

Gentzen and Frege systems for QBF

Ján Pich

University of Leeds

17 May 2016

joint work with Olaf Beyersdorff

overview:

overview:

Propositional proof systems: Frege, Extended Frege (EF)

overview:

Propositional proof systems: Frege, Extended Frege (EF)

QBF proof systems: Frege + \forall red, EF + \forall red

overview:

Propositional proof systems: Frege, Extended Frege (EF)

QBF proof systems: Frege + \forall red, EF + \forall red

I. Gentzen vs. Frege in QBF

G_1^* p-simulates EF + \forall red

i.e. Gentzen systems prove theorems more efficiently than QBF Frege

overview:

Propositional proof systems: Frege, Extended Frege (EF)

QBF proof systems: Frege + $\forall\text{red}$, EF + $\forall\text{red}$

I. Gentzen vs. Frege in QBF

G_1^* p-simulates EF + $\forall\text{red}$

i.e. Gentzen systems prove theorems more efficiently than QBF Frege

II. First-order version of EF + $\forall\text{red}$

EF + $\forall\text{red}$ is intuitionistic S_2^1

i.e. theorems of intuitionistic S_2^1 have short proofs in EF + $\forall\text{red}$

overview:

Propositional proof systems: Frege, Extended Frege (EF)

QBF proof systems: Frege + $\forall\text{red}$, EF + $\forall\text{red}$

I. Gentzen vs. Frege in QBF

G_1^* p-simulates EF + $\forall\text{red}$

i.e. Gentzen systems prove theorems more efficiently than QBF Frege

II. First-order version of EF + $\forall\text{red}$

EF + $\forall\text{red}$ is intuitionistic S_2^1

i.e. theorems of intuitionistic S_2^1 have short proofs in EF + $\forall\text{red}$

III. Characterizing lower bounds for QBF Frege

\exists hard theorems for EF + $\forall\text{red}$

\Leftrightarrow

PSPACE $\not\subseteq$ P/poly or \exists hard theorems for EF

Frege systems: common systems for propositional logic

- operate with propositional formulas
- finite set of derivation rules

e.g.

$$\frac{\phi \quad \phi \rightarrow \psi}{\psi} \text{ (modus ponens)}$$

Frege systems: common systems for propositional logic

- operate with propositional formulas
- finite set of derivation rules

e.g.

$$\frac{\phi \quad \phi \rightarrow \psi}{\psi} \text{ (modus ponens)}$$

EF systems: operate with circuits

$$\text{QBFs: } \forall x \phi(x) \Leftrightarrow \phi(0) \wedge \phi(1)$$

$$\exists x \phi(x) \Leftrightarrow \phi(0) \vee \phi(1)$$

QBFs: $\forall x \phi(x) \Leftrightarrow \phi(0) \wedge \phi(1)$

$\exists x \phi(x) \Leftrightarrow \phi(0) \vee \phi(1)$

QBF Frege systems [Beyersdorff, Bonacina, Chew]

Frege + \forall red: a refutation of a QBF $Q\phi$ is a sequence of formulas L_1, \dots, L_l where $L_1 = \phi$, $L_l = \emptyset$ and each L_i is derived using a Frege derivation rule or \forall red rule:

$$\frac{L_j(u)}{L_j(u/B)}$$

- where u is
 1. universally quantified (in the prefix Q)
 2. the innermost (w.r.t. Q) among the variables of L_j
- B is a formula containing only variables left of u

QBFs: $\forall x \phi(x) \Leftrightarrow \phi(0) \wedge \phi(1)$

$\exists x \phi(x) \Leftrightarrow \phi(0) \vee \phi(1)$

QBF Frege systems [Beyersdorff, Bonacina, Chew]

Frege + \forall red: a refutation of a QBF $Q \phi$ is a sequence of formulas L_1, \dots, L_l where $L_1 = \phi$, $L_l = \emptyset$ and each L_i is derived using a Frege derivation rule or \forall red rule:

$$\frac{L_j(u)}{L_j(u/B)}$$

- where u is
 1. universally quantified (in the prefix Q)
 2. the innermost (w.r.t. Q) among the variables of L_j
- B is a formula containing only variables left of u

