

On a Proof of Inequality of the Classes of Decision Problems P and NP

*Original*

On a Proof of Inequality of the Classes of Decision Problems P and NP / Meo, Angelo Raffaele. - In: JOURNAL OF GLOBAL RESEARCH IN COMPUTER SCIENCE. - ISSN 2229-371X. - 15:1(2025), pp. 12-31.

*Availability:*

This version is available at: 11583/3010558 since: 2026-05-05T12:57:54Z

*Publisher:*

OMICS Publishing Group

*Published*

DOI:

*Terms of use:*

This article is made available under terms and conditions as specified in the corresponding bibliographic description in the repository

*Publisher copyright*

(Article begins on next page)

# On a Proof of Inequality of the Classes of Decision Problems P and NP

Angelo Raffaele Meo\*

Department of Control and Computer Engineering, Politecnico di Torino, Turin, Italy

## Review Article

**Received:** 13-Apr-2024,  
Manuscript No. GRCS-24-132206;  
**Editor assigned:** 15-Apr-2024,  
Pre QC No. GRCS-24-132206 (PQ);  
**Reviewed:** 29-Apr-2024,  
QC No. GRCS-24-132206;  
**Revised:** 06-May-2024,  
Manuscript No. GRCS-24-  
132206(R); **Published:** 13-May-  
2024, DOI: 10.4172/2229-  
371X.15.1.003

**\*For Correspondence:**

Angelo Raffaele Meo, Department  
of Control and Computer  
Engineering, Politecnico di Torino,  
Turin, Italy

**E-mail:** [angelo.meo@polito.it](mailto:angelo.meo@polito.it)

**Citation:** Meo AR. On a Proof of  
Inequality of the Classes of  
Decision Problems P and NP. J Glob  
Res Comput Sci. 2024;15:003

**Copyright:** © 2024 Meo AR. This is  
an open-access article distributed  
under the terms of the Creative  
Commons Attribution License,  
which permits unrestricted use,  
distribution, and reproduction in  
any medium, provided the original  
author and source are credited.

## ABSTRACT

This paper is a new version of three papers presented to the academy of sciences of Turin in 2016 and to the Journal of Computer Science in 2020 and 2022 [1-3]. According to the Journal of Computer Science, more than 6000 readers have "viewed" the two papers published by that journal and more than 1700 readers have downloaded them.

The theorems presented in those papers were based on the equivalence of a deterministic turing machine M processing some input  $x$  belonging to  $\{0,1\}^n$  with an  $n$ -input Boolean circuit  $C_n$ , and on the hypothesis that the number of gates, or AND, OR, NOT operators, appearing in circuit  $C_n$ , is polynomial in the running time of the corresponding turing machine.

According to some readers that hypothesis of the equivalence "turing machine -boolean circuit" is questionable. The purpose of this paper is to present a new proof of the inequality of P and NP which is not based on this equivalence. Besides, this new paper contains the answers to the questions asked by some readers and the proofs of some theorems which had been omitted for the sake of brevity.

The analysis discussed in this paper and in its previous versions is based on a well-known NP-complete problem which is called "satisfiability problem" or "SAT". From SAT a new NP-complete problem, called "Core function", derives; this problem is described by a boolean function of the number of the clauses of SAT. In this paper a proof is presented according which the number of boolean operations of the minimal implementation of core function increases with  $n$  exponentially. Since the synthesis of core function is an NP-complete problem, this result can be considered as the proof of the theorem which states that the class P of all the decision problems which can be solved in polynomial time does not coincide with the class NP of the problems for which an answer can be verified in polynomial time.

**Keywords:** Computer science; Polynomial; Decision; Synthesis; Core function; Theorems; Circuit; Operators

INTRODUCTION

Definitions

A brief description of the definitions and properties well known among the scientists of modern computational complexity theory is presented in this section. P denotes the class of all the decision problems which can be solved in polynomial time. NP denotes the class of all the decision problems f satisfying the property that the function check (f) analysing a witness of the decision problem is polynomial time decidable. “P=NP?”, or, in other terms, “Is P a proper subset of NP?”, is one of the most important open questions in modern computational complexity theory. A decision problem C in NP is NP-complete if it is in NP and if every other problem L in NP is reducible to it, in the sense that there is a polynomial time algorithm which transforms instances of L into instances of C producing the same output values.

The importance of NP-completeness derives from the fact that, if we find a polynomial time algorithm for just one NP-complete problem, then we can construct polynomial time algorithms for all the problems in NP and, conversely, if any single NP-complete problem does not have a polynomial time algorithm, then no NP-complete problem has a polynomial time solution. The analysis discussed in this paper will be based on the following well-known NP- complete problem which is called “satisfiability problem or SAT”. Given a Boolean expression containing only the names of variables (some of which may be complemented), the operators AND, OR and NOT, and parentheses, is there an assignment of TRUE or FALSE values to the variables which makes the entire expression TRUE?

It is well known that the problem remains NP-complete also when all the expressions are written in “conjunctive normal form” with 3 variables per clause (problem 3SAT). In this case, the analysed expressions will be of the type:

$$\begin{aligned}
 3SAT(t) = & \\
 & (x_{11} OR x_{12} OR x_{13}) AND \\
 & (x_{21} OR x_{22} OR x_{23}) AND \\
 & ..... \\
 & (x_{t1} OR x_{t2} OR x_{t3}) .....(1)
 \end{aligned}$$

where:

**t is the number of clauses or triplets;**

each  $x_{ij}$  is a variable in complemented or uncomplemented form;

each variable may appear multiple times in that expression.

The synthesis of the state of art of question **PvsNP** can be found <sup>[4-5]</sup>.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The core function

The computation of satisfiability problem described by Equation 1 can be decomposed into two processing layers called “compatibility layer” and “core layer”.

**Compatibility layer:** A variable j of triplet i will be defined as “compatible” with variable k of triplet h when, and only when, either

- the sign  $S_{ij}$  of the former variable is equal to the sign  $S_{hk}$  of the latter variable,

or



$$c(1,1; 2,2) * c(1,1; 3,1) * c(2,2; 3,1) + \dots \text{(other 22 products)} \dots + c(1,3; 2,3) * c(1,3; 3,3) * c(2,3; 3,3) \dots \dots \dots (6)$$

It is easy to prove that there is an assignment of values TRUE or FALSE to variables appearing in Equation 1 which make the value of that equation equal to TRUE when, and only when, the core function takes the value TRUE.

Notice that the processing work of the elementary operations of compatibility layer (Equation 2) increases as a logarithmic function  $P(t)$  of the number of the variables since the increment of the length of the code of a name is logarithmic. Therefore, the total processing work of the compatibility layer increases as  $9 \cdot t \cdot (t-1) \cdot P(t)$  where  $9 \cdot t \cdot (t-1)/2$  is the total number of compatibility operations.

Besides, the problem solved by the core layer is clearly in NP, because it is easy to verify a witness solution. It follows that, since the compatibility layer polynomially reduces an NP-complete problem (3SAT) to the problem solved by the core layer, the core function describes a new NP-complete problem. Notice that the boolean function implemented by the core layer may be an incompletely specified function. Indeed, assume that  $c(i, j; l, m) = 0$  and  $c(i, j; p, q) = 0$ . This implies that variable  $\langle i, j \rangle$  and variable  $\langle l, m \rangle$  have the same name and a different sign; similarly,  $\langle i, j \rangle$  and  $\langle p, q \rangle$  have the same name and a different sign. It follows that  $\langle l, m \rangle$  and  $\langle p, q \rangle$  have the same name and the same sign. Therefore,  $c(l, m; p, q)$  cannot be equal to 0. Therefore, all the minterms implying  $\neg c(i, j; l, m) * \neg c(i, j; p, q) * c(l, m; p, q)$  are incomplete specifications of the Boolean function implemented by the core layer. Some properties of core function have been discussed [7-9].

**A theorem of boolean monotonic functions**

Let  $f(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_h)$  be an isotonic Boolean function, that is a Boolean function which can be implemented with only AND and OR gates, applied to uncomplemented literals  $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_h$ . It was believed that the minimum cost implementation of  $f(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_h)$  always contains only OR and AND gates, but A.Razborov proved that there are isotonic functions whose minimum cost implementation contains also NOT gates [6].

However, there is an upper bound on the comparison of the costs of the minimum cost implementations with and without NOT gates. It is specified by the following theorem.

**Theorem 4.1:** Let  $I_{min}$  be one of the minimum cost implementations of the isotonic Boolean function  $f(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_h)$ , the cost being defined as the total number of AND, OR or NOT gates. Let  $C_{min}$  be the cost of  $I_{min}$ .

There exists always an implementation  $J$  of  $f$  containing only AND and OR gates (in addition, if necessary, to the NOT operators producing input variables  $\neg x_1, \neg x_2, \dots, \neg x_h$ ) such that  $cost(J) \leq 2 \cdot C_{min} + h$ . Where  $h$  is the number of variables. The proof of this theorem can be found [2]. This theorem will be used to simplify the analysis of core function circuits.

**Properties of core function**

It is easy to prove the following properties of core function.

**Property 1:** As stated in section 2, core function is a not completely specified function.

**Property 2:** Any product defined by Equation 4 is a prime implicant of core function (that is, a product of compatibilities (“PoC”) which implies core function and no other term of it).

