# Towards Efficient SAT Solving using XOR-OR-AND Normal Forms

work-in-progress

Julian Danner

joint work with B. Andraschko and M. Kreuzer



# $\bigwedge \begin{array}{l} (\neg X_1 \oplus X_3) \lor X_2 \\ (X_1 \oplus X_2 \oplus X_3) \lor \neg X_3 \\ X_3 \lor (X_1 \oplus X_2) \\ (\neg X_1 \oplus X_2) \lor X_1 \lor X_2 \end{array}$









**Proposition** Every formula is equisatisfiable to a formula in 2-XNF.

 $\Upsilon \ \leftrightarrow \ (L_1 \ \lor \ L_2) \quad \equiv \quad (\Upsilon \ \lor \ \neg L_2) \ \land \ ((\neg \Upsilon \oplus L_1) \ \lor \ L_2).$ 



**Proposition** Every formula is equisatisfiable to a formula in 2-XNF.  $Y \leftrightarrow (L_1 \lor L_2) \equiv (Y \lor \neg L_2) \land ((\neg Y \oplus L_1) \lor L_2).$ 

 $\rightarrow$  allows implication graph based solving



 $\begin{array}{l} \mbox{Proposition} \mbox{ Every formula is equisatisfiable to a formula in 2-XNF.} \\ Y \leftrightarrow (L_1 \lor L_2) &\equiv (Y \lor \neg L_2) \land ((\neg Y \oplus L_1) \lor L_2). \\ & \rightarrow \mbox{ allows implication graph based solving} \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & &$ 



PropositionEvery formula is equisatisfiable to a formula in 2-XNF. $Y \leftrightarrow (L_1 \lor L_2) \equiv (Y \lor \neg L_2) \land ((\neg Y \oplus L_1) \lor L_2).$  $\rightarrow$  allows implication graph based solving

SCCs, Failed Linerals, ....







**Definition**  $C_1 \sim C_2$  iff  $\mathcal{S}(C_1) = \mathcal{S}(C_2)$ ;  $V_C = \langle 1 + C \rangle_{\mathbb{F}_2}$ 



Logic Algebra  $X_1 \oplus X_2$  $x_1 + x_2 + 1$  $\longleftrightarrow$  $\{X_1 \oplus X_2, \neg X_3 \oplus X_4\}$  $\{x_1 + x_2 + 1, x_3 + x_4\}$ **Definition**  $C_1 \sim C_2$  iff  $S(C_1) = S(C_2)$ ;  $V_C = \langle 1 + C \rangle_{\mathbb{F}_2}$ Proposition  $C_1 \sim C_2 \iff V_{C_1} = V_{C_2}$  or  $1 \in V_{C_1} \cap V_{C_2}$ **Corollary** For  $i \neq j$  $\{L_1, \ldots, L_k\} \sim \{L_1, \ldots, L_i \oplus L_j, \ldots, L_k\}$ 

Logic Algebra  $X_1 \oplus X_2$  $x_1 + x_2 + 1$  $\longleftrightarrow$  $\{X_1 \oplus X_2, \neg X_3 \oplus X_4\}$  $\{x_1 + x_2 + 1, x_3 + x_4\}$ **Definition**  $C_1 \sim C_2$  iff  $S(C_1) = S(C_2)$ ;  $V_C = \langle 1 + C \rangle_{\mathbb{F}_2}$ Proposition  $C_1 \sim C_2 \iff V_{C_1} = V_{C_2}$  or  $1 \in V_{C_1} \cap V_{C_2}$ **Corollary** For  $i \neq j$  $\{L_1, \ldots, L_k\} \sim \{L_1, \ldots, L_i \oplus L_j, \ldots, L_k\}$ Corollary C is a tautology  $\iff 1 \in V_C$ 

## ANF\_to\_XNF converts Algebraic Normal Form (ANF) to XNF.

ASCON-128	format	#vars	# cls/polys	avg cls len
—	ANF	6080	11 904	_
anf_to_xnf	XNF	12 224	17 920	1.64
SageMath	CNF	26 048	260 416	4.79
ApCoCoA	CNF-XOR	28 545	158 809	3.59
bosphorus	CNF	49 289	1 424 034	5.83

ASCON-128	format	#vars	# cls/polys	avg cls len
—	ANF	6080	11 904	_
$anf_to_xnf$	XNF	12 224	17 920	1.64
SageMath	CNF	26 048	260 416	4.79
ApCoCoA	CNF-XOR	28 545	158 809	3.59
bosphorus	CNF	49 289	1 424 034	5.83

