

A Reply to “On Salum’s Algorithm for X3SAT”

Latif Salum

Department of Industrial Engineering, Dokuz Eylül University
latif.salum@gmail.com

Abstract

This paper gives a reply to “On Salum’s Algorithm for X3SAT” [1].

The authors confuse the definition of the scope $\psi(r_i)$, beyond the scope $\phi'(r_i)$, and the formula $\varphi = \psi \wedge \phi$. Also, they claim that “it is easy to see that X3SAT formulas with empty minterms are equivalent to 3CNF formulas (by simply replacing the \odot notational element with \vee)”. I did not understand what the authors meant here. The formula $(a \odot b \odot c) \wedge (b \odot x \odot y) \wedge (c \odot x \odot \bar{y})$ is totally different from the formula $(a \vee b \vee c) \wedge (b \vee x \vee y) \wedge (c \vee x \vee \bar{y})$.

In particular, the authors find $\phi = (a \wedge \bar{b} \wedge \bar{c}) \wedge (x \odot y) \wedge (x \odot \bar{y})$, after $\text{Scope}(a, \phi)$ runs. They next run $\text{Scope}(\bar{a}, \phi)$ over ϕ , and detect the conflict with a already in the minterm. The authors also run $\text{Scope}(x, \phi)$ over ϕ , and find $\phi = (a \wedge \bar{b} \wedge \bar{c} \wedge x \wedge \bar{y} \wedge y)$. These are totally wrong.

The correct way of the executions is as follows.

$\varphi = \psi \wedge \phi$. ψ is empty and $\phi = (a \odot b \odot c) \wedge (b \odot x \odot y) \wedge (c \odot x \odot \bar{y})$.

$\text{Scope}(a, \phi)$: $\phi(a) := a \wedge \phi$. Then, $\phi(a) = \psi(a) \wedge \phi'(a)$, as $\text{Scope}(a, \phi)$ terminates. $\psi(a) = a \wedge \bar{b} \wedge \bar{c}$ and $\phi'(a) = (x \odot y) \wedge (x \odot \bar{y})$.

$\text{Scope}(\bar{a}, \phi)$: $\phi(\bar{a}) := \bar{a} \wedge \phi$. $\phi(\bar{a}) = \psi(\bar{a}) \wedge \phi'(\bar{a})$. $\psi(\bar{a}) = \bar{a}$ and $\phi'(\bar{a}) = (b \odot c) \wedge (b \odot x \odot y) \wedge (c \odot x \odot \bar{y})$.

$\text{Scope}(x, \phi)$: $\phi(x) := x \wedge \phi$. $\psi(x) \Rightarrow \bar{b} \wedge x \wedge \bar{y} \wedge \bar{c} \wedge y$. Thus, x is incompatible, because $\psi(x) \Rightarrow \bar{y} \wedge y$. As a result, \bar{x} is necessary. That is, $\varphi \leftarrow \bar{x} \wedge \phi$.

$\varphi = \psi \wedge \phi$, where $\psi = \bar{x}$ and $\phi = (a \odot b \odot c) \wedge (b \odot y) \wedge (c \odot \bar{y})$.

$\text{Scope}(a, \phi)$: $\phi(a) := a \wedge \phi$. $\psi(a) \Rightarrow a \wedge \bar{b} \wedge \bar{c} \wedge y \wedge \bar{y}$. Thus, \bar{a} is necessary.

$\varphi \leftarrow \psi \wedge \phi$, where $\psi = \bar{x} \wedge \bar{a}$ and $\phi = (b \odot c) \wedge (b \odot y) \wedge (c \odot \bar{y})$.

$\text{Scope}(b, \phi)$: $\phi(b) := b \wedge \phi$. $\psi(b) = b \wedge \bar{c} \wedge \bar{y}$ and $\phi'(b)$ is empty.

$\text{Scope}(\bar{b}, \phi)$: $\phi(\bar{b}) := \bar{b} \wedge \phi$. $\psi(\bar{b}) = \bar{b} \wedge c \wedge y$ and $\phi'(\bar{b})$ is empty.

Likewise, c, \bar{c}, y, \bar{y} are decided to be compatible. Then, the current formula becomes $\varphi = \bar{x} \wedge \bar{a} \wedge (b \odot c) \wedge (b \odot y) \wedge (c \odot \bar{y})$, which is satisfiable. Note that $\bar{x} \wedge \bar{a}$ is fixed in any satisfying assignment. Next, a satisfying assignment is constructed over $\phi = (b \odot c) \wedge (b \odot y) \wedge (c \odot \bar{y})$. See also the final version [2].

References

- [1] Arian Nadjimzadah and David E. Narváez (2021). On Salum’s Algorithm for X3SAT. arXiv:2104.02886
- [2] Latif Salum (2022). The Complexity of X3SAT: P = NP = PSPACE. arXiv:2012.06304