

# The complete classification for quantified equality constraints

Dmitriy Zhuk and Barnaby Martin

December 30, 2021

## Abstract

We prove that  $\text{QCSP}(\mathbb{N}; x = y \rightarrow y = z)$  is PSpace-complete, settling a question open for more than ten years. This completes the complexity classification for quantified equality languages as a trichotomy between Logspace, NP-complete and PSpace-complete.

## 1 Introduction

The *quantified constraint satisfaction problem*,  $\text{QCSP}(\Delta)$ , asks whether some input sentence, whose quantifier-free part is positive conjunctive, is true on the *constraint language*  $\Delta$  comprised of a set of relations over the same domain  $D$ . The QCSP is itself a generalisation of its better-studied brother, the *constraint satisfaction problem*,  $\text{CSP}(\Delta)$ , in which one assumes the quantification of the sentence is entirely existential. By now, a great deal is known about the CSP, while many important questions for the QCSP remain open.

The celebrated Feder-Vardi Dichotomy Conjecture, which asserts that  $\text{CSP}(\Delta)$  is always either in P or is NP-complete, when  $\Delta$  is over a finite domain, has been proved independently in [10, 11] and [19, 20]. This provides the basis for some CSP classifications over an infinite domain [7, 8]. In the meantime, the study of infinite-domain CSPs has itself matured to become a field of active research incorporating Universal Algebra and Model Theory. Important results from its formative years include [6, 9, 7] (as well as the earlier [17]), but most of the post-modern work concerns the finitely-bounded  $\omega$ -categorical case [1, 2].

At present, we are far from a complexity classification for finite domain QCSPs. The 3-element case with constants is settled in [21], where evidence is also given that the classification is more complicated than previously thought. The study of infinite-domain QCSPs is also far less advanced than that for infinite-domain CSPs, with only a partial known classification in the temporal case (see [13, 12, 15, 18]).

The modern, systematic study of infinite-domain CSPs began with a complexity classification for equality languages, which are defined as those which have a first-order definition in  $(\mathbb{N}; =)$  [5]. It made sense to begin the systematic study of infinite-domain QCSPs similarly, with the equality languages, spawning the works [3, 4]. There was an error in the conference version [3] which was corrected in the journal version [4] at the cost of a trichotomy between L, NP-complete and Co-NP-hard instead of L, NP-complete and PSpace-complete. Thus, a gap was left in this foundational result. It was known that there were PSpace-complete cases, e.g.  $\text{QCSP}(\mathbb{N}; x = y \rightarrow u = v)$ , but it was not known whether  $\text{QCSP}(\mathbb{N}; x = y \rightarrow y = z)$  was Co-NP-complete or PSpace-complete (or even somewhere in between). Indeed, this constraint language became notorious; more so, because a solution of it as either Co-NP-complete or PSpace-complete would complete the classification.

In an invited talk at the *Arbeitstagung Allgemeine Algebra* (Workshop on General Algebra – AAA98) in July 2019 in Dresden, Hubie Chen posed the complexity of  $\text{QCSP}(\mathbb{N}; x = y \rightarrow y = z)$  as one of three open problems in the area of the complexity of constraints that apparently needed new insights to resolve [14]. In this paper we settle the complexity of  $\text{QCSP}(\mathbb{N}; x = y \rightarrow y = z)$  as PSpace-complete.

## 1.1 The classification

Equality constraint languages admit quantifier elimination<sup>1</sup> so let us assume  $\Gamma$  is a finite set of relations over an infinite countable set (e.g.  $\mathbb{N}$ ) where each relation is defined by some Boolean combination of atoms of the form  $x = y$ . Let us additionally assume this Boolean combination is in conjunctive normal form (CNF). A relation is *negative* if it has a CNF definition in which all of the clauses are either equalities, or are disjunctions of negative literals (i.e. of the form  $x \neq y$ ). A relation is *positive* if it has a CNF definition in which all of the literals are positive (i.e. of the form  $x = y$ ).  $\Gamma$  is *negative* (respectively, *positive*) if all of its relations are negative (respectively, positive). Let  $I$  be the relation  $x = y \rightarrow y = z$ .

