

Pruning Boolean d-DNNF Circuits Through Tseitin-Awareness

Vincent Derkinderen

Dept. of Computer Science, KU Leuven, B-3000 Leuven, Belgium

Abstract—Boolean circuits in d-DNNF form enable tractable probabilistic inference. However, as a key insight of this work, we show that commonly used d-DNNF compilation approaches introduce irrelevant subcircuits. We call these subcircuits Tseitin artifacts, as they are introduced due to the Tseitin transformation step – a well-established procedure to transform any circuit into the CNF format required by several d-DNNF knowledge compilers. We discuss how to detect and remove both Tseitin variables and Tseitin artifacts, leading to more succinct circuits. We empirically observe an average size reduction of 77.5% when removing both Tseitin variables and artifacts. The additional pruning of Tseitin artifacts reduces the size by 22.2% on average. This significantly improves downstream tasks that benefit from a more succinct circuit, e.g., probabilistic inference tasks.

Index Terms—Knowledge Representation Formalisms and Methods

I. INTRODUCTION

Boolean circuits represent Boolean functions in a manner that allows certain operations to become feasible. In this work we focus on d-DNNF circuits (see Fig. 1 for an example), because they allow us to compute the weighted model count in polytime, despite it being a computationally hard task in general [1]. As such, they play an important role in enabling tractable probabilistic inference [2]–[7]. Furthermore, a key advantage of the circuit-approach to computing the weighted model count, is that when the weights change, the same compiled circuit can be reused and only the circuit evaluation must be repeated. This effectively amortizes the compilation cost across evaluations, and is especially relevant in the context of parameter learning where the parameters evolve over many evaluations. However, in such a context, the circuit size also becomes important. In neuro-symbolic AI, for instance, where such circuits are being combined with neural networks, many evaluations take place during training and an efficient circuit evaluation is key to maintaining a fast enough neural network learning pipeline [8], [9]. To conclude, besides efficiently obtaining a d-DNNF circuit, it is also important that these circuits are succinct.

To obtain a succinct d-DNNF circuit from any Boolean circuit, the field of knowledge compilation has developed several d-DNNF compilers. The CDCL-based class of compilers, which includes D4 [10] and sharpSAT-TD [11], requires the input circuit to be in conjunctive normal form (CNF). The most prominent algorithm to efficiently obtain this form

This article is a longer version (includes supplementary material) of the one submitted to ICTAI2024. This work was supported by the EU H2020 ICT48 project “TAILOR” under contract #952215.




Fig. 1. A d-DNNF representation of $\mathcal{T}(\psi)$, of Example 4.

for compilation is the Tseitin transformation [12]. This is a procedure to convert any propositional Boolean circuit ψ into an equisatisfiable version in CNF.

A side-effect of the Tseitin transformation, is that it introduces additional auxiliary variables. These variables can be removed after compilation through existential quantification [11]. However, as **our primary contribution**, we discuss the insight that this approach can result in tautological d-DNNF subcircuits. That is, these subcircuits are equivalent to true and can be removed entirely. We call these subcircuits *Tseitin artifacts* as they emerge during compilation because of the prior Tseitin transformation. We discuss and formally define such artifacts in Section III.

Tseitin artifacts can be efficiently detected within a compiled d-DNNF circuit by a single bottom-up pass of the representation. We discuss this approach, and when these artifacts are expected to emerge, in Section IV, after which we briefly discuss related work in Section V. Finally, in Section VI, we empirically confirm the prevalence of Tseitin artifacts and show that actively removing both Tseitin variables and Tseitin artifacts reduces the circuit size by an average of 77.5%. Compared to only removing Tseitin variables, the additional pruning of Tseitin artifacts reduces the size by 22.2% on average (29.7% if we only consider the circuits where Tseitin artifacts were present).

II. BACKGROUND

A. Propositional Logic

We use the standard terminology of propositional logic. A literal is a Boolean variable v or its negation $\neg v$. A

propositional formula ψ is inductively defined as a literal l , the negation of a formula $\neg\psi_1$, a conjunction of formulas $\psi_1 \wedge \psi_2$, or a disjunction of formulas $\psi_1 \vee \psi_2$, each with the usual semantics. We will also allow \top ('true') and \perp ('false') to appear in the formula, and when convenient, also the equivalence symbol $\psi_1 \iff \psi_2$ defined as $(\psi_1 \wedge \psi_2) \vee (\neg\psi_1 \wedge \neg\psi_2)$. A clause is a literal or a disjunction of multiple literals, and a formula ψ is in conjunctive normal form (CNF) iff it is a clause or a conjunction of multiple clauses.

An interpretation is a truth assignment to the Boolean variables. When formula ψ is satisfied under the assignment, we say the interpretation is a model of ψ . When a formula is trivially satisfied, that is, satisfied under any interpretation, we call it a tautology. A trivial example of a tautology is $x \vee \neg x$.

We use $\psi|_l$ to denote formula ψ conditioned on l being true. This is different from $\psi \wedge l$, as l and $\neg l$ no longer occur within $\psi|_l$. The existential quantification of a variable X in ψ , denoted as $\exists X.\psi$, is semantically equivalent to $\psi|_x \vee \psi|_{\neg x}$. This process is also called "forgetting variable X ". We extend this notation to operate on a set of variables $\mathbf{X} = \{X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n\}$: $\exists \mathbf{X}.\psi = \exists X_1 \exists X_2 \dots \exists X_n.\psi$.

Example 1: Consider $\psi := a \wedge (-b \vee c)$. This is a CNF formula of two clauses. There exist 2^3 interpretations over $\mathbf{V} = \{A, B, C\}$, three of which are a model of ψ : $\{a, -b, c\}$, $\{a, -b, -c\}$ and $\{a, b, c\}$. ψ is not a tautology. When conditioning on a , we have $\psi|_a = -b \vee c$.

B. Weighted Model Counting

Definition 1 (weighted model count): Given a propositional formula ψ over variables \mathbf{V} , and weight function w that maps each literal to a real value, the weighted model count is defined as

$$WMC(\psi, \mathbf{V}, w) = \sum_{\text{model of } \psi} \prod_{\text{lit} \in \text{model}} w(\text{lit}). \quad (1)$$

We will use $WMC(\psi, w)$ when \mathbf{V} is clear from context, and $MC(\psi)$ to refer to unweighted model counting, which is equivalent to using weight 1 for all literals. Since probabilistic inference can be cast as a weighted model counting (WMC) task [2], [13], efficiently computing the WMC is of great interest. This is possible using a compilation-based approach.

C. Circuit Properties

The structure of a propositional formula ψ is a tree. When allowing reuse of substructures, i.e., when we have a more general single-rooted DAG structure, we instead use the term Boolean circuit. There are several structural properties [2] that such a circuit may have, and that are of interest to our work.

Definition 2 (determinism (d)): A Boolean circuit ψ is deterministic iff for each $\psi_1 \vee \psi_2$ within ψ , ψ_1 and ψ_2 do not share any models. That is, $\psi_1 \wedge \psi_2 = \perp$.

Definition 3 (Decomposability (D)): A Boolean circuit ψ is decomposable iff for each $\psi_1 \wedge \psi_2$ within ψ , ψ_1 and ψ_2 do not share any variables.

Definition 4 (Negation Normal Form (NNF)): A Boolean circuit is in negation normal form iff it consists only of \vee , \wedge , and literals (negation is only allowed over variables).

Definition 5 (smoothness (s)): A Boolean circuit ψ is smooth iff for each $\psi_1 \vee \psi_2$ within ψ , ψ_1 and ψ_2 contain the same variables.

When ψ satisfies the sd-DNNF properties, its WMC can be computed in time linear in the size of the representation by a single bottom-up evaluation. The smoothness property is less important from a computational complexity perspective as it is obtainable in polytime while preserving the d-DNNF properties [14], [15]. Furthermore, if $w(v) + w(\neg v) = 1$ holds for all variables V (for example within a probabilistic inference context when the variables represent a Bernoulli distribution), then the smoothness property is unnecessary and a d-DNNF circuit suffices to efficiently compute the WMC.

D. CDCL Algorithm

Several algorithms have been developed to compile a Boolean circuit into a d-DNNF. Many state-of-the-art compilers are based on the CDCL algorithm that was initially developed for SAT solving, but can be adapted for compilation. Examples include D4 [10] and sharpsat-TD [11], [16]. For a more detailed explanation of these algorithms we refer to [10], [11], [17].

Important to understanding our contributions is that these algorithms operate on a CNF formula ψ , and that they iteratively condition on literals until the remaining formula is satisfied.

