1 (10 p) In the very first lecture, we decided to focus only on CNF formulas and said that this is essentially without loss of generality since any propositional logic formula $F$ can be transformed to CNF formula $F'$ such that $F'$ only linearly larger than $F$ and is unsatisfiable iff $F$ is a tautology. We did do the full transformation, however, and your task now is to fill in the missing details regarding the connectives $\land$ and $\leftrightarrow$.

Given a formula $F \equiv G \land H$, show how to write CNF clauses that force $x_F$ to take the value of $G \land H$ assuming that $x_G$ and $x_H$ are correctly representing the truth values of $G$ and $H$, respectively. Then solve the same problem for the formula $F \equiv G \leftrightarrow H$. Please do not forget to argue why your encodings into CNF are correct.
The purpose of this problem is to clarify the relation between edge expanders and connectivity expanders as defined in the third lecture. In what follows below, all graphs \( G = (V, E) \) are assumed to be connected, and \( \delta \) and \( c \) are constants independent of the size of the graph.

2a (10 p) Prove that if \( G = (V, E) \) is a \((d, \delta)\)-edge expander, then \( G \) is also a \((d, c)\)-connectivity expander for \( c \geq \delta/4 \).

Hint: Consider a minimal edge set \( E' \) that disconnects \( G \) into components of size at most \(|V|/2\) and reason about the edge expansion of these components.

2b (10 p) Prove that there is some constant \( c > 0 \) such that for any \( \delta > 0 \) it holds that for all large enough \( n \in \mathbb{N}^+ \) there is an \( n \)-vertex \((d, c)\)-connectivity expander that is not a \((d, \delta)\)-edge expander.

3 (20 p) When proving theorems about the resolution proof system it is sometimes technically convenient to also have a second inference rule, namely the weakening rule that allows to derive \( C \lor D \) from the clause \( C \) (where \( D \) can be any arbitrarily chosen clause). Since \( C \lor D \) is a weaker clause than \( C \) it seems intuitively clear that this should not be a very useful rule, and indeed it is the case that any use of weakening in a resolution refutation can be eliminated without loss of generality. Your task is to prove this formally.

That is, prove that if \( \pi : F \vdash \bot \) is a resolution refutation with weakening, then there is another resolution refutation \( \pi' : F' \vdash \bot \) in at most the same length that does not use the weakening rule.

Hint: Do a proof by forward induction over the resolution refutation \( \pi = (C_1, C_2, \ldots, C_L) \) containing weakening steps.

4 (30 p) In the Prosecutor-Defendant game for PHP formulas, say that Prosecutor has a size-\( L \) strategy for winning against a class of Defendant strategies \( \mathcal{D} \) if there is an instruction book with at most \( L \) records such that Prosecutor can always win by using this instruction book when Defendant uses any strategy \( D \in \mathcal{D} \). (Thus, a complete Prosecutor strategy is a strategy for winning against the class \( \mathcal{T}_D \) of all possible Defendant strategies, but here we are interested also in incomplete Prosecutor strategies.)

4a (15 p) Let \( \mathcal{D} \) be the set consisting of the single defendant strategy which always gives the answer “no” to the question “Does pigeon \( i \) fly to hole \( j \)” as long as there is some other hole permitted for pigeon \( i \) according to Prosecutor’s current record (and otherwise answers “yes” if the forced choice for pigeon \( i \) is pigeonhole \( j \)). Show that Prosecutor has a strategy in size \( O(n) \) for winning when Defendant plays according to this strategy.

4b (15 p) Let \( \mathcal{D} \) be the set consisting of all the defendant strategies of picking uniformly at random \( n \) out of the \( n + 1 \) pigeons and matching them randomly to pigeonholes, and then always answer consistently with this randomly chosen matching. Show that Prosecutor has a strategy in size \( O(n^2) \) for winning when Defendant plays according to this strategy.
Let $F$ be an unsatisfiable CNF formula and let $\alpha$ denote any truth value assignment to the variables in $F$. The search problem for $F$ given $\alpha$ is to find a clause $C \in F$ falsified by $\alpha$.

