thus, the maximum spread is 2^{24} and $c = 24$. The major for loop (Lines 06-14) executes $O(k)$ times. Thus the expression takes a total of $O(k^7 \log k)$ time and $O(k^7)$ storage. The loop to enumerate the tuples executes $O(i^2) = O(k^2)$ times and within the loop (Lines 8-10), it has to compute $\psi_i^e \leftarrow \psi_i^e \oplus \eta\eta(i_1, i_2)T_1T_{i_1}T_{i_2}\theta_{i_2}T_i\delta_i$ in Line 09 which gives the dominating complexity of the algorithm. This can be written as

$$\psi_i^e \leftarrow \Sigma_\oplus \eta\eta(i_1, i_2)T_1T_{i_1}T_{i_2}\theta_{i_2}T_i\delta_i = \Sigma_\oplus T_1T_{i_1}T_{i_2}T_i(1 \oplus \alpha \oplus \beta\gamma)(1 \oplus \alpha_{s_1} \oplus \beta_{s_1}\gamma_{s_1})\alpha_{s_2}\gamma_{s_2}\beta_{s_3}\gamma_{s_3}$$

where s_1 and s_2 and s_3 denote subsets of terms associated with $\eta(i_1, i_2)(T_1, T_{i_1}, T_{i_2}, T_{i_2+1}, T_{i_2+2}, \ldots, T_i, \ldots, T_k)$, $\theta(T_{i_2+1}, T_{i_2+2}, \ldots, T_{i-1})$ and $\delta(T_{i+1}, T_{i+2}, \ldots, T_k)$ functions, respectively. The term dominating the complexity of this expression is $T_1T_{i_1}T_{i_2}T_i\beta\gamma\beta_{s_1}\gamma_{s_1}\alpha_{s_2}\gamma_{s_2}\beta_{s_3}\gamma_{s_3}$. The lengths of α and β functions are $O(k)$. The lengths of γ functions are $O(k^2)$. Thus the worst case length of the expression is $O(k^{12})$. This yields $O(k^{12}\log k)$ time and $O(k^{12})$ storage to obtain the Reed-Muller expression for ψ_i^e. The maximum spread is 2^{48} with $c = 48$ determined by the product of sixteen 3-terms with 48 possible negative literals. Since the function ψ_i^e has to be computed $O(k^2)$ times in the loop of Lines 8-10 and $O(k)$ times in the major loop (Lines 6-14), the total time complexity is $O(k^{15}\log k)$. The storage requirement is $O(k^{15})$.

We should also consider the worst case sizes of ψ_i and ψ in Lines 11 and 12. These expressions are updated $O(k)$ times in the major loop (Lines 6-14) and in each update the sizes might go up by $O(k^{15})$. Thus the maximum worst case sizes are $O(k^{16})$. To obtain the Reed-Muller form of these expressions, we use Algorithm 1 which takes $O(k^{16}\log k)$ time and $O(k^{16})$ storage. Note, we can add or subtract the sets of minterms using *Exclusive OR* ($\oplus$) operation because all the components are mutually disjoint and in computing the corrected function ψ_i^c, we take away ψ_e^i which are subsets of minterms of ψ_i.

As we indicated in the first paragraph of this Section and Line 19, to determine whether T_1 is essential or not, we compare to determine whether η and ψ are identical. We can scan the sorted output lists *Terms* for η and ψ in the same order comparing pairs of terms, one from the sorted list for η and the other from the corresponding position in the sorted list for ψ, for equality. *If at any step, the pair of terms do not match, we can conclude that* $\eta \neq \psi$ *and therefore,* T_1 *is essential. This comparison step will take* $O(k^3)$ *time since the size of* η *is bounded by* $O(k^3)$.

7 The Main Algorithm

In this section, we present the main algorithm of our paper that decides the satisfiability of a *3-CNF* Boolean expression based on the formulation presented in Section 3. A crucial component of this algorithm is Algorithm 2 presented in Section 6 to determine whether an implicant is an essential implicant in a projected *3-DNF* form of a Boolean expression. We apply this algorithm to check whether $E(t_i^e)$ of Lemma 1 is essential or not for $1 \leq i \leq m$.

Main Algorithm : The 3-satisfiability Algorithm

Input: A Boolean function of n variables $g(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n)$ given in 3-CNF form with clauses $(c_1, c_2, \ldots, c_m)$
Output:YES if g is satisfiable, NO if g is not satisfiable.

01 *Obtain a 3-DNF form of $f = \overline{g}$ by applying De Morgan's theorem*
($f = t_1 + t_2 + \ldots + t_m$, where $t_i = \overline{c_i}$, $1 \leq i \leq m$)
02 *TwoTerms* $\leftarrow$ *null*
03 **for** $i \leftarrow 1$ **to** m **do**
04 *Obtain an expansion t_i^e of t_i and derive the associated term $E(t_i^e)$*
05 *Determine whether $E(t_i^e)$ is an essential implicant in the function f_i^e which is obtained by adding $E(t_i^e)$ in f (see Lemma 1)*
06 ***If*** *$E(t_i^e)$ is essential in f_i^e* ***then***
07 ***return YES***
08 ***Exit*** *(Conclude $f \neq 1$(logical) implying g is satisfiable)*
09 **end if**
10 ***If*** *$E(t_i^e)$ is a non-essential implicant of f_i^e* ***then*** *TwoTerms* $\leftarrow$ *TwoTerms* $\cup\, t_i^e$
11 **end for**
12 *Obtain an equivalent 2-DNF expression of f as $f^e = t_1^e + t_2^e \ldots + t_m^e$ with the 2-terms in TwoTerms*
13 *Apply iterated consensus algorithm to determine whether $f^e = 1$ or $f^e \neq 1$*
14 ***If*** *$f^e = 1$* ***then*** *(g is not satisfiable.)* ***return*** *NO* ***else*** *(g is satisfiable.)* ***return*** *YES*