EF + \forall red : Frege + \forall red but with circuits

Gentzen's sequent systems: [Cook, Morioka] [~~Krajíček, Pudlák~~]

LK: operates with sequents $\Gamma \longrightarrow \Delta$ (i.e. $\bigwedge_{\phi \in \Gamma} \phi \models \bigvee_{\psi \in \Delta} \psi$)

e.g.

$$\frac{\Gamma \longrightarrow \Delta, A \quad A, \Gamma \longrightarrow \Delta}{\Gamma \longrightarrow \Delta} \text{ (cut rule)}$$

Gentzen's sequent systems: [Cook, Morioka] [~~Krajíček, Pudlák~~]

LK: operates with sequents $\Gamma \longrightarrow \Delta$ (i.e. $\bigwedge_{\phi \in \Gamma} \phi \models \bigvee_{\psi \in \Delta} \psi$)
e.g.

$$\frac{\Gamma \longrightarrow \Delta, A \quad A, \Gamma \longrightarrow \Delta}{\Gamma \longrightarrow \Delta} \text{ (cut rule)}$$

G: LK + QBFs in sequents and quantification rules

$$\frac{\phi(x/\psi), \Gamma \longrightarrow \Delta}{\forall x \phi, \Gamma \longrightarrow \Delta} (\forall\text{-l}) \quad \frac{\Gamma \longrightarrow \Delta, \phi(x/p)}{\Gamma \longrightarrow \Delta, \forall x \phi} (\forall\text{-r})$$

$$\frac{\phi(x/p), \Gamma \longrightarrow \Delta}{\exists x \phi, \Gamma \longrightarrow \Delta} (\exists\text{-l}) \quad \frac{\Gamma \longrightarrow \Delta, \phi(x/\psi)}{\Gamma \longrightarrow \Delta, \exists x \phi} (\exists\text{-r})$$

for quantifier-free formulas ψ

Gentzen's sequent systems: [Cook, Morioka] [~~Krajíček, Pudlák~~]

LK: operates with sequents $\Gamma \longrightarrow \Delta$ (i.e. $\bigwedge_{\phi \in \Gamma} \phi \models \bigvee_{\psi \in \Delta} \psi$)
e.g.

$$\frac{\Gamma \longrightarrow \Delta, A \quad A, \Gamma \longrightarrow \Delta}{\Gamma \longrightarrow \Delta} \text{ (cut rule)}$$

G: LK + QBFs in sequents and quantification rules

$$\frac{\phi(x/\psi), \Gamma \longrightarrow \Delta}{\forall x \phi, \Gamma \longrightarrow \Delta} (\forall\text{-l}) \quad \frac{\Gamma \longrightarrow \Delta, \phi(x/p)}{\Gamma \longrightarrow \Delta, \forall x \phi} (\forall\text{-r})$$

$$\frac{\phi(x/p), \Gamma \longrightarrow \Delta}{\exists x \phi, \Gamma \longrightarrow \Delta} (\exists\text{-l}) \quad \frac{\Gamma \longrightarrow \Delta, \phi(x/\psi)}{\Gamma \longrightarrow \Delta, \exists x \phi} (\exists\text{-r})$$

for quantifier-free formulas ψ

G₁: G with cut formulas of the form $\exists x A(x, y)$ for propositional A

Gentzen's sequent systems: [Cook, Morioka] [~~Krajíček, Pudlák~~]

LK: operates with sequents $\Gamma \longrightarrow \Delta$ (i.e. $\bigwedge_{\phi \in \Gamma} \phi \models \bigvee_{\psi \in \Delta} \psi$)
e.g.

$$\frac{\Gamma \longrightarrow \Delta, A \quad A, \Gamma \longrightarrow \Delta}{\Gamma \longrightarrow \Delta} \text{ (cut rule)}$$