**Corollary 1.** *Let  $\Gamma$  be an equality constraint language. Either*

- $\Gamma$  is negative, and  $\text{QCSP}(\Gamma)$  is in Logspace, or else
- $\Gamma$  is positive, and  $\text{QCSP}(\Gamma)$  is NP-complete, or else
- $\text{QCSP}(\Gamma)$  is PSpace-complete.

*Proof.* We follow the argument as laid out in Theorem 5.5 of [4]. If  $\Gamma$  is negative then  $\text{QCSP}(\Gamma)$  is in Logspace by Theorem 6.1 of [4]. If  $\Gamma$  is positive but not negative then  $\text{QCSP}(\Gamma)$  is NP-complete by Theorem 7.1 of [4]. Otherwise, by Theorem 8.1 of [4],  $I$  is definable as a quantified positive conjunction within  $\Gamma$ , and the result follows from our Corollary 5.  $\square$

Let us give examples of each of the three complexity classes in this classification. A non-trivial negative language might be  $(x \neq y \vee u \neq v) \wedge v = w$ . A positive language that is not negative might be  $x = y \vee u = v$ . Finally, the canonical example for the third class is, of course,  $I$ !

## 2 Preliminaries

We identify a constraint language  $\Gamma$  with a set of relations over a fixed finite domain  $D$ . We may also think of this as a first-order relational structure.

We always may assume that an instance of  $\text{QCSP}(\Gamma)$  is of the prenex form

$$\forall x_1 \exists y_1 \forall x_2 \exists y_2 \dots \forall x_n \exists y_n \Phi,$$

since if it is not it may readily be brought into such a form in polynomial time. Then a solution is a sequence of (Skolem) functions  $f_1, \dots, f_n$  such that

$$(x_1, f(x_1), x_2, f_2(x_1, x_2), \dots, x_n, f_n(x_1, \dots, x_n))$$

is a solution of  $\Phi$  for all  $x_1, \dots, x_n$  (i.e.  $y_i = f_i(x_1, \dots, x_i)$ ). This belies a (Hintikka) game semantics for the truth of a QCSP instance in which a player called Universal (male) plays the

---

<sup>1</sup>Indeed, equality sits within all models, so must be dealt with in any discussion of quantifier elimination. For more details on this, we refer the reader to Section 2.7 in [16].

universal variables and a player called Existential (female) plays the existential variables, one after another, from the outside in. The Skolem functions above give a strategy for Existential. In our proofs we may occasionally revert to a game-theoretical parlance.

A formula in conjunctive normal form with 3-literals per clause is called a 3-CNF. We indicate negation of a propositional variable  $z_i$  with the overline notation  $\bar{z}_i$ .

### 3 Main result

We will define formulas (constraints) over  $I$  by diagrams. An edge labeled with  $z$  from a vertex  $x$  to a vertex  $y$  means the constraint  $I(x, y, z)$ . Sometimes we do not label a vertex. This means that the corresponding variable is existentially quantified after all other variables are quantified (innermost). For instance, in Figure 1 there is one unlabeled vertex. If we call it  $u$  then Figure 1 can be interpreted as the formula

$$\exists u(I(x, y, u) \wedge I(x, z, u) \wedge I(t, z, u)).$$




Figure 1: An example of a graph defining constraints.

We define a reduction from the problem *Quantified 3-Satisfiability*. Suppose we have a formula  $\Phi$ , whose quantifier-free part is a propositional formula in 3-CNF, that is a formula of the form

$$\exists x_1 \forall y_1 \exists x_2 \forall y_2 \dots \exists x_n \forall y_n ((x_2 \vee \bar{y}_1 \vee y_3) \wedge (\bar{x}_1 \vee \bar{x}_2 \vee x_5) \wedge \dots) \quad (1)$$

