

Complexity of the Model Checking problem for inquisitive propositional and modal logic

Gianluca Grilletti¹ and Ivano Ciardelli²

¹Munich Center for Mathematical Philosophy

²University of Padua

April 1, 2024

1 Introduction

The aim of this paper is to study the complexity of the *model checking problem* MC for *inquisitive propositional logic* InqB and for *inquisitive modal logic* InqM , that is, the problem of deciding whether a given finite structure for the logic satisfies a given formula.¹ In particular, we prove that both problems are AP-complete.

Inquisitive logics are a family of formalisms that extend classical and non-classical logic to encompass *questions*. Traditionally, logic is concerned with *statements*, that is, expressions completely determined by their *truth-conditions*. The standard approaches to semantics are based on this assumption and are usually formulated in terms of truth-assignment (e.g., *Boolean valuations* in propositional logic). However, this semantical approach does not allow us to study expressions whose meaning is *not* determined in terms of truth-conditions, such as *questions*.

In order to interpret questions, which are not true or false, the semantics of *Inquisitive logic* is based on a relation called *support* between *information states* and a sentence. This allows to give a uniform semantic account for statement and questions alike: an information state *supports* a statement if it *implies* the statement; and it *supports* a question if it *resolves* the question.

The particular instances of inquisitive logic we consider in this paper are InqB and InqM , extending propositional logic and modal logic respectively with the question-forming operators. In these systems information states are formalized

Gefördert durch die Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG), Projektnummer 446711878. Funded by the German Research Foundation (DFG), project number 446711878.

¹In the terminology introduced by Vardi in [8], this is the so-called *combined complexity* for the model checking problem.

as *sets of truth-assignments*, which gives us a much richer semantical structure than in the classical setting. The main question we tackle in this paper is: how hard is it to *decide if a formula of InqB (resp., InqM) is supported by an information state in a given model?*

The problem of deciding whether a formula ϕ of a logic L is satisfied by a model \mathcal{M} is referred to as the *model checking problem for L* (in symbols $\text{MC}(L)$). The computational complexity of this problem is known for several logics (see, e.g., [4] for an overview of the classical results). In recent years, the problem has been addressed also for a class of logics called *team logics* which, like our inquisitive systems, are interpreted relative to sets of assignments (see, e.g., [5, 6] and [9, Ch. 7]).

Although there is a close connection between these logics and inquisitive logics, it was still an open question what are the complexities of $\text{MC}(\text{InqB})$ and $\text{MC}(\text{InqM})$.² In this paper we give a reduction of the PSPACE-complete problem *true quantified Boolean formulas* TQBF (see, e.g., [7, Ch. 8]) to $\text{MC}(\text{InqB})$, thus settling that both $\text{MC}(\text{InqB})$ and $\text{MC}(\text{InqM})$ are PSPACE-complete.

The paper is structured as follows: In Section 2 we present the basic notions of inquisitive logic used throughout the paper. In Section 3 we introduce suitable encodings of InqB and InqM structures and formalize the model checking problems $\text{MC}(\text{InqB})$ and $\text{MC}(\text{InqM})$. Moreover, in the same section we present an algorithm for *alternating Turing machines* to solve $\text{MC}(\text{InqM})$ and use it to show that $\text{MC}(\text{InqM})$ —and a fortiori also $\text{MC}(\text{InqBQ})$ —is in the class PSPACE. In Section 4 we present and study a polynomial-space reduction of the TQBF problem to the $\text{MC}(\text{InqB})$, thus showing that the problem is also PSPACE-hard, and we thus infer that $\text{MC}(\text{InqB})$ and $\text{MC}(\text{InqM})$ are both PSPACE-complete. We conclude in Section 5 with some remarks and directions for future work.

2 Preliminaries

In this section we recall some basic notions of inquisitive logic that we use throughout the paper. As an extended introduction on the topic of inquisitive logic we suggest [1]. As for computational complexity, we assume the reader to be already familiar with the basic notions on the topic (we refer to [7] for an introduction) and we limit ourselves to recall the main results used in the paper.

2.1 Inquisitive propositional and modal logic

Henceforth, we indicate with AP a fixed set of atomic propositions.

Definition 1 (Syntax of InqB and InqM). *The set of formulas of InqM—also called inquisitive modal formulas—is defined by the following grammar:*

$$\phi ::= \perp \mid p \mid \phi \wedge \phi \mid \phi \vee \phi \mid \phi \rightarrow \phi \mid \Box \phi \mid \boxplus \phi$$

²Both model checking problems have been investigated in [10] (unpublished), building up on previous work by Yang [6].

where $p \in \text{AP}$. The set of inquisitive (propositional) formulas InqB is the set of InqM formulas not containing the symbols \Box and \boxplus .