**Property 3:** Since the different selections of each of variables defined by Equation 3 are 3, the number of prime implicants of Core Function is equal to  $3^t$ . Each of these prime implicants is essential (that is, it does not imply a sum of other prime implicants) and it is the product of  $t \cdot (t - 1)/2$  compatibilities.

**Products of compatibilities**

In the next chapters, reference will be made to the following definitions related to PoC's or "products of compatibilities".

**Definition of spurious compatibilities pair:** A pair of compatibility variables  $\{c(h, k; l, m), c(p, q; r, s)\}$  is defined as a spurious pair if  $(h = p \text{ and } k \neq q)$  or  $(h = r \text{ and } k \neq s)$  or  $(l = p \text{ and } m \neq q)$  or  $(l = r \text{ and } m \neq s)$ .

For example, the pair  $\{c(1,1; 2,1), c(1,2; 3,1)\}$  is a spurious pair since the triplet index 1 is associated to two different indexes of variables (1 and 2).

**Definition of spurious products of compatibilities:** A spurious product of compatibilities (spurious PoC) is a product of compatibility variables containing the elements of one or more than one spurious pair.

For example, the PoC  $c(1,1; 2,1) * c(1,2; 3,1) * c(2,1; 3,1)$  is a spurious PoC since it contains the elements of the spurious pair  $\{c(1,1; 2,1), c(1,2; 3,1)\}$ .

**Definition of impure products of compatibilities:** A PoC containing one or more complemented variables will be defined as an impure PoC. In particular a term T of CF (that is, a PoC implying CF) which contains one or more complemented variables, will be defined as an impure term of CF. A product of compatibilities which is neither spurious nor impure will be defined as a pure product of compatibilities.

**Definition of mark:** Consider a pure product of compatibilities satisfying the property that all the indexes of triplet  $\{1,2, \dots, t\}$  appear at least once in some variable. The product of the variables of such a subset will defined as a "mark" or "pure mark" of the prime implicant of which it contains a subset of compatibilities.

For example, in the case of CF(4), the PoC

$$M = c(1, a; 2, b) * c(1, a; 3, c) * c(1, a; 4, d) \dots \dots \dots (7)$$

(Where the indexes of triplet are elements of the set  $\{1,2,3,4\}$  and a, b, c, d are elements of  $\{1,2,3\}$ ) is a mark of the prime implicant

$$P = c(1, a; 2, b) * c(1, a; 3, c) * c(1, a; 4, d) * c(2, b; 3, c) * c(2, b; 4, d) * c(3, c; 4, d) \dots (8)$$

since all the indexes of triplet appear at least once in Equation 7.

A mark M can be defined as a "strong mark" if there is a PoC R which is not a mark such that  $M * R$  is a prime implicant of core function. For example, the strong mark  $c(1,1; 2,1) * c(1,1; 3,1) * c(1,1; 4,1)$ , multiplied by  $c(2,1; 3,1) * c(2,1; 4,1) * c(3,1; 4,1)$ , becomes a prime implicant of CF(4).

If a mark can not be defined as a strong mark, it will be called "a weak mark". For example, the weak mark  $c(1,1; 2,1) * c(1,1; 3,1) * c(2,1; 4,1)$ , must be multiplied by the weak mark  $c(1,1; 4,1) * c(2,1; 3,1) * c(3,1; 4,1)$  in order to produce a prime implicant.

**Definition of spurious mark:** A spurious PoC in which all the indexes of triplet appear uncomplemented at least once will be called a "spurious mark". Notice that a spurious mark may be the mark of more than one prime implicant. For example, in the case of CF(3),  $c(1,1; 2,1) * c(1,1; 3,1) * c(1,1; 2,2)$  is a spurious mark of both the prime implicants  $c(1,1; 2,1) * c(1,1; 3,1) * c(2,1; 3,1)$  and  $c(1,1; 2,2) * c(1,1; 3,1) * c(2,2; 3,1)$ . An impure PoC containing a (possibly spurious) mark will be a defined as a (possibly spurious) impure mark.

**Definition of remainder:** A PoC which is not a mark will be called a “remainder”. Also a remainder may be pure (if for any triplet index there is only one uncomplemented index of variable in that triplet) or spurious or impure. A remainder is implied by more than one prime implicant. For example,

$$R = c(2,1; 3,1) \text{ of CF(3)}$$

is implied by the following prime implicants

$$\begin{aligned} P1 &= c(1,1; 2,1) * c(1,1; 3,1) * c(2,1; 3,1) \\ P2 &= c(1,2; 2,1) * c(1,2; 3,1) * c(2,1; 3,1) \\ P3 &= c(1,3; 2,1) * c(1,3; 3,1) * c(2,1; 3,1) \dots\dots\dots(9) \end{aligned}$$

On the definitions of mark and remainder the following property is based.

**Property 1:** Let  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  be two PoC’s such that  $P_1 * P_2$  is equal to a prime implicant  $P$  of core function. It is easy to prove that either  $P_1$  or  $P_2$  is a mark of  $P$ .

**Property 2:** The product of two marks  $M_1$  and  $M_2$  which are implied by two different prime implicants of core function is not implied by core function.

For example, both  $M_1 = c(1,1; 2,1) * c(1,1; 3,1)$  and  $M_2 = c(1,1; 2,1) * c(1,1; 3,2)$  are marks of CF(3) and are implied by CF(3), but their product is not implied by CF(3). Indeed, for example, the PoC  $c(1,1; 2,1) * c(1,1; 3,1) * !c(1,1; 3,2)$  is implied by  $M_1$  but it is not implied by  $M_2$ , by  $M_1 * M_2$  and by CF(3).

It follows, as is easy to verify, that the product  $(a + b) * (c + d)$  (where a,b,c,d are products of compatibilities) can produce only one or two prime implicants.

Indeed, assume that  $a * c$  is a prime implicant  $P_1$  and  $a$  is a mark. It follows that  $a * d$  cannot be a prime implicant  $P_2$  different from  $P_1$ .  $b * c$  can be a new prime implicant  $P_2$  only if  $c$  is a remainder satisfying the conditions of the following property 7.

**Property 7:** The best way to integrate operations OR and AND is suggested by the ability of a remainder  $R$  to produce  $3^m$  prime implicants, where  $m$  is the number of triplet indexes missing in  $R$ , through the multiplication by a suitable OoM (“Or Of Marks”). For example, the remainder  $R = c(2,1; 3,1)$  of CF(4) can be used to obtain the following prime implicants of CF(4):

$$\begin{aligned} R * OoM = & \\ & c(1,1; 2,1) * c(1,1; 3,1) * c(1,1; 4,1) * c(2,1; 3,1) * c(2,1; 4,1) * c(3,1; 4,1) + \\ & c(1,2; 2,1) * c(1,2; 3,1) * c(1,2; 4,1) * c(2,1; 3,1) * c(2,1; 4,1) * c(3,1; 4,1) + \\ & c(1,3; 2,1) * c(1,3; 3,1) * c(1,3; 4,1) * c(2,1; 3,1) * c(2,1; 4,1) * c(3,1; 4,1) + \\ & c(1,1; 2,1) * c(1,1; 3,1) * c(1,1; 4,2) * c(2,1; 3,1) * c(2,1; 4,2) * c(3,1; 4,2) + \\ & c(1,2; 2,1) * c(1,2; 3,1) * c(1,2; 4,2) * c(2,1; 3,1) * c(2,1; 4,2) * c(3,1; 4,2) + \\ & c(1,3; 2,1) * c(1,3; 3,1) * c(1,3; 4,2) * c(2,1; 3,1) * c(2,1; 4,2) * c(3,1; 4,2) + \\ & c(1,1; 2,1) * c(1,1; 3,1) * c(1,1; 4,3) * c(2,1; 3,1) * c(2,1; 4,3) * c(3,1; 4,3) + \\ & c(1,2; 2,1) * c(1,2; 3,1) * c(1,2; 4,3) * c(2,1; 3,1) * c(2,1; 4,3) * c(3,1; 4,3) + \\ & c(1,3; 2,1) * c(1,3; 3,1) * c(1,3; 4,3) * c(2,1; 3,1) * c(2,1; 4,3) * c(3,1; 4,3) \dots\dots\dots (10) \end{aligned}$$

**The external core function**

Let  $I_j$  be a prime implicant of CF(n). The External Core Function related to  $I_j$ ,  $I_j$ ,  $ECF(n, I_j)$ , is defined as the sum of all the minterms of CF(n) which imply  $I_j$  and no other prime implicant  $I_k$  of CF(n) with  $k \neq j$ . (Remember that a minterm

of a boolean function F is a product of all the variables of F, some complemented and some other uncomplemented, implying F).

Of course,

$$ECF(n, I_j) = I_j * \prod_{k \neq j} (! I_k)$$

where all the prime implicants of Core Function are involved and  $! I_k$  denotes the complement of  $I_k$  (i.e., NOT  $I_k$ ).

The global external core function of order n, or ECF(n), will be defined as the sum of ECF(n,  $I_j$ )'s relative to all the prime implicants  $I_j$  of CF(n):

$$ECF(n) = \sum_j ECF(n, I_j) \dots \dots \dots (11)$$

The importance of External Core Function derives from the following theorems.