G: LK + QBFs in sequents and quantification rules

$$\frac{\phi(x/\psi), \Gamma \longrightarrow \Delta}{\forall x \phi, \Gamma \longrightarrow \Delta} (\forall\text{-l}) \quad \frac{\Gamma \longrightarrow \Delta, \phi(x/p)}{\Gamma \longrightarrow \Delta, \forall x \phi} (\forall\text{-r})$$

$$\frac{\phi(x/p), \Gamma \longrightarrow \Delta}{\exists x \phi, \Gamma \longrightarrow \Delta} (\exists\text{-l}) \quad \frac{\Gamma \longrightarrow \Delta, \phi(x/\psi)}{\Gamma \longrightarrow \Delta, \exists x \phi} (\exists\text{-r})$$

for quantifier-free formulas ψ

G_1 : G with cut formulas of the form $\exists x A(x, y)$ for propositional A

G_0 : G but cut formulas are propositional

Gentzen's sequent systems: [Cook, Morioka] [~~Krajíček, Pudlák~~]

LK: operates with sequents $\Gamma \longrightarrow \Delta$ (i.e. $\bigwedge_{\phi \in \Gamma} \phi \models \bigvee_{\psi \in \Delta} \psi$)
e.g.

$$\frac{\Gamma \longrightarrow \Delta, A \quad A, \Gamma \longrightarrow \Delta}{\Gamma \longrightarrow \Delta} \text{ (cut rule)}$$

G: LK + QBFs in sequents and quantification rules

$$\frac{\phi(x/\psi), \Gamma \longrightarrow \Delta}{\forall x \phi, \Gamma \longrightarrow \Delta} (\forall\text{-l}) \quad \frac{\Gamma \longrightarrow \Delta, \phi(x/p)}{\Gamma \longrightarrow \Delta, \forall x \phi} (\forall\text{-r})$$

$$\frac{\phi(x/p), \Gamma \longrightarrow \Delta}{\exists x \phi, \Gamma \longrightarrow \Delta} (\exists\text{-l}) \quad \frac{\Gamma \longrightarrow \Delta, \phi(x/\psi)}{\Gamma \longrightarrow \Delta, \exists x \phi} (\exists\text{-r})$$

for quantifier-free formulas ψ

G_1 : G with cut formulas of the form $\exists x A(x, y)$ for propositional A

G_0 : G but cut formulas are propositional

G_i^* : G_i with tree-like proofs

witnessing properties

[CM]

$\exists y A_n(x, y)$, where A_n is propositional, have p-size G_1^* proofs

\Rightarrow

$\exists f \in P/\text{poly}$ s.t. $A_n(x, f(x))$

witnessing properties

[CM]

$\exists y A_n(x, y)$, where A_n is propositional, have p-size G_1^* proofs
 \Rightarrow
 $\exists f \in P/poly$ s.t. $A_n(x, f(x))$

[CM]

$\exists y A_n(x, y)$, where A_n is propositional, have p-size G_0 proofs
 \Rightarrow
 $\exists f \in NC^1$ s.t. $A_n(x, f(x))$

witnessing properties

[CM]

$\exists y A_n(x, y)$, where A_n is propositional, have p-size G_1^* proofs
 \Rightarrow
 $\exists f \in P/poly$ s.t. $A_n(x, f(x))$

[CM]

$\exists y A_n(x, y)$, where A_n is propositional, have p-size G_0 proofs
 \Rightarrow
 $\exists f \in NC^1$ s.t. $A_n(x, f(x))$

[BBC]

$\exists y A_n(x, y)$ have p-size $EF + \forall red$ proofs
 \Rightarrow
 $\exists f \in P/poly$ s.t. $A_n(x, f(x))$

Separations

$NP \not\subseteq P/poly \Rightarrow \exists$ formulas with p -size G_1 proofs but no p -size $EF + \forall$ red proofs