Example 2: Consider the following ψ , a CNF of two clauses.

$$\psi := (a \vee -b) \wedge (a \vee -c) \quad (2)$$

If a CDCL-based algorithm were to condition on $\neg b$, clauses that contain $\neg b$ are removed, and b is removed from every clause. The remaining formula is $\psi|_{\neg b} = (a \vee -c)$. When then conditioning on a , the remaining formula is $\psi|_{\neg b, a} = \top$, and the algorithm backtracks to cover the other models in a similar fashion.

Also relevant is component decomposition [18], a very effective optimisation used within weighted model counting and d-DNNF compilation to reduce the search space. This optimisation exploits the fact that if a CNF can be partitioned into sets of clauses that do not share any variables (called components), then these can be treated separately. Furthermore, these components can be cached such that when they are encountered again later in the search space, the cached result can be reused. For d-DNNF compilation, this enables reuse of subcircuits and results in a DAG rather than a tree. The effectiveness of this optimisation has led the community to propose a variety of component representations [19]–[21].

Example 3: Consider the following CNF of three clauses.

$$\psi := (a \vee -b) \wedge (a \vee -c) \wedge (-d \vee e)$$

The first two clauses together form a component \mathcal{C}_1 , while the third clause forms component \mathcal{C}_2 as it does not share any variables with the previous clauses. From a weighted model count perspective we have (3) which indicates that the model count of each component can be computed separately.

$$WMC(\psi, \mathbf{V}, w) = WMC(\mathcal{C}_1, w) \times WMC(\mathcal{C}_2, w), \quad (3)$$

Similarly for d-DNNF compilation, both components can be compiled separately and combined using a conjunction \wedge .

CDCL-based algorithms require the input ψ to be a CNF formula, which is obtainable using the Tseitin transformation.

E. Tseitin Transformation

The Tseitin (or Tseytin) transformation is a procedure by which any Boolean circuit ψ can be converted into CNF [12]. The main idea powering this transformation is that, when we introduce a new auxiliary Boolean variable x to refer to a subcircuit ψ' , we can conveniently replace each occurrence of ψ' by x . For larger nested circuits this significantly simplifies the CNF transformation because each $(l \Leftrightarrow \bigvee_i l_i)$ and $(l \Leftrightarrow \bigwedge_i l_i)$ can easily be transformed into a CNF where the number of clauses is exactly equal to the number of literals l_i and l . The number of clauses in the resulting CNF is therefore linear in the number of subcircuits ψ' and in the number of literals occurring in ψ' .

Example 4 (Tseitin transformation): Consider the circuit ψ given below.

$$\psi := (a \wedge b) \vee (c \wedge d) \quad (4)$$

The Tseitin transformation introduces new variables x_1 and x_2 to refer to $(a \wedge b)$ and $(c \wedge d)$ respectively. Using this new equivalence, the original circuit ψ could be summarized as

$$\mathcal{T}(\psi) := (x_1 \vee x_2) \wedge (x_1 \iff a \wedge b) \wedge (x_2 \iff c \wedge d). \quad (5)$$

As CNF, this results in circuit $\text{CNF}(\mathcal{T}(\psi))$, displayed below as a conjunction of seven clauses.

$$\begin{aligned} &(x_1 \vee \neg a \vee \neg b) \wedge (\neg x_1 \vee a) \wedge (\neg x_1 \vee b) \wedge \\ &(x_2 \vee \neg d \vee \neg c) \wedge (\neg x_2 \vee d) \wedge (\neg x_2 \vee c) \wedge (x_1 \vee x_2) \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

In this example we distinguished $\mathcal{T}(\psi)$ from $\text{CNF}(\mathcal{T}(\psi))$. In the remainder of this paper we use $\mathcal{T}(\psi)$ to refer to the circuit resulting from the Tseitin transformation on ψ . Its exact representation, as a CNF (6) or not (5), will generally not be important. In case it is important, the representation we refer to will be clear from context.

Note that ψ and $\mathcal{T}(\psi)$ are not equivalent as $\mathcal{T}(\psi)$ contains variables that are not present in ψ , and that were introduced by the Tseitin transformation. We call these Tseitin variables. Importantly, there is a one-to-one mapping between the models of ψ and the models of $\mathcal{T}(\psi)$ [22]. By construction, each model of ψ implies a truth value for the Tseitin variables in $\mathcal{T}(\psi)$ through the equivalences introduced by the transformation (5). In the other direction, ignoring the Tseitin variables from a model of $\mathcal{T}(\psi)$ yields exactly one model of ψ . As a consequence, we have the following relation (7) where \mathbf{X} is the set of Tseitin variables introduced during the Tseitin transformation.

$$\exists \mathbf{X}. \mathcal{T}(\psi) = \psi \quad (7)$$

When computing the weighted model count of ψ using $\mathcal{T}(\psi)$, the weight of a Tseitin variable X is typically set to one ($w(x)=1=w(\neg x)$). This preserves the weight of each model and consequently also the weighted model count of ψ .




Fig. 2. The d-DNNF of Fig. 1, with the Tseitin variables x_1 and x_2 existentially quantified (that is, $\exists x_1, x_2. \mathcal{T}(\psi)$). The red node indicates the root of a subcircuit that is a Tseitin artifact.

III. WHAT ARE TSEITIN ARTIFACTS?

We first informally introduce the concept that we refer to as a *Tseitin artifact*. A more formal definition is then provided afterwards. We study these artifacts in the context of d-DNNF compilation. Therefore, suppose we wish to obtain a d-DNNF representation of circuit ψ (4) in Example 4. We will use a CDCL-based d-DNNF compiler that requires a CNF as input, so we first use the Tseitin transformation to obtain $\mathcal{T}(\psi)$ (6). Fig. 1 shows a possible output of the compiler, a d-DNNF circuit representing $\mathcal{T}(\psi)$. Since we are interested in the number of computations during evaluation, we define the circuit size as the number of binary nodes (e.g., a node with three inputs represents two binary nodes, and so on). The size of the d-DNNF in Fig. 1 is 16.

A. Existential Quantification of Tseitin Variables

The circuit in Fig. 1 is a d-DNNF and can hence be used to efficiently compute the weighted model count of $\mathcal{T}(\psi)$ and ψ . The current representation, however, does contain many unnecessary elements. In particular, the Tseitin variables \mathbf{X} were introduced by the Tseitin transformation to easily obtain a CNF, but are irrelevant to downstream counting tasks. These variables can be removed through existential quantification, i.e., by computing $\exists \mathbf{X}. \mathcal{T}(\psi)$.

Thanks to the decomposability property, existential quantification of $X \in \mathbf{X}$ is very simple here: replace each occurrence of x and $\neg x$ in the formula by \top . We refer to this procedure as $\text{EXISTS}(\psi, X)$. This procedure is guaranteed to preserve the DNNF properties [22]. Additionally, recent work has proven that since we existentially quantify Tseitin variables, this procedure is guaranteed to also preserve determinism [11].

Fig. 2 shows the circuit of Fig. 1 after performing existential quantification of the Tseitin variables. Combining the results above with (7), it follows that Fig. 2 again represents circuit ψ instead of $\mathcal{T}(\psi)$, but now as a d-DNNF due to the earlier compilation step.

The \top values in Fig. 2 can be propagated¹, simplifying occurrences of the form $\psi_i \vee \top$ and $\psi_i \wedge \top$. This reduces the circuit size to 11. Importantly, we show in the next section that the circuit size can be reduced even more.

B. Tseitin Artifacts

The subcircuit f whose root is marked in red in Fig. 2, is given in (8). While this subcircuit initially represented $(x_2 \iff c \wedge d)$, which is not a tautology, after performing the existential quantification of x_2 , it did become a tautology.

$$\exists x_2. f \equiv \left(((\neg d \wedge c) \vee \neg c) \wedge \top \right) \vee \left(\top \wedge c \wedge d \right) \equiv \top \quad (8)$$

This means that f can be entirely replaced by \top . Indeed, consider the initial circuit ψ of Example 4 and note that $\psi|_{a,b} \equiv \top$. We call f a Tseitin artifact, a tautological subcircuit introduced to the compiled circuit due to the Tseitin transformation.

Definition 6 (Tseitin artifact): A (sub)circuit $f(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y})$ over Tseitin variables \mathbf{X} and non-Tseitin variables \mathbf{Y} is a Tseitin artifact if and only if it is a tautology when existentially quantifying over \mathbf{X} . That is, when $\exists \mathbf{X}. f(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}) \equiv \top$.

This definition can be generalised beyond Tseitin variables \mathbf{X} , to variables that are completely defined by other variables (cf. the definition of *definability* by [11], [23]). Our focus on Tseitin variables is a practical choice. First, they are known to be defined by other variables so we do not need a procedure to determine the set of defined variables. Second, they are irrelevant from a user perspective. That is, these variables are not present in the original circuit (pre-Tseitin transformation) so we can safely assume they are irrelevant to any downstream model counting task and can thus be removed.