So the language of inquisitive logic is the standard language of modal logic extended with \vee and \boxplus . The operator \vee is called *inquisitive disjunction*, while \boxplus is the *window modality*. Additionally, we introduce the following standard shorthands:

$$\neg\phi := \phi \rightarrow \perp \qquad \phi \vee \psi := \neg(\neg\phi \wedge \neg\psi)$$

The role of \vee is to enhance the language of modal logic with *alternative questions*. For example, the formula $p \vee \neg p$ stands for the *natural language question* “does p hold (or not)?”. Instead, the derived operator \vee corresponds to the usual disjunction from propositional logic: for example, the expression $p \vee \neg p$ is intuitively interpreted as the *sentence* “ p holds or p does not hold”. We will show the formal difference in the interpretation of these two formulas after introducing the semantics of the logic.

The operator \boxplus plays the role of an *inquisitive modality*, sensitive to the inquisitive structures of the models. For example, in the context of epistemic logic (see, e.g., [3]) where the operator \Box is interpreted as *knowledge* of an abstract agent (e.g., $\Box p$ usually stands for “the agent knows that p ”), the operator \boxplus is roughly interpreted as a *wondering* operator, encoding what the agent wonders about (e.g., $\boxplus p$ stands for “the agent wonders whether p is the case”).

As pointed out in Section 1, the presence of questions requires to move from a semantics based on *truth-assignments* to one based on *information states*. To formalize this intuition, the logic employs special semantic structures, called *information models*.

Definition 2 (Information models). *An information model for InqB is a tuple of the form $\mathcal{M} = \langle W, V \rangle$ where W is a non-empty set (the worlds of the model) and $V : \text{AP} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(W)$ is a function called the valuation of the model.*

An information model for InqM is a tuple of the form $\mathcal{M} = \langle W, V, \Sigma \rangle$ where W and V are as before, and $\Sigma : W \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{P}(W))$ is a function called an inquisitive state map, satisfying the following conditions for every $w \in W$:

1. $\Sigma(w) \neq \emptyset$;
2. If $s \in \Sigma(w)$ and $t \subseteq s$, then $t \in \Sigma$.

We refer to the second condition as downward closure of $\Sigma(w)$.

An example of information model for InqM is depicted in Figure 1. Each world $w \in W$ is naturally associated with a *Boolean valuation* over AP , defined as

$$V_w(p) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } w \in V(p) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

So we can think of each world as providing a *complete description* of the current *state of affairs*. Under this interpretation, we can represent an information state as a *set of worlds*, that is, all the worlds *compatible* with the information state




Figure 1: A graphical representation of an information model for InqM over the set of atoms $AP = \{p_0, p_1\}$ and with set of worlds $W = \{w_0, w_1, w_2\}$. The valuation function V is represented by the colored rectangles in the first image: $V(p_0) = \{w_0, w_2\}$ (the red rectangle) and $V(p_1) = \{w_0, w_1\}$ (the blue rectangle). The map Σ is represented in the other images by depicting the maximal states of each $\Sigma(w)$ for $w \in W$. So for example $\Sigma(w_2) = \{\{w_0, w_1\}, \{w_0, w_2\}\}$, as depicted in the last image. Notice that to obtain a graphical representation of an information model for InqB, we require only the first image of the sequence, that is, a representation of the valuation function V .

considered. So for example, the information that “ p holds” can be represented as the set of worlds w that assign truth value 1 to p : $\{w \in W \mid V_w(p) = 1\} = V(p)$. In line with this intuition, henceforth we refer to a subset $s \subseteq W$ as an *information state* of the model. The semantics of the logic is then defined relative to a model *and* an information state.

Definition 3 (Semantics of InqM). *Let \mathcal{M} be an information and s an information state of the model. We define the semantic relation \models of InqM by the following inductive clauses:*

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{M}, s \models \perp & \iff s = \emptyset \\
\mathcal{M}, s \models p & \iff s \subseteq V(p) \iff \forall w \in s. V_w(p) = 1 \\
\mathcal{M}, s \models \phi \wedge \psi & \iff \mathcal{M}, s \models \phi \text{ and } \mathcal{M}, s \models \psi \\
\mathcal{M}, s \models \phi \vee \psi & \iff \mathcal{M}, s \models \phi \text{ or } \mathcal{M}, s \models \psi \\
\mathcal{M}, s \models \phi \rightarrow \psi & \iff \text{For all } t \subseteq s, \text{ if } \mathcal{M}, t \models \phi \text{ then } \mathcal{M}, t \models \psi \\
\mathcal{M}, s \models \Box\phi & \iff \text{For all } w \in s, \mathcal{M}, \bigcup \Sigma(w) \models \phi \\
\mathcal{M}, s \models \boxplus\phi & \iff \text{For all } t \in \Sigma[s], \mathcal{M}, t \models \phi
\end{aligned}$$

If $\mathcal{M}, s \models \phi$ we say that s supports ϕ .