Separations

$NP \not\subseteq P/poly \Rightarrow \exists$ formulas with p -size G_1 proofs but no p -size $EF + \forall$ red proofs

'take $f \notin P/poly$ s.t. $T_2^1 \vdash \exists y f(x) = y$ '

Separations

$NP \not\subseteq P/poly \Rightarrow \exists$ formulas easy for G_0^* but hard for $EF + \forall red$

Separations

$NP \not\subseteq P/poly \Rightarrow \exists$ formulas easy for G_0^* but hard for $EF + \forall red$

$P/poly \not\subseteq NC^1 \Rightarrow \exists$ formulas easy for $EF + \forall red$ but hard for G_0

Separations

$NP \not\subseteq P/poly \Rightarrow \exists$ formulas easy for G_0^* but hard for $EF + \forall red$

$P/poly \not\subseteq NC^1 \Rightarrow \exists$ formulas easy for $EF + \forall red$ but hard for G_0

Simulations

G_1^* p-simulates $EF + \forall red$

i.e. if ϕ has an $EF + \forall red$ -proof π , it has also a G_1^* proof $f(|\pi|)$
for a poly-time function f

Separations

$NP \not\subseteq P/poly \Rightarrow \exists$ formulas easy for G_0^* but hard for $EF + \forall red$

$P/poly \not\subseteq NC^1 \Rightarrow \exists$ formulas easy for $EF + \forall red$ but hard for G_0

Simulations

G_1^* p-simulates $EF + \forall red$

i.e. if ϕ has an $EF + \forall red$ -proof π , it has also a G_1^* proof $f(|\pi|)$
for a poly-time function f

Open problem: G_0^* p-simulates Frege + $\forall red$?

Formalized strategy extraction

Given an EF + \forall red proof π of a QBF

$$\forall x_1 \exists y_1 \dots \forall x_n \exists y_n \phi(x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_n)$$

we can construct in $poly(|\pi|)$ -time an EF proof of

$$\bigwedge_{i=1}^n (y_i = C_i(x_1, \dots, x_i, y_1, \dots, y_{i-1})) \rightarrow \phi(x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_n)$$

for some circuits C_i .

Formalized strategy extraction

Given an $EF + \forall\text{red}$ proof π of a QBF

$$\forall x_1 \exists y_1 \dots \forall x_n \exists y_n \phi(x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_n)$$

we can construct in $\text{poly}(|\pi|)$ -time an EF proof of

$$\bigwedge_{i=1}^n (y_i = C_i(x_1, \dots, x_i, y_1, \dots, y_{i-1})) \rightarrow \phi(x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_n)$$

for some circuits C_i .

Applications:

Simulations (mentioned before)

Normal forms of $EF + \forall\text{red}$ proofs

Correspondence to intuitionistic theories

Normal forms of EF + \forall red proofs

'Start with EF derivation and finish with \forall red rules'

Normal forms of EF + \forall red proofs

'Start with EF derivation and finish with \forall red rules'

To refute

$$\exists x_1 \forall y_1 \dots \exists x_n \forall y_n \neg \phi(x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_n)$$

Start with $\neg \phi$ and derive in EF

$$\bigvee_{i=1}^n (y_i \neq C_i(x_1, \dots, x_i, y_1, \dots, y_{i-1}))$$

Then apply \forall red to replace y_i 's by $C_i(x_1, \dots, x_i, y_1, \dots, y_{i-1})$ and derive \emptyset

Normal forms of EF + \forall red proofs

'Start with EF derivation and finish with \forall red rules'

To refute

$$\exists x_1 \forall y_1 \dots \exists x_n \forall y_n \neg \phi(x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_n)$$

Start with $\neg \phi$ and derive in EF

$$\bigvee_{i=1}^n (y_i \neq C_i(x_1, \dots, x_i, y_1, \dots, y_{i-1}))$$

Then apply \forall red to replace y_i 's by $C_i(x_1, \dots, x_i, y_1, \dots, y_{i-1})$ and derive \emptyset

