

# The Complexity of Propositional Implication<sup>☆</sup>

Olaf Beyersdorff<sup>a</sup>, Arne Meier<sup>a</sup>, Michael Thomas<sup>a</sup>, Heribert Vollmer<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup>*Institut für Theoretische Informatik, Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz Universität,  
Appelstr. 4, 30167 Hannover, Germany*

---

## Abstract

The question whether a set of formulae  $\Gamma$  implies a formula  $\varphi$  is fundamental. The present paper studies the complexity of the above implication problem for propositional formulae that are built from a systematically restricted set of Boolean connectives. We give a complete complexity classification for all sets of Boolean functions in the meaning of Post's lattice and show that the implication problem is efficiently solvable only if the connectives are definable using the constants  $\{0, 1\}$  and only one of  $\{\wedge, \vee, \oplus\}$ . The problem remains coNP-complete in all other cases. We also consider the restriction of  $\Gamma$  to singletons.

*Key words:* Computational complexity, Propositional implication, Post's lattice

---

## 1. Introduction

SAT, the satisfiability problem for propositional formulae, is the most fundamental and historically first NP-complete problem (proven by S. Cook in 1971 [6]). A natural question, posed by H. Lewis in 1979, is what the sources of hardness in Cook's Theorem are. More precisely, Lewis systematically restricted the language of propositional formulae and determined the computational complexity of the satisfiability problem depending on the set of allowed connectives. E. g., if only logical "and" ( $\wedge$ ) and "or" ( $\vee$ ) are allowed, we deal with *monotone formulae* for which the satisfiability problem obviously is easy to solve (in polynomial time). Lewis proved that SAT is NP-complete iff the negation of implication,  $x \wedge \neg y$ , is an allowed connective or can be simulated by the allowed connectives [7]. That a logical connective  $f$  can be simulated by a set of logical connectives (in other words: a set of Boolean functions)  $B$  formally means that  $f$  can be obtained from functions from  $B$  by superposition, i. e., general composition of functions; in other words, that  $f$  is a member of the *clone* generated by  $B$ , in symbols:  $f \in [B]$ . This brings us into the realm of Post's lattice, the lattice of all Boolean clones [10]. In this language, the problem SAT( $B$ ), the satisfiability problem for propositional formulas with connectives restricted to the set  $B$  of Boolean functions, is NP-complete iff  $S_1 \subseteq [B]$ ; otherwise the problem is polynomial-time solvable. Note that the 2-ary Boolean function  $x \wedge \neg y$  forms a basis for  $S_1$ .

Since then, many problems related to propositional formulae and Boolean circuits have been studied for restricted sets of connectives or gates, and their computational complexity has been classified, depending on a parameter  $B$ , as just explained

for SAT. These include, e. g., the equivalence problem [11], the circuit value problem [12], the quantified Boolean formulae problem QBF [12], but also recently questions related to non-classical logics like LTL [1], CTL [8], or default logic [2]. An important part of the proof of the classification of different reasoning tasks for default logic in the latter paper [2] was the identification of the coNP-complete and polynomial-time fragments of the *propositional implication problem*. Though implication is without doubt a very fundamental and natural problem, its computational complexity has not yet been fully classified. This is the purpose of the present note.

We study the problem, given a set  $\Gamma$  of propositional formulae and a formula  $\varphi$ , to decide if  $\varphi$  is implied by  $\Gamma$ . Depending on the set of allowed connectives in the occurring formulae, we determine the computational complexity of this problem as coNP-complete,  $\oplus$ L-complete, in  $AC^0[2]$ , or in  $AC^0$ . The type of reduction we use are *constant-depth reductions* [5] and the weaker  $AC^0$  *many-one reductions*. For both reductions,  $AC^0$  forms the 0-degree. We also consider the case of the problem restricted to singleton sets  $\Gamma$ , the singleton premise implication problem. Interestingly, the complexity of the previously  $\oplus$ L-complete cases now drops down to the class  $AC^0[2]$ ; all other cases stay the same as for the unrestricted problem. Finally, our results give as an easy consequence a refinement of Reith's previous classification of the equivalence problem for propositional formulae [11]. While Reith only considered the dichotomy between the coNP-complete and logspace-solvable cases, we show that under constant-depth reductions, 3 complexity degrees occur: coNP-complete, membership in  $AC^0[2]$ , or membership in  $AC^0$ .

## 2. Preliminaries

In this paper we make use of standard notions of complexity theory. The arising complexity degrees compass the classes

---

<sup>☆</sup>Supported in part by DFG grant VO 630/6-1.

*Email addresses:* beyersdorff@thi.uni-hannover.de (Olaf Beyersdorff), meier@thi.uni-hannover.de (Arne Meier), thomas@thi.uni-hannover.de (Michael Thomas), vollmer@thi.uni-hannover.de (Heribert Vollmer)

$AC^0$ ,  $AC^0[2]$ ,  $\oplus L$ ,  $P$ , and  $coNP$  (cf. [9, 14] for background information).