**Theorem 1:** Let  $T = I_j * X$

where  $I_j$  is a prime implicant and X is a possibly empty PoC. T can also be written as  $T = T(I_j)$ .

All the minterms of  $T(I_j)$  contained in ECF(n) are minterms of ECF(n,  $I_j$ ).

**Theorem 2:** Let T be a term of CF(n) implying two or more than two prime implicants of CF(n):  $T = T(I_j, I_k)$ .

The number of minterms of  $T(I_j, I_k)$  belonging to ECF(n) is equal to 0.

**Theorem 3:** Let  $T = T(I_j) = I_j * X$  be a term of CF(n) which is spurious for a single not complemented compatibility X.

If NMT(F) denotes the number of minterms of boolean function F, the number of minterms of  $I_j * X$  contained in ECF(n,  $I_j$ ) is

$$NMT(I_j * X * ECF(n, I_j)) \leq (1/2) \cdot NMT(ECF(n, I_j)) \dots \dots \dots (12)$$

However, for large values of n,

$$NMT(I_j * X * ECF(n, I_j)) \approx (1/2) \cdot NMT(ECF(n, I_j)) \dots \dots \dots (13)$$

By proceeding in the same way it is possible to generalize the preceding THEOREM 3 as follows.

**Theorem 4:** Let  $I_j * X_1 * X_2 * \dots * X_m$  be a spurious term characterized by m spurious not complemented compatibilities.

The number of its minterms contained in ECF(n,  $I_j$ ) is

$$NMT(I_j * X_1 * X_2 * \dots * X_m * ECF(n, I_j)) \leq (1/(2^m)) \cdot NMT(ECF(n, I_j)) \dots \dots (14)$$

However, for large values of n,

$$NMT(I_j * X_1 * X_2 * \dots * X_m * ECF(n, I_j)) \approx (1/(2^m)) \cdot NMT(ECF(n, I_j)) \dots (15)$$

**Theorem 5:** Let  $T = T(I_j)$  be an impure term of CF(n) characterized by a single impure variable (!X):  $T = I_j * (!X)$ .

For large values of n, the number of minterms of ECF(n,  $I_j$ ) contained in T is

$$NMT(I_j * (!X) * ECF(n, I_j)) \approx (1/2) \cdot NMT(ECF(n, I_j)) \dots \dots \dots (16)$$

**Theorem 6:** Let  $T = T(I_j)$  be an impure term of CF(n) characterized by m impure variables:  $T = I_j * (!X_1) * (!X_2) * \dots * (!X_m)$ . For large values of n, the number of minterms of ECF(n,  $I_j$ ) contained in T is

$$NMT(T * ECF(n, I_j)) \approx ((1/2)^m) \cdot NMT(ECF(n, I_j)) \dots \dots \dots (17)$$

Notice that  $NMT(ECF(n, I_j)) = NMT(ECF(n, I_k))$  for any j and k. It will be called NMT1(n).

**The value of a node**

Let U be a node of the network implementing core function and let F(U) be the boolean function of compatibilities c(i, j, h, k) implemented by U. Since the subnetwork having U as its input does not contain any NOT gate, we can write:

$$CF = F(U) * (x_1 + x_2 + \dots) + y_1 + y_2 \dots \dots \dots (18)$$

where  $x_1, x_2, \dots, y_1, y_2, \dots$ , are products of variables of core function, that is, products of compatibilities. Notice also that every  $F(U) * x_i$  and every  $y_j$  must be an extended prime implicant of core function, that is, it is equal to  $P * X$  where  $P$  is a prime implicant of core function and  $X$  is a PoC. As we shall see in some examples, often a single product of compatibilities is sufficient to implement core function according to the following equation:

$$CF = F(U) * x + y_1 + y_2 \dots \dots \dots (19)$$

where  $x$  is a single compatibility.  $x_1, x_2, \dots, x, y_1, y_2, \dots$ , will be called "completion code".

More than one solution of Equation 18 or Equation 19 can produce core function. However, we are looking for a solution characterized by the following property: The total number of minterms of the External Core Functions  $ECF(n)$  contained in  $F(U) * (x_1 + x_2 + \dots)$  or in  $F(U) * x$  takes the maximum value. By definition, this maximum value will be considered as the value  $val(U)$  of the node  $U$  or the value  $val(F(U))$  of the boolean function implemented by  $U$ .

If  $U$  is a strong mark  $M$ , the value  $val(M)$  will be assumed to be equal to  $NMT1(n)$  (unless corrections must be made because of spurious or impure variables in  $F(U)$  or  $x_i$ ). The value  $val(R)$  of a remainder  $R$  will be assumed to be equal to 0. The reasons for these choices are very simple as follows.

$M$  is implied by the set of minterms of  $ECF(n)$  deriving from the prime implicant of which  $M$  is a mark and by no other minterm of  $ECF(n)$ , while  $R$  is implied by the minterms of many prime implicants and by the corresponding subsets of minterms of  $ECF(n, I_j)$ . Besides,  $R$  must be multiplied by a mark  $x_i$  (or  $x$ ) in order to produce a prime implicant and that mark is generated outside the circuit produced by node  $U$ . The merit of that prime implicant will be attributed to another node  $V$  of the network.

The value of a weak mark can be assumed as equal to  $(1/2) \cdot NMT1(n)$ . Indeed, a weak mark  $A$  must be multiplied by a weak mark  $B$  in order to produce a prime implicant  $I = A * B$ .

Variables  $x, x_1, x_2, \dots$  must be remainders. This choice is justified by the fact that remainders are the basic units of all the circuits implementing Core Function while a mark used as a variable  $x$  or  $x_i$  in Equation 18 and Equation 19 would be produced outside the subnetwork which produces node  $U$ .

Boolean function implemented by a node  $U$  may be the sum of products of compatibilities which may be marks or remainders. The values of node  $U$  for the most important values of addends can be determined as follows. By virtue of the above discussed properties it is easy to prove the following theorem. Consider the sum of two strong marks  $M_1$  and  $M_2$ . For the sake of simplicity, assume that  $M_2$  can be obtained from  $M_1$  by replacing all the occurrences of a single variable  $v_1$  of  $M_1$  with variable  $v_2$  of  $M_2$ . For example, if  $M_1 = c(1,1; 2,1) * c(1,1; 3,1) * c(1,1; 4,1)$  and  $M_2 = c(1,2; 2,1) * c(1,2; 3,1) * c(1,2; 4,1)$  are the two strong marks of  $CF(4)$ , by assuming the completion code (Equation 21)  $x = c(2,1; 3,1) * c(2,1; 4,1) * c(3,1; 4,1)$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} val(M_1) &= val(M_2) = NMT1(4) \\ val(M_1 + M_2) &= val(M_1) + val(M_2) = 2 \cdot NMT1(4). \end{aligned}$$

This does not happen if both  $M_1$  and  $M_2$  are strong marks but they are not characterized by a single different variable. For example, if  $M_1 = c(1,1; 2,1) * c(1,1; 3,1) * c(1,1; 4,1)$  and  $M_2 = c(1,2; 2,2) * c(2,2; 3,1) * c(2,2; 4,1)$  by assuming in Equation 19  $x_1 = !c(1,2; 2,2) * c(2,1; 3,1) * c(2,1; 4,1) * c(3,1; 4,1)$  and  $x_2 = !c(1,1; 2,1) * c(1,2; 3,1) * c(1,2; 4,1) * c(3,1; 4,1)$ , we obtain

$$val(M_1) = val(M_2) = NMT1(4)$$

$$\text{val}(M_1 + M_2) = (1/2) \cdot \text{NMT1}(4) + (1/2) \cdot \text{NMT1}(4) = \text{NMT1}(4)$$

Other important examples of sums of two PoC's related to CF(4) are the following ones. If  $A = c(1,1; 2,1) * c(1,1; 3,1) * c(1,1; 4,1)$  (strong mark) and  $B = c(1,2; 2,1) * c(1,2; 3,1) * c(2,1; 4,1)$  (weak mark) then, by assuming  $x = c(2,1; 3,1) * c(2,1; 4,1) * c(3,1; 4,1) * !c(1,2; 2,1)$  in Equation 19, we obtain:

$$\text{val}(A) = \text{NMT1}(4)$$

$$\text{val}(B) = 0$$

$$\text{val}(A + B) = (1/2) \cdot \text{NMT1}(4) < \text{val}(A) + \text{val}(B)$$

If  $M_1 = c(1,1; 2,1) * c(1,1; 3,1) * c(1,1; 4,1)$  (strong mark) and  $R = c(1,1; 2,1) * c(1,1; 3,2)$  (remainder) then, by assuming  $x = c(2,1; 3,1) * c(2,1; 4,1) * c(3,1; 4,1) * !c(1,1; 3,2)$  we obtain:

$$\text{val}(M_1) = \text{NMT1}(4)$$

$$\text{val}(R) = 0$$

$$\text{val}(M_1 + R) = (1/2) \cdot \text{NMT1}(4) < \text{val}(M) + \text{val}(R)$$

On the basis of previous properties it is easy to prove the following theorem.