A decision tree $T_F$ for $F$ is a binary tree with leaves labelled by clauses in $F$, internal vertices labelled by variables $x$, and two edges from each internal vertex labelled 0 and 1. Any $\alpha$ defines a path through $T_F$ starting from the root, following from each internal vertex $x$ the edge labelled by the value $\alpha(x)$, and ending in some leaf $C$ that is the answer of $T_F$ on $\alpha$. The tree $T_F$ solves the search problem for $F$ if on any $\alpha$ the answer $C$ is a clause falsified by $\alpha$.

Let us write $S_D(F)$ to denote the minimal size (i.e., number of vertices) of any decision tree solving the search problem for $F$, and write $L_T(F \vdash \bot)$ to denote the minimal length of any tree-like resolution refutation of $F$. A very convenient fact is that decision trees and tree-like resolution refutations are essentially just two different ways of looking at the same object. Your task is to formalize this claim as described below.

Please note that Problems 5a, 5b, and 5c below can be solved independently of one another and that results from preceding subproblems can be used in succeeding subproblems regardless of which problems were actually solved.

5a (10 p) Prove that $S_D(F) \leq L_T(F \vdash \bot)$ by showing that any tree-like resolution refutation of $F$ can be made into a decision tree solving the search problem for $F$.

5b (20 p) Prove that $L_T(F \vdash \bot) \leq S_D(F)$ by showing that any decision tree solving the search problem for $F$ can be made into a tree-like resolution refutation of $F$. (For partial credit, just prove $L_T(F \vdash \bot) = O(S_D(F))$ using the weakening rule and the fact claimed in Problem 3 which you can use regardless of whether you solved that problem or not.)

5c (10 p) Argue that this proves the implicational completeness of resolution, and, in particular, shows that any unsatisfiable CNF formula over $n$ variables has a resolution refutation $\pi$ in length $L(\pi) = \exp(O(n))$. What is the best concrete bounds you can get, not using big-oh notation but providing explicit constants instead?

6 (60 p) Using notation and terminology from the second lecture, let $I_R$ denote the set of thoroughly investigated pigeons in a Prosecutor record and assume that $R$ is informative, i.e., that $|I_R| \geq n/4$. We claimed that when Defendant randomly chooses a partial matching of $n/4$ pigeons, then the probability that the size of the intersection is less than $n/32$ is at most exponentially small, i.e., at most $2^{-\epsilon n}$ for some $\epsilon > 0$ for $n$ large enough. Your task is to perform the calculations to prove this. In what follows we assume tacitly, but without loss of generality, that $n$ is large enough for our claims to hold and also for simplicity that 32 evenly divides $n$.

Please note that Problems 6a, 6b, and 6c below can be solved independently of one another and that results from preceding subproblems can be used in succeeding subproblems regardless of which problems were actually solved.

6a (10 p) Explain, briefly but clearly and convincingly, why the probability that the size of the intersection is less than $n/32$ is at most

$$\sum_{i=0}^{n/32-1} \binom{n/4}{i} \binom{n+1-n/4}{n/4-i} \binom{n+1}{n/4}.$$
6b  (20 p) Show that
\[
\sum_{i=0}^{n/32-1} \binom{n/4}{i} \binom{n + 1 - n/4}{n/4 - i} \leq \frac{n}{32} \binom{n/4}{n/32} \left( \frac{3n/4 + 1}{7n/32} \right).
\]

6c  (30 p) Using the inequalities in Problems 6a and 6b as well as Stirling’s formula
\[
\sqrt{2\pi m} \left( \frac{m}{e} \right)^m e^{\frac{1}{12m+1}} < m! < \sqrt{2\pi m} \left( \frac{m}{e} \right)^m e^{\frac{1}{12m}},
\]
prove that the probability of a small intersection is at most \(2^{-δn}\) for some \(δ > 0\). (You should not have to be too careful with the calculations here—using Stirling to get the size of the main protagonists mostly right should be enough.)