$AC^0$  forms the class of languages recognizable by a logtime-uniform Boolean circuits of constant depth and polynomial size over  $\{\wedge, \vee, \neg\}$ , where the fan-in of gates of the first two types is not bounded.

The class  $AC^0[2]$  is defined similarly as  $AC^0$ , but in addition to  $\{\wedge, \vee, \neg\}$  we also allow  $\oplus$ -gates of unbounded fan-in.

The class  $\oplus L$  is defined as the class of languages  $L$  such that there exists a nondeterministic logspace Turing machine that exhibits an odd number of accepting paths iff  $x \in L$  for all  $x$ .

For the hardness results we use *constant-depth* and  $AC^0$  *many-one reductions*, defined as follows:

A language  $A$  is *constant-depth reducible* to a language  $B$  ( $A \leq_{cd} B$ ) if there exists a logtime-uniform  $AC^0$ -circuit family  $\{C_n\}_{n \geq 0}$  with  $\{\wedge, \vee, \neg\}$ -gates and oracle gates for  $B$  such that for all  $x$ ,  $C_{|x|}(x) = 1$  iff  $x \in A$  [14].

A language  $A$  is  $AC^0$  *many-one reducible* to a language  $B$  ( $A \leq_m^{AC^0} B$ ) if there exists a function  $f$  that can be computed by some logtime-uniform  $AC^0$ -circuit family such that  $x \in A \iff f(x) \in B$ .

For both reductions, the class  $AC^0$  forms the  $\mathbf{0}$ -degree. Furthermore, it is easy to see that

$$MOD_2 := \{w \in \{0, 1\}^* \mid |w|_1 \equiv 1 \pmod{2}\},$$

where  $|w|_1 = |\{i \mid 1 \leq i \leq n, w_i = 1\}|$ , is complete for  $AC^0[2]$  under  $\leq_{cd}$ -reductions.

We assume familiarity with propositional logic. The set of all propositional formulae is denoted by  $\mathcal{L}$ . For  $\Gamma \subseteq \mathcal{L}$  and  $\varphi \in \mathcal{L}$ , we write  $\Gamma \models \varphi$  iff all assignments satisfying all formulas in  $\Gamma$  also satisfy  $\varphi$ .

### 3. Boolean Clones

A propositional formula using only connectives from a finite set  $B$  of Boolean functions is called a  $B$ -formula. The set of all  $B$ -formulae is denoted by  $\mathcal{L}(B)$ . In order to cope with the infinitely many finite sets  $B$  of Boolean functions, we require some algebraic tools to classify the complexity of the infinitely many arising reasoning problems. A *clone* is a set  $B$  of Boolean functions that is closed under superposition, i. e.,  $B$  contains all projections and is closed under arbitrary composition. We denote by  $[B]$  the smallest clone containing  $B$  and call  $B$  a *base* for  $[B]$ . In [10] Post classified the lattice of all clones and found a finite base for each clone, see Fig. 1. In order to introduce the clones relevant to this paper, we define the following notions for  $n$ -ary Boolean functions  $f$ :

- $f$  is *c-reproducing* if  $f(c, \dots, c) = a$ ,  $c \in \{0, 1\}$ .
- $f$  is *monotone* if  $a_1 \leq b_1, \dots, a_n \leq b_n$  implies  $f(a_1, \dots, a_n) \leq f(b_1, \dots, b_n)$ .
- $f$  is *c-separating* if there exists an  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$  such that  $f(a_1, \dots, a_n) = c$  implies  $a_i = c$ ,  $c \in \{0, 1\}$ .
- $f$  is *self-dual* if  $f \equiv \text{dual}(f)$ , where  $\text{dual}(f)(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \neg f(\neg x_1, \dots, \neg x_n)$ .

- $f$  is *linear* if  $f \equiv x_1 \oplus \dots \oplus x_n \oplus c$  for a constant  $c \in \{0, 1\}$  and variables  $x_1, \dots, x_n$ .

The clones relevant to this paper are listed in Table 1. The definition of all Boolean clones can be found, e. g., in [3].

### 4. The Complexity of the Implication Problem

Let  $B$  be a finite set of Boolean functions. The *Implication Problem* for  $B$ -formulae is defined as

- Problem:*  $\text{IMP}(B)$   
*Instance:* A set  $\Gamma$  of  $B$ -formulae and a  $B$ -formula  $\varphi$ .  
*Question:* Does  $\Gamma \models \varphi$  hold?

The complexity of the implication problem is classified by the following theorem.