**Theorem 7:** Let  $F(U) = P_1 + P_2 + \dots$ , where every  $P_i$  may be a mark or a remainder. It is easy to prove that  $\text{val}(F(U)) < = \text{val}(P_1) + \text{val}(P_2) + \dots$ . Besides, it is necessary to remember that the sum of two remainders may be a mark. For example, for CF(4), if  $R_1 = c(1,1; 2,1) * c(1,1; 3,1) * !c(1,1; 3,2)$ ,  $R_2 = c(1,1; 4,1) * c(1,1; 3,2)$ ,  $M = c(1,1; 2,1) * c(1,1; 3,1) * c(1,1; 4,1)$  then

$$R_1 + R_2 = R_1 + R_2 + M$$

However, all the minterms of  $M_1$  are contained in  $R_1$  or  $R_2$ . This holds also for the minterms contained in ECF. Therefore, the new mark gives no contribution to ECF. The following new definitions will be adopted.

The set of the minterms of ECF produced by  $F(U) * (x_1 + x_2 + \dots)$  or by  $F(U) * x$  will be called SECF(U) (set of minterms of external core function produced by U). The number of elements in SECF(U) will be the value  $\text{val}(U)$  of node U or the value  $\text{val}(F(U))$  of the boolean function implemented by U.

### The value of an OR operation

An n inputs OR operation can be implemented as a set of  $(n - 1)$  two inputs OR operations. Therefore, we can restrict our attention to two inputs OR operations.

Consider the operation  $\text{op}(U = A \text{ OR } B)$ . Let  $\text{SECF}(\text{op}(A \text{ OR } B))$  be the set of all minterms of ECF contained in  $\text{SECF}(U)$  and not contained in  $\text{SECF}(A)$  or  $\text{SECF}(B)$ . The value  $\text{val}(\text{op}(A \text{ OR } B))$  of this operation is defined as the number of elements in  $\text{SECF}(\text{op}(A \text{ OR } B))$ , i.e. the number of new minterms of ECF created by the operation  $\text{op}(A \text{ OR } B)$ . Note that  $\text{val}(\text{op}(A \text{ OR } B))$ , which is the value of this operation, is less than or equal to  $\text{val}(A \text{ OR } B)$ , which is the value of the node that implements the Boolean function  $(A \text{ OR } B)$ .

Let  $A = a_1 + a_2 + \dots$ ,  $B = b_1 + b_2 + \dots$ , where every  $a_i$  and every  $b_j$  is a mark or a remainder. Obviously,  $C = A + B = a_1 + a_2 + \dots + b_1 + b_2 + \dots$ . By virtue of the properties above listed and summarized by Theorem 7.1 and also by virtue of the property above stated according which the mark produced by the sum of two remainders does not give any new contribution to the minterms of ECF, it is easy to prove the following theorem.

**Theorem 8:** The value of an OR operation is always equal to 0.

**The value of an AND operation, the most powerful AND operation**

As in the case of OR operations, an n inputs AND operation can be implemented as a set of (n – 1) two inputs AND operations. Therefore, we can restrict our attention to two inputs AND operations.

The value of an AND operation having A and B as its inputs and U as its output can be defined as: the number of minterms of the external core function contained in the definition of the value of U (according to Equation 18 or Equation 19) and not contained in the definitions of A and B.

Since we are interested in identifying the most powerful AND operation, as a first step we shall assume that both F(A) and F(B) are sums of remainders so that both val(A) and val(B) are equal to 0 and the value of the considered operation is equal to the value of output U.

The most powerful AND operation of this type (val(A) = val(B) = 0) can be identified by proceeding as follows.

1. Let  $A = (a_1 + a_2 + a_3 + \dots)$  and  $B = (b_1 + b_2 + b_3 + \dots)$ , where all the  $a_i$  and  $b_j$  are remainders.

A product  $a_i * b_j$  might become the product of two or more than two marks of different prime implicants. For example, in CF(4),  $a_i * b_j$  might be equal to  $m_1 * m_2 = (c(1,1; 2,1) * c(1,1; 3,1) * c(2,1; 4,1)) * (c(1,2; 2,1) * c(1,2; 3,2) * c(1,2; 4,1))$ . The completion code might be equal to  $x = c(1,1; 4,1) * c(2,1; 3,1) * c(3,1; 4,1) * c(1,2; 3,2) * c(2,1; 3,2) * c(2,1; 4,1) * c(3,2; 4,1)$  in such a way that

$$m_1 * m_2 * x = I_1 * I_2$$

where  $I_1$  is the prime implicant produced by  $m_1$  and  $I_2$  is the prime implicant produced by  $m_2$ . Since val( $I_1 * I_2$ ) = 0 because no minterm contained in the product of two prime implicants may belong to External Core Function, the product  $a_i * b_j * x$  can produce only one prime implicant of CF(n).

2. Consider the product  $a_1 * b_1$  if it is a mark. If  $a_1$  is a remainder, at least one of the t indexes of triplet does not appear in the list of triplet indexes of  $a_1$  because, otherwise,  $a_1$  would be a mark, Let it be 'i'. For the same reason, at least another triplet index does not appear in the list of triplet indexes of  $b_1$ , Let it be 'j'.

By example, for CF(4):

$$\begin{aligned} a_1 &= c(1,1; 2,1) * c(1,1; 3,1) * c(2,1; 3,1) \\ b_1 &= c(1,1; 4,1) * c(2,1; 4,1) \\ m_1 &= a_1 * b_1 \dots \dots \dots (20) \end{aligned}$$

Triplet index 4 is missing in  $a_1$ ; triplet index 3 is missing in  $b_1$ . In order that  $a_1 * b_1 * x$  is a prime implicant of CF(4), x must be equal to  $c(3,1; 4,1)$ .

3. Equation 20 is the example of two remainders whose product is a mark without spurious or impure variables. Obviously, the value of this mark is NMT1(4). According to Theorems 3 and 6, a mark containing a spurious or impure compatibility has a value equal to about  $(1/2) \cdot NMT1(n)$  while a mark containing m spurious or impure compatibilities has a value equal to about  $(1/2^m) \cdot NMT1(n)$ .
4. Assume that  $a_2 * b_1$  is equal to a new mark  $m_2$  such that  $m_2 * x$  is a new prime implicant of CF(4). We can start by assuming that  $a_2$  is equal to  $c(1,2; 2,1) * c(1,2; 3,1) * c(2,1; 3,1)$ . Since the optimal completion code x is equal to  $c(3,1; 4,1)$  and  $a_2$  cannot contain all the three compatibilities involving < 1,2 >, the value of  $b_1$  must be corrected by adding  $c(1,2; 4,1)$  to  $b_1$  :  $b_1' = b_1 * c(1,2; 4,1)$  Therefore,  $val(a_1 * b_1') = (1/2) \cdot NMT1(4)$ ,  $val(a_2 * b_1') = (1/2) \cdot NMT1(4)$ .

No increment of the total value has been obtained by introducing a new mark. In the preceding example remainder  $a_2$  is different from  $a_1$  for a single variable ( $\langle 1,1 \rangle$  in  $a_1$ ,  $\langle 1,2 \rangle$  in  $a_2$ ). Now assume that  $a_1$  and  $a_2$  are different for the values of two variables ( $\langle 1,1 \rangle$  and  $\langle 2,1 \rangle$  in  $a_1$ ,  $\langle 1,2 \rangle$  and  $\langle 2,2 \rangle$  in  $a_2$ ):  $a_2 = c(1,2; 2,2) * c(1,2; 3,1) * c(2,2; 3,1)$ .

Since the optimal completion code is  $c(3,1; 4,1)$  and  $a_2$  cannot contain all the compatibilities involving  $\langle 1,2 \rangle$  and  $\langle 2,2 \rangle$ ,  $b_1'$  must become:  $b_1' = b_1 * c(1,2; 4,1) * c(2,2; 4,1)$ .

Therefore,  $val(a_1 * b_1') = 1/4 * NMT1(4)$ ,  $val(a_2 * b_1') = 1/4 * NMT1(4)$ , The total value has been further decreased.

5. Let us return to the example relative to CF(4) described by Equation 20, and assume:  $a_2 = c(1,2; 2,1) * c(1,2; 3,1) * c(2,1; 3,1)$ .
6. In order to implement the new mark  $m_2$  without reducing the value of  $m_1$  it is necessary to introduce a new remainder  $b_2 = c(1,2; 4,1) * c(2,1; 4,1)$  so that

$$m_2 = a_2 * b_2 \dots \dots \dots (21)$$

7. The result stated in 4 and 5 can be extended as follows.

The most powerful AND gate can be obtained by producing every mark as the product of a remainder  $a_i$  by a corresponding remainder  $b_j$ , and it is not useful to produce two marks  $m_1$  and  $m_2$  by means of three remainders as follows:  $m_1 = a_i * b_j$ ,  $m_2 = a_k * b_j$ .

