

# Unsatisfiable CNF-formulas

Heidi Gebauer \*

November 17, 2018

## Abstract

A Boolean formula in a conjunctive normal form is called a  $(k, s)$ -*formula* if every clause contains exactly  $k$  variables and every variable occurs in at most  $s$  clauses. We show that there are unsatisfiable  $(k, 4 \cdot \frac{2^k}{k})$ -CNF formulas.

## 1 A better bound for unsatisfiable formulas

**Theorem 1.1** *For every sufficiently large  $k$  there is an unsatisfiable  $(k, 4 \cdot \frac{2^k}{k})$ -CNF.*

Note that due to Kratochvíl, Savický and Tuza [2] every  $(k, \frac{2^k}{e^k})$ -CNF is satisfiable. So our result shows that this bound is tight up to a factor  $4e$ .

*Proof:* We consider the class  $\mathcal{C}$  of hypergraphs  $\mathcal{G}$  whose vertices can be arranged in a binary tree  $T_{\mathcal{G}}$  such that every hyperedge of  $\mathcal{G}$  is a path of  $T_{\mathcal{G}}$ . For positive integers  $k, s \geq 1$  we denote by a  $(k, s)$ -*tree* a  $k$ -uniform hypergraph  $\mathcal{G} \in \mathcal{C}$  such that

- every full branch of  $T_{\mathcal{G}}$  contains a hyperedge of  $\mathcal{G}$  and
- every vertex of  $T_{\mathcal{G}}$  belongs to at most  $s$  hyperedges of  $\mathcal{G}$

When there is no danger of confusion we write  $\mathcal{G}$  for  $T_{\mathcal{G}}$ . The following lemma is the core of our proof.

**Lemma 1.2** *For every sufficiently large  $k$  there is a  $(k, 2 \cdot \frac{2^k}{k})$ -tree  $\mathcal{G}$ .*

We first show that Lemma 1.2 implies Theorem 1.1. Suppose that there is a  $(k, 2 \cdot \frac{2^k}{k})$ -tree  $\mathcal{G}$  and let  $\mathcal{G}'$  be a copy of  $\mathcal{G}$ . Let  $\mathcal{H}$  be the hypergraph obtained by generating a new root  $v$  and attaching  $\mathcal{G}$  as a left subtree and  $\mathcal{G}'$  as a right subtree. Note that  $\mathcal{H}$  is a  $(k, 2 \cdot \frac{2^k}{k})$ -tree as well.

Let  $(x_1, x'_1), (x_2, x'_2), \dots, (x_r, x'_r)$  denote the pairs of siblings of  $\mathcal{H}$ . We set  $x'_i := \bar{x}_i$  for every  $i$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, r$  (i.e. each non-root vertex represents a literal  $x \in \{x_1, \bar{x}_1, x_2, \bar{x}_2, \dots, x_r, \bar{x}_r\}$ ). Let  $E(\mathcal{H})$

---

\*Institute of Theoretical Computer Science, ETH Zurich, CH-8092 Switzerland. Email: gebauerh@inf.ethz.ch.

denote the set of hyperedges of  $\mathcal{H}$ . Then for every hyperedge  $\{y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n\} \in E(\mathcal{H})$  we form the clause  $C_{\{y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n\}} = (y_1 \vee y_2 \vee \dots \vee y_n)$  and set  $\mathcal{F} := \bigwedge_{e \in E(\mathcal{H})} C_e$ .

Note that every variable  $x_i$  of  $\mathcal{F}$  occurs in at most  $2 \cdot \Delta(F)$  clauses with  $\Delta(F)$  denoting the maximum degree a variable in  $\mathcal{F}$ . Indeed, the number of occurrences of the variable  $x_i$  is bounded by the number of occurrences of the literal  $x_i$  plus the number of occurrences of the literal  $\bar{x}_i$ , which is at most  $2\Delta F$ . So  $\mathcal{F}$  is a  $(k, 2 \cdot \frac{2^k}{k})$ -CNF.

It remains to show that  $\mathcal{F}$  is not satisfiable. Let  $\alpha$  be an assignment to  $\{x_1, \dots, x_r\}$ .