Our insight can be applied more generally: if a (sub)circuit is equivalent to \top , you can replace it with \top to reduce the circuit size. However, a top-down d-DNNF compiler would never produce such subcircuits under normal conditions because a non-empty CNF is never equivalent to \top (unless we allow CNFs of only trivial clauses such as $x \vee \neg x$). Subcircuits that are equivalent to \top only emerge within a d-DNNF once we perform existential quantification, which is advised when using the Tseitin transformation as we show in the experiments. We therefore position our insight around Tseitin variables, and refer to the subcircuits as Tseitin artifacts.

Existential quantification of Tseitin variables using the EXISTS procedure of section III-A does not eliminate all Tseitin artifacts. For example, while propagating \top in Fig. 2, we would not have realised that subcircuit f (node marked in red) is equivalent to \top , missing the possible reduction to a circuit of size 6 instead of 11. In the next section we study how to detect these artifacts and how they emerge.

IV. DETECTING TSEITIN ARTIFACTS

A. How To Detect Them?

Tseitin artifacts can be detected in an sd-DNNF representation in time linear in the size of the sd-DNNF.

¹When we refer to the EXISTS procedure, we include the propagation step




Fig. 3. The noisy-OR BN where $Prob(pa) = \theta_{pa}$. When Pa is true and its signal is not noisy (θ_{pa}^a), A becomes true.

Proposition 1: When $f(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y})$ is a (sub)circuit of a d-DNNF representation for $\mathcal{T}(\psi)$, over Tseitin variables \mathbf{X} and non-Tseitin variables \mathbf{Y} , then f is a Tseitin artifact if and only if the unweighted model count is $MC(f) = 2^{|\mathbf{Y}|}$.

Proof: We know $MC(f) = MC(\exists \mathbf{X}. f(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}))$, because by construction a Tseitin variable X is completely defined by non-Tseitin variables \mathbf{Y} .

$$MC(f) = 2^{|\mathbf{Y}|} \iff MC(\exists \mathbf{X}. f(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y})) = 2^{|\mathbf{Y}|} \iff \exists \mathbf{X}. f(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}) = \top \iff f(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}) \text{ is a Tseitin artifact}$$

It is well known that the model count for each sd-DNNF (sub)circuit can be computed in time linear in the size of the representation, and that a similar approach can be used for non-smooth d-DNNF representations by performing the appropriate smoothing operations in polytime either before or during evaluation [1], [15]. Furthermore, since we only require unweighted model counts, smoothing is unnecessary and we only need to know the number of variables that would have to be smoothed over. The number of these so called free variables is easy to extract during the compilation process. Combining this fact with Proposition 1, we can detect Tseitin artifacts by computing the unweighted model count of each subcircuit $f(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y})$ using a single bottom-up evaluation. If the model count is equivalent to $2^{|\mathbf{Y}|}$, f is a Tseitin artifact and it can be removed when we existentially quantify over \mathbf{X} . ■

B. When Do They Emerge?

Next we provide more intuition on when these artifacts may emerge within CDCL-based d-DNNF compilers. This helps to identify the types of circuits for which our proposed technique (removing Tseitin artifacts) has a high impact. Consider again ψ and $\mathcal{T}(\psi)$ from Example 4.

$$\begin{aligned} \psi &:= (a \wedge b) \vee (c \wedge d) \\ \mathcal{T}(\psi) &:= (x_1 \vee x_2) \wedge (x_1 \iff a \wedge b) \wedge (x_2 \iff c \wedge d) \end{aligned}$$

When a d-DNNF compiler conditions on x_1 (9), the clause $(x_1 \vee x_2)$ becomes satisfied and, since x_2 is not used elsewhere, the Tseitin equivalence $(x_2 \iff c \wedge d)$ will emerge as a Tseitin artifact (after component decomposition which splits off the $(a \wedge b)$ part).

$$\mathcal{T}(\psi)|_{x_1} = (a \wedge b) \wedge (x_2 \iff c \wedge d) \quad (9)$$

More generally, if ψ_1 and ψ_2 are circuits more complex than a single literal, appearing together as $\psi_1 \vee \psi_2$, such that $\psi_1 \wedge \psi_2 \neq \perp$, then a Tseitin artifact may emerge depending on the variable ordering of the CDCL compiler. We empirically




Fig. 4. The d-DNNF circuit size for varying sizes of the noisy-OR problem. d-DNNF+p represents EXISTS($\mathcal{T}(\psi), \mathbf{X}$). d-DNNF+t represents the additional removal of Tseitin artifacts. Lower is better.

confirm this using a circuit that represents a noisy-or Bayesian network [24], which has a structure similar to Example 4. The circuit ψ is given in the equation below, while the Bayesian network is illustrated in Fig. 3.

$$\begin{aligned} \psi &:= a \wedge \left(a \iff \bigvee_{Pa \in \mathbf{Pa}(A)} (\theta_{pa} \wedge \theta_{pa}^a) \right) \\ \mathcal{T}(\psi) &:= a \wedge \left(a \iff \bigvee_{Pa \in \mathbf{Pa}(A)} x_{pa} \right) \wedge \\ &\quad \bigwedge_{Pa \in \mathbf{Pa}(A)} (x_{pa} \iff \theta_{pa} \wedge \theta_{pa}^a). \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

Fig. 4 shows the results, confirming that the number of Tseitin artifacts increases as the circuit grows, and that removing them significantly reduces the circuit size (d-DNNF+t). Additionally, it shows that the EXISTS procedure on its own also reduces the formula size but not nearly as much (d-DNNF+p).

Note the previously stated condition of $\psi_1 \wedge \psi_2 \neq \perp$. If ψ_1 and ψ_2 were to be mutually exclusive ($\psi_1 \wedge \psi_2 = \perp$) and not complete ($\psi_1 \vee \psi_2 \neq \top$), then resolving ψ_1 would imply $\neg\psi_2$, reducing the chance of a Tseitin artifact. We empirically confirmed this using 8 Bayesian networks whose conditional probability tables are encoded in a way that each \vee is mutually exclusive [25]. A limited number of artifacts did emerge for two instances (see Appendix A for a brief explanation), but overall there was little difference between existential quantification (d-DNNF+p) and the removal of Tseitin artifacts (d-DNNF+t). We conclude that under these conditions artifacts may emerge, but it becomes more dependent on the variable ordering of the d-DNNF compiler and more unlikely.

Both the circuit ψ and the variable ordering within the d-DNNF compiler influence the prevalence of Tseitin artifacts. We illustrate the influence of the latter using Example 5.

Example 5 (variable order impact): Suppose we have

$$\begin{aligned} \psi &:= (a \wedge b) \vee c \\ \mathcal{T}(\psi) &:= (x_1 \vee c) \wedge (x_1 \iff a \wedge b). \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

If the d-DNNF compiler first conditions on c , a Tseitin artifact emerges. If it instead conditions on x_1 , or on a and b , no Tseitin artifact emerges.

V. RELATED WORK

Prior work [22] has studied the usage of existential quantification, the EXISTS procedure, to obtain succinct DNNF circuits. Continuing on this result, [11] proved that existential quantification of X also preserves determinism if X is defined in terms of the other variables, and is thus applicable when targetting d-DNNF circuits. Our work continues on these findings, realising that this procedure may result in subcircuits that can be removed to reduce the circuit size even further.

The concept of definability, which strongly relates to the Tseitin variables, has previously been used in preprocessing, altering the CNF to improve model counting [23], [26]. Similarly, the variable elimination approach of [11] could eliminate Tseitin variables prior to compilation. While this is beneficial in some cases, it may also degrade performance in the context of Tseitin variables as these were introduced exactly to ensure a small CNF size (with likely faster compilation) [11]. For this reason they consider heuristics to determine which variables to eliminate. Furthermore, prior elimination of the Tseitin variables prevents the compiler from conditioning on them. This may lead to larger circuit sizes and a potential increase in compilation time.

[27] proposed a novel projected model counter restricted to Horn clauses, which are clauses whose form is equivalent to $(\bigwedge_i l_i) \Rightarrow h$, with l_i and h positive literals or \top . The relation to our work is their propagation technique. This technique is based on the insight that during the counting process, if h is an auxiliary variable that is not constrained by any other remaining Horn clause, then its associated clause can be satisfied without impacting the count. In other words, they can remove such clauses (only because h is an auxiliary variable). This relates to the Tseitin artifacts, although these emerge from an equivalence structure rather than an implication and are not restricted to projected model counting.