**Theorem 4.1.** *Let  $B$  be a finite set of Boolean functions. Then the implication problem for propositional  $B$ -formulae,  $\text{IMP}(B)$ , is*

1. *coNP-complete for  $\leq_m^{AC^0}$ -reductions if  $S_{00} \subseteq [B]$ ,  $S_{10} \subseteq [B]$  or  $D_2 \subseteq [B]$ ,*
2.  *$\oplus L$ -complete for  $\leq_m^{AC^0}$ -reductions if  $L_2 \subseteq [B] \subseteq L$ ,*
3. *in  $AC^0[2]$  and  $MOD_2 \leq_m^{AC^0} \text{IMP}(B)$  if  $N_2 \subseteq [B] \subseteq N$ , and*
4. *in  $AC^0$  for all other cases.*

**Remark 4.2.** For  $N_2 \subseteq [B] \subseteq N$ ,  $\text{IMP}(B)$  is  $AC^0[2]$ -complete under  $\leq_{cd}$ -reductions. However, for  $\leq_m^{AC^0}$ -reductions, a complete problem  $A$  would state that any  $AC^0[2]$ -circuit would be equivalent to an  $AC^0$ -computation followed by a single oracle call to  $A$ . To date, there is no such problem known.

We split the proof of Theorem 4.1 into several lemmas.

**Lemma 4.3.** *Let  $B$  be a finite set of Boolean functions. Then  $\text{IMP}(B)$  is coNP-complete for  $\leq_m^{AC^0}$ -reductions if  $S_{00} \subseteq [B]$  or  $S_{10} \subseteq [B]$ .*

**PROOF.** Membership in coNP is apparent, because given  $\Gamma$  and  $\varphi$ , we just have to check that for all assignments  $\sigma$  to the variables of  $\Gamma$  and  $\varphi$ , either  $\sigma \not\models \Gamma$  or  $\sigma \models \varphi$ .

The hardness proof is inspired by [11]. Observe that  $\text{IMP}(B) \equiv_{cd} \text{IMP}(B \cup \{1\})$  if  $\wedge \in [B]$ , and that  $\text{IMP}(B) \equiv_{cd} \text{IMP}(B \cup \{0\})$  if  $\vee \in [B]$  (because  $\varphi \models \psi \iff \varphi_{[1/t]} \wedge t \models \psi_{[1/t]}$  and  $\varphi \models \psi \iff \varphi_{[0/f]} \vee f \models \psi_{[0/f]}$  where  $t, f$  are new variables). It hence suffices to show that  $\text{IMP}(B)$  is coNP-hard for  $M_0 = [S_{00} \cup \{0\}]$  and  $M_1 = [S_{10} \cup \{1\}]$ . We will show that  $\text{IMP}(B)$  is coNP-hard for each base  $B$  with  $M_2 \subseteq [B]$ . To prove this claim, we will provide a reduction from  $\text{TAUT}_{DNF}$  to  $\text{IMP}(B)$ , where  $\text{TAUT}_{DNF}$  is the coNP-complete problem to decide, whether a given propositional formula in disjunctive normal form is a tautology.

Let  $\varphi$  be a propositional formula in disjunctive normal form over the propositions  $X = \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}$ . Then  $\varphi = \bigvee_{i=1}^n \bigwedge_{j=1}^m l_{ij}$ , where  $l_{ij}$  are literals over  $X$ . We take new variables  $Y = \{y_1, \dots, y_k\}$  and replace in  $\varphi$  each negative literal  $l_{ij} = \neg x_l$  by  $y_l$ .

Name	Definition	Base
BF	All Boolean functions	$\{\wedge, \neg\}$
$M_2$	$\{f : f \text{ is monotone and 0- and 1-reproducing}\}$	$\{\vee, \wedge\}$
$S_{00}$	$\{f : f \text{ is 0-separating}\} \cap M_2$	$\{x \vee (y \wedge z)\}$
$S_{10}$	$\{f : f \text{ is 1-separating}\} \cap M_2$	$\{x \wedge (y \vee z)\}$
$D_2$	$\{f : f \text{ is monotone and self-dual}\}$	$\{(x \wedge y) \vee (y \wedge z) \vee (x \wedge z)\}$
L	$\{f : f \text{ is linear}\}$	$\{\oplus, 1\}$
$L_2$	$\{f : f \text{ is linear and 0- and 1-reproducing}\}$	$\{x \oplus y \oplus z\}$
V	$\{f : f \equiv c_0 \vee \bigvee_{i=1}^n c_i x_i \text{ for } c_i \in \{0, 1\}, 1 \leq i \leq n\}$	$\{\vee, 0, 1\}$
E	$\{f : f \equiv c_0 \wedge \bigwedge_{i=1}^n c_i x_i \text{ for } c_i \in \{0, 1\}, 1 \leq i \leq n\}$	$\{\wedge, 0, 1\}$
N	$\{f : f \text{ depends on at most one variable}\}$	$\{\neg, 0, 1\}$
$N_2$	$\{f : f \text{ is the negation or a projection}\}$	$\{\neg\}$

Table 1: A list of Boolean clones with definitions and bases.




