

## P=NP resolution, with 3-SAT not tautologous

© Copyright 2017-2018 by Colin James III All rights reserved.

### 1. NP

We use the definition of NP as “nondeterministic polynomial time” from Stephen Cook at [claymath.org/sites/default/files/pvsnp.pdf](http://claymath.org/sites/default/files/pvsnp.pdf) as:

$$w \in L \iff \exists y(|y| \leq |w|^k \text{ and } R(w, y)) \quad (1)$$

where:

$$R(w, y) \iff w \in L \quad (2)$$

$$R(\sim a, \sim b) \iff 1 < b < a \text{ and } b|a \quad (\text{with negation replacing the obtuse vinculum}) \quad (3)$$

We substitute the expression  $R(a, b)$  as:

$$R(\sim a, \sim b) \iff [ R(w, y) \iff 1 < b < a \text{ and } b|a ] \quad (4)$$

then substitute  $R(w, y)$  in Eq. 1 with Eq. 4 for:

$$w \in L \iff \exists y(|y| \leq |w|^k \text{ and } [ R(\sim a, \sim b) \iff [ R(w, y) \iff 1 < b < a \text{ and } b|a ] ]). \quad (5.1)$$

We assume the apparatus and method of Meth8/VL4.

LET:  $a b L R (w,y) \text{ as } t u p q (w, y); (r, s) = (w, y)$

$\sim$  Negation,  $\%$  modal possibility, existential quantifier for all,  $\exists$ ;

$\&$  And,  $\backslash$  Not And,  $+$  Or,  $-$  Not Or,  $=$  Equivalent,  $@$  Not Equivalent,  $>$  Imply,  $<$  Not Imply;

and where:

$$|w| :: (w+((w<((w\w)-(\w\w)))>(w\&((w\w)-((w\w)-(\w\w)))))); \quad (6)$$

$$|y| :: (y+((y<((y\y)-(\y\y)))>(y\&((y\y)-((y\y)-(\y\y)))))); \quad (7)$$

$$|y| \leq |w| :: (y' = w') \text{ or } (y' < w') :: |w| > |y|. \quad (8)$$

We note that in the modal propositional logic of Meth8, as based on system VL4, an exponential expression reduces to the mantissa such that  $w^3$  is  $w\&w\&w = w$ . This means that in Eq. 5.1 the power series term  $|w|^k$ , with  $k$  as a natural number, reduces to  $|w|$ . In other words, in Meth8 a power series is effectively reduced to a linear expression.

$$(w < p) = (\%y\&(((w+((w<((w\w)-(\w\w)))>(w\&((w\w)-((w\w)-(\w\w))))))>(y+((y<((y\y)-(\y\y)))>(y\&((y\y)-((y\y)-(\y\y))))))\&((q\&(\sim r\&\sim s))=((q\&(w\&y))=(((t\<t)<(t\<u))\&(t+u)))))); \quad (5.2)$$

Eq. 5.2 is evaluated on the five logical models of Meth8 as *not* tautologous.

The truth table for Eq. 5.2 is presented as two different segments of two repeating blocks of 16 lines below. The designated truth values are Tautologous and Evaluated.



## 2. P

We use the definition of P as "deterministic polynomial time", that is,  $\sim$ NP as the negation of Eq. 5.1.

3. Problem statement: *Does P = NP?* (9.1)

We test Eq. 9.1 as equivalent to Eq. 5.1. For  $\sim$ NP = NP, obviously the expression is contradictory.

## 4. 3-SAT

Cook describes an example of the 3-SAT test as NP-complete for the expression (with negation replacing the vinculum):

$$(p \vee q \vee r) \wedge (\sim p \vee q \vee \sim r) \wedge (p \vee \sim q \vee s) \wedge (\sim p \vee \sim r \vee \sim s) \quad (10.1)$$

$$((p+(q+r)) \& (\sim p+(q+\sim r))) \& ((p+(\sim q+s)) \& (\sim p+(\sim r+\sim s))) ;$$

$$FTFT \quad TFFT \quad FTTT \quad FTTF \quad (10.2)$$

with

$$\tau(P) = \tau(Q) = \textit{Tautologous} \text{ and } \tau(R) = \tau(S) = \textit{contradictory} \quad (11.1)$$

$$(((p=q)=(p=p))\&((r=s)=(r@r))) ; \quad FFFF \quad TFFT \quad TFFT \quad FFFF \quad (11.2)$$

Eqs. 10.2 and 11.2 as rendered are *not* tautologous.

We combine Eq. 10.1 and its qualification with clause of Eq. 11.1.

$$\text{If } \tau(P) = \tau(Q) = \textit{Tautologous} \text{ and } \tau(R) = \tau(S) = \textit{contradictory}, \text{ then}$$

$$(p \vee q \vee r) \wedge (\sim p \vee q \vee \sim r) \wedge (p \vee \sim q \vee s) \wedge (\sim p \vee \sim r \vee \sim s) \quad (12.1)$$

$$(((p=q)=(p=p))\&((r=s)=(r@r))) > (((p+(q+r))\&(\sim p+(q+\sim r)))\&((p+(\sim q+s))\&(\sim p+(\sim r+\sim s)))) ;$$

$$TTTT \quad TTTT \quad FTTT \quad TTTT \quad (12.2)$$

Eq. 12.2 as rendered is *not* tautologous, but nearly so with deviation by one F value. This means the 3-SAT test is *not* tautologous, and hence incapable of testing NP-completeness.

What follows is that the logical foundation supporting satisfiability is suspicious.