VI. EXPERIMENTS

Given the influence of the variable ordering and the structure of disjunctions within ψ , a natural research question is: how prevalent are Tseitin artifacts? We primarily focus on the former, avoiding instances that we know will not contain Tseitin artifacts (i.e., Bayesian networks with mutual exclusive disjunctions). We study the effect of removing Tseitin artifacts on the circuit size, and compare the effect of performing simple existential quantification (denoted as d-DNNF+p) versus removing the Tseitin artifacts entirely as well (denoted as d-DNNF+t).

A. Datasets

a) Reverse-engineered CNFs (MCC): Benchmarks used for weighted model counting and d-DNNF compilation are typically CNF formulas already, so these are not useful from




Fig. 5. The fraction of d-DNNF nodes remaining after removing Tseitin artifacts (65 instances of the MCC dataset). Lower is better.

a Tseitin transformation perspective. In our experiments however, we will assume these CNFs were produced by a Tseitin transformation before they were made publicly available. We determine the set of Tseitin variables X by identifying equivalences ($l \Leftrightarrow \bigvee_i l_i$ or $l \Leftrightarrow \bigwedge_i l_i$). As dataset, we consider the CNF instances of the 2022 and 2023 model counting competitions (MCC) [28], [29], only using instances with more than 25% Tseitin variables. We ran the D4 d-DNNF compiler [10] with a timeout of 3600 seconds, resulting in 65 completed instances (after removing duplicate instances).

b) CNFs with Tseitin variables (CNFT): We also consider the dataset of [11]: “a new set of benchmarks using two tools to translate (probabilistic) logic programs to CNFs [30], [31] on standard benchmarks from probabilistic logic programming”. By construction, their auxiliary variables are completely defined in terms of the other remaining variables. We include additional programs that were translated using ProbLog [13], for instance the power transmission networks from [32], originating from [33]. These two datasets resulted in 146 and 34 instances respectively (already excluding timeouts). From the neuro-symbolic (NeSy) AI setting we include the Countries knowledge graph: “Countries is a knowledge graph with the *locatedIn* and *neighborOf* relations between the countries and continents on Earth” [34]. There are three tasks leading to three DNF formulas. While more instances can be created, the results are expected to be similar since the structure will be similar. We therefore consider the three DNF formulas, and apply the Tseitin transformation to obtain CNFs and Tseitin variables X .

B. Results

a) MCC dataset: Fig. 5 shows the relative number of nodes that remain after removing the Tseitin artifacts and performing existential quantification. On average, this prunes




Fig. 6. The fraction of d-DNNF nodes remaining after removing Tseitin artifacts, compared to only doing existential quantification. Lower is better.

TABLE I
THE NESY DATASET INSTANCES: THE ORIGINAL D-DNNF SIZE, AFTER PERFORMING EXISTENTIAL QUANTIFICATION, AND AFTER ADDITIONALLY REMOVING THE TSEITIN ARTIFACTS. THE INCLUDED PERCENTAGES SHOW THE NUMBER OF NODES RELATIVE TO THE ORIGINAL D-DNNF.

inst	d-DNNF	d-DNNF+p	d-DNNF+t
S1	26 268 407	16 828 763 (64%)	13 090 502 (50%)
S2	83 265 347	62 161 281 (75%)	36 721 586 (44%)
S3	79 311 007	33 708 205 (43%)	16 714 673 (21%)

68.3% of the nodes (std. of 22.6%). The additional contribution of detecting Tseitin artifacts, that is, d-DNNF+p compared to d-DNNF+t, is shown in Fig. 6. This improves 27 out of the 65 instances, with an average of 24.0% nodes pruned (for those 27, with std. of 26.7%).

b) CNFT dataset: Fig. 7 shows the relative number of nodes that remain after removing the Tseitin artifacts and performing existential quantification. On average, this prunes 81.1% of the nodes (std. of 13.1%). The additional contribution of detecting Tseitin artifacts, that is, d-DNNF+p compared to d-DNNF+t, is shown in Fig. 8. This improves 155 out of the 180 instances, with an average of 30.6% nodes pruned (for those 155, with std. of 15.7%). The three NeSy instances we illustrate separately, in Table I.

c) Discussion: The overall results indicate the importance of existentially quantifying over irrelevant variables, and the additional reductions that can be achieved through the removal of Tseitin artifacts. As previously discussed, Tseitin artifacts do not necessarily appear in every circuit. This is observed in Fig. 8 where the circuits of class *gnb* do not result in any additional reduction, meaning no Tseitin artifacts arose. We hypothesize, and manually confirmed for a few disjunctions, that the disjunctions within the *gnb* circuits are mutually exclusive. This supports the explanation in Sec-




Fig. 7. The fraction of d-DNNF nodes remaining after removing Tseitin artifacts (180 instances of the CNFT dataset). Lower is better. The different markers indicate the different instance classes within the dataset.




Fig. 8. The fraction of d-DNNF nodes remaining after removing Tseitin artifacts (180 instances of the CNFT dataset), compared to only doing existential quantification. Lower is better.

tion IV-B: disjunctions that do overlap are likely to result in Tseitin artifacts, while those that are mutually exclusive rarely lead to an artifact. For the remaining circuits the benefit is very clear, especially considering the low-cost of existential quantification and detection of Tseitin artifacts.

VII. CONCLUSION

The Tseitin transformation introduces auxiliary variables to obtain a small CNF circuit. These variables can easily be removed after d-DNNF compilation. But as we have shown, subcircuits that are trivially satisfied may then emerge. Fortunately, we can easily detect and remove such artifacts using a single bottom-up evaluation of the d-DNNF circuit. We have empirically shown the positive impact of pruning these artifacts on the final circuit size. In future work, we will investigate the detection and removal of these artifacts during compilation, with the additional aim of reducing compilation time. This requires a new detection mechanism as the current one relies on each subcircuit to already be compiled.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The author thanks Wannes Meert for the valuable discussions on this topic, and Jaron Maene for providing the knowledge graph DNF formulas.

APPENDIX A

MUTUALLY EXCLUSIVE DISJUNCTION

A Bayesian network whose conditional probability tables are encoded in a way that each \vee is mutually exclusive, results in few Tseitin artifacts. We illustrate one such probability table, $P(C|A, B)$:

$$c \iff \begin{cases} (a \wedge b \wedge \theta_{a,b}^c) \vee \\ (a \wedge \neg b \wedge \theta_{a,\neg b}^c) \vee \\ (\neg a \wedge b \wedge \theta_{\neg a,b}^c) \vee \\ (\neg a \wedge \neg b \wedge \theta_{\neg a,\neg b}^c). \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

We now briefly discuss one of the few found Tseitin artifacts. The subformula that formed this artifact was (using equivalences instead of CNF for clarity, and x and y to distinguish the Tseitin and non-Tseitin variables respectively):

$$\begin{aligned} & (x_{306} \iff x_{296}) \wedge (x_{296} \iff y_{295}) \wedge \\ & (x_{321} \iff x_{311}) \wedge (x_{311} \iff y_{310}) \wedge \\ & (x_{322} \iff x_{321} \wedge x_{306}). \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

The Tseitin artifact of this formula is illustrated in Fig. 9. To understand how this artifact emerged, we explain the meaning behind (13) and how the conditioning process led to its existence. The role of x_{306} within andes is akin to c in (12). ($x_{306} \iff x_{296}$) was a larger equivalence with a four-case disjunction, similar to how (12) has four cases. After conditioning on several literals during the compilation process, the equivalence was reduced to ($x_{306} \iff x_{296}$). The case itself, like $a \wedge b \wedge \theta_{a,b}^c$, is represented by x_{296} , whose definition was reduced to $x_{296} \iff y_{295}$ (where y_{295} is akin to $\theta_{a,b}^c$). The third and fourth conjunct within (13)




Fig. 9. Example of a Tseitin artifact within the andes formula instance.