Figure 1: Post's lattice. Colors indicate the complexity of  $\text{IMP}(B)$ , the Implication Problem for  $B$ -formulae.

Let  $\varphi'$  be the resulting formula. Now define  $\psi_1 := \bigwedge_{i=1}^k (x_i \vee y_i)$  and  $\psi_2 := \varphi'$ . We claim that  $\varphi \in \text{TAUT}_{\text{DNF}} \iff \psi_1 \models \psi_2$ .

Let us first assume  $\varphi \in \text{TAUT}_{\text{DNF}}$  and let  $\sigma: X \cup Y \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  be an assignment such that  $\sigma \models \psi_1$ . As  $\varphi$  is a tautology,  $\sigma \models \varphi$ . But also  $\sigma \models \varphi'$ , as we simply replaced the negated variables in  $\varphi$  by positive ones and  $\varphi'$  is monotone. As  $\sigma$  was arbitrarily chosen,  $\psi_1 \models \psi_2$ .

For the opposite direction, let  $\varphi \notin \text{TAUT}_{\text{DNF}}$ . Then there exists an assignment  $\sigma: X \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  such that  $\sigma \not\models \varphi$ . We extend  $\sigma$  to an assignment  $\sigma': X \cup Y \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  by setting  $\sigma'(y_i) = 1 - x_i$  for  $i = 1, \dots, k$ . Then  $\sigma'(x_i) = 0$  iff  $\sigma'(y_i) = 1$ , and consequently  $\sigma'$  simulates  $\sigma$  on  $\varphi'$ . As a result,  $\sigma' \not\models \varphi' = \psi_2$ . Yet, either  $\sigma'(x_i) = 1$  or  $\sigma'(y_i) = 1$  and thus  $\sigma' \models \psi_1$ , yielding  $\psi_1 \not\models \psi_2$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 4.4.** *Let  $B$  be a finite set of Boolean functions. Then  $\text{IMP}(B)$  is coNP-complete for  $\leq_m^{\text{AC}^0}$ -reductions if  $\text{D}_2 \subseteq [B]$ .*

**PROOF.** Again we just have to argue for coNP-hardness of  $\text{IMP}(B)$ . We give a reduction from  $\text{TAUT}_{\text{DNF}}$  to  $\text{IMP}(B)$  for  $[B] \subseteq \text{D}_2$  by modifying the reduction given in the proof of Lemma 4.3.

Given a formula  $\varphi$  in disjunctive normal form, define the formulae  $\psi_1$  and  $\psi_2$  as above. As  $\text{D}_2 \subseteq [B]$ , we know that  $g(x, y, z) := (x \wedge y) \vee (y \wedge z) \vee (x \wedge z) \in [B]$ . Clearly,  $g(x, y, 0) = x \wedge y$  and  $g(x, y, 1) = x \vee y$ . Denote by  $\psi_i^B$ ,  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ , the formula  $\psi_i$  with all occurrences of  $x \wedge y$  and  $x \vee y$  replaced with a  $B$ -representation of  $g(x, y, f)$  and  $g(x, y, t)$ , resp. The variables  $x$  and  $y$  occur several times in  $g$ , hence  $\psi_1^B$  and  $\psi_2^B$  might be exponential in the length of  $\varphi$  (recall that  $\psi_2$  is  $\varphi$  with all negative literals replaced by new variables). That this is not the case follows from the associativity of  $\wedge$  and  $\vee$ : we insert parentheses in such a way that we get a tree of logarithmic depth.

We now map a pair  $(\psi_1, \psi_2)$  to  $(\psi'_1, \psi'_2)$  where

$$\psi'_1 := g(\psi_1^B, t, f) \text{ and } \psi'_2 := g(g(\psi_1^B, \psi_2^B, f), t, f).$$

We claim that  $\psi_1 \models \psi_2 \iff \psi'_1 \models \psi'_2$ .

Let  $\sigma$  be an arbitrary assignment for the variables in  $\varphi$ . Then  $\sigma$  may be extended to  $\{f, t\}$  in the following ways:

$\sigma(t) := c, \sigma(f) := c, c \in \{0, 1\}$ : Then both  $\psi'_1$  and  $\psi'_2$  are equivalent to  $c$ .

$\sigma(t) := 1, \sigma(f) := 0$ : In this case,  $g(\psi_1^B, 1, 0) \equiv \psi_1^B \wedge 1 \equiv \psi_1$  and  $g(g(\psi_1^B, \psi_2^B, 0), 1, 0) \equiv (\psi_1^B \wedge \psi_2^B) \wedge 1 \equiv \psi_1 \wedge \psi_2$ .