EF + \forall red p-equivalent to EF + \forall red_{0,1}

Normal forms of EF + \forall red proofs

'Start with EF derivation and finish with \forall red rules'

To refute

$$\exists x_1 \forall y_1 \dots \exists x_n \forall y_n \neg \phi(x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_n)$$

Start with $\neg \phi$ and derive in EF

$$\bigvee_{i=1}^n (y_i \neq C_i(x_1, \dots, x_i, y_1, \dots, y_{i-1}))$$

Then apply \forall red to replace y_i 's by $C_i(x_1, \dots, x_i, y_1, \dots, y_{i-1})$ and derive \emptyset

EF + \forall red p-equivalent to EF + \forall red_{0,1}

$$C_n(x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_{n-1}) \neq 0/1 \vee \bigvee_{i=1}^{n-1} (y_i \neq C_i(x_1, \dots, x_i, y_1, \dots, y_{i-1}))$$

First-order theories

[Buss]

$$S_2^1 - L = \{ 0, S, +, \cdot, \leq, \lfloor \frac{x}{2} \rfloor, |x|, \# \}$$

First-order theories

[Buss]

$$S_2^1 - L = \{ 0, S, +, \cdot, \leq, \lfloor \frac{x}{2} \rfloor, |x|, \# \}$$

$|x| \sim$ 'the length of the binary representation of x '

$$x\#y = 2^{|x| \cdot |y|}$$

First-order theories

[Buss]

$$S_2^1 - L = \{ 0, S, +, \cdot, \leq, \lfloor \frac{x}{2} \rfloor, |x|, \# \}$$

$|x| \sim$ 'the length of the binary representation of x '

$$x\#y = 2^{|x| \cdot |y|}$$

Axioms: for symbols in L

First-order theories

[Buss]

$$S_2^1 - L = \{ 0, S, +, \cdot, \leq, \lfloor \frac{x}{2} \rfloor, |x|, \# \}$$

$|x| \sim$ 'the length of the binary representation of x '

$$x\#y = 2^{|x| \cdot |y|}$$

Axioms: for symbols in L

polynomial induction: for Σ_1^b -formulas A

$$A(0) \wedge \forall x \left(A\left(\left\lfloor \frac{x}{2} \right\rfloor\right) \rightarrow A(x) \right) \rightarrow \forall x A(x)$$

First-order theories

[Buss]

$$S_2^1 - L = \{0, S, +, \cdot, \leq, \lfloor \frac{x}{2} \rfloor, |x|, \#\}$$

$|x| \sim$ 'the length of the binary representation of x '

$$x\#y = 2^{|x| \cdot |y|}$$

Axioms: for symbols in L

polynomial induction: for Σ_1^b -formulas A

$$A(0) \wedge \forall x \left(A\left(\left\lfloor \frac{x}{2} \right\rfloor\right) \rightarrow A(x) \right) \rightarrow \forall x A(x)$$

[Buss] $S_2^1 \vdash \exists y A(x, y)$ for Σ_1^b -formula $A \Rightarrow \exists$ p-time f s.t. $A(x, f(x))$

First-order theories

[Buss]

$$S_2^1 - L = \{0, S, +, \cdot, \leq, \lfloor \frac{x}{2} \rfloor, |x|, \#\}$$

$|x| \sim$ 'the length of the binary representation of x '

$$x\#y = 2^{|x| \cdot |y|}$$

Axioms: for symbols in L

polynomial induction: for Σ_1^b -formulas A

$$A(0) \wedge \forall x \left(A\left(\left\lfloor \frac{x}{2} \right\rfloor\right) \rightarrow A(x) \right) \rightarrow \forall x A(x)$$

[Buss] $S_2^1 \vdash \exists y A(x, y)$ for Σ_1^b -formula $A \Rightarrow \exists$ p-time f s.t. $A(x, f(x))$