Intuitively, an information state s supports a formula ϕ if the information represented by s *implies the statement represented by ϕ* or *resolves the question represented by ϕ* . For example, consider the formula $p \vee \neg p$ representing the question “Does p hold?”. The support conditions for this formula are:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{M}, s \models p \vee \neg p & \iff \mathcal{M}, s \models p \text{ or } \mathcal{M}, s \models \neg p \\
& \iff (\forall w \in s. V_w(p) = 1) \text{ or } (\forall w \in s. V_w(p) = 0)
\end{aligned}$$

So a state s supports the formula $p \vee \neg p$ if *either* all the worlds in s agree on

p being true *or* all the worlds in s agree on p being false. That is, if we have enough information to *either* affirm that p holds *or* affirm that p does not hold.

We conclude the Section with a proposition, exhibiting two fundamental properties of the semantics.

Proposition 4. *Let ϕ be a formula of the language and \mathcal{M} be a model.*

(Empty state) $\mathcal{M}, \emptyset \models \phi$.

(Persistency) *For every $s \subseteq t \subseteq W$, if $\mathcal{M}, s \models \phi$ then $\mathcal{M}, t \models \phi$.*

3 Encoding and model checking algorithm

Henceforth, we limit ourselves to work with finite sets of atomic propositions and with finite models (i.e., with models with finitely many worlds). Throughout the section, we will use the following ad-hoc notations for ease of presentation:

- The vocabulary consists of the atomic propositions $\text{AP} = \{p_0, \dots, p_{l-1}\}$, thus l is the number of atomic propositions;
- The set of worlds is $W = \{w_0, \dots, w_{n-1}\}$, thus n is the number of worlds in the model;
- The state map is $\Sigma(w_i) = \{S_0^i, \dots, S_{k_i-1}^i\}$ for every $w_i \in W$;
- We define m as the “size” of the function Σ , that is, the value

$$m = |\Sigma(w_0)| + \dots + |\Sigma(w_{n-1})| = k_0 + \dots + k_{n-1}$$

Consider an information model. We define a natural way to encode this model by storing the propositional valuation in $n + 1$ binary strings as follows:

- The first string is δ of length nl . The $(li + j)^{\text{th}}$ bit of the string is $\delta_{li+j} = V_{w_i}(p_j)$. This representation allows to check conditions of the form $w_i \in V(p_j)$ in time linear in nl .
- The other strings are $\epsilon_0, \dots, \epsilon_{n-1}$. The string ϵ_k has length $(n + 1)k_k + 1$ and contains in order a digit 0, a binary representation of length n of S_0^k , a digit 0, a binary representation of length n of $S_1^k \dots$ and ends with a digit 1. This representation allows to check conditions of the form $w_i \in \bigcup \Sigma[s]$ in time linear in mn .

An example of encoding is given in Figure 2. Notice that to encode an information model for InqB we do not need to store the strings $\epsilon_0, \dots, \epsilon_{n-1}$, but just the string δ .

We use a similar representation for *information states*, encoded as strings of length n —where a 1 in position i indicates that the world w_i is part of the state. So, for example, the state $\{w_0, w_2\}$ in a model with worlds $\{w_0, w_1, w_2\}$

- Given a state s , we indicate with $\forall t \subseteq s$ that we are employing the universal states of the ATM to choose a subset $t \subseteq s$. In particular, the result yielded by the algorithm (relative to this non-deterministic branch of the computation) is **true** iff for all possible choices of t the algorithm yields **true**.
- Given a state s , we indicate with $\exists t \subseteq s$ that we are employing the existential states of the ATM to choose a subset $t \subseteq s$. In particular, the result yielded by the algorithm (relative to this non-deterministic branch of the computation) is **true** iff for at least one choice of t the algorithm yields **true**.