8. However, the products  $a_1 * b_2$  and  $a_2 * b_1$  are not marks. Therefore, it is necessary to introduce the following corrections:

$$\begin{aligned}
 a_1 &= c(1,1; 2,1) * c(1,1; 3,1) * c(2,1; 3,1) \\
 b_1 &= c(1,1; 4,1) * c(2,1; 4,1) * c(1,1; 2,1) \\
 a_2 &= c(1,2; 2,1) * c(1,2; 3,1) * c(2,1,3,1) * !c(1,1; 2,1) \\
 b_2 &= c(1,2; 4,1) * c(2,1; 4,1) * c(1,2; 2,1) * !c(1,1; 2,1) \\
 val(m_1 = a_1 * b_1) &= NMT1(4) \\
 val(m_2 = a_2 * b_2) &= NMT1(4) * (1/2) \dots \dots \dots (22)
 \end{aligned}$$

Notice that  $c(1,1; 2,1)$  appears in both  $a_1$  and  $b_1$  and  $c(1,2; 2,1)$  appears in both  $a_2$  and  $b_2$ . According to the corrections introduced in Equation 22, both the products  $a_1 * b_2$  and  $a_2 * b_1$  are equal to 0. It is also possible to introduce two spurious compatibilities in order that both  $a_1 * b_2 * x$  and  $a_2 * b_1 * x$  become prime implicants of core function.

For example,

$$\begin{aligned}
 a_1 &= c(1,1; 2,1) * c(1,1; 3,1) * c(2,1; 3,1) \\
 b_1 &= c(1,1; 4,1) * c(2,1; 4,1) * c(1,2,4,1) \\
 a_2 &= c(1,2; 2,1) * c(1,2; 3,1) * c(2,1,3,1) \\
 b_2 &= c(1,2; 4,1) * c(2,1; 4,1) * c(1,1; 4,1)
 \end{aligned}$$

In this case,

$$\begin{aligned}
 val(m_1 = a_1 * b_1) &= NMT1(4) * (1/2) \\
 val(m_2 = a_2 * b_2) &= NMT1(4) * (1/2) \dots \dots \dots (23)
 \end{aligned}$$

It follows that Equation 22 is better than Equation 23. It is easy to prove that Equation 22 represents the best solution for implementing two marks from the viewpoint of their values.

9. Consider the product  $(a_1 + a_2) * (b_1 + b_2)$  relative to CF(4) where  $a_1 = c(1,1; 2,1) * c(1,1; 3,1) * c(1,1; 3,2)$ ,  
 $a_2 = c(1,1; 2,2) * c(1,1; 3,2) * c(1,1; 3,1)$ ,  $b_1 = c(2,1; 3,1) * c(2,1; 4,1) * c(3,1; 4,1) * c(2,2; 3,1) * c(2,2; 4,1)$   
 $b_2 = c(2,2; 3,2) * c(2,2; 4,1) * c(3,2; 4,1) * c(2,1; 3,2) * c(2,1; 4,1)$  with  $x = c[1,1] * c[4,1]$ . The following four marks of CF(4) are generated:

$$m_1 = a_1 * b_1 \text{ involving variables } ([1,1], [2,1], [3,1], [4,1]),$$

$$m_2 = a_1 * b_2 \text{ involving variables } ([1,1], [2,1], [3,2], [4,1])$$

$$m_3 = a_2 * b_1 \text{ involving variables } ([1,1], [2,2], [3,1], [4,1])$$

$$m_4 = a_2 * b_2 \text{ involving variables } ([1,1], [2,2], [3,2], [4,1])$$

It is easy to verify that  $val(m_1) = val(m_2) = val(m_3) = val(m_4) = (1/8) * NMT1(4)$ , Therefore, the total value of the considered product is  $(1/2) * NMT1(4)$ . These values are very small. Therefore, there is no point in continuing this line.

10. By following the same line of reasoning which has made it possible to prove that Equation 22 is the best solution for implementing two marks, it is easy to prove that the best solution for implementing three marks is the following one:

$$a_1 = c(1,1; 2,1) * c(1,1; 3,1) * c(2,1; 3,1)$$

$$b_1 = c(1,1; 4,1) * c(2,1; 4,1) * c(1,1; 2,1)$$

$$a_2 = c(1,2; 2,1) * c(1,2; 3,1) * c(2,1,3,1) * !c(1,1; 2,1)$$

$$b_2 = c(1,2; 4,1) * c(2,1; 4,1) * c(1,2; 2,1) * !c(1,1; 2,1)$$

$$a_3 = c(1,3; 2,1) * c(1,3; 3,1) * c(2,1; 3,1) * !c(1,1; 2,1) * !c(1,2; 2,1)$$

$$b_3 = c(1,3; 4,1) * c(2,1; 4,1) * !c(1,1; 2,1) * !c(1,2; 2,1) \dots\dots\dots(24)$$

The value of this solution is

$$(1 + (1/2) + (1/4)) * NMT1(4)$$

Equation 24 can be extended with the following algorithm in order to implement the marks of all the nine prime implicants of CF(4) compatible with the conditions that the variables  $\langle 3,2 \rangle, \langle 3,3 \rangle, \langle 4,2 \rangle, \langle 4,3 \rangle$  do not appear in that product and the completion code x takes the value  $c(3,1; 4,1)$ .

$$U = A * B = (a_1 + a_2 + \dots + a_9) * (b_1 + b_2 + \dots + b_9).. (24')$$

Where

$$a_1 = c(1,1; 2,1) * c(1,1; 3,1) * c(2,1; 3,1)$$

$$b_1 = c(1,1; 4,1) * c(2,1; 4,1) * c(1,1; 2,1)$$

$$a_2 = c(1,2; 2,1) * c(1,2; 3,1) * c(2,1,3,1) * !c(1,1; 2,1)$$

$$b_2 = c(1,2; 4,1) * c(2,1; 4,1) * c(1,2; 2,1) * !c(1,1; 2,1)$$

$$a_3 = c(1,3; 2,1) * c(1,3; 3,1) * c(2,1; 3,1) * !c(1,1; 2,1) * !c(1,2; 2,1)$$

$$b_3 = c(1,3; 4,1) * c(2,1; 4,1) * !c(1,1; 2,1) * !c(1,2; 2,1)$$

$$a_4 = c(1,1; 2,2) * c(1,1; 3,1) * c(2,2; 3,1) * !c(2,1; 4,1)$$

$$b_4 = c(1,1; 4,1) * c(2,2; 4,1) * c(1,1; 2,2) * !c(2,1; 3,1)$$

$$a_5 = c(1,2; 2,2) * c(1,2; 3,1) * c(2,2; 3,1) * !c(1,1; 2,2) * !c(2,1; 4,1)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 b_5 &= c(1,2; 4,1) * c(2,2; 4,1) * c(1,2; 2,2) * !c(1,1; ,2,2) * !c(2,1; 3,1) \\
 a_6 &= c(1,3; 2,2) * c(1,3; 3,1) * c(2,2; 3,1) * !c(1,1; 2,2) * !c(1,2; 2,2) * !c(2,1; 4,1) \\
 b_6 &= c(1,3; 4,1) * c(2,2; 4,1) * !c(1,1; 2,2) * !c(1,2; 2,2) * !c(2,1; 3,1) \\
 a_7 &= c(1,1; 2,3) * c(1,1; 3,1) * c(2,3; 3,1) * !c(2,1; 4,1) * !c(2,2; 4,1) \\
 b_7 &= c(1,1; 4,1) * c(2,3; 4,1) * c( 1,1; 2,3) * !c(2,1; 3,1) * !c(2,2; 3,1) \\
 a_8 &= c(1,2; 2,3) * c( 1,2; 3,1) * c(2,3; 3,1) * !c(1,1; 2,3) * !c(2,1; 4,1) * !c(2,2; 4,1) \\
 b_8 &= c(1,2; 4,1) * c(2,3; 4,1) * c(1,2; 2,3) * !c(1,1; 2,3) * !c(2,1; 3,1) * !c(2,2; 3,1) \\
 a_9 &= c(1,3; 2,3) * c(1,3; 3,1) * c(2,3; 3,1) * !c(1,1; 2,3) * !c(1,2; 2,3) * !c(2,1; 4,1) * !c(2,2; 4,1) \\
 b_9 &= c(1,3; 4,1) * c(2,3; 4,1) * !c(1,1; 2,3) * !c(1,2; 2,3) * !c(2,1; 3,1) * !c(2,2; 3,1).....(25)
 \end{aligned}$$

The value of the AND operation implementing those imarks is

$$(1 + 1/2 + 1/4) \cdot (1 + 1/4 + 1/16) \cdot NMT1(4)$$

which is slightly less than

$$(1 + (1/2) + (1/4))^2 \cdot NMT1(4).....(26)$$

Equation 25 and Equation 26 can be generalized and the value of the best operation implementing the marks of  $3^{(n-2)}$  prime implicants of CF(n) becomes:

$$val1(n) = (1 + 1/2 + 1/4)^{n-3} \cdot (1 + 1/4 + 1/16) \cdot NMT1(n).....(27)$$

which is slightly less than

$$val2(n) = (1 + 1/2 + 1/4)^{n-2} \cdot NMT1(n).....(28)$$

In order to prove that the solution proposed by Equation 24 and extended by Equation 24' is the most powerful one, consider three marks which are different for the value of one and only one triplet index. For example, the three marks  $m_7 = a_7 * b_7$ ,  $m_8 = a_8 * b_8$ ,  $m_9 = a_9 * b_9$ , which have been defined in Equation 24', are different only for the values in triplet index 1. A set as  $\{m_7, m_8, m_9\}$  will be called a "set of connected marks". In this example, in order that  $a_7 * b_8 = 0$  and  $a_8 * b_7 = 0$ , both  $a_8$  and  $b_8$  must contain compatibility  $!c(1,1; 2,3)$ . Therefore, the value of mark  $m_8$  will be multiplied by 1/2.