$\sigma(t) := 0, \sigma(f) := 1$ : In this case,  $g(\psi_1^B, 0, 1) \equiv \psi_1^B \vee 0 \equiv \text{dual}(\psi_1)$  and  $g(g(\psi_1^B, \psi_2^B, 1), 0, 1) \equiv (\psi_1^B \vee \psi_2^B) \vee 0 \equiv \text{dual}(\psi_1) \vee \text{dual}(\psi_2)$ .

As  $\psi_1 \models \psi_2$  iff  $\psi_1 \models \psi_1 \wedge \psi_2$  and  $\text{dual}(\psi_1) \models \text{dual}(\psi_1) \vee \text{dual}(\psi_2)$  is a tautology, we conclude that  $\psi_1 \models \psi_2 \iff \psi'_1 \models \psi'_2$ . Hence,  $\text{TAUT}_{\text{DNF}} \leq_m^{\text{AC}^0} \text{IMP}(B)$  via the reduction  $\varphi \mapsto (\psi'_1, \psi'_2)$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 4.5.** *Let  $B$  be a finite set of Boolean functions. Then  $\text{IMP}(B)$  is  $\oplus\text{L}$ -complete for  $\leq_m^{\text{AC}^0}$ -reductions if  $\text{L}_2 \subseteq [B] \subseteq \text{L}$ .*

**PROOF.** Observe that  $F \models \alpha$  iff  $F \cup \{\alpha \oplus t, t\}$  is inconsistent. Let  $F'$  denote  $F \cup \{\alpha \oplus t, t\}$  rewritten such that for all  $\varphi \in F'$ ,  $\varphi = c_0 \oplus c_1 x_1 \oplus \dots \oplus c_n x_n$ , where  $c_0, \dots, c_n \in \{0, 1\}$  ( $F'$  is logspace constructible, since  $c_i = 1$  iff  $\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, 0, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_n) \neq \varphi(x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, 1, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_n)$ ).  $F'$  can now be transformed into a system of linear equations  $S$  via

$$c_0 \oplus c_1 x_1 \oplus \dots \oplus c_n x_n \mapsto c_0 + c_1 x_1 + \dots + c_n x_n = 1 \pmod{2}.$$

Clearly, the resulting system of linear equations has a solution iff  $F'$  is consistent. The equations are furthermore defined over the field  $\mathbb{Z}_2$  and can thence be solved using the Gaussian algorithm. And solving a system of linear equations over  $\mathbb{Z}_2$  is  $\oplus\text{L}$ -complete under  $\leq_m^{\text{AC}^0}$ -reductions: let  $\text{MOD-GAP}_2$  denote the problem to decide whether a given directed acyclic graph  $G$  with nodes  $s$  and  $t$  has an odd number of distinct paths leading from  $s$  to  $t$ . Buntrock et al. give an  $\text{NC}^1$ -reduction from  $\text{MOD-GAP}_2$  to the problem whether a given matrix over  $\mathbb{Z}_2$  is nonsingular [4]. The given reduction is actually an  $\text{AC}^0$  many-one reduction. Finally recall that a matrix is nonsingular iff the corresponding system of linear equations has only the trivial solution, hence the claim follows.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.6.** *Let  $B$  be a finite set of Boolean functions. If  $\text{N}_2 \subseteq [B] \subseteq \text{N}$  then  $\text{IMP}(B)$  is contained in  $\text{AC}^0[2]$  and  $\text{MOD}_2 \leq_m^{\text{AC}^0} \text{IMP}(B)$ .*

**PROOF.** Let  $B$  be a finite set of Boolean functions such that  $\text{N}_2 \subseteq [B] \subseteq \text{N}$ . Let  $\varphi$  be a  $B$ -formula and  $\Gamma$  be a set of  $B$ -formulae, both over the set of propositions  $\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ .

We will argue on membership in  $\text{AC}^0[2]$  first. For all  $f \in [B]$ ,  $f$  is equivalent to some literal or a constant. Let  $L$  denote this set of literals, i. e.  $L := \{l_i \mid \exists \psi \in \Gamma: l_i \equiv \psi\}$ , where  $l_i = x_i$  or  $l_i = \neg x_i$  for  $1 \leq i \leq n$ .  $L$  is easily computable from  $\Gamma$  using an  $\text{AC}^0$  circuits with oracle gates for  $\text{MOD}_2$ . It holds that

$$\Gamma \models \varphi \iff \bigwedge_{l_i \in L} l_i \models \varphi \iff \exists L' \subseteq L: \varphi \equiv \bigwedge_{l_i \in L'} l_i.$$

It hence remains to compute an equivalent formula of the form  $\bigwedge_{l_i \in L'} l_i$  from  $\varphi$  and test whether  $L' \subseteq L$ . It is easy to see that the former task can be performed in  $\text{AC}^0[2]$ , while the latter merely requires  $\text{AC}^0$ . Concluding,  $\text{IMP}(B) \in \text{AC}^0[2]$ .

