

Proposition 6 *The call $dpll(\epsilon, \varphi)$ terminates.*

PROOF.

Let us give a proof by contradiction. Suppose that the $dpll(\epsilon, \varphi)$ does not terminate. We exhibit a strictly increasing sequence $(x^{(t)})_t$ of elements in a finite set with a strict total order. This leads to a contradiction.

Definition of $(x^{(t)})_t$. Given a partial valuation ν (where assigned literals have levels), let $k(\nu, i)$ be the number of assigned (chosen or deduced) literals at level i in ν . Let us consider the t^{th} call of $dpll$. Let

$$x^{(t)} = (k(\nu, 0), \dots, k(\nu, n)) \in \{0, \dots, n\}^{n+1}$$

where ν is the valuation at t^{th} call of $dpll$ after saturation by unit propagation.

Evolution of $x^{(t)}$. There are two reasons for a $t + 1^{\text{th}}$ call of $dpll$:

- Either we chose a new literal. For instance:

before	after
$\neg p$ q r $\neg s$ t u v w a	$\neg p$ q r $\neg s$ t u v w a e

In the example:

$$\begin{aligned} x^{(t)} &= (0, 3, 2, 1, 1, 2, 0, 0, \dots); \\ x^{(t+1)} &= (0, 3, 2, 1, 1, 2, \mathbf{1}, 0, \dots). \end{aligned}$$

- Or we performed backjumping. For instance:

before	after
$\neg p$ q r $\neg s$ t u v w a e b	$\neg p$ q r $\neg s$ t for sure a \dots

In the example:

$$\begin{aligned} x^{(t)} &= (0, 3, 2, 1, 1, 2, 2, 0, \dots); \\ x^{(t+1)} &= (0, 3, > \mathbf{2}, 0, 0, \dots). \end{aligned}$$

Lexicographical order. That is why we introduce the lexicographic order $>$ on $\{0, \dots, n\}^{n+1}$. Given $x, y \in \{0, \dots, n\}^{n+1}$, we have $x > y$ iff there exists an integer $i \in \{0, \dots, n\}$ such that $x_i > y_i$ and for all $j < i$, we have $x_j = y_j$.

Conclusion. The sequence $(x^{(t)})_t$ is strictly increasing and takes only a finite number of values. Contradiction.

■