7.1 Complexity Analysis for the Main Algorithm

Line 01 of the main algorithm takes $O(m)$ time to covert the 3-*CNF* expression to a 3-*DNF* form by applying De Morgan's theorem. The iterated consensus algorithm in Line 13 takes $O(n^2)$ time [Hachtel-Somenzi96]. The time complexity of the algorithm is dominated by line 05 where we determine whether $E(t_i^e)$ is an essential implicant in the function f_i^e which is obtained by adding $E(t_i^e)$ in f as in Lemma 1. This is done in the projected domain of $E(t_i^e)$ by testing whether $T_1 = E(t_i^e)$ is essential in the projected function of f_i^e. Let us denote this projected function also as f^{pr}. Converting the problem to the projected domain takes $O(m)$ time at worst. The determination of whether T_1 is an essential implicant in f^{pr} takes $O(k^{16} \log k)$ time and $O(k^{16})$ storage. Thus, the total time complexity for testing all the excess terms $E(t_i^e)$ for $(1 \leq i \leq m)$ takes a total of $O(m^{17} \log m)$ time and $O(m^{17})$ storage. The algorithm could take $O(m^{16})$ amount of storage by reusing the storage in the main algorithm for different terms. The value of k may be different for different values of i but in the worst case they all may equal m.

8 Conclusions

We have presented an $O(m^{17} \log m)$ time algorithm to solve the 3-satisfiability problem with m input clauses. The goal of this paper was to establish the existence of a polynomially bounded time algorithm to solve the long standing open problem. The paper did not attempt to optimize the algorithm. There is a significant body of literature on SAT-solver which could be brought to bear on the proposed algorithm for further improvements.

References

[Aho-Hopcroft-Ullman74] Aho, A. V., Hopcroft, J. E. and Ullman, J. D. "The Design and Analysis of Computer Algorithms," Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.,1974.

[Aspvall-Plass-Tarjan79] Aspvall Bengt, Plass, Michael F. and Tarjan, Robert E. , "A linear-time algorithm for testing the truth of certain quantified boolean formulas", Information Processing Letters 8(3): 121-123,(1979).

[Cook71] Cook, S. A. "The Complexity of Theorem Proving Procedures," *Proc. 3rd Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, 1971, pp.151-158.

[Conway-Guy] Conway, J. H. and Guy, R. K. "The Book of Numbers", Springer-Verlag, New York, 1996.

[Garey-Johnson79] Garey, M. R. and Johnson, D. S. "Computers and Intractability: A Guide to the Theory of NP-Completeness," W. H. Freeman and Co. New York, 1979.

[Hachtel-Somenzi96] Hachtel, G. D. and Somenzi, F. "Logic Synthesis and Verification Algorithms", Kluwer Academic Publishers, Boston, 1996.

[Karp72] Karp, R. M. "Reducibility among Combinatorial Problems," in Miller, R. E., and Thatcher, J. W. (eds.) *Complexity of Computer Computations*, Plenum Press, New York, 1972.

[Mukhopadhyay-Schmitz70] Mukhopadhyay, Amar and Schmitz, G. " Minimization of Exclusive OR and Logical Equivalence of Switching Circuits," *IEEE Transactions on Computers*, Vol. C-19, No.2, pp.132-140, Feb. 1970.

[Mukhopadhyay71] Mukhopadhyay, Amar, "Complete Sets of Logic Primitives," Chapter 1 of "Recent Developments in Switching Theory," (Ed. Mukhopadhyay, Amar), pp.1-26, Academic Press, New York, 1971.(This book is availabl free from http://vlsi.cs.ucf.edu/)[The current last name of the author 'Mukherjee' is a short form of 'Mukhopadhyay']

[Sasao99] Sasao, T. "Switching Theory for Logic Synthesis," Kluwer Academic Publishers,, Boston, 1999.

[Muller54] Muller, D.E., "Application of Boolean Algebra to Switching Circuit Design and to Error Detection", *IRE Transactions Electron. Comput.*,EC-3,pp.6-12, 1954.

[Reed54] Reed, I.S., "A Class of multiple-error-correcting codes and their decoding scheme", *IRE Tran. Information Theory*,Vol.4, pp.38-42, 1954.

[Shannon38] Shannon, C. E. "A Symbolic Analysis of Relay and Switching Circuits," *Transactions AIEE*, Vol. 57,pp.713-723, 1938.

[Zhegalkin27] Zhegalkin, I. I. "The Technique of Calculation of Statements in Symbolic Logic," (in Russian) Mathe.Sbornik, Vol.34, pp.9-28, 1927.