In order that  $a_7 * b_9 = a_9 * b_7 = a_8 * b_9 = a_9 * b_8 = 0$ , both  $a_9$  and  $b_9$  must contain  $!c(1,1; 2,3) * !c(1,2; 2,3)$ . Therefore, the value of mark  $m_9$  will be multiplied by 1/4. No other solution makes it possible to reduce the values of  $m_8$  and  $m_9$  by a smaller value.

Every mark m appearing in Equation 24' belongs to t sets of connected marks. It is easy to verify on the data of Equation 24' that all the triplets  $\{m_i, m_j, m_k\}$  of connected marks have received the same type of corrections and only those corrections have been applied.

Therefore, we can state that the solution proposed in this paper leads to the best solution and that the maximum value of an AND operation of the type above specified is slightly less than  $val2(n) = (1 + 1/2 + 1/4)^{n-2} \cdot NMT1(n)$ .

In the described algorithms, two different marks  $m_i = a_i * b_i$  and  $m_j = a_j * b_j$  are characterized by one or two complemented compatibilities. These complemented compatibilities reduce the total value. If we use strong marks, not all these complemented compatibilities are necessary. For example, in the following product, characterized by the use of strong marks:

$$A * B = (a_1 + a_2 + a_3) * (b_1 + b_2 + b_3)$$

where:

$$\begin{aligned}
 a_1 &= c(1,1; 2,1) * c(1,1; 3,1) * c(1,1; 4,1) \\
 b_1 &= c(2,1; 3,1) * c(2,1; 4,1) * c(3,1; 4,1) \\
 a_2 &= c(1,2; 2,1) * c(1,2; 3,1) * c(1,2; 4,1) \\
 b_2 &= b_1 \\
 a_3 &= c(1,3; 2,1) * c(1,3; 3,1) * c(1,3; 4,1) \\
 b_3 &= b_1
 \end{aligned}$$

the three variables of triplet ( $a_1 + a_2 + a_3$ ) are associated to a single remainder  $b_1=b_2=b_3$ . Besides, it has been proved that a sum of three strong marks multiplied by a single remainder may reach the value  $3 \cdot NMT1$ . These results lead us to hope that strong marks may be useful in the synthesis of the most powerful AND operation. A possible line of research is presented in the following example devoted to the synthesis of CF(5) by using also strong marks.

$$A * B = (a_1 + a_2 + \dots + a_{27}) * (b_1 + b_2 + \dots + b_{27}) \dots\dots\dots(29)$$

where:

$$\begin{aligned}
 a_1 &= c(1,1; 2,1) * c(1,1; 3,1) * c(1,1; 4,1) * c(1,1; 5,1) * c(2,1; 3,1) * c(3,1; 5,1) \\
 b_1 &= c(2,1; 3,1) * c(2,1; 4,1) * c(3,1; 4,1) * c(2,1; 5,1) * c(3,1; 5,1) * c(4,1; 5,1) \\
 a_2 &= c(1,2; 2,1) * c(1,2; 3,1) * c(1,2; 4,1) * c(1,2; 5,1) * c(2,1; 3,1) * c(3,1; 5,1) \\
 b_2 &= b_1 \\
 a_3 &= c(1,3; 2,1) * c(1,3; 3,1) * c(1,3; 4,1) * c(1,3; 5,1) * c(2,1; 3,1) * c(3,1; 5,1) \\
 b_3 &= b_1 \\
 a_4 &= c(1,1; 2,2) * c(1,1; 3,1) * c(1,1; 4,1) * c(1,1; 5,1) * c(2,2; 3,1) * !c(2,1; 3,1) * c(3,1; 5,1) \\
 b_4 &= c(2,2; 3,1) * c(2,2; 4,1) * c(3,1; 4,1) * c(2,2; 5,1) * c(3,1; 5,1) * c(4,1; 5,1) * !c(2,1; 3,1) \\
 a_5 &= c(1,2; 2,2) * c(1,2; 3,1) * c(1,2; 4,1) * c(1,2; 5,1) * !c(2,1; 3,1) * c(2,2; 3,1) * c(3,1; 5,1) \\
 b_5 &= b_4 \\
 a_6 &= c(1,3; 2,2) * c(1,3; 3,1) * c(1,3; 4,1) * c(1,3; 5,1) * !c(2,1; 3,1) * c(2,2; 3,1) * c(3,1; 5,1) \\
 b_6 &= b_4 \\
 a_7 &= c(1,1; 2,3) * c(1,1; 3,1) * c(1,1; 4,1) * c(1,1; 5,1) * c(3,1; 5,1) * !c(2,1; 3,1) * !c(2,2; 3,1) \\
 b_7 &= c(2,3; 3,1) * c(2,3; 4,1) * c(3,1; 4,1) * c(2,3; 5,1) * c(3,1; 5,1) * c(4,1; 5,1) * !c(2,1; 3,1) * !c(2,2; 3,1) \\
 a_8 &= c(1,2; 2,3) * c(1,2; 3,1) * c(1,2; 4,1) * c(1,2; 5,1) * c(3,1; 5,1) * !c(2,1; 3,1) * !c(2,2; 3,1) \\
 b_8 &= b_7 \\
 a_9 &= c(1,3; 2,3) * c(1,3; 3,1) * c(1,3; 4,1) * c(1,3; 5,1) * c(3,1; 5,1) * !c(2,1; 3,1) * !c(2,2; 3,1) \\
 b_9 &= b_7 \\
 &\dots\dots\dots \\
 a_{27} &= c(1,3; 2,3) * c(1,3; 3,1) * c(1,3; 4,1) * c(1,3; 5,3) * c(3,1; 5,3) * !c(2,1; 3,1) * !c(2,2; 3,1) * \\
 &!c(3,1; 5,1) * !c(3,1; 5,2)
 \end{aligned}$$

$$b_{27} = b_{25}$$

Notice that

$$A * B = (a_1 + a_2 + \dots + a_{27}) * (b_1 + b_2 + \dots + b_{27})$$

produces all the prime implicants of CF(5) with the exception of those which include variables  $\langle 3,2 \rangle$ ,  $\langle 3,3 \rangle$ ,  $\langle 4,2 \rangle$  or  $\langle 4,3 \rangle$ , exactly as the prime implicants produced by Equation 24'.

Starting from Equation 29 it is easy to prove that

$$\text{val}(A * B) = 3 \cdot (1 + 1/2 + 1/4)^3 \cdot \text{NMT1}(5) \dots \dots \dots (29.2)$$

which can be extended to CF(n) as follows:

$$\text{val}(A * B) = 3 \cdot (1 + 1/2 + 1/4)^{n-3} \cdot \text{NMT1}(n) \dots \dots \dots (29.3)$$

It has been shown that the value of the product (A \* B) specified by Equation 24 is equal to

$$\text{val}(A * B) = (1 + 1/2 + 1/4)^{n-3} \cdot (1 + 1/4 + 1/16) \cdot \text{NMT1}(n)$$

Since  $3 > (1 + 1/4 + 1/16)$ ,  $\text{val}(A * B)$  related to Equation 29 (solution with strong marks) is larger than  $\text{val}(A * B)$  related to Equation 24 (solution with only remainders). However, as it is easy to prove, in the solution with strong marks  $\text{val}(A)$  is equal to  $\text{val}(A * B)$  and, therefore, the value of the AND operation producing (A \* B) is equal to 0.

**To complete the most powerful AND operation**

So far all the new marks contained only  $\langle 3,1 \rangle$  and  $\langle 4,1 \rangle$  of triplet 3 or 4 in the compatibilities used in the synthesis of core function. This condition can be removed in order to increase the value of the considered AND operation.