are explained analogously to the first two. Finally, x_{306} and x_{321} were both used within the case of another variable that depended on them (represented by x_{322}). This formed the final conjunct, that prevented their equivalences from being compiled independently.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Darwiche and P. Marquis, “A knowledge compilation map,” *J. Artif. Intell. Res.*, vol. 17, pp. 229–264, 2002.
- [2] M. Chavira and A. Darwiche, “On probabilistic inference by weighted model counting,” *Artif. Intell.*, vol. 172, no. 6-7, pp. 772–799, 2008.
- [3] D. Suciu, D. Olteanu, C. Ré, and C. Koch, *Probabilistic Databases*, ser. Synthesis Lectures on Data Management. Springer International Publishing, 2011.
- [4] S. Holtzen, G. Van den Broeck, and T. Millstein, “Scaling exact inference for discrete probabilistic programs,” *Proceedings of the ACM on Programming Languages*, vol. 4, pp. 140:1–140:31, Nov. 2020.
- [5] V. Derkinderen, R. Manhaeve, P. Z. Dos Martires, and L. De Raedt, “Semirings for probabilistic and neuro-symbolic logic programming,” *International Journal of Approximate Reasoning*, p. 109130, 2024.
- [6] K. Ahmed, T. Li, T. Ton, Q. Guo, K.-W. Chang, P. Kordjamshidi, V. Srikumar, G. Van den Broeck, and S. Singh, “PYLON: A PyTorch framework for learning with constraints,” in *NeurIPS 2021 Competitions and Demonstrations Track*. PMLR, 2022, pp. 319–324.
- [7] W. X. Cao, P. Garg, R. Tjoa, S. Holtzen, T. Millstein, and G. Van den Broeck, “Scaling integer arithmetic in probabilistic programs,” in *UAI*. PMLR, 2023, pp. 260–270.
- [8] R. Manhaeve, S. Dumančić, A. Kimmig, T. Demeester, and L. De Raedt, “Neural probabilistic logic programming in DeepProbLog,” *Artif. Intell.*, vol. 298, p. 103504, 2021.
- [9] J. Xu, Z. Zhang, T. Friedman, Y. Liang, and G. Van den Broeck, “A semantic loss function for deep learning with symbolic knowledge,” in *ICML*, vol. 80. PMLR, 2018, pp. 5498–5507.
- [10] J. Lagniez and P. Marquis, “An Improved Decision-DNNF Compiler,” in *IJCAI*, C. Sierra, Ed., 2017, pp. 667–673.
- [11] R. Kiesel and T. Eiter, “Knowledge Compilation and More with SharpSAT-TD,” in *KR*, 2023, pp. 406–416.
- [12] G. S. Tseitin, *On the Complexity of Derivation in Propositional Calculus*. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1983, pp. 466–483.
- [13] D. Fierens, G. Van den Broeck, J. Renkens, D. S. Shterionov, B. Gutmann, I. Thon, G. Janssens, and L. De Raedt, “Inference and learning in probabilistic logic programs using weighted Boolean formulas,” *Theory Pract. Log. Program.*, vol. 15, no. 3, pp. 358–401, 2015.
- [14] A. Darwiche, “On the tractable counting of theory models and its application to truth maintenance and belief revision,” *Journal of Applied Non-Classical Logics*, vol. 11, no. 1-2, pp. 11–34, 2001.
- [15] A. Shih, G. Van den Broeck, P. Beame, and A. Amarilli, “Smoothing structured decomposable circuits,” in *NeurIPS*, 2019, pp. 11 412–11 422.
- [16] T. Korhonen and M. Järvisalo, “SharpSAT-TD in Model Counting Competitions 2021-2023,” *CoRR*, vol. abs/2308.15819, 2023.
- [17] J. Huang and A. Darwiche, “DPLL with a trace: From SAT to knowledge compilation,” in *IJCAI*. Professional Book Center, 2005, pp. 156–162.
- [18] R. J. Bayardo, Jr. and J. D. Pehoushek, “Counting models using connected components,” in *AAAI/IAAI*, 2000, pp. 157–162.
- [19] M. Thurley, “sharpSAT - Counting Models with Advanced Component Caching and Implicit BCP,” in *SAT*, ser. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 4121. Springer, 2006, pp. 424–429.
- [20] S. Sharma, S. Roy, M. Soos, and K. S. Meel, “GANAK: A scalable probabilistic exact model counter,” in *IJCAI*, 2019, pp. 1169–1176.
- [21] T. Van Bremen, V. Derkinderen, S. Sharma, S. Roy, and K. S. Meel, “Symmetric Component Caching for Model Counting on Combinatorial Instances,” in *AAAI*, vol. 35, 2021, pp. 3922–3930.
- [22] U. Oztok and A. Darwiche, “On Compiling DNNFs without Determinism,” *CoRR*, vol. abs/1709.07092, 2017.
- [23] J. Lagniez, E. Lonca, and P. Marquis, “Improving model counting by leveraging definability,” in *IJCAI*, 2016, pp. 751–757.
- [24] W. Meert, J. Vlasselaeer, and G. Van den Broeck, “A relaxed Tseitin transformation for weighted model counting,” in *Proceedings of the Sixth International Workshop on Statistical Relational AI*, 2016, pp. 1–7.
- [25] M. Scutari, “The bnlearn Bayesian network repository,” 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://www.bnlearn.com/bnrepository/>
- [26] J. Lagniez, E. Lonca, and P. Marquis, “Definability for model counting,” *Artif. Intell.*, vol. 281, p. 103229, 2020.
- [27] A. Dubray, P. Schaus, and S. Nijssen, “Probabilistic Inference by Projected Weighted Model Counting on Horn Clauses,” in *CP*, ser. LIPIcs, vol. 280, 2023, pp. 15:1–15:17.
- [28] M. Hecher and J. Fichte, “Model counting competition 2022: Full instance set,” Feb. 2024, 10.5281/zenodo.10014715.
- [29] J. Fichte and M. Hecher, “Model counting competition 2023: Full instance set,” Feb. 2024, 10.5281/zenodo.10012822.
- [30] T. Janhunen and I. Niemelä, “Compact translations of non-disjunctive answer set programs to propositional clauses,” in *Logic Programming, Knowledge Representation, and Nonmonotonic Reasoning*, ser. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 6565. Springer, 2011, pp. 111–130.
- [31] T. Eiter, M. Hecher, and R. Kiesel, “Treewidth-Aware Cycle Breaking for Algebraic Answer Set Counting,” in *KR*, 2021, pp. 269–279.
- [32] A. L. D. Latour, B. Babaki, and S. Nijssen, “Stochastic constraint propagation for mining probabilistic networks,” in *IJCAI*, 2019.
- [33] B. Wiegman, “GridKit: European and North-American extracts,” 2016, doi: 10.5281/zenodo.47317.
- [34] J. Maene and L. De Raedt, “Soft-unification in deep probabilistic logic,” in *NeurIPS*, 2023.




Fig. 10. The number of nodes remaining after applying both procedures (y-axis) on a few formulas (x-axis). Each formula represents a query in a Bayesian network. d-DNNF+p represents the procedure of $\text{EXISTS}(\mathcal{T}(\psi), \mathbf{X})$. d-DNNF+t represents the additional removal of Tseitin artifacts. Lower is better.

APPENDIX B EMPIRICAL RESULTS

Table II and III report the empirical results in more detail. Fig. 10 shows the results of the Bayesian network experiments.

TABLE II: Experimental results comparing the compiled formula size ($|\text{d-DNNF}|$) to the size after performing existential quantification ($|\text{d-DNNF+p}|$) and to the size after also considering Tseitin artifacts ($|\text{d-DNNF+t}|$). The percentages are relative to the d-DNNF size. The percentage next to $|\text{Tseitin Vars}|$ indicates the relative number of tseitin variables compared to the total number of variables. The instances are those of the CNFT dataset, excluding the NeSy DNF formulas.

Benchmark	Vars	Tseitin Vars	d-DNNF	d-DNNF+p	d-DNNF+t
card_drawing_10.pl	13766	11775 (86%)	111 937	27 516 (25%)	641 (1%)
biased_coin_toss1_100.pl	502	300 (60%)	12 286	10 498 (85%)	400 (3%)
biased_coin_toss3_100_100_f.pl	601	398 (66%)	17 739	9 107 (51%)	1 647 (9%)
na/newhampshire0	646	407 (63%)	44 326	9 570 (22%)	2 918 (7%)
tree_10_0	96	67 (70%)	414	136 (33%)	53 (13%)
tree_70_1	2394	2042 (85%)	429 012	65 235 (15%)	27 791 (6%)
lp2sat/smokers_8_7	1897	1745 (92%)	186 150 857	37 841 795 (20%)	16 283 851 (9%)
tree_90_1	3000	2548 (85%)	579 643	92 559 (16%)	41 466 (7%)
tree_20_1	646	544 (84%)	26 002	4 630 (18%)	2 104 (8%)
tree_100_1	3332	2830 (85%)	729 133	119 756 (16%)	55 687 (8%)
lp2sat/smokers_7_6	1443	1324 (92%)	15 342 276	2 909 745 (19%)	1 361 010 (9%)
tree_80_1	2737	2335 (85%)	467 568	76 424 (16%)	35 822 (8%)
tree_40_1	1362	1160 (85%)	128 369	21 167 (16%)	10 060 (8%)
tree_60_1	2070	1768 (85%)	243 367	39 684 (16%)	19 108 (8%)
tree_50_1	1729	1477 (85%)	170 358	28 207 (17%)	13 774 (8%)
na/arkansas0_2	765	486 (64%)	61 091	17 342 (28%)	8 542 (14%)
smokers/smokers_8_7	736	656 (89%)	6 658 551	1 914 221 (29%)	956 492 (14%)
gh_6	74	53 (72%)	2 072	786 (38%)	404 (19%)
tree_10_1	251	199 (79%)	10 686	2 835 (27%)	1 458 (14%)
tree_30_1	1022	870 (85%)	80 661	14 296 (18%)	7 456 (9%)
tree_30_2	1858	1644 (88%)	3 451 907	459 994 (13%)	244 253 (7%)
smokers/smokers_7_6	518	455 (88%)	1 444 858	434 244 (30%)	234 901 (16%)