 $\rightarrow$  cryptographic instances have compact representation



#### **Definition** A lineral is called **forcing** if it is a literal.

decision

















Problem watching distinct literals from distinct linerals

 $\left\{\begin{array}{cc}X_1\oplus X_2\oplus X_3\oplus X_4\,,\quad X_1\oplus X_2\oplus X_5\end{array}\right\}$ 

Problem watching distinct literals from distinct linerals

 $\left\{\begin{array}{cc} X_1 \oplus X_2 \oplus X_3 \oplus X_4 \,, \quad X_1 \oplus X_2 \oplus X_5 \end{array}\right\}$ 

Problem watching distinct literals from distinct linerals

 $\left\{\begin{array}{cc} X_1 \oplus X_2 \oplus X_3 \oplus X_4 \,, \quad X_1 \oplus X_2 \oplus X_5 \end{array}\right\}$ 

#### Problem watching distinct literals from distinct linerals

# $\left\{\begin{array}{c} X_1 \oplus X_2 \oplus X_3 \oplus X_4, \quad X_1 \oplus X_2 \oplus X_5 \end{array}\right\}$

Problem watching distinct literals from distinct linerals

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{c} X_1 \oplus X_2 \oplus X_3 \oplus X_4 , \quad X_1 \oplus X_2 \oplus X_5 \end{array} \right\}$$

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{c} X_1 \oplus X_2 \end{array} \right\}$$

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{c} X_1 \oplus X_2 \end{array} \right\}$$

might miss unit clauses!

Solution watch unshared literals from two distinct linerals

Solution watch unshared literals from two distinct linerals

Solution watch unshared literals from two distinct linerals
Solution watch unshared literals from two distinct linerals

Solution watch unshared literals from two distinct linerals, change representation if necessary

Solution watch unshared literals from two distinct linerals, change representation if necessary

 $\rightarrow$  swap *shared/unshared* parts

Solution watch unshared literals from two distinct linerals, change representation if necessary

 $\begin{array}{cccc} \mathbf{L}_{1}: & X_{3} \oplus X_{4} & \oplus & \mathbf{X}_{1} \oplus \mathbf{X}_{2} \\ \\ \mathbf{L}_{1} \oplus \mathbf{L}_{2}: & X_{3} \oplus X_{4} & \oplus & X_{5} \end{array}$ 

 $\rightarrow$  swap *shared/unshared* parts

 $\rightarrow$  XNF clauses can be efficiently managed by watch-lists

$$\frac{\{X_1, \neg X_3\}}{\{X_2, \neg X_3\}} \frac{\{\neg X_1, X_2\}}{\{X_2, \neg X_3\}}$$

$$\frac{\{X_1, \neg X_3\} \quad \{\neg X_1, X_2\}}{\{X_2, \neg X_3\}}$$

$$\{X_1, \neg X_2, \neg X_3\} \qquad \{\neg X_1, X_2\}$$

$$\frac{\{X_1, \neg X_3\} \quad \{\neg X_1, X_2\}}{\{X_2, \neg X_3\}}$$

$$\frac{\{X_1, \neg X_2, \neg X_3\}}{\{X_1 \oplus X_2, \neg X_3\}}$$

$$\frac{\{X_1, \neg X_3\} \quad \{\neg X_1, X_2\}}{\{X_2, \neg X_3\}}$$

$$\frac{\{X_1, \neg X_2, \neg X_3\}}{\{X_1 \oplus X_2, \neg X_3\}}$$



[Horacek]

$$\frac{\bigcup_{i=1}^{s} \{L_i\} \cup \mathsf{F} \qquad \bigcup_{i=1}^{s} \{\neg L_i\} \cup \mathsf{G}}{\bigcup_{i=1}^{s-1} \{L_i \oplus L_{i+1}\} \cup \mathsf{F} \cup \mathsf{G}}$$

$$\frac{\{X_1, \neg X_3\} \quad \{\neg X_1, X_2\}}{\{X_2, \neg X_3\}}$$

$$\frac{\{X_1, \neg X_2, \neg X_3\}}{\{X_1 \oplus X_2, \neg X_3\}} \{\neg X_1, X_2\}}$$



[Horacek]

$$\frac{\bigcup_{i=1}^{s} \{L_i\} \cup \mathsf{F} \qquad \bigcup_{i=1}^{s} \{\neg L_i\} \cup \mathsf{G}}{\bigcup_{i=1}^{s-1} \{L_i \oplus L_{i+1}\} \cup \mathsf{F} \cup \mathsf{G}}$$