We define a formula  $\Psi$  by

$$\forall t \forall f \exists x_1^0 \forall x_1^1 \forall y_1^0 \forall y_1^1 \exists x_2^0 \forall x_2^1 \forall y_2^0 \forall y_2^1 \dots \exists x_n^0 \forall x_n^1 \forall y_n^0 \forall y_n^1 \exists z \exists \dots \exists (\mathcal{C}_0 \wedge \mathcal{C}_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \mathcal{C}_n \wedge \mathcal{F}),$$

where

- $\mathcal{C}_0$  is defined in Figure 2.
- $\mathcal{C}_1, \dots, \mathcal{C}_n$  are defined in Figure 3; for the extreme cases  $\mathcal{C}_{n-1}$  and  $\mathcal{C}_n$  to be clear, they are also shown in Figures 4 and 5.
- $\mathcal{F}$  encodes the 3-CNF and is defined as follows. Associated with each clause  $(\ell_1 \vee \ell_2 \vee \ell_3)$  is a path of length 3 from  $t$  to  $z$  with edge labels, in sequence,  $\lambda(\ell_1), \lambda(\ell_2), \lambda(\ell_3)$ , where  $\lambda(\ell) = u^0$ , iff  $\ell$  is a positive variable  $u$ , and  $\lambda(\ell) = u^1$ , iff  $\ell$  is a negative variable  $\bar{u}$ . In Figure 6 we show  $\mathcal{F}$  for the formula (1).
- $\exists \dots \exists$  means that all the remaining variables are existentially quantified.

Below we explain how to interpret different values of the variables:

1. variables  $t$  and  $f$  encode the value true and the value false;

2. variables  $x_i^0$  and  $x_i^1$  encode the variable  $x_i$ ;  $x_i^0 = t$  means that  $x_i = 0$ ,  $x_i^1 = t$  means that  $x_i = 1$ ;
3. variables  $y_i^0$  and  $y_i^1$  encode the variable  $y_i$ ;  $y_i^0 = t$  means that  $y_i = 0$ ,  $y_i^1 = t$  means that  $y_i = 1$ .




Figure 2: Set of constraints  $\mathcal{C}_0$ .




Figure 3: Set of constraints  $\mathcal{C}_i$ .




Figure 4: Set of constraints  $\mathcal{C}_{n-1}$ .




Figure 5: Set of constraints  $\mathcal{C}_n$ .




Figure 6: Set of constraints  $\mathcal{F}$ .

**Theorem 2.** *Formulas  $\Phi$  and  $\Psi$  are equivalent.*

**Lemma 3.**  $\Phi \rightarrow \Psi$ .

*Proof.* In the following, we make no assumption that  $t \neq f$ , though the more interesting cases arise when this is true. Suppose we have a strategy for the existential player (EP) in  $\Phi$ . Let us define a strategy for the existential player (EP) in  $\Psi$ . First, we want at most one of the two values  $x_i^0$  and  $x_i^1$  to be equal to  $t$ , and at most one of  $y_i^0$  and  $y_i^1$  to be equal to  $t$ . Assume that the above rule was violated for the first time by the universal player (UP) in  $\Psi$  when he plays  $y_i^0 = t$  and  $y_i^1 = t$ , or when he plays  $x_i^1 = t$  after  $x_i^0 = t$ . In both cases the winning strategy for the EP is to choose  $x_{i+1}^0 = \dots = x_n^0 = z = t$ . Thus, we may assume that the above rule always holds.

Then we interpret  $x_i^0 = t$  as  $x_i = 0$ ,  $x_i^1 = t$  as  $x_i = 1$ ,  $y_i^0 = t$  as  $y_i = 0$ ,  $y_i^1 = t$  as  $y_i = 1$ . It will be convenient for us to assume that  $x_i = 0$  if both  $x_i^0$  and  $x_i^1$  are different from  $t$ . Similarly, we assume that  $y_i = 0$  if both  $y_i^0$  and  $y_i^1$  are different from  $t$ .

Then the EP in  $\Psi$  should play according to the strategy of the EP in  $\Phi$ , that is, if the EP in  $\Phi$  chooses  $x_i = 0$ , then the EP in  $\Psi$  should choose  $x_i^0 = t$ , otherwise the EP in  $\Psi$  should choose  $x_i^0 = f$ . Additionally, the EP in  $\Psi$  chooses  $z = f$ , and the remaining values (for the variables that are not labeled in figures) can be chosen uniquely.