Continued on next page

TABLE II – Continued from previous page

Benchmark	Vars	Tseitín Vars	d-DNNF	d-DNNF+p	d-DNNF+t
lp2sat/smokers_11_4	1629	1524 (94%)	8 791 418	919 749 (10%)	502 144 (6%)
tree_50_2	3128	2774 (89%)	21 929 055	2 617 220 (12%)	1 428 938 (7%)
tree_60_2	3740	3316 (89%)	34 091 435	3 920 293 (11%)	2 163 597 (6%)
na/mexicocity0	333	204 (61%)	13 799	3 385 (25%)	1 873 (14%)
tree_40_2	2413	2129 (88%)	9 791 517	1 153 522 (12%)	638 534 (7%)
lp2sat/smokers_10_5	1193	1095 (92%)	6 053 347	778 090 (13%)	434 753 (7%)
gh_7	104	76 (73%)	6 314	2 387 (38%)	1 358 (22%)
gh_5	49	34 (69%)	852	331 (39%)	193 (23%)
gh_9	179	134 (75%)	46 021	17 176 (37%)	10 107 (22%)
gh_8	139	103 (74%)	17 269	6 244 (36%)	3 734 (22%)
tree_20_2	1182	1038 (88%)	1 026 192	144 424 (14%)	86 798 (8%)
gh_10	224	169 (75%)	154 798	57 898 (37%)	35 186 (23%)
gh_15	524	404 (77%)	47 061 892	17 210 730 (37%)	10 551 421 (22%)
gh_14	454	349 (77%)	14 556 112	5 343 502 (37%)	3 277 196 (23%)
lp2sat/smokers_9_5	867	792 (91%)	594 712	68 184 (11%)	42 006 (7%)
tree_10_2	578	504 (87%)	268 341	42 249 (16%)	26 092 (10%)
tree_20_3	1940	1754 (90%)	58 459 455	6 399 205 (11%)	3 988 155 (7%)
lp2sat/smokers_11_5	1806	1693 (94%)	26 030 467	2 164 333 (8%)	1 352 240 (5%)
gh_11	274	208 (76%)	480 258	177 134 (37%)	110 946 (23%)
lp2sat/smokers_13_3	1838	1719 (94%)	71 715 154	5 621 907 (8%)	3 544 183 (5%)
lp2sat/smokers_10_4	1069	979 (92%)	2 311 217	232 632 (10%)	146 807 (6%)
gh_12	329	251 (76%)	1 267 316	453 895 (36%)	291 926 (23%)
lp2sat/smokers_12_3	1915	1795 (94%)	34 645 012	2 433 502 (7%)	1 569 165 (5%)
gh_16	740	604 (82%)	83 689 609	22 402 902 (27%)	14 500 697 (17%)
smokers/smokers_14_5	798	700 (88%)	34 464 202	9 089 030 (26%)	5 902 348 (17%)
gh_13	389	298 (77%)	3 651 005	1 284 063 (35%)	835 151 (23%)
gh_4	29	19 (66%)	239	103 (43%)	67 (28%)
lp2sat/smokers_7_4	456	411 (90%)	16 874	1 731 (10%)	1 129 (7%)
smokers/smokers_13_5	681	597 (88%)	15 737 234	4 210 361 (27%)	2 748 694 (17%)
lp2sat/smokers_9_4	867	792 (91%)	487 149	45 485 (9%)	29 864 (6%)
lp2sat/smokers_14_3	2113	1979 (94%)	72 449 868	5 608 578 (8%)	3 682 952 (5%)
lp2sat/smokers_10_3	1298	1212 (93%)	1 862 646	158 308 (8%)	104 051 (6%)
tree_10_4	1304	1186 (91%)	129 094 229	14 303 711 (11%)	9 404 966 (7%)
lp2sat/smokers_8_2	352	304 (86%)	9 926	1 161 (12%)	765 (8%)
lp2sat/smokers_9_3	867	792 (91%)	315 460	29 518 (9%)	19 465 (6%)
lp2sat/smokers_6_2	277	239 (86%)	12 435	1 639 (13%)	1 082 (9%)
lp2sat/smokers_7_3	456	411 (90%)	14 773	1 550 (10%)	1 032 (7%)
lp2sat/smokers_11_3	1396	1303 (93%)	1 691 231	139 915 (8%)	93 236 (6%)
lp2sat/smokers_14_2	1769	1651 (93%)	10 374 869	777 505 (7%)	520 046 (5%)
lp2sat/tree_10_0	755	709 (94%)	2 831	357 (13%)	239 (8%)
tree_10_3	933	837 (90%)	4 717 504	603 456 (13%)	405 405 (9%)
smokers/smokers_13_4	571	491 (86%)	2 183 708	603 412 (28%)	408 403 (19%)
lp2sat/smokers_8_3	597	541 (91%)	106 363	9 112 (9%)	6 203 (6%)
lp2sat/smokers_6_3	233	199 (85%)	4 239	635 (15%)	434 (10%)
lp2sat/smokers_8_5	595	539 (91%)	40 198	4 163 (10%)	2 853 (7%)
smokers/smokers_12_5	518	442 (85%)	1 924 863	585 345 (30%)	401 907 (21%)
lp2sat/smokers_13_2	1518	1415 (93%)	198 518	15 619 (8%)	10 744 (5%)
lp2sat/smokers_10_2	1050	976 (93%)	317 339	26 413 (8%)	18 335 (6%)
smokers/smokers_15_4	591	501 (85%)	2 397 884	684 620 (29%)	482 867 (20%)
smokers/smokers_9_3	203	161 (79%)	9 955	3 535 (36%)	2 496 (25%)
lp2sat/smokers_15_2	2046	1913 (93%)	29 694 411	2 070 764 (7%)	1 465 241 (5%)
lp2sat/smokers_8_4	672	612 (91%)	56 444	5 352 (9%)	3 795 (7%)
smokers/smokers_12_4	498	428 (86%)	1 424 575	387 035 (27%)	275 147 (19%)