Both operations can be implemented in an ATM by choosing non-deterministically the bits of the representation of t . This amounts to $|s|$ non-deterministic choices, thus both operations have complexity in $\mathcal{O}(n)$.

```

1  Algorithm PosSem
2  Input:   $\mathcal{M}, s, \phi$ .
3  Output: true if  $[\mathcal{M}, s \models \phi]$ , false otherwise.
4
5  Match  $\phi$  with
6     $\phi = p_j$ :
7      define result := true
8      foreach i in  $\{0, \dots, n-1\}$ :
9        if  $w_i \in s$  and  $V_{w_i}(p_j) = 0$  then result := false
10     return result
11    $\phi = \psi \wedge \chi$ :
12     define result := PosSem( $\mathcal{M}, s, \psi$ ) and PosSem( $\mathcal{M}, s, \chi$ )
13     return result
14    $\phi = \psi \vee \chi$ :
15     define result := PosSem( $\mathcal{M}, s, \psi$ ) or PosSem( $\mathcal{M}, s, \chi$ )
16     return result
17    $\phi = \psi \rightarrow \chi$ :
18      $\forall t \subseteq s$ 
19     define result := NegSem( $\mathcal{M}, t, \psi$ ) or PosSem( $\mathcal{M}, t, \chi$ )
20     return result
21    $\phi = \Box\psi$ :
22     define result := true
23     foreach i in  $\{0, \dots, n-1\}$ :
24       if  $w_i \in s$  then:
25         define  $t := \bigcup \Sigma(w_i)$ 
26         if NegSem( $\mathcal{M}, t, \psi$ ) then result := false
27     return result
28    $\phi = \Box\psi$ :
29     define result := true
30     foreach i in  $\{0, \dots, n-1\}$ :
31       if  $w_i \in s$  then foreach  $t \in \Sigma(w)$ :
32         if NegSem( $\mathcal{M}, t, \psi$ ) then result := false
33     return result

```

```

1 Algorithm NegSem
2 Input:  $\mathcal{M}, s, \phi$ .
3 Output: true if  $[\mathcal{M}, s \models \phi]$ , true otherwise.
4
5 Match  $\phi$  with
6    $\phi = p_j$ :
7     return neg(PosSem( $\mathcal{M}, s, p_j$ ))
8    $\phi = \psi \wedge \chi$ :
9     define result := NegSem( $\mathcal{M}, s, \psi$ ) or NegSem( $\mathcal{M}, s, \chi$ )
10    return result
11   $\phi = \psi \vee \chi$ :
12    define result := NegSem( $\mathcal{M}, s, \psi$ ) and NegSem( $\mathcal{M}, s, \chi$ )
13    return result
14   $\phi = \psi \rightarrow \chi$ :
15     $\exists t \subseteq s$ 
16    define result := PosSem( $\mathcal{M}, t, \psi$ ) and NegSem( $\mathcal{M}, t, \chi$ )
17    return result
18   $\phi = \Box\psi$ :
19    define result := false
20    foreach i in  $\{0, \dots, n-1\}$ :
21      if  $w_i \in s$  then:
22        define  $t := \bigcup \Sigma(w_i)$ 
23        if NegSem( $\mathcal{M}, t, \psi$ ) then result := true
24    return result
25   $\phi = \Box\psi$ :
26    define result := false
27    foreach i in  $\{0, \dots, n-1\}$ :
28      if  $w_i \in s$  then foreach  $t \in \Sigma(w_i)$ :
29        if NegSem( $\mathcal{M}, t, \psi$ ) then result := true
30    return result

```

Both algorithms work as intended, as proved in the following proposition.

Proposition 5. *Let \mathcal{M} be an information model, s an information state of \mathcal{M} and ϕ an inquisitive formula.*

- PosSem with inputs \mathcal{M}, s, ϕ returns as output *true* iff $\mathcal{M}, s \models \phi$.
- NegSem with inputs \mathcal{M}, s, ϕ returns as output *true* iff $\mathcal{M}, s \not\models \phi$.

Proof. The proof proceeds by induction on the structure of the formula ϕ . The cases for conjunction and disjunction are a direct translation of the semantic clauses (or their contrapositive conditions), so we comment only the cases for atomic proposition, implication and modalities.

- **Case $\phi = p_j$ in PosSem:** The pseudo-code for this case consists of the following lines:

```

7 define result := true
8 foreach i in  $\{0, \dots, n-1\}$ :
9   if  $w_i \in s$  and  $V_{w_i}(p_j) = 0$  then result := false
10 return result

```

The variable **result** (the output of this portion of code) is initially assigned value **true** (line 7) and this value may be updated to **false** in the **foreach**-loop (lines 8-9).

Firstly assume that $\mathcal{M}, s \models p_j$, i.e., for every $w_i \in s$ we have $V_{w_i}(p_j) = 1$. In this case, the condition of the **if-then** expression at line 17 (**if** $w_i \in s$ **and** $V_{w_i}(p_j) = 0$) is never satisfied, thus the variable **result** maintains the value **true**, and the algorithm returns the correct value **true** (line 10).