It is not hard to see that the constraints in  $\mathcal{F}$  are equivalent to the 3-CNF part of  $\Phi$ . This is because at least one of the edge labels in the path must not be evaluated to  $t$ , which corresponds to one of the literals being true.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.**  $\Psi \rightarrow \Phi$ .

*Proof.* Suppose we have a winning strategy for the EP in  $\Psi$ . To define a winning strategy for the EP in  $\Phi$ , we will show how the UP in  $\Psi$  should play and how moves of the EP in  $\Psi$  should be interpreted by the EP in  $\Phi$ . First, the UP in  $\Psi$  assigns two different values to  $t$  and  $f$ . If the EP plays  $x_i^0 = t$  then the EP in  $\Phi$  plays  $x_i = 0$ , if the EP plays  $x_i^0 \neq t$  then the EP in  $\Phi$  plays  $x_i = 1$ . Let us show how the UP in  $\Psi$  should play. Let  $d$  be the last value in the sequence  $f, x_1^0, x_2^0, \dots, x_i^0$  different from  $t$ . He plays  $x_i^1 = d$  if  $x_i^0 = t$ , and  $x_i^1 = t$  if  $x_i^0 \neq t$ . He plays  $y_i^0 = t$  and  $y_i^1 = d$  if the UP in  $\Phi$  plays  $y_i = 0$ . He plays  $y_i^0 = d$  and  $y_i^1 = t$  if the UP in  $\Phi$  plays  $y_i = 1$ .

Let us show that if the EP in  $\Phi$  follows this strategy then all the constraints are satisfied. Let  $i$  be the maximal number such that  $x_i = 1$ , which means that  $x_i^0 \neq t$ . Put  $d = x_i^0$ . If  $x_i = 0$  for every  $i$ , then we put  $i = 0$  and  $d = f$ . Since  $x_{i+1} = \dots = x_n = 0$ , we have  $x_{i+1}^0 = \dots = x_n^0 = t$  and  $x_{i+1}^1 = \dots = x_n^1 = d$ . Notice that for every  $i \in \{i, i+1, \dots, n\}$  exactly one of the two variables  $y_i^0$  and  $y_i^1$  is equal to  $d$ . Hence, the constraints from  $\mathcal{C}_i$  imply  $z \neq t$ . Then the constraints from  $\mathcal{F}$  imply that the 3-CNF part holds, since, for each path from  $z$  to  $t$ , at least one of the edge labels must not be evaluated as  $t$ . For instance, the path  $x_2^0 - y_1^1 - y_3^0$  in Figure 6 implies that at least one of the variables  $x_2^0, y_1^1, y_3^0$  does not equal  $t$ , which means that  $x_2 = 1, y_1 = 0$ , or  $y_3 = 1$  and the constraint  $(x_2 \vee \bar{y}_1 \vee y_3)$  holds.  $\square$

**Corollary 5.**  $QCSP(\mathbb{N}; x = y \rightarrow y = z)$  is PSpace-complete.

Let us remark that an alternative construction of  $\Psi$  has  $t$  and  $f$  quantified existentially (still outermost) but adds the new constraint  $t \neq f$  (note that disequality  $x \neq y$  can be defined over  $I$  by  $\forall z I(x, y, z)$ ).

## References

- [1] BARTO, L., KOMPATSCHER, M., OLSÁK, M., PHAM, T. V., AND PINSKER, M. The equivalence of two dichotomy conjectures for infinite domain constraint satisfaction problems. In *32nd Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science, LICS 2017, Reykjavik, Iceland, June 20-23, 2017* (2017), IEEE Computer Society, pp. 1–12.
- [2] BARTO, L., AND PINSKER, M. Topology is irrelevant (in a dichotomy conjecture for infinite domain constraint satisfaction problems). *SIAM J. Comput.* *49*, 2 (2020), 365–393.
- [3] BODIRSKY, M., AND CHEN, H. Quantified equality constraints. In *22nd IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (LICS 2007), 10-12 July 2007, Wroclaw, Poland, Proceedings* (2007), IEEE Computer Society, pp. 203–212.
- [4] BODIRSKY, M., AND CHEN, H. Quantified equality constraints. *SIAM J. Comput.* *39*, 8 (2010), 3682–3699.
- [5] BODIRSKY, M., AND KÁRA, J. The complexity of equality constraint languages. *Theory Comput. Syst.* *43*, 2 (2008), 136–158.
- [6] BODIRSKY, M., AND KÁRA, J. The complexity of temporal constraint satisfaction problems. *J. ACM* *57*, 2 (2010), 9:1–9:41.