Continued on next page

TABLE II – Continued from previous page

Benchmark	Vars	Tseitin Vars	d-DNNF	d-DNNF+p	d-DNNF+t
lp2sat/smokers_12_2	1315	1223 (93%)	991 917	76 021 (8%)	54 240 (5%)
lp2sat/smokers_7_2	392	351 (90%)	6 116	646 (11%)	462 (8%)
smokers/smokers_12_3	528	462 (88%)	639 673	148 377 (23%)	107 119 (17%)
lp2sat/smokers_11_2	1144	1063 (93%)	248 139	17 835 (7%)	12 902 (5%)
smokers/smokers_9_2	163	125 (77%)	3 928	1 607 (41%)	1 173 (30%)
lp2sat/smokers_9_2	750	683 (91%)	72 120	7 043 (10%)	5 146 (7%)
smokers/smokers_10_5	322	268 (83%)	93 962	28 783 (31%)	21 032 (22%)
05_smokers_10_2_f.pl	402	339 (84%)	1 635 018	197 490 (12%)	144 333 (9%)
smokers/smokers_7_3	103	77 (75%)	1 107	550 (50%)	404 (36%)
smokers/smokers_7_5	83	61 (73%)	385	136 (35%)	100 (26%)
smokers/smokers_9_5	211	169 (80%)	14 509	5 168 (36%)	3 802 (26%)
smokers/smokers_13_3	423	357 (84%)	201 327	56 048 (28%)	41 440 (21%)
smokers/smokers_11_5	395	333 (84%)	149 664	42 562 (28%)	31 516 (21%)
smokers/smokers_15_3	615	531 (86%)	1 841 428	444 181 (24%)	329 683 (18%)
lp2sat/smokers_6_4	187	157 (84%)	1 395	214 (15%)	159 (11%)
smokers/smokers_9_4	211	169 (80%)	11 594	3 861 (33%)	2 869 (25%)
smokers/smokers_8_5	132	100 (76%)	1 969	744 (38%)	554 (28%)
smokers/smokers_14_4	614	528 (86%)	7 202 247	1 859 261 (26%)	1 389 939 (19%)
smokers/smokers_10_4	266	216 (81%)	42 602	14 285 (34%)	10 682 (25%)
smokers/smokers_14_3	492	418 (85%)	323 550	86 608 (27%)	64 880 (20%)
smokers/smokers_8_4	142	108 (76%)	2 020	804 (40%)	604 (30%)
lp2sat/smokers_5_2	133	110 (83%)	703	113 (16%)	85 (12%)
smokers/smokers_11_4	339	281 (83%)	154 297	48 349 (31%)	36 506 (24%)
smokers/smokers_11_2	193	147 (76%)	3 193	1 216 (38%)	920 (29%)
smokers/smokers_15_2	485	411 (85%)	440 143	110 887 (25%)	84 154 (19%)
smokers/smokers_10_3	270	222 (82%)	23 305	6 999 (30%)	5 339 (23%)
smokers/smokers_13_2	299	241 (81%)	6 351	1 891 (30%)	1 443 (23%)
lp2sat/smokers_5_3	133	110 (83%)	719	109 (15%)	84 (12%)
smokers/smokers_8_3	156	124 (79%)	3 020	958 (32%)	739 (24%)
lp2sat/tree_50_1	12662	12211 (96%)	24 898 141	1 358 634 (5%)	1 048 205 (4%)
lp2sat/tree_60_1	15382	14841 (96%)	45 619 048	2 103 378 (5%)	1 623 763 (4%)
smokers/smokers_14_2	499	433 (87%)	362 333	71 563 (20%)	55 476 (15%)
lp2sat/tree_20_1	3822	3641 (95%)	1 253 443	96 084 (8%)	74 498 (6%)
smokers/smokers_7_4	103	77 (75%)	812	308 (38%)	239 (29%)
lp2sat/tree_40_1	9990	9629 (96%)	12 153 003	727 574 (6%)	564 705 (5%)
smokers/smokers_12_2	258	206 (80%)	15 773	5 068 (32%)	3 948 (25%)
smokers/smokers_11_3	297	245 (82%)	21 180	6 123 (29%)	4 772 (23%)
smokers/smokers_6_3	74	54 (73%)	368	151 (41%)	118 (32%)
smokers/smokers_10_2	220	178 (81%)	13 440	4 111 (31%)	3 222 (24%)
smokers/smokers_6_2	88	66 (75%)	965	371 (38%)	291 (30%)
smokers/smokers_7_2	89	65 (73%)	447	187 (42%)	148 (33%)
lp2sat/tree_20_2	5832	5568 (95%)	137 062 107	9 841 020 (7%)	7 807 204 (6%)
lp2sat/tree_30_1	6322	6051 (96%)	6 068 033	408 990 (7%)	324 796 (5%)
eu/no2	416	237 (57%)	80 572	16 140 (20%)	12 895 (16%)
lp2sat/smokers_4_2	53	37 (70%)	195	46 (24%)	37 (19%)
lp2sat/tree_10_1	1552	1461 (94%)	204 505	19 843 (10%)	15 987 (8%)
smokers/smokers_5_2	45	31 (69%)	146	62 (42%)	50 (34%)
gh_3	14	8 (57%)	67	31 (46%)	25 (37%)
lp2sat/smokers_7_5	326	289 (89%)	2 365	277 (12%)	224 (9%)
lp2sat/tree_10_3	3131	2954 (94%)	155 421 713	14 425 885 (9%)	11 685 815 (8%)
lp2sat/tree_10_2	2275	2141 (94%)	4 060 745	401 091 (10%)	325 151 (8%)
na/illinois1_4	436	271 (62%)	210 624	60 538 (29%)	49 219 (23%)
smokers/smokers_5_3	45	31 (69%)	140	59 (42%)	48 (34%)

Continued on next page

TABLE II – Continued from previous page

Benchmark	Vars	Tseitin Vars	d-DNNF	d-DNNF+p	d-DNNF+t
smokers/smokers_8_2	110	82 (75%)	852	334 (39%)	272 (32%)
na/illinois1_3	455	290 (64%)	172 524	46 592 (27%)	38 062 (22%)
na/nuevoleon0_3	485	321 (66%)	222 888	63 957 (29%)	53 252 (24%)
eu/hr0	401	255 (64%)	349 915	95 158 (27%)	79 612 (23%)
smokers/smokers_6_4	66	48 (73%)	365	140 (38%)	118 (32%)
na/westvirginia0	548	404 (74%)	688 822	125 195 (18%)	105 649 (15%)
smokers/smokers_4_2	30	20 (67%)	73	34 (47%)	29 (40%)
05_smokers_10_f.pl	229	168 (73%)	76 013	15 081 (20%)	12 952 (17%)
na/nuevoleon0_2	480	317 (66%)	155 228	41 833 (27%)	35 989 (23%)
na/guanajuato0_4	581	363 (62%)	243 381	71 368 (29%)	61 803 (25%)
na/newyork1	382	255 (67%)	267 893	60 782 (23%)	52 819 (20%)
05_smokers_20_f.pl	156	52 (33%)	1 611	958 (59%)	845 (52%)
na/arkansas0_3	767	488 (64%)	347 875	86 564 (25%)	76 495 (22%)
na/arkansas0_4	824	544 (66%)	749 924	199 067 (27%)	177 464 (24%)
na/arkansas0_1	869	590 (68%)	997 520	260 394 (26%)	232 210 (23%)
na/nuevoleon0_1	669	506 (76%)	11 881 970	1 508 787 (13%)	1 359 634 (11%)
na/guanajuato0_2	615	397 (65%)	703 710	182 359 (26%)	164 487 (23%)
na/minnesota1	532	392 (74%)	1 317 519	261 319 (20%)	235 729 (18%)
na/illinois1_2	450	285 (63%)	334 939	86 464 (26%)	78 538 (23%)
na/sanluispotosi0	486	328 (67%)	858 929	227 773 (27%)	207 698 (24%)
na/guanajuato0_1	701	483 (69%)	2 864 815	566 413 (20%)	523 804 (18%)
na/guanajuato0_3	613	395 (64%)	1 012 685	240 711 (24%)	223 486 (22%)
eu/ru1	892	676 (76%)	15 835 947	2 217 816 (14%)	2 077 827 (13%)
na/bajacalifornia0	537	412 (77%)	2 318 894	265 241 (11%)	248 967 (11%)
na/illinois1_1	530	365 (69%)	876 888	199 911 (23%)	188 925 (22%)
na/chihuahua0_1	641	478 (75%)	47 630 040	6 990 905 (15%)	6 744 530 (14%)
na/chihuahua0_2	633	470 (74%)	36 016 817	5 836 703 (16%)	5 716 480 (16%)
gnb_20	400	208 (52%)	6 058	1 485 (25%)	1 485 (25%)
gnb_50	2500	1273 (51%)	144 700	26 511 (18%)	26 511 (18%)
gnb_60	3600	1828 (51%)	298 756	50 815 (17%)	50 815 (17%)
gnb_90	8100	4093 (51%)	1 623 372	251 742 (16%)	251 742 (16%)
gnb_30	900	463 (51%)	22 798	4 864 (21%)	4 864 (21%)
gnb_40	1600	818 (51%)	64 235	12 603 (20%)	12 603 (20%)
gnb_70	4900	2483 (51%)	543 578	88 635 (16%)	88 635 (16%)
gnb_80	6400	3238 (51%)	982 006	155 952 (16%)	155 952 (16%)
smokers/smokers_6_5	30	18 (60%)	47	23 (49%)	23 (49%)
smokers/smokers_4_3	20	12 (60%)	31	15 (48%)	15 (48%)
smokers/smokers_5_4	25	15 (60%)	39	19 (49%)	19 (49%)
smokers/smokers_3_2	15	9 (60%)	23	11 (48%)	11 (48%)
gh_2	4	1 (25%)	8	6 (75%)	6 (75%)
lp2sat/smokers_4_4	9	5 (56%)	9	3 (33%)	3 (33%)
lp2sat/smokers_4_5	9	5 (56%)	9	3 (33%)	3 (33%)
lp2sat/smokers_4_3	21	9 (43%)	32	19 (59%)	19 (59%)
lp2sat/smokers_6_5	31	13 (42%)	48	29 (60%)	29 (60%)
lp2sat/smokers_3_4	7	4 (57%)	7	2 (29%)	2 (29%)
lp2sat/smokers_3_3	7	4 (57%)	7	2 (29%)	2 (29%)
lp2sat/smokers_5_5	11	6 (55%)	11	4 (36%)	4 (36%)
lp2sat/smokers_5_4	26	11 (42%)	40	24 (60%)	24 (60%)
lp2sat/smokers_3_2	16	7 (44%)	24	14 (58%)	14 (58%)
lp2sat/smokers_7_7	15	8 (53%)	15	6 (40%)	6 (40%)
lp2sat/smokers_3_5	7	4 (57%)	7	2 (29%)	2 (29%)
weather_50.pl	596	296 (50%)	7 007	3 507 (50%)	3 507 (50%)

TABLE III: Experimental results comparing the compiled formula size ($|d\text{-DNNF}|$) to the size after performing existential quantification ($|d\text{-DNNF+p}|$) and to the size after also considering Tseitin artifacts ($|d\text{-DNNF+t}|$). The percentages are relative to the $d\text{-DNNF}$ size. The percentage next to $|Tseitin\ Vars|$ indicates the relative number of tseitin variables compared to the total number of variables. The instances are those of the MCC dataset.