For  $\text{MOD}_2 \leq_m^{\text{AC}^0} \text{IMP}(B)$ , we claim that, for  $x = x_1 \dots x_n \in \{0, 1\}^n$ ,  $x \in \text{MOD}_2$  iff  $t \models \neg^{x_1} \neg^{x_2} \dots \neg^{x_n} (\neg t)$ , where  $\neg^1 := \neg$  and  $\neg^0 := \text{id}$ .

First observe that  $t \models \neg^{x_1} \neg^{x_2} \dots \neg^{x_n} (\neg t)$  iff for all assignments  $\sigma$  of  $t$  to  $\{0, 1\}$ ,  $\sigma \models t$  implies that  $\sigma \models \neg^{x_1} \neg^{x_2} \dots \neg^{x_n} (\neg t)$ . Now, if  $\sigma(t) := 0$  then  $t \models \neg^{x_1} \neg^{x_2} \dots \neg^{x_n} (\neg t)$  is always true, whereas, if  $\sigma(t) := 1$  then  $t \models \neg^{x_1} \neg^{x_2} \dots \neg^{x_n} (\neg t)$  iff  $1 \models \neg^{x_1} \neg^{x_2} \dots \neg^{x_n} 0$ . Hence, the claim applies and it follows that  $\text{MOD}_2 \leq_{\text{cd}} \text{IMP}(B)$ .  $\square$

As an immediate consequence of the above Lemma, we obtain the following Corollary.

**Corollary 4.7.** *Let  $B$  be a finite set of Boolean functions. Then  $\text{IMP}(B)$  is  $\text{AC}^0[2]$ -complete for  $\leq_{\text{cd}}$ -reductions if  $\text{N}_2 \subseteq [B] \subseteq \text{N}$ .*

**Lemma 4.8.** *Let  $B$  be a finite set of Boolean functions such that  $[B] \subseteq V$  or  $[B] \subseteq E$ . Then  $\text{IMP}(B)$  is in  $\text{AC}^0$ .*

**PROOF.** We prove the claim for  $[B] \subseteq V$  only. The case  $[B] \subseteq E$  follows analogously.

Let  $B$  be a finite set of Boolean functions such that  $[B] \subseteq V$ . Let  $\Gamma$  be a finite set of  $B$ -formulae and let  $\varphi$  be a  $B$ -formula such that  $\Gamma$  and  $\varphi$  only use the variables  $x_1, \dots, x_n$ . Let  $\varphi \equiv c_0 \vee c_1 x_1 \vee \dots \vee c_n x_n$  with constants  $c_i \in \{0, 1\}$  for  $0 \leq i \leq n$ . Equally, every formula from  $\Gamma$  is equivalent to an expression of the form  $c'_0 \vee c'_1 x_1 \vee \dots \vee c'_n x_n$  with  $c'_i \in \{0, 1\}$ . Then,  $\Gamma \models \varphi$  iff either  $c_0 = 1$  or there exists a formula  $\psi \equiv c'_0 \vee c'_1 x_1 \vee \dots \vee c'_n x_n$  from  $\Gamma$  such that  $c'_i \leq c_i$  for all  $0 \leq i \leq n$ .

The value of  $c_0$  can be determined by evaluating  $\varphi(0, \dots, 0)$ . Furthermore, for  $1 \leq i \leq n$ ,  $c_i = 0$  iff  $c_0 = 0$  and

$$\varphi(\underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{i-1}, 1, 0, \dots, 0) = 0.$$

The values of the coefficients of formulae in  $\Gamma$  can be computed analogously. Thus  $\text{IMP}(B)$  can be computed in constant depth using oracle gates for  $B$ -formula evaluation. As  $B$ -formula evaluation is in  $\text{NLOGTIME}$  [13] and  $\text{NLOGTIME} \subseteq \text{AC}^0$ , the claim follows.  $\square$

## 5. The Complexity of the Singleton Premise Implication Problem

Let  $B$  be a finite set of Boolean functions. The *Singleton Premise Implication Problem* for  $B$ -formulae is defined as

*Problem:*  $\text{IMP}'(B)$   
*Instance:* Two  $B$ -formulae  $\varphi$  and  $\psi$ .  
*Question:* Does  $\varphi \models \psi$  hold?