- [7] BODIRSKY, M., MARTIN, B., AND MOTTET, A. Discrete temporal constraint satisfaction problems. *J. ACM* 65, 2 (2018), 9:1–9:41.
- [8] BODIRSKY, M., AND MOTTET, A. A dichotomy for first-order reducts of unary structures. *Log. Methods Comput. Sci.* 14, 2 (2018).
- [9] BODIRSKY, M., AND PINSKER, M. Schaefer’s theorem for graphs. *J. ACM* 62, 3 (2015), 19:1–19:52.
- [10] BULATOV, A. A. A dichotomy theorem for nonuniform CSPs. In *2017 IEEE 58th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)* (2017), pp. 319–330.
- [11] BULATOV, A. A. A dichotomy theorem for nonuniform csps. *CoRR abs/1703.03021* (2017).
- [12] CHARATONIK, W., AND WRONA, M. Quantified positive temporal constraints. In *Computer Science Logic, 22nd International Workshop, CSL 2008, 17th Annual Conference of the EACSL, Bertinoro, Italy, September 16-19, 2008. Proceedings* (2008), M. Kaminski and S. Martini, Eds., vol. 5213 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, Springer, pp. 94–108.
- [13] CHARATONIK, W., AND WRONA, M. Tractable quantified constraint satisfaction problems over positive temporal templates. In *Logic for Programming, Artificial Intelligence, and Reasoning, 15th International Conference, LPAR 2008, Doha, Qatar, November 22-27, 2008. Proceedings* (2008), I. Cervesato, H. Veith, and A. Voronkov, Eds., vol. 5330 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, Springer, pp. 543–557.
- [14] CHEN, H. Three concrete complexity questions about constraints, in search of theories. Invited talk at Arbeitstagung Allgemeine Algebra (Workshop on General Algebra), AAA98, Dresden, Germany, July 2019.
- [15] CHEN, H., AND WRONA, M. Guarded ord-horn: A tractable fragment of quantified constraint satisfaction. In *19th International Symposium on Temporal Representation and Reasoning, TIME 2012, Leicester, United Kingdom, September 12-14, 2012* (2012), B. C. Moszkowski, M. Reynolds, and P. Terenziani, Eds., IEEE Computer Society, pp. 99–106.
- [16] HODGES, W. *Model Theory*. Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications. Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- [17] KROKHIN, A. A., JEAVONS, P., AND JONSSON, P. Reasoning about temporal relations: The tractable subalgebras of allen’s interval algebra. *J. ACM* 50, 5 (2003), 591–640.
- [18] WRONA, M. Tractability frontier for dually-closed ord-horn quantified constraint satisfaction problems. In *Mathematical Foundations of Computer Science 2014 - 39th International Symposium, MFCS 2014, Budapest, Hungary, August 25-29, 2014. Proceedings, Part I* (2014), E. Csuhaj-Varjú, M. Dietzfelbinger, and Z. Ésik, Eds., vol. 8634 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, Springer, pp. 535–546.
- [19] ZHUK, D. A proof of CSP dichotomy conjecture. In *2017 IEEE 58th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)* (Oct 2017), pp. 331–342.
- [20] ZHUK, D. A proof of the CSP dichotomy conjecture. *J. ACM* 67, 5 (2020), 30:1–30:78.

- [21] ZHUK, D., AND MARTIN, B. QCSP monsters and the demise of the chen conjecture. In *Proceedings of the 52nd Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing* (2020), pp. 91–104.