 $\rightarrow$  CDCL *in principle* possible

$$\frac{\{X_1, \neg X_3\} \quad \{\neg X_1, X_2\}}{\{X_2, \neg X_3\}}$$

$$\frac{\{X_1, \neg X_2, \neg X_3\}}{\{X_1 \oplus X_2, \neg X_3\}}$$



[Horacek]

$$\frac{\bigcup_{i=1}^{s} \{L_i\} \cup \mathsf{F} \qquad \bigcup_{i=1}^{s} \{\neg L_i\} \cup \mathsf{G}}{\bigcup_{i=1}^{s-1} \{L_i \oplus L_{i+1}\} \cup \mathsf{F} \cup \mathsf{G}}$$

 $\rightarrow \mathsf{CDCL} \underbrace{in \ principle}_{|} \mathsf{possible} \\ \mathsf{weaken \ clauses} \ \& \ change \ representation \ before \ resolution \\ \rightsquigarrow \ expensive \ linear \ algebra?$ 



- $\circ\,$  watched linerals  $\checkmark\,$
- $\circ~$  linear algebra  $\sim~$



- $\circ\,$  watched linerals  $\checkmark\,$
- ∘ linear algebra ~
  - $\rightarrow$  Gauß-Jordan with backtracking?
  - $\rightarrow$  how to treat equivalent literals?



- $\circ~$  watched linerals  $\checkmark~$
- $\circ~$  linear algebra  $\sim~$ 
  - $\rightarrow$  Gauß-Jordan with backtracking?
  - $\rightarrow$  how to treat equivalent literals?

#### • conflict learning

- $\circ$  theory  $\checkmark$
- $\circ~$  implementation  $\sim$



- $\circ\,$  watched linerals  $\checkmark\,$
- $\circ~$  linear algebra  $\sim~$ 
  - $\rightarrow$  Gauß-Jordan with backtracking?
  - $\rightarrow$  how to treat equivalent literals?

#### • conflict learning

- $\circ$  theory  $\checkmark$
- $\circ$  implementation  $\sim$

 $\rightarrow$  clause minimization?



- $\circ\,$  watched linerals  $\checkmark\,$
- $\circ~$  linear algebra  $\sim~$ 
  - $\rightarrow$  Gauß-Jordan with backtracking?
  - $\rightarrow$  how to treat equivalent literals?

#### • conflict learning

- $\circ$  theory  $\checkmark$
- $\circ$  implementation  $\sim$

 $\rightarrow$  clause minimization?

- modern decision heuristics  $\times$
- proofs for UNSAT instances  $\times$



- $\circ\,$  watched linerals  $\checkmark\,$
- $\circ~$  linear algebra  $\sim~$ 
  - $\rightarrow$  Gauß-Jordan with backtracking?
  - $\rightarrow$  how to treat equivalent literals?

#### • conflict learning

- $\circ\,$  theory  $\checkmark\,$
- $\circ~$  implementation  $\sim$

 $\rightarrow$  clause minimization?

- modern decision heuristics  $\times$
- proofs for UNSAT instances  $\times$

 $\rightarrow$  DPLL solver in  $\mathrm{C}{++}$   $\checkmark$ 

#### XNF\_to\_ANF

# $L_1 \hspace{0.1cm} \overline{\hspace{0.1cm} \vee \hspace{0.1cm} \cdots \hspace{0.1cm} \vee \hspace{0.1cm} } \hspace{0.1cm} L_k \hspace{0.1cm} \longleftrightarrow \hspace{0.1cm} \hspace{0.1cm} \hspace{0.1cm} \ell_1 \hspace{0.1cm} \cdots \hspace{0.1cm} \hspace{0.1cm} \hspace{0.1cm} \ell_k$

# $\begin{array}{ccc} (\texttt{XNF\_to\_ANF}) \\ & L_1 \lor \cdots \lor L_k & \longleftrightarrow & \ell_1 \cdots \ell_k \end{array}$

# $\begin{array}{c} \underbrace{\text{XNF\_to\_CNF-XOR}} \\ L_1 \lor \cdots \lor L_k \\ & \\ & \\ & \\ (Y_1 \oplus \neg L_1) \land \cdots \land (Y_k \oplus \neg L_k) \land (Y_1 \lor \cdots \lor Y_k) \end{array}$



Figure: Cactus plots for 400 random *satisfiable* 2-XNF in n variables and 3n clauses where  $n \in \{21, \ldots, 40\}$ .



Figure: Cactus plots for 400 random 3n clauses where  $n \in \{21, \ldots, 40\}$ .

2-XNF in  $\boldsymbol{n}$  variables and



Figure: Cactus plots for 400 random *satisfiable* ANFs in n indeterminates and 2n quadratic polynomials where  $n \in \{21, ..., 40\}$ .



Figure: Cactus plots for 400 random *satisfiable* ANFs in n indeterminates and 2n quadratic polynomials where  $n \in \{21, ..., 40\}$ .

Thank you for your attention!