For example, we might start from Equation 24 and we might add nine new remainders  $a_{10} \dots a_{18}$  to  $a_1 \dots a_9$  and  $b_{10} \dots b_{18}$  to  $b_1 \dots b_9$ , where the new remainders are obtained by replacing all the appearances of  $\langle 4,1 \rangle$  with  $\langle 4,2 \rangle$ . Thus nine new marks and nine new prime implicants will be generated. This solution can be extended in such a way that all the 81 prime implicants of CF(4) are generated. However, the values of many of these new 81 prime implicants are very small because many complemented compatibilities must be introduced in order that all the products  $a_i * b_j$  with  $i \neq j$  become equal to 0. Besides, the theoretical multiplication of every mark by the completion code

$x = c(3,1; 4,1) * c(3,1; 4,2) * c(3,1; 4,3) * c(3,2; 4,1) * c(3,2; 4,2) * c(3,2; 4,3) * c(3,3; 4,1) * c(3,3; 4,2) * c(3,3; 4,3)$  strongly would reduce the value of the corresponding prime implicants. A better solution can be obtained by integrating the completion codes in the tables of remainders and by multiplying the new terms produced by complemented compatibilities in such a way that all the products  $a_i * b_j$  with  $i \neq j$  become equal to 0. It is necessary to start from the values of  $a_i$  and  $b_i$  listed in Equation 24. As a first step, assume that:

for all  $i \leq 9$

$$\begin{aligned} a_i' &= a_i * c(3,1; 4,1) \\ b_i' &= b_i * c(3,1; 4,1); \end{aligned}$$

for all  $i > 9$  and  $\leq 18$

replace all the appearances of  $\langle 4,1 \rangle$  with  $\langle 4,2 \rangle$  and apply the following corrections:

$$\begin{aligned} a_i' &= a_{i-9} * c(3,1; 4,2) * !c(3,1; 4,1) \\ b_i' &= b_{i-9} * c(3,1; 4,2) * !c(3,1; 4,1). \end{aligned}$$

for all  $i > 18$  and  $\leq 27$

replace all the appearances of  $\langle 4,1 \rangle$  with  $\langle 4,3 \rangle$  and apply the following corrections:

$$a_i' = a_{i-18} * c(3,1; 4,3) * !c(3,1; 4,1) * !c(3,1; 4,2)$$

$$b_i' = b_{i-18} * c(3,1; 4,3) * !c(3,1; 4,1) * !c(3,1; 4,2)$$

it follows that:

$$\text{val}((a_1' + a_2' + \dots + a_9' + a_{10}' + \dots + a_{19}' + \dots) * (b_1' + b_2' + \dots + b_9' + b_{10}' + \dots + b_{19}' + \dots)) = (1 + 1/2 + 1/4) \cdot \text{val1}(4) = (1 + 1/2 + 1/4) \cdot (1 + 1/2 + 1/4) \cdot (1 + 1/4 + 1/16) \cdot \text{NMT1}(4)$$

which is the total value of the  $3 \cdot 9 = 27$  prime implicants of CF(4) characterized by the following pairs of indexes:  $\langle 3,1 \rangle, \langle 4,1 \rangle; \langle 3,1 \rangle, \langle 4,2 \rangle; \langle 3,1 \rangle, \langle 4,3 \rangle$ .

The same line of corrections can be applied in order to find the values of the other  $6 \cdot 9 = 54$  prime implicants of CF(4) which are characterized by the following pairs of indexes  $\langle 3,2 \rangle, \langle 4,1 \rangle; \langle 3,2 \rangle, \langle 4,2 \rangle; \langle 3,2 \rangle, \langle 4,3 \rangle; \langle 3,3 \rangle, \langle 4,1 \rangle; \langle 3,3 \rangle, \langle 4,2 \rangle; \langle 3,3 \rangle, \langle 4,3 \rangle$ .

For example, for all  $i > 27$  and  $\leq 36$ , it is necessary to replace all the appearances of  $\langle 3,1 \rangle; \langle 4,1 \rangle$  with  $\langle 3,2 \rangle, \langle 4,1 \rangle$  and to apply the following correction:

$$a_i' = a_{i-27} * c(3,2; 4,1) * !c(3,1; 4,1) * !c(3,1; 4,2) * !c(3,1; 4,3)$$

$$b_i' = b_{i-27} * c(3,2; 4,1) * !c(3,1; 4,1) * !c(3,1; 4,2) * !c(3,1; 4,3)$$

The final result of this line of corrections will be the following equation:

$$\text{val}((a_1 + \dots + a_{10} + \dots + a_{19} + \dots + a_{28} + \dots + a_{37} + \dots + a_{46} + \dots + a_{55} + \dots + a_{64} + \dots + a_{73} + \dots) * (b_1 + \dots + b_{10} + \dots + b_{19} + \dots + b_{28} + \dots + b_{37} + \dots + b_{46} + \dots + b_{55} + \dots + b_{64} + \dots + b_{73} + \dots)) = (1 + 1/2 + 1/4 + 1/8 + 1/16 + 1/32 + 1/64 + 1/128 + 1/256) \cdot (1 + 1/2 + 1/4) \cdot (1 + 1/4 + 1/16) \cdot \text{NMT1}(4) \sim 2 \cdot (1 + 1/2 + 1/4) \cdot (1 + 1/4 + 1/16) \cdot \text{NMT1}(4)$$

which can be extended to

$$2 \cdot (1 + 1/2 + 1/4)^{n-3} \cdot (1 + 1/4 + 1/16) \cdot \text{NMT1}(n)$$

The set of solutions for completing the AND operation is discussed in the following section.

### The value of the most powerful AND operation

The determination of the exact value of the most powerful AND operation is interesting and important, but it is very difficult. The difficulty derives from the fact that the evaluation of the output of that operation is closely connected with the evaluation of the values of inputs A and B. However, as will be proved, in order to solve the problem PvsNP the exact solution of that question is not necessary.

The solution here proposed derives from Equation 25.

Equation 25 is a solution for CF(4), but it can be easily extended to CF(n), as shown by Equation 27. As already observed, the products  $(a_1 + a_2 + \dots + a_9) * (b_1 + b_2 + \dots + b_9)$  do not produce all the prime implicants of Core Function. Indeed, the prime implicants containing variables different from those appearing in the completion code x (in our example:  $\langle 3,2 \rangle, \langle 3,3 \rangle, \langle 4,2 \rangle, \langle 4,3 \rangle$ ) do not appear in the list of prime implicants which have been generated.

A simple solution for producing all the prime implicants of core function is the following one.

First, multiply  $a_1, a_2, \dots, a_9$  by  $c(3,1; 4,1)$ .

Then extend the list  $(a_1 + a_2 + \dots + a_9)$  with  $(a_{10} + a_{11} + \dots + a_{18})$  and the list  $(b_1 + b_2 + \dots + b_9)$  with  $(b_{10} + b_{11} + \dots + b_{18})$  in order to obtain all the marks and all the prime implicants containing both variables  $\langle 3,1 \rangle$  and  $\langle 4,2 \rangle$ , in addition to the marks and the prime implicants containing variables  $\langle 3,1 \rangle$  and  $\langle 4,1 \rangle$  obtained by the product  $(a_1 + a_2 + \dots) * (b_1 + b_2 + \dots)$ :

$$a_{10} = c(1,1; 2,1) * c(1,1; 3,1) * c(2,1; 3,1) * c(3,1; 4,2)$$

$$b_{10} = c(1,1; 4,2) * c(2,1; 4,2) * c(1,1; 2,1)$$

$$a_{11} = c(1,2; 2,1) * c(1,2; 3,1) * c(2,1,3,1) * !c(1,1; 2,1) * c(3,1; 4,2)$$

$$b_{11} = c(1,2; 4,2) * c(2,1; 4,2) * c(1,2; 2,1) * !c(1,1; 2,1)$$

$$a_{18} = c(1,3; 2,3) * c(1,3; 3,1) * c(2,3; 3,1) * !c(1,1; 2,3) * !c(1,2; 2,3) * !c(2,1; 4,2) * !c(2,2; 4,2) * c(3,1; 4,2)$$

$$b_{18} = c(1,3; 4,2) * c(2,3; 4,2) * !c(1,1; 2,3) * !c(1,2; 2,3) * !c(2,1; 3,1) * !c(2,2; 3,1).....(30)$$

The product  $(a_{10} + a_{11} + \dots + a_{18}) * (b_{10} + b_{11} + \dots + b_{18})$  produces all the nine implicants of core function containing only  $\langle 3,1 \rangle$  and  $\langle 4,2 \rangle$  and no other variable of triplets 3 and 4. Similarly, a new product  $(a_{19} + \dots + a_{27}) * (b_{19} + \dots + b_{27})$  can produce all the prime implicants of core function containing only  $\langle 3,1 \rangle$  and  $\langle 4,3 \rangle$  of the variables of triplets 3 and 4, while the product  $(a_{28} + \dots + a_{36}) * (b_{28} + \dots + b_{36})$  can produce all the prime implicants of core function characterized by variables  $\langle 3,2 \rangle$  and  $\langle 4,1 \rangle$ , and so on.

In this way all the prime implicants of core function will be produced by the product

$$(a_1 + \dots + a_{10} + \dots + a_{19} + \dots + a_{28} + \dots + a_{37} + \dots + a_{46} + \dots + a_{55} + \dots + a_{64} + \dots + a_{73} + \dots) * (b_1 + \dots + b_{10} + \dots + b_{19} + \dots + b_{28} + \dots + b_{37} + \dots + b_{46} + \dots + b_{55} + \dots + b_{64} + \dots + b_{73} + \dots).....(31)$$

where the nine pairs of variables  $\langle 3,1 \rangle, \langle 4,1 \rangle; \langle 3,1 \rangle, \langle 4,2 \rangle; \langle 3,1 \rangle, \langle 4,3 \rangle; \langle 3,2 \rangle, \langle 4,1 \rangle; \langle 3,2 \rangle, \langle 4,2 \rangle; \langle 3,2 \rangle, \langle 4,3 \rangle; \langle 3,3 \rangle, \langle 4,1 \rangle; \langle 3,3 \rangle, \langle 4,2 \rangle; \langle 3,3 \rangle, \langle 4,3 \rangle$  are involved.

