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- Abstract DPLL uses states and transitions to model the progress of the algorithm.
- Most states are of the form $M \| F$, where
- $M$ is a sequence of annotated literals denoting a partial truth assignment, and
- $F$ is the CNF formula being checked, represented as a set of clauses.
- The initial state is $\emptyset \| F$, where $F$ is to be checked for satisfiability.
- Transitions between states are defined by a set of conditional transition rules.


## Abstract DPLL

The final state is either:

- a special fail state: fail, if $F$ is unsatisfiable, or
- $M \| G$, where $G$ is a CNF formula equisatisfiable with the original formula $F$, and $M$ satisfies $G$

We write $M \models C$ to mean that for every truth assignment $v, v(M)=$ True implies $v(C)=$ True.

## Abstract DPLL Rules
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Fail :

$$
M \| F, C \quad \Longrightarrow \quad \text { fail }
$$

if $\left\{\begin{array}{l}M \neq \neg C \\ M \text { contains no decision literals }\end{array}\right.$
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$$
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| $\emptyset$ | $1 \vee \overline{2}$ | $\bar{\square} \overline{2}$, | $2 \vee 3$, | $\overline{3} \vee 2$, | $1 \vee 4$ | $\Longrightarrow$ | (PureLiteral) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4 | $1 \vee 2$ | $\bar{\square} \overline{2}$, | $2 \vee 3$, | $\overline{3} \vee 2$, | $1 \vee 4$ | $\Longrightarrow$ | (Decide) |
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| $41^{\text {d }} \overline{2} 3$ | $1 \vee 2$ | $\checkmark \overline{2}$, | $2 \vee 3$, | $\overline{3} \vee 2$, | $1 \vee 4$ | $\Rightarrow$ | (Backtrack) |
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Result: Unsatisfiable

## Abstract DPLL: Backjumping and Learning

The basic rules can be improved by replacing the Backtrack rule with the more powerful Backjump rule and adding a Learn rule:

Backjump :

$$
M I^{d} N\left\|F, C \quad \Longrightarrow \quad M I^{\prime}\right\| F, C \quad \text { if }\left\{\begin{array}{l}
M I^{d} N \models \neg C, \text { and there is } \\
\text { some clause } C^{\prime} \vee I^{\prime} \text { such that : } \\
F, C \models C^{\prime} \vee I^{\prime} \text { and } M \models \neg C^{\prime}, \\
I^{\prime} \text { is undefined in } M, \text { and } M I^{\mathrm{d}} N \\
I^{\prime} \text { or } \neg l^{\prime} \text { occurs in } F \text { or in } M I^{d}
\end{array}\right.
$$

Learn :

$$
M\|F \quad \Longrightarrow \quad M\| F, C \quad \text { if }\left\{\begin{array}{l}
\text { all atoms of } C \text { occur in } F \\
F \models C
\end{array}\right.
$$

## Abstract DPLL: Backjumping and Learning

The Backjump rule is best understood by introducing the notion of implication graph, a directed graph associated with a state $M \| F$ of Abstract DPLL:

- The vertices are the variables in $M$
- There is an edge from $v_{1}$ to $v_{2}$ if $v_{2}$ was assigned a value as the result of an application of UnitProp using a clause containing $v_{2}$.

When we reach a state in which $M \vDash \neg C$ for some $C \in F$, we add an extra conflict vertex and edges from each of the variables in $C$ to the conflict vertex.

## Abstract DPLL: Backjumping and Learning

The clause to use for backjumping (called the conflict clause) is obtained from the resulting graph:

- We first cut the graph along edges in such a way that it separates the conflict vertex from all of the decision vertices.
- Then, every vertex with an outgoing edge that was cut is marked.
- For each literal / in $M$ whose variable is marked, $-/$ is added to the conflict clause.

To avoid ever having the same conflict again, we can learn the conflict clause using the learn rule.

