Lecture 8(QBF)

Feb 17, 2017

Geng Lan

(These lecture notes are **not** proofread and proof-checked by the instructor.)

Genral Notes:

- Assignment 4 due Wed, Feb 22
- Assignment 5 posted next Tuesday
- Tuesday, Feb 21 no lecture
- 1. QBF: Quantified Boolean Formula. Quantifiers: \forall , \exists
- 2. Scope: the scope of two binding occurrences " Q_1x_1 " and " Q_2x_2 " should be either disjoint or nested, but never overlap. The situation that " Q_1x_1 " and " Q_2x_2 " are partially joint cannot happen.



 x_1 and x_2 are not the same.

3. Closed and Open QBF:

closed: all occurrences of propositional variables are bound.

open: some occurrences of propositional variables are free.

(page 9, handout 13)

Substitution: cannot happen to the bound occurrences, like x in the example of handout 13.

should also remove any conflict about the name. In this example we cannot substitute $\neg x$ for y, because x has been name-captured.

4. Problems we do not know:

 $\begin{array}{ll} P \subseteq NP \subseteq PSPACE \subseteq EXPTIME \subseteq NEXPTIME \\ . =? =? =? =? =? \\ Problems we do know: \\ PSPACE=NPSACE \\ P \subsetneq EXPTIME \\ NP \subsetneq NEXPTIME \end{array}$

SAT belongs to NP, QBF belongs to PSPACE.

- 5. QBF-solvers are just like SAT-solvers, but the development of QBF-solvers is currently far behind that of SAT-solvers.
- 6. validity and satisability of closed QBFs coincide, not open QBFs, why? Take this example: $\varphi = (p \rightarrow q) \land (q \rightarrow p), \text{ we can convert it to:} \\ \varphi = (\neg p \lor q) \land (\neg q \lor p) \\ \text{ if we assign "T" to q and p, what happen? } \varphi \vdash T \\ \text{WFFs of QBF:} \\ \exists q \ \varphi \text{ - open} \\ \exists p \exists q \ \varphi \text{ - closed} \\ \forall p \ \varphi \text{ - open} \\ \exists q \forall p \ \varphi \text{ - closed} \\ \forall q \exists p \ \varphi \text{ - closed} \\ \forall q \exists p \ \varphi \text{ - closed} \\ \forall q \exists p \ \varphi \text{ - closed} \\ \forall q \exists p \ \varphi \text{ - closed} \\ \forall p \ \varphi \text{ - closed} \\ \forall q \exists q \ \varphi \text{ - closed} \\ \forall q \exists q \ \varphi \text{ - closed} \\ \forall q \exists q \ \varphi \text{ - closed} \\ \forall q \exists q \ \varphi \text{ - closed} \\ \forall q \exists q \ \varphi \text{ - closed} \\ \forall q \exists q \ \varphi \text{ - closed} \\ \forall q \exists q \ \varphi \text{ - closed} \\ \forall q \ \forall q \$
- 7. satisfiable: one, or more, but not necessarily all of the row in truth-table is true. tautology: all of the row in truth-table are true.
- 8. Prenexform: QBF is in prenex form iff $Q_1 x_1 Q_2 x_2 \dots Q_n x_n \varphi$ $Q_1, Q_2, \dots Q_n \in \{\forall, \exists\}$ and φ quantifier free. $Q_1, Q_2, \dots Q_n$ is quantifier prefix, φ is matrix.
- 9. Sometimes quantifiers are inside matrix φ , we want to push them out:

 $\neg(\exists x \ \varphi) \rightsquigarrow (transform \ to)(\forall x \ \neg \varphi)$ define $* \in \{\land, \lor\}$. $(Q_1x_1 \ \varphi_1) * (Q_2x_2 \ \varphi_2) \rightsquigarrow Q_1x_1 \ Q_2x_2(\varphi_1 * \varphi_2)$ provided x_1 not free in φ_2 and x_2 not free in φ_1 .

Why should we do this? Because QBF solvers work on QBF prenex form, where the matrix is in CNF.