[Buss] [Cook, Urquhart]

$IS_2^1 - S_2^1$ but with

intuitionistic logic

polynomial induction for Σ_1^{b+} formulas (no \rightarrow or \neg signs)

First-order theories

[Buss]

$$S_2^1 - L = \{ 0, S, +, \cdot, \leq, \lfloor \frac{x}{2} \rfloor, |x|, \# \}$$

$|x| \sim$ 'the length of the binary representation of x '

$$x \# y = 2^{|x| \cdot |y|}$$

Axioms: for symbols in L

polynomial induction: for Σ_1^b -formulas A

$$A(0) \wedge \forall x \left(A\left(\left\lfloor \frac{x}{2} \right\rfloor\right) \rightarrow A(x) \right) \rightarrow \forall x A(x)$$

[Buss] $S_2^1 \vdash \exists y A(x, y)$ for Σ_1^b -formula $A \Rightarrow \exists$ p-time f s.t. $A(x, f(x))$

[Buss] [Cook, Urquhart]

$IS_2^1 - S_2^1$ but with

intuitionistic logic

polynomial induction for Σ_1^{b+} formulas (no \rightarrow or \neg signs)

[Buss] $IS_2^1 \vdash \exists y A(x, y) \Rightarrow \exists$ p-time f s.t. $A(x, f(x))$

First-order theories vs propositional

first order statement

$T(x)$

\mapsto

QBF formulas

$T_1(x), T_2(x), \dots$

First-order theories vs propositional

first order statement

$$T(x)$$

\mapsto

QBF formulas

$$T_1(x), T_2(x), \dots$$

$$\forall x T(x) \leftrightarrow \forall n \forall x, |x| = n T(x)$$

First-order theories vs propositional

first order statement

$$T(x)$$

\mapsto

QBF formulas

$$T_1(x), T_2(x), \dots$$

$$\forall x T(x) \leftrightarrow \forall n \forall x, |x| = n T(x)$$

$$\forall x, |x| = n T(x) \leftrightarrow \forall x \text{ 'quantifiers' 'open formula'}$$

First-order theories vs propositional

first order statement

$$T(x)$$

\mapsto

QBF formulas

$$T_1(x), T_2(x), \dots$$

$$\forall x T(x) \leftrightarrow \forall n \forall x, |x| = n T(x)$$

$$\forall x, |x| = n T(x) \leftrightarrow \forall x \text{ 'quantifiers' 'open formula'}$$

S_2^1 corresponds to G_1^*

$$S_2^1 \vdash T \Rightarrow \exists \text{ p-size } G_1^* \text{ proofs of } T_n$$

First-order theories vs propositional

first order statement $T(x)$ \mapsto QBF formulas $T_1(x), T_2(x), \dots$

$\forall x T(x) \leftrightarrow \forall n \forall x, |x| = n T(x)$
 $\forall x, |x| = n T(x) \leftrightarrow \forall x$ 'quantifiers' 'open formula'

S_2^1 corresponds to G_1^*

$S_2^1 \vdash T \Rightarrow \exists$ p-size G_1^* proofs of T_n

IS_2^1 corresponds to $EF + \forall\text{red}$

$IS_2^1 \vdash T \Rightarrow \exists$ p-size $EF + \forall\text{red}$ proofs of T_n

$IS_2^1 \vdash$ 'EF + $\forall\text{red}$ is sound'

Circuit and proof complexity united

\exists formulas with no p-size EF + \forall red proofs

\Leftrightarrow

PSPACE $\not\subseteq$ P/poly or \exists formulas with no p-size EF proofs

Circuit and proof complexity united

\exists formulas with no p -size EF + \forall red proofs

\Leftrightarrow

PSPACE $\not\subseteq$ P/poly or \exists formulas with no p -size EF proofs

ϕ_n hard formulas for EF + \forall red \wedge PSPACE \subseteq P/poly

\Rightarrow

ϕ_n are equivalent to hard tautologies

Thank You