Benchmark	Vars	Tseitin Vars	$ d\text{-DNNF} $	$ d\text{-DNNF+p} $	$ d\text{-DNNF+t} $
MCC22_wpu2_005	100	50 (50%)	2 776 738	1 761 751 (63%)	1 (0%)
MCC22_wpu2_007	140	70 (50%)	63 959	36 835 (58%)	6 916 (11%)
MCC22_wpu2_013	100	50 (50%)	66 763	42 193 (63%)	10 838 (16%)
MCC22_wpu2_009	140	70 (50%)	32 118	18 846 (59%)	7 538 (23%)
MCC22_pu1_007	200	100 (50%)	687	328 (48%)	162 (24%)
MCC22_wpu2_011	200	100 (50%)	7 176 802	5 038 851 (70%)	3 203 903 (45%)
MCC22_pu1_011	120	60 (50%)	57 772	39 137 (68%)	27 578 (48%)
MCC22_pu1_015	200	100 (50%)	239	119 (50%)	87 (36%)
MCC22_pu1_021	586	388 (66%)	27 169	9 286 (34%)	6 822 (25%)
MCC22_wpu2_093	1736	1547 (89%)	398 357	36 790 (9%)	28 177 (7%)
MCC22_pu1_051	1060	735 (69%)	295 814	109 243 (37%)	83 723 (28%)
MCC22_pu1_037	781	583 (75%)	228 199	82 992 (36%)	64 723 (28%)
MCC22_pu1_055	1332	908 (68%)	874 535	283 090 (32%)	227 330 (26%)
MCC23_pr1_066	2297	2106 (92%)	9 155 265	783 912 (9%)	638 138 (7%)
MCC23_pr1_068	14948	14266 (95%)	1 441 086	43 472 (3%)	37 287 (3%)
MCC23_pu1_043	1985	1280 (64%)	59 793	12 715 (21%)	11 215 (19%)
MCC22_pu1_031	777	507 (65%)	807 597	234 294 (29%)	210 472 (26%)
MCC23_wpu2_009	9532	8643 (91%)	14 746 443	1 223 890 (8%)	1 126 578 (8%)
MCC22_wpu2_049	795	507 (64%)	1 521 468	480 206 (32%)	443 030 (29%)
MCC23_pu1_037	2811	1974 (70%)	74 120	19 741 (27%)	19 593 (26%)
MCC22_pu1_079	1548	913 (59%)	32 619	15 316 (47%)	15 211 (47%)
MCC23_wpu2_023	3012	2089 (69%)	77 431	22 069 (29%)	21 921 (28%)
MCC23_wpr2_036	2708	2014 (74%)	90 758	28 828 (32%)	28 714 (32%)
MCC23_wpu2_035	2374	1447 (61%)	72 406	34 609 (48%)	34 504 (48%)
MCC22_pu1_121	9386	2828 (30%)	36 720 080	26 300 884 (72%)	26 286 822 (72%)
MCC22_pu1_149	17849	8694 (49%)	297 569	157 314 (53%)	157 250 (53%)
MCC22_wpu2_149	17918	8694 (49%)	299 748	161 117 (54%)	161 053 (54%)
MCC22_wpu2_103	586	243 (41%)	3 481 642	2 210 014 (63%)	2 210 014 (63%)
MCC23_pu1_085	892	243 (27%)	1 916 976	1 425 391 (74%)	1 425 391 (74%)
MCC22_pu1_099	1843	968 (53%)	76 554 867	33 765 798 (44%)	33 765 798 (44%)
MCC23_pu1_027	1916	1134 (59%)	64 127	30 507 (48%)	30 507 (48%)
MCC22_pu1_093	2065	1060 (51%)	566 809	338 489 (60%)	338 489 (60%)
MCC23_pu1_031	2649	1905 (72%)	46 726	14 542 (31%)	14 542 (31%)
MCC23_pr1_090	2687	968 (36%)	82 680 156	50 593 787 (61%)	50 593 787 (61%)
MCC22_wpu2_101	2815	1060 (38%)	790 369	548 570 (69%)	548 570 (69%)
MCC23_wpr2_032	2646	1985 (75%)	72 318	22 277 (31%)	22 277 (31%)
MCC22_pu1_107	3045	1528 (50%)	13 606 870	8 030 943 (59%)	8 030 943 (59%)
MCC23_pr1_044	3383	2347 (69%)	92 416	32 825 (36%)	32 825 (36%)
MCC23_pr1_096	4131	1528 (37%)	21 409 219	14 949 035 (70%)	14 949 035 (70%)
MCC23_pu1_007	3727	3234 (87%)	126 623	15 142 (12%)	15 142 (12%)
MCC23_pu1_049	3754	3317 (88%)	1 301 455	130 565 (10%)	130 565 (10%)
MCC23_pu1_073	6139	5461 (89%)	2 437 952	234 861 (10%)	234 861 (10%)
MCC23_wpu2_033	6772	6012 (89%)	691 193	69 937 (10%)	69 937 (10%)
MCC23_pr1_008	6856	6159 (90%)	201 009	20 037 (10%)	20 037 (10%)
MCC22_pu1_133	9638	6358 (66%)	16 099	5 725 (36%)	5 725 (36%)
MCC23_pu1_009	8978	8124 (90%)	262 046	24 516 (9%)	24 516 (9%)

Continued on next page

TABLE III – *Continued from previous page*

Benchmark	 Vars 	 Tseitín Vars 	 d-DNNF 	 d-DNNF+p 	 d-DNNF+t
MCC23_pu1_105	11557	6808 (59%)	3 076 699	1 518 536 (49%)	1 518 536 (49%)
MCC23_pu1_053	11024	2757 (25%)	4 367 241	3 531 666 (81%)	3 531 666 (81%)
MCC23_pr1_094	9797	8794 (90%)	8 783 294	838 762 (10%)	838 762 (10%)
MCC23_wpr2_050	11118	2793 (25%)	2 675 743	2 200 837 (82%)	2 200 837 (82%)
MCC23_pu1_033	10481	9438 (90%)	193 448	18 991 (10%)	18 991 (10%)
MCC23_wpr2_034	11825	10621 (90%)	359 365	32 681 (9%)	32 681 (9%)
MCC23_pr1_072	14685	10179 (69%)	388 592	145 863 (38%)	145 863 (38%)
MCC23_wpu2_081	13808	12301 (89%)	630 642	58 587 (9%)	58 587 (9%)
MCC23_pr1_110	16162	14651 (91%)	31 486 631	2 553 281 (8%)	2 553 281 (8%)
MCC23_pr1_100	16767	14868 (89%)	14 758 376	1 155 455 (8%)	1 155 455 (8%)
MCC23_pr1_070	17299	15727 (91%)	838 399	71 378 (9%)	71 378 (9%)
MCC23_pu1_117	20192	12696 (63%)	2 432 088	1 147 968 (47%)	1 147 968 (47%)
MCC23_pu1_103	20977	19095 (91%)	9 511 202	783 373 (8%)	783 373 (8%)
MCC23_pr1_146	28701	28343 (99%)	8 119 721	83 212 (1%)	83 212 (1%)
MCC23_pu1_099	23246	21294 (92%)	2 910 837	218 127 (7%)	218 127 (7%)
MCC23_pu1_119	37821	22486 (59%)	17 933 041	9 254 462 (52%)	9 254 462 (52%)
MCC23_wpr2_098	33446	30521 (91%)	1 497 939	103 126 (7%)	103 126 (7%)
MCC23_pu1_133	44805	27489 (61%)	55 146 328	25 261 313 (46%)	25 261 313 (46%)
MCC23_pr1_032	192958	63516 (33%)	2 352 179	1 562 547 (66%)	1 562 547 (66%)