It is easy to prove that every product as, for example,  $(a_{10} + a_{11} + \dots + a_{18}) * (b_{10} + b_{11} + \dots + b_{18})$  produces a subset of prime implicants of core function disjoint from the other subsets of prime implicants; that is, a prime implicant produced by a subset does not appear in any other subset. Besides, the value of a subset is the optimal one for that subset of prime implicants. Equation 31 can be used to search for the maximum  $val(A * B)$  but it can not be used to search for the maximum value of the AND operation performing the product  $(A * B)$ . Indeed,  $val(A) = val(A * B)$  and, therefore, the value of the AND operation is equal to 0. In order to search for the maximum value of the AND operation, the starting point of the above described algorithm must be corrected. A simple example of the necessary correction is the following one.

multiply  $a_1, a_3, a_5, a_7, a_9$  by  $c(3,1; 4,1)$

multiply  $b_2, b_4, b_6, b_8$  by  $c(3,1; 4,1)$

multiply  $a_{10}, a_{12}, a_{14}, a_{16}, a_{18}$  by  $c(3,1; 4,2)$

multiply  $b_{11}, b_{13}, b_{15}, b_{17}$  by  $c(3,1; 4,2)$

multiply  $a_{19}, a_{21}, a_{23}, a_{25}, a_{27}$  by  $c(3,1; 4,3)$

multiply  $b_{20}, b_{22}, b_{24}, b_{26}$  by  $c(3,1; 4,3)$

and so on.

Thus,  $val(A)$  and  $val(B)$  will become relatively small and the value of the AND gate will be slightly smaller than  $val(A * B)$ . A very large number of the terms appearing in Equation 31 and its variants must be corrected with complemented compatibilities in order that, for any  $i \neq j, a_i * b_j = 0$ . In order to reduce the number of complemented compatibilities we can use some marks of the subset of "strong marks". As an example, we can start from the algorithm described by Equation 29. That algorithm uses many strong marks as shown by the following lines which are the first lines of the code related to CF(5):

Let

$$A * B = (a_1 + a_2 + \dots + a_{27}) * (b_1 + b_2 + \dots + b_{27})$$

where:

$$\begin{aligned} a_1 &= c(1,1; 2,1) * c(1,1; 3,1) * c(1,1; 4,1) * c(1,1; 5,1) * c(2,1; 3,1) * c(3,1; 5,1) \\ b_1 &= c(2,1; 3,1) * c(2,1; 4,1) * c(3,1; 4,1) * c(2,1; 5,1) * c(3,1; 5,1) * c(4,1; 5,1) \\ a_2 &= c(1,2; 2,1) * c(1,2; 3,1) * c(1,2; 4,1) * c(1,2; 5,1) * c(2,1; 3,1) * c(3,1; 5,1) \\ b_2 &= b_1 \\ a_3 &= c(1,3; 2,1) * c(1,3; 3,1) * c(1,3; 4,1) * c(1,3; 5,1) * c(2,1; 3,1) * c(3,1; 5,1) \\ b_3 &= b_1 \end{aligned}$$

As shown by those lines, three strong marks (for example  $a_1, a_2, a_3$ ) are multiplied by the same remainder ( $b_1 = b_2 = b_3$ ) in order to produce three different prime implicants of core function. This makes it possible to increase  $val(A * B)$  which was

$$(1 + 1/2 + 1/4)^{n-3} \cdot (1 + 1/4 + 1/16) \cdot NMT1(n)$$

according to Equation 27 while now it is

$$3 \cdot (1 + 1/2 + 1/4)^{n-3} \cdot NMT1(n) \dots \dots \dots (32)$$

before the corrections with complemented compatibilities. In section 9 it has been proved that the solution proposed by Equation 24 and extended by Equation 27 is the best solution for the product of two sums of remainders. That proof is based on the analysis of the so-called “connected marks”, which are triplets of marks different from each other only for the values of one index. For example,

$$\begin{aligned} &c(1,1; 2,1) * c(1,1; 3,1) * c(1,1; 4,1) \\ &c(1,2; 2,1) * c(1,2; 3,1) * c(1,2; 4,1) \\ &c(1,3; 2,1) * c(1,3; 3,1) * c(1,3; 4,1) \end{aligned}$$

are a triplets of connected marks of CF (4).

The proof that the solution described by (25) is the best solution was based on the property that all the connected marks had received the best corrections and that only those corrections had been applied. The proof that the solution above presented, where also strong marks are involved, is the best solution can be developed as follows.

As shown by Equation 11, the sum of three marks ( $a_1 + a_2 + a_3$ ) multiplied by ( $b_1 = b_2 = b_3$ ) produces three connected marks without any complemented compatibility.

Analogously,

$$\begin{aligned} &(a_4 + a_5 + a_6) * b_4 \text{ (where } b_4 = b_5 = b_6) \\ &(a_7 + a_8 + a_9) * b_7 \text{ (where } b_7 = b_8 = b_9) \\ &\dots \\ &(a_{25} + a_{26} + a_{27}) * b_{25} \text{ (where } b_{25} = b_{26} = b_{27}) \end{aligned}$$

produce other connected marks without any complemented compatibility.

Instead, the connected marks

$$(a_1 + a_4 + a_7) * (b_1 + b_4 + b_7)$$

have requested the following corrections:

$$a_1 = a_1'$$

$$a_4 = a_4' * ! c(2,1; 3,1)$$

$$a_7 = a_7' * ! c(2,1; 3,1) * ! c(2,1; 4,1)$$

The number of corrections necessary for implementing this sum of remainders is larger than the number of corrections used in the solution involving also strong marks. This is the reason for which  $val(A * B)$  relative to the implementation with strong marks is larger than the implementation with remainders.

Probably,  $val(op(AANDB))$  of the implementation with remainders is larger than the corresponding value of the implementation with strong marks but we narrow the focus on the implementation with strong marks, because it leads to a more secure solution.

Equation 29.3 specifies the value of variable  $C1 = A1 \text{ AND } B1$  which produces all the  $3^{n-2}$  prime implicants of core function containing variables  $\langle 3,1 \rangle$  and  $\langle 4,1 \rangle$  and not containing variables  $\langle 3,2 \rangle, \langle 3,3 \rangle, \langle 4,2 \rangle, \langle 4,3 \rangle$ .

In order to produce all the prime implicant of core function it is necessary to extend the product  $A_1 \text{ AND } B_1$  as follows:

$$C = (A_1 + A_2 + \dots + A_9) * (B_1 + B_2 + \dots + B_9)$$

where

$A_2 * B_2$  produce all the prime implicants containing only variables  $\langle 3,1 \rangle$  and  $\langle 4,2 \rangle$ ;

$A_3 * B_3$  produce all the prime implicants containing only variables  $\langle 3,1 \rangle$  and  $\langle 4,3 \rangle$ ;

.....

$A_9 * B_9$  produce all the prime implicants containing only variables  $\langle 3,3 \rangle$  and  $\langle 4,3 \rangle$ ;

Since many complemented compatibilities must be introduced in order that, for  $i \neq j, a_i * b_j = 0$ ,

$$val(C = A \text{ AND } B) < valmax(n)$$

where

$$valmax(n) = 9 \cdot 3 \cdot (1 + 1/2 + 1/4)^{n-3} \cdot NMT1(n)$$

Besides ,

$$val(op(A \text{ AND } B) < val(A \text{ AND } B)$$

### CONCLUSION

Since the number of minterms of  $ECF(n)$  contained in  $CF(n)$  is equal to  $3^n \cdot NMT1(n)$  and the value of an AND or OR operation, that is the number of new minterms of  $ECF(n)$  produced by an operation, is less than

$$valmax(n) = 9 \cdot 3 \cdot (1 + 1/2 + 1/4)^{n-3} \cdot NMT1(n)$$

the number of operations necessary to implement  $CF(n)$  is larger than

$$3^n / (9 \cdot 3 \cdot (1 + 1/2 + 1/4)^{n-3})$$

and, therefore, it increases exponentially with  $n$ .

Since the synthesis of Core Function  $CF(n)$  is an NP-complete problem, this result is equivalent to proving that P and NP do not coincide.

### REFERENCES

1. A.R.Meo: "On the P versus NP question".  
<https://www.accademiadelle scienze.it/attivita/editoria/lavori-di-soci>
2. A.R.Meo: "On the P vs NP question: a proof of inequality", *arXiv:1802.005484*.
3. Lance Fortnow: "The status of the P versus NP problem", *Communications of the ACM*, September 2009.
4. "The P versus NP problem," in J.Carlson, A. Wiles (eds.), *The Millennium Prize Problem*, pp.88-104, Providence: American Mathematical Society.
5. Razborov, "Lower bounds on the monotone complexity of some Boolean functions". *Soviet Mathematics-Doklady* 31,(1985)485-493.
6. A.R.Meo: "Some theorems concerning the core function" in "Concurrency, Graphs and Models", Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, 2008.
7. S.A.Cook: The complexity of theorem proving procedures, in: Proc. 3<sup>rd</sup> Annual ACM Symp. on Theory of Computing, (1971),pp.151-158. ACM Press.
8. K.Mulmuley and M.Sohoni. Geometric complexity theory I: An approach to the P vs. NP and related problems. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 31(2):496{526,2001}.