**Observation 1.3** *Note that there is (at least) one full branch  $b_{full}$  of  $\mathcal{H}$  such that all literals along  $b_{full}$  are set to FALSE by  $\alpha$ .*

By assumption  $b_{full}$  contains a hyperedge  $h$ . But  $\alpha$  does not satisfy the clause  $C_h$ , implying that  $\alpha$  does not satisfy  $\mathcal{F}$ . Since  $\alpha$  was chosen arbitrarily,  $\mathcal{F}$  is not satisfiable.  $\square$

It remains to prove our key lemma.

*Proof of Lemma 1.2:* We need some notation first. The vertex set and the hyperedge set of a hypergraph  $\mathcal{H}$  are denoted by  $V(\mathcal{H})$  and  $E(\mathcal{H})$ , respectively. By a slight abuse of notation we consider  $E(\mathcal{H})$  as a multiset, i.e. every hyperedge  $e$  can have a multiplicity greater than 1. By a *bottom hyperedge* of a tree  $T_{\mathcal{H}}$  we denote a hyperedge covering a leaf of  $T_{\mathcal{H}}$ . Let  $d = \frac{2^k}{k}$ . For simplicity we assume that  $k$  is a power of 2, implying that  $d$  is power of 2 as well.

To construct the required hypergraph  $\mathcal{G}$  we establish first a (not necessarily  $k$ -uniform) hypergraph  $\mathcal{H}$  and then successively modify its hyperedges and  $T_{\mathcal{H}}$ . The following lemma is about the first step.

**Lemma 1.4** *There is a hypergraph  $\mathcal{H} \in \mathcal{C}$  with maximum degree  $2d$  such that every full branch of  $T_{\mathcal{H}}$  has  $2^i$  bottom hyperedges of size  $\log d + 1 - i$  for every  $i$  with  $0 \leq i \leq \log d$ .*

*Proof of Lemma 1.4:* Let  $T$  be a binary tree with  $\log d + 1$  levels. In order to construct the desired hypergraph  $\mathcal{H}$  we proceed for each vertex  $v$  of  $T$  as follows. For each leaf descendant  $w$  of  $v$  we let the path from  $v$  to  $w$  be a hyperedge of multiplicity  $2^{l(v)}$  where  $l(v)$  denotes the level of  $v$ . Figure 1 shows an illustration. The construction yields that each full branch of  $T_{\mathcal{H}}$  has  $2^i$  bottom hyperedges




Figure 1: An illustration of  $\mathcal{H}$  for  $d = 4$ . The hyperedge  $\{a, b, c\}$  has multiplicity 1,  $\{b, c\}$  has multiplicity 2 and  $\{c\}$  has multiplicity 4.

of size  $\log d + 1 - i$  for every  $i$  with  $0 \leq i \leq \log d$ . So it remains to show that  $d(v) \leq 2d$  for every vertex of  $v \in V(T)$ . Note that every vertex  $v$  has  $2^{\log d - l(v)}$  leaf descendants in  $T_{\mathcal{H}}$ , implying that  $v$  is the start node of  $2^{\log d - l(v)} \cdot 2^{l(v)} \leq d$  hyperedges. So the degree of the root is at most  $d \leq 2d$ . We then apply induction. Suppose that  $d(u) \leq 2d$  for all nodes  $u$  with  $l(u) \leq i - 1$  for some  $i$  with  $1 \leq i \leq \log d$  and let  $v$  be a vertex on level  $i$ . By construction exactly half of the hyperedges containing the ancestor of  $v$  also contain  $v$  itself. Hence  $v$  occurs in at most  $\frac{1}{2} \cdot 2d = d$  hyperedges as non-start node. Together with the fact that  $v$  is the start node of at most  $d$  hyperedges this implies that  $d(v) \leq d + d \leq 2d$ .  $\square$

The next lemma deals with the second step of the construction of the required hypergraph  $\mathcal{G}$ .