7  (70 p) The purpose of this problem is to establish Lemma 9 in the notes from Lecture 3, i.e., that if \(G = (V, E)\) is a connected graph with odd-charge function \(χ : V → \{0, 1\}\) for which we randomly sample a charge-preserving assignment to a medium-large edge set \(E_1 \subseteq E\), then for any subset \(E_2 \subseteq E_1\) such that \(G_2 = (V, E \setminus E_2)\) is connected this random sampling yields independent and uniformly random bits.

Please note that Problems 7a, 7b, and 7c below can be solved independently of one another and that results from preceding subproblems can be used in succeeding subproblems regardless of which problems were actually solved.

7a  (20 p) Let \(A \subseteq \{0, 1\}^m\) be an affine subspace and suppose for a subset of coordinates \(S \subseteq [m]\) that all bit strings in \(\{0, 1\}^S\) are supported by \(A\) (i.e., for any \(β \in \{0, 1\}^S\) there is a vector \(u_β \in A\) that agrees with \(β\) on the coordinates in \(S\)). Prove that a uniformly random sample from \(A\) restricted to \(S\) yields independent and uniformly random bits.

**Hint:** There are a couple of suggested approaches for this problem in the lecture notes.

7b  (20 p) Fix a connected graph \(G = (V, E)\) with an arbitrary charge function \(χ : V → \{0, 1\}\). Let \(E' \subseteq E\) be any minimal set disconnecting \(G\) into exactly two connected graphs \(G_1\) and \(G_2\). Prove that for \(G\) and \(χ\) fixed as above, it holds for any assignment \(ρ\) of values in \(\{0, 1\}\) to the edge variables in \(\{x_e \mid e \in E'\}\) that whether \(G_1\) and \(G_2\) gets odd or even total charges only depends on the parity of the sum \(\sum_{e \in E'} ρ(x_e)\).

Note that when we apply \(ρ\) to the edges in \(E'\), then \(χ\) is updated to \(χ'\) according to edge values in \(ρ\) so that \(χ'(v) = χ(v) + \sum_{e \in E', e \in E'} ρ(x_e)\) (mod 2). The total charge of \(G_i\) for \(i \in \{1, 2\}\) is then defined as \(\sum_{v \in V(G_i)} χ'(v)\).

7c  (30 p) Suppose that \(G = (V, E)\) is a \((d, δ)\)-edge expander for \(δ > 0\), that \(E_1 \subseteq E\) is a moderate-size set such that \(G_1 = (V, E \setminus E_1)\) has a unique connected component of size larger than \(|V|/2\), and that \(E_2 \subseteq E_1\) is such that \(G_2 = (V, E \setminus E_2)\) is connected. Use the claims in Problems 7a and 7b together with the material in the “appendix notes” for Lecture 3 (which does not have to be reproven, but state clearly what you use and how) to prove that if we sample uniformly at random a charge-preserving assignment \(ρ\) to \(E_1\), then the values assigned to the edges in \(E_2\) are independent and uniformly random bits.
(a) Matrix encoding row and column constraints. 

(b) Example cardinality constraints in CNF.

Figure 1: Matrix and (fragment of) corresponding subset cardinality formula in Problem 8.

8 (90+ p) A slightly annoying aspect of the Tseitin formula lower bound we did in Lecture 3 was that we only obtained lower bounds for \((d, \delta)\)-edge expanders with \(\delta > 1\). It is known that the theorem is true for any \(\delta > 0\). In this problem, we want to take a closer look at how the result proven in class can (or cannot) be improved if we assume that the graph is \(d\)-regular (i.e., that every vertex has exactly \(d\) incident edges).

