

Notes prepared by
Stanley Burris
March 13, 2001

Relative strength of propositional calculi

Cook and Reckow (1974/1979) looked at the question of whether or not there exists a sound propositional calculus \mathcal{P} with an adequate set of connectives such that tautologies have polynomial length derivations, i.e., such that there is a polynomial $p(x)$ with the property that every tautology τ has a derivation Δ for which the total number of occurrences of symbols in Δ is no more than $p(|\tau|)$, $|\tau|$ being the length of the string τ . Such a \mathcal{P} is said to be *polynomially bounded*. (If a polynomially bounded propositional calculus exists then TAUT is in NP, and hence $\text{NP} = \text{co-NP}$.) In an effort to study the above question they introduced the notion of *p-simulation* (polynomial time simulation). A propositional calculus \mathcal{P}_1 *p-simulates* another propositional calculus \mathcal{P}_2 if there is a polynomial time translation from formulas of \mathcal{P}_2 to formulas of \mathcal{P}_1 and a polynomial time algorithm to convert derivations in \mathcal{P}_2 into derivations of the translates in \mathcal{P}_1 . If \mathcal{P}_1 and \mathcal{P}_2 *p-simulate* each other then we say they are *p-equivalent*. Cook and Reckow focused on variations of well-known propositional calculi and arrived at the following relative strength diagram (where ‘arrow’ as well as ‘is in the same box’ in the diagram means ‘p-simulates’):

p-simulation chart

The main results are:

- i. some system in one of the boxes is polynomially bounded iff all systems in the box are (for a fixed set of connectives);
- ii. resolution and truth-tables are not polynomially bounded.

References

- [1] S.A. Cook and R.A. Reckow, On the lengths of proof in the propositional calculus, Preliminary version. *Proc. Sixth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing* (1974), 135–148. Corrections for “On the lengths of proofs in the propositional calculus”. *SIGACT News* (1974), 15–22.
- [2] S.A. Cook and R.A. Reckow, The relative efficiency of propositional proof systems. *J. Symbolic Logic* **44** (1979), 36–50.