**Lemma 1.5** *There is a hypergraph  $\mathcal{H}' \in \mathcal{C}$  with maximum degree  $2d$  such that each full branch of  $T_{\mathcal{H}'}$  has  $2^i$  bottom hyperedges of size  $\log d + 1 - i + \lfloor \log \log d \rfloor$  for some  $i$  with  $0 \leq i \leq \log d$ .*

*Proof:* Let  $\mathcal{H} \in \mathcal{C}$  be a hypergraph with maximum degree  $2d$  such that every leaf  $u$  of  $T_{\mathcal{H}}$  is the end node of a set  $S_i(u)$  of  $2^i$  hyperedges of size  $\log d + 1 - i$  for every  $i$  with  $0 \leq i \leq \log d$ . (Lemma 1.4 guarantees the existence of  $\mathcal{H}$ .) To each leaf  $u$  of  $T_{\mathcal{H}}$  we then attach a binary tree  $T'_u$  of height  $\lfloor \log \log d \rfloor$  in such a way that  $u$  is the root of  $T'_u$ . Let  $v_0, \dots, v_{2^{\lfloor \log \log d \rfloor - 1}}$  denote the leaves of  $T'_u$ . For every  $i$  with  $0 \leq i \leq 2^{\lfloor \log \log d \rfloor} - 1$  we then augment every hyperedge of  $S_i(u)$  with the set of vertices different from  $u$  along the full branch of  $T'_u$  ending at  $v_i$ .

After repeating this procedure for every leaf  $u$  of  $T_{\mathcal{H}}$  we get the desired hypergraph  $\mathcal{H}'$ . It remains to show that every vertex in  $\mathcal{H}'$  has degree at most  $2d$ . To this end note first that during our construction the vertices of  $\mathcal{H}$  did not change their degree. Secondly, let  $u$  be a leaf of  $T_{\mathcal{H}}$ . By assumption  $u$  has degree at most  $2d$  and by construction  $d(v) \leq d(u)$  for all vertices  $v \in V(\mathcal{H}') \setminus \mathcal{V}(\mathcal{H})$ , which completes our proof.  $\square$

**Lemma 1.6** *There is a hypergraph  $\mathcal{H}'' \in \mathcal{C}$  with maximum degree  $2d$  such that every full branch of  $T_{\mathcal{H}''}$  has one bottom hyperedge of size  $\log d + 1 + \lfloor \log \log d \rfloor$ .*

Note that due to our choice of  $d$ , Lemma 1.6 directly implies Lemma 1.2.  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 1.6:* By Lemma 1.5 there is a hypergraph  $\mathcal{H}' \in \mathcal{C}$  with maximum degree  $2d$  such that each full branch of  $T_{\mathcal{H}'}$  has  $2^i$  bottom hyperedges of size  $\log d + 1 - i + \lfloor \log \log d \rfloor$  for some  $i$  with  $0 \leq i \leq \log d$ . For every leaf  $u$  of  $T_{\mathcal{H}'}$  we proceed as follows. Let  $e_1, \dots, e_{2^i}$  denote the bottom hyperedges of  $\mathcal{H}'$  ending at  $u$ . We then attach a binary tree  $T''$  of height  $i$  to  $u$  in such a way that  $u$  is the root of  $T''$ . Let  $p_1, \dots, p_{2^i}$  denote the full branches of  $T''$ . We finally augment  $e_j$  with the vertices along  $p_j$ , for  $j = 1 \dots 2^i$ .

After repeating this procedure for every leaf  $u$  of  $T_{\mathcal{H}'}$  we get the resulting graph  $\mathcal{H}''$ . By construction every full path of  $T_{\mathcal{H}''}$  has one bottom hyperedge of size  $\log d + 1 + \lfloor \log \log d \rfloor$ . A similar argument as in the proof of Lemma 1.5 shows that the maximum degree of  $\mathcal{H}''$  is at most  $2d$ .  $\square$

## References

- [1] N. Alon and J.H. Spencer, *The Probabilistic Method* *J. John Wiley & Sons* (2002).
- [2] J. Kratochvíl, P. Savický and Z. Tuza, One more occurrence of variables makes satisfiability jump from trivial to NP-complete *SIAM Journal of Computing* 22(1) **22(1)** (1993) 203210