8a (40 p) For partial credit on this subproblem, prove that refuting Tseitin formulas over random 4-regular graphs requires exponential length in resolution asymptotically almost surely (a.a.s). You might want to use that a.a.s. such graphs have edge expansion at least 0.4.

For full credit, prove an exponential lower bound (not almost surely, but unconditionally) for any 4-regular graph that has arbitrarily small but positive (and fixed) edge expansion \(\delta > 0\).

8b (50 p) Can the approach in Lecture 3 be implemented to yield strong lower bounds for edge expanders with arbitrary expansion \(\delta > 0\) if we just work a bit harder on the analysis? Or can you show that some fact/claim/proposition/lemma in the notes is provably false for positive but sufficiently small \(\delta, 0 < \delta \leq 1\)?

8c (100+ p) **Open problem:** Can you improve the Defendant lower bound strategy in Lecture 3 to prove for 3-regular graphs with arbitrarily small but positive (and fixed) edge expansion \(\delta > 0\) that Tseitin formulas over such graphs require exponential resolution refutation length? This is known to be true, but the main instructor does not know of any way of using Prosecutor-Defendant games to prove such a lower bound.
This problem is about the subset cardinality formulas discussed in the first lecture. Please study the example in Figure 1 to understand what these formulas are encoding—this might be helpful when dealing with the more abstract, and perhaps harder to parse, description below.

Recall that we have an $n \times n$ 0/1-matrix $M$ with exactly 4 ones per row and column, except that we add an extra one somewhere so that one row and one column has 5 ones. The variables of the formula are $x_{i,j}$ corresponding to positions in the matrix $M = (m_{i,j})$ such that $m_{i,j} = 1$. Every row provides a constraint that a majority of the variables in that row should be true. Every column requires that a majority of the variables in that column should be false.

In more formal notation, let $R_i = \{ j \mid m_{i,j} = 1 \}$ be the column indices for 1-entries in row $i$ and let $C_j = \{ i \mid m_{i,j} = 1 \}$ be the row indices for 1-entries in column $j$. (We note in passing that specifying only the row sets $R_i$, $i \in [n]$, or only the column sets $C_j$, $j \in [n]$, is sufficient to describe $M$ completely.) Then the subset cardinality formula $SC(M)$ corresponding to a matrix $M$ contains the following clauses:

- For every row $i$ the set of clauses $\{ \forall j \in R_i \forall x_{i,j} \left| R^*_i \subseteq R_i \right. \mid |R^*_i| = 3 \}$.
- For every column $j$ the set of clauses $\{ \forall i \in C_j \forall x_{i,j} \left| C^*_j \subseteq C_j \right. \mid |C^*_j| = 3 \}$.

It has been shown that the formula $SC(M)$ is exponentially hard for resolution if $M$ is an expanding matrix (meaning, roughly, that every small-to-medium-large set of rows contain 1-entries in many different columns), and, in particular, the exponential lower bound holds asymptotically almost surely if $M$ is a randomly sampled matrix subject to the constraints described above.

Please note that Problems 9a, 9b, and 9c below can be solved independently of one another.

9a (20 p) Prove that any subset cardinality formula $SC(M)$, regardless of any expansion properties of the matrix $M$, is always easy for cutting planes. Describe the structure of a short CP refutation and analyze how short you can get it to be. You do not actually have to write down every single low-level syntactic detail, but the description should be detailed enough so that a fellow student could purely mechanically reproduce the cutting planes refutation from your description without having to do any creative thinking.

9b (40 p) The example subset cardinality formula in Figure 1 has a very particular structure in that the first row contains 1s in positions $2^t$ for $t = 0, 1, 2, 3$ and that subsequent rows just has this pattern shifted down the diagonal and wrapping around when reaching the final column. In formal notation, we have $R_i = \{ 1 + (i + 2^t - 2 \mod n) \mid t = 0, 1, 2, 3 \}$ (except that this ignores where the extra 1-entry is added, but exactly where this is done is not too important).