**Theorem 5.1.** *Let  $B$  be a finite set of Boolean functions. Then  $\text{IMP}'(B) \in \text{AC}^0[2]$  and  $\text{MOD}_2 \leq_m^{\text{AC}^0} \text{IMP}'(B)$  if  $L_2 \subseteq [B] \subseteq L$ , and equivalent to  $\text{IMP}(B)$ , otherwise.*

**PROOF.** For  $S_{00} \subseteq [B]$ ,  $S_{10} \subseteq [B]$ , and  $D_2 \subseteq [B]$ , observe that the proofs of Lemma 4.3 and Lemma 4.4 actually establish  $\text{coNP}$ -hardness of  $\text{IMP}'(B)$ . Analogously, for  $N_2 \subseteq [B]$ ,  $\text{MOD}_2 \leq_m^{\text{AC}^0} \text{IMP}'(B)$  follows from the same reduction given in the proof of Lemma 4.6. For  $[B] \subseteq V$  and  $[B] \subseteq E$ , we have  $\text{IMP}'(B) \leq_m^{\text{AC}^0} \text{IMP}(B) \in \text{AC}^0$ . It thus remains to show that  $\text{IMP}'(B) \in \text{AC}^0[2]$  for  $[B] \subseteq L$ , and that  $\text{MOD}_2 \leq_m^{\text{AC}^0} \text{IMP}'(B)$  for  $L_2 \subseteq [B]$ .

Let  $(\varphi, \psi)$  be a pair of  $B$ -formulae over the variables  $\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ . As  $[B] \subseteq L$ ,  $\varphi$  and  $\psi$  are equivalent to expressions of the form  $\varphi \equiv c_0 \oplus c_1 x_1 \oplus \dots \oplus c_n x_n$  and  $\psi \equiv c'_0 \oplus c'_1 x_1 \oplus \dots \oplus c'_n x_n$ , where  $c_i, c'_i \in \{0, 1\}$  for  $1 \leq i \leq n$ . It holds that  $\varphi \models \psi$  iff  $\chi := (c_0 \oplus c_1 x_1 \oplus \dots \oplus c_n x_n) \wedge (1 \oplus c'_0 \oplus c'_1 x_1 \oplus \dots \oplus c'_n x_n)$  is unsatisfiable. Assume that  $\varphi \not\models \psi$  and that  $\chi$  is unsatisfiable. We construct an assignment  $\sigma$  such that  $\sigma \models \chi$ . Let  $I := \{i_1, \dots, i_k\}$  denote those indices in  $\{1, \dots, n\}$  satisfying  $c_i = c'_i$  for  $i \in I$ . Define  $\sigma(x_i) := 0$  for  $i \in I$ . As  $\varphi \not\models \psi$ , the set  $\bar{I} := \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus I$  is nonempty and for all  $i \in \bar{I}$ ,  $c_i = 1 \iff c'_i = 0$ . Hence, there is a partition  $P_1 \uplus P_2 = \bar{I}$  such that

$$\sigma \models \chi \iff \sigma \models (c_0 \oplus \bigoplus_{i \in P_1} c_i x_i) \wedge (1 \oplus c'_0 \oplus \bigoplus_{i \in P_2} c'_i x_i).$$

Here the subformulae  $c_0 \oplus \bigoplus_{i \in P_1} c_i x_i$  and  $1 \oplus c'_0 \oplus \bigoplus_{i \in P_2} c'_i x_i$  are over disjoint sets of variables. But still, both subformulae are satisfiable using an appropriate completion of  $\sigma$ . Consequently,  $\sigma$  will also satisfy  $\chi$ —a contradiction to  $\varphi \not\models \psi$ .

Thus  $\varphi \models \psi \iff \varphi \equiv \psi$  and, similar to the proof of Lemma 4.8, it follows that  $\varphi \models \psi$  iff  $c_i = c'_i$  for all  $0 \leq i \leq n$ . There  $c_0 = \varphi(0, \dots, 0)$  and

$$c_i = \varphi(\underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{i-1}, 1, 0, \dots, 0) \oplus c_0, 1 \leq i \leq n.$$

The values of the  $c'_i$ 's can be determined analogously. As  $B$ -formula evaluation is equivalent to  $\text{MOD}_2$  [13],  $\text{IMP}'(B) \in \text{AC}^0[2]$ .

Finally, to prove  $\text{MOD}_2 \leq_m^{\text{AC}^0} \text{IMP}'(B)$  for  $L_2 \subseteq [B]$ , let  $x \in \{0, 1\}^*$  be an instance of  $\text{MOD}_2$ . We map  $x$  to  $(t, \psi)$ , where  $\psi$  is defined as the image of  $x$  under the substitution  $h$  defined as  $h(0y) := t \oplus t \oplus h(y)$ ,  $h(1y) := t \oplus f \oplus h(y)$ , and  $h(\varepsilon) := f$  with  $\varepsilon$  denoting the empty word. Then

$$\begin{aligned} x \in \text{MOD}_2 &\implies \psi \equiv t \implies (t, h(x)) \in \text{IMP}'(B), \\ x \notin \text{MOD}_2 &\implies \psi \equiv f \implies (t, \psi) \notin \text{IMP}'(B). \end{aligned}$$