Prove that for such a regular matrix $M$ which can be described by a pattern shifted down the diagonal (except for the extra 1 that appears somewhere), i.e., where there are $a_t$, $i \in [4]$, with $1 \leq a_1 < a_2 < a_3 < a_4 \leq K$ for some constant $K$ independent of $n$, such that $R_i = \{ 1 + (i + a_t - 2 \mod n) \mid t \in [4] \}$, the subset cardinality formulas $SC(M)$ are in fact easy also for resolution.

Hint: Notice that, as usual, the above is an asymptotic claim, so you might need to pick $n$ large enough for the upper bound to kick in (but not ridiculously large). There are actually resolution refutations in length only linear in the size of the formula, but polynomial length is sufficient to get a full score on this subproblem.
An intriguing fact is that even for regular matrices $M$ as in Problem 9b, for which subset cardinality formulas $SC(M)$ are theoretically very easy for resolution, the formulas can be really, really hard in practice for state-of-the-art so-called conflict-driven clause learning (CDCL) SAT solvers based on resolution. Moreover, the hardness seems to depend in subtle ways on the concrete patterns used, and we do not really understand this dependence. (This is a polite way of saying that there are some theoretical predictions regarding which patterns should be easy or hard, but somewhat interestingly these predictions sometimes seem to flatly contradict what can actually be observed in practice…)

The purpose of this final subproblem is to do some empirical research to come up with the hardest pattern you can find for very regular subset cardinality formulas $SC(M)$ as described above. This involves picking four numbers $a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4$, where we require $1 \leq a_1 < a_2 < a_3 < a_4 \leq 9$ to capture the hardness of small, compact patterns, adding an extra 1 somewhere, generating the corresponding subset cardinality formulas $SC(M)$, and running the SAT solver MiniSat on them (available in the Ubuntu environment at KTH CSC; see also the webpage minisat.se).

To solve this subproblem you will need to do the following:

1. Write code that given $n$ and $1 \leq a_1 < a_2 < a_3 < a_4 \leq 9$ generates a file where the first line contains the number $n$ repeated twice, to give the dimensions of the matrix, and all following lines are rows in the matrix, one row per line, where the specified pattern appears shifted along the diagonal (and with 0s and 1s separated by blanks). Note that you also need to flip a 0 to an extra 1 somewhere.

2. Write code for generating the subset cardinality formula $SC(M)$ from any matrix $M$ given in the format described above. The formula should be in the standard DIMACS format described, e.g., at www.csc.kth.se/DD2442/semteo16/useful-info, where you can also find some information about MiniSat.

   Alternatively, you can install and use the tool CNFgen (available at github.com/MassimoLauria/cnfgen) to generate the formulas from matrices for which you coded up in item 1. Assuming that you have stored your matrix in the file matrix.txt, you can call CNFgen to write the corresponding formula to the file formula.cnf by doing cnfgen subsetcard -gf matrix -i matrix.txt > formula.cnf (assuming Unix-style file redirections).

3. Report which is the hardest pattern $1 \leq a_1 < a_2 < a_3 < a_4 \leq 9$ that you can find. Evaluate the hardness of a pattern by finding (and reporting) the smallest $n$ such that MiniSat does not solve the formula $SC(M)$ for a matrix $M$ of dimensions $n \times n$ generated from this pattern within 10 minutes of CPU time when run on the computer u-shell.csc.kth.se. Measure time as reported by the time command.

   There will be an extra bonus to the student who finds the very hardest pattern (with reproducible results when we run the same experiments on u-shell).

   Just to give a sense of the scale, you should expect these formulas to start getting seriously difficult for $25 \times 25$ matrices or so, i.e., for around 100 variables, or even earlier depending on how devious patterns you can design.