Whence,  $\text{MOD}_2 \leq_m^{\text{AC}^0} \text{IMP}'(B)$  for  $L_2 \subseteq [B]$ .  $\square$

Let  $\text{EQ}(B)$  denote the equivalence problem for  $B$ -formulae. Obviously,  $(\varphi, \psi) \in \text{EQ}(B)$  iff  $(\varphi, \psi) \in \text{IMP}'(B)$  and  $(\psi, \varphi) \in \text{IMP}'(B)$ . As  $\text{AC}^0$ ,  $\text{AC}^0[2]$  and  $\text{coNP}$  are all closed under intersection, we obtain as an immediate corollary a finer classification than the one given by Reith [11]. He establishes a dichotomy between  $\text{coNP}$ -hardness and membership in  $\mathbb{L}$ . We split the second case into two complexity degrees.

**Corollary 5.2.** *Let  $B$  be a finite set of Boolean functions. Then  $\text{EQ}(B)$  is  $\text{coNP}$ -complete for  $\leq_{\text{cd}}$ -reductions if  $S_{00} \subseteq [B]$ ,  $S_{10} \subseteq [B]$  or  $D_2 \subseteq [B]$ ;  $\text{AC}^0[2]$ -complete for  $\leq_{\text{cd}}$ -reductions if  $N_2 \subseteq [B] \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ , and in  $\text{AC}^0$  for all other cases.*

## 6. Conclusion

In this paper we provided a complete classification of the complexity of the implication problem,  $\text{IMP}(B)$ , and the singleton premise implication problem,  $\text{IMP}'(B)$ —fundamental problems in the area of propositional logic. Though  $\text{IMP}'(B)$  is a restricted version of  $\text{IMP}(B)$ , the simplification amounts to a difference for  $L_2 \subseteq [B] \subseteq L$  only:  $\text{IMP}'(B)$  is  $\text{AC}^0[2]$ -complete under constant-depth reductions, whereas  $\text{IMP}(B)$  is  $\oplus\text{L}$ -complete under  $\text{AC}^0$  many-one reductions and thus strictly harder. For all other clones, both problems are equally hard.

Due to the close relationship between the implication and the equivalence problem, we were also able to slightly refine the classification of the complexity of the equivalence problem given in [11].

## References

- [1] M. Bauland, T. Schneider, H. Schnoor, I. Schnoor, and H. Vollmer. The complexity of generalized satisfiability for linear temporal logic. In *Proceedings of the Foundations of Software Science and Computation Structures*, volume 4423 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 48–62. Springer, 2007.

- [2] O. Beyersdorff, A. Meier, M. Thomas, and H. Vollmer. The complexity of reasoning for fragments of default logic. *ACM Computing Research Repository*, arXiv:0808.3884v3 [cs.CC], 2008.
- [3] E. Böhler, N. Creignou, S. Reith, and H. Vollmer. Playing with Boolean blocks, part I: Post's lattice with applications to complexity theory. *SIGACT News*, 34(4):38–52, 2003.
- [4] G. Buntrock, C. Damm, U. Hertrampf, and C. Meinel. Structure and importance of logspace MOD-classes. *Mathematical Systems Theory*, 25:223–237, 1992.
- [5] A. K. Chandra, L. Stockmeyer, and U. Vishkin. Constant depth reducibility. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 13:423–439, 1984.
- [6] S. A. Cook. Characterizations of pushdown machines in terms of time-bounded computers. *Journal of the Association for Computing Machinery*, 18:4–18, 1971.
- [7] H. Lewis. Satisfiability problems for propositional calculi. *Mathematical Systems Theory*, 13:45–53, 1979.
- [8] A. Meier, M. Mundhenk, M. Thomas, and H. Vollmer. The complexity of satisfiability for fragments of CTL and CTL\*. In *Proceedings 2nd Workshop on Reachability Problems*, Electronic Notes in Computer Science, 2008. To appear.
- [9] C. H. Papadimitriou. *Computational Complexity*. Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA, 1994.
- [10] E. Post. The two-valued iterative systems of mathematical logic. *Annals of Mathematical Studies*, 5:1–122, 1941.
- [11] S. Reith. On the complexity of some equivalence problems for propositional calculi. In *Proceedings 28th International Symposium on Mathematical Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 632–641, 2003.
- [12] S. Reith and K. W. Wagner. The complexity of problems defined by subclasses of boolean functions. In *Proceedings Mathematical Foundation of Informatics (MFI99)*, pages 141–156. World Science Publishing, 2005.
- [13] H. Schnoor. The complexity of the Boolean formula value problem. Technical report, Theoretical Computer Science, University of Hannover, 2005.
- [14] H. Vollmer. *Introduction to Circuit Complexity – A Uniform Approach*. Texts in Theoretical Computer Science. Springer Verlag, Berlin Heidelberg, 1999.