Secondly assume that $\mathcal{M}, s \not\models p_j$, i.e., there exists $w_i \in s$ for which $V_{w_i}(p_j) = 0$. In this case, the condition of the **if-then** expression at line 17 is satisfied for w_i , thus the variable **result** is assigned value **false**, and the algorithm returns the correct value **false** (line 10).

- **Case $\phi = p_j$ in NegSem:** The pseudo-code for this case consists of the following lines:

```
7 return neg(PosSem( $\mathcal{M}, s, p_j$ ))
```

In this case the algorithm returns the Boolean negation of the output of $\text{PosSem}(\mathcal{M}, s, p_j)$. That is, the algorithm returns **true** if $\mathcal{M}, s \not\models p_j$ and it returns **false** if $\mathcal{M}, s \models p_j$, which is the expected behavior.

- **Case $\phi = \psi \rightarrow \chi$ in PosSem:** The pseudo-code for this case consists of the following lines:

```
15  $\forall t \subseteq s$ 
16 define result := NegSem( $\mathcal{M}, t, \psi$ ) or PosSem( $\mathcal{M}, t, \chi$ )
17 return result
```

Translating the algorithm in mathematical expressions and applying the inductive hypothesis, this piece of code returns the Boolean value corresponding to the following expression:

$$\forall t \subseteq s. [\mathcal{M}, t \not\models \psi \text{ or } \mathcal{M}, t \models \chi],$$

which is exactly the semantic clause for $\mathcal{M}, s \models \psi \rightarrow \chi$.

- **Case $\phi = \psi \rightarrow \chi$ in NegSem:** The pseudo-code for this case consists of the following lines:

```
15  $\exists t \subseteq s$ 
16 define result := PosSem( $\mathcal{M}, t, \psi$ ) and NegSem( $\mathcal{M}, t, \chi$ )
17 return result
```

Translating the algorithm in mathematical expressions and applying the inductive hypothesis, this piece of code returns the Boolean value corresponding to the following expression:

$$\exists t \subseteq s. [\mathcal{M}, t \models \psi \text{ and } \mathcal{M}, t \not\models \chi]$$

which is equivalent to the following expression, that is, the semantic condition corresponding to $\mathcal{M}, s \not\models \psi \rightarrow \chi$:

$$\neg(\forall t \subseteq s. [\mathcal{M}, t \not\models \psi \text{ or } \mathcal{M}, t \models \chi])$$

- **Case $\phi = \Box\psi$ in PosSem:** The pseudo-code for this case consists of the following lines:

```

22 define result := true
23 foreach i in {0,...,n-1}:
24     if  $w_i \in s$  then:
25         define  $t := \bigcup \Sigma(w_i)$ 
26         if NegSem( $\mathcal{M}, t, \psi$ ) then result := false
27 return result

```

The variable **result** (the output of this portion of code) is initially assigned value **true** (line 22) and the value is updated to **false** in the **foreach**-loop only if there exists $w_i \in s$ such that $\text{NegSem}(\mathcal{M}, \bigcup \Sigma(w_i), \psi)$ (lines 23-26). Applying the inductive hypothesis, the piece of code returns the Boolean value corresponding to the following expression:

$$\forall w_i \in s. \mathcal{M}, \bigcup \Sigma(w_i) \models \psi$$

which is the semantic condition corresponding to $\mathcal{M}, s \models \Box\psi$.

- **Case $\phi = \Box\psi$ in NegSem:** The pseudo-code for this case consists of the following lines:

```

19 define result := true
20 foreach i in {0,...,n-1}:
21     if  $w_i \in s$  then:
22         define  $t := \bigcup \Sigma(w_i)$ 
23         if NegSem( $\mathcal{M}, t, \psi$ ) then result := false
24 return result

```

This portion of code is exactly the same as the portion for $\Box\psi$ in the algorithm **PosSem** (lines 22-27), but with the values assigned to the variable **result** reversed. Thus applying an analogous reasoning as in the previous point, the piece of code returns the Boolean value corresponding to the following expression:

$$\exists w_i \in s. \mathcal{M}, \bigcup \Sigma(w_i) \not\models \psi$$

which is the semantic condition corresponding to $\mathcal{M}, s \not\models \Box\psi$.

- **Case $\phi = \boxplus\psi$ in PosSem:** The pseudo-code for this case consists of the following lines:

```

29 define result := true
30 foreach i in {0,...,n-1}:
31     if  $w_i \in s$  then foreach  $t \in \Sigma(w)$ :
32         if NegSem( $\mathcal{M}, t, \psi$ ) then result := false
33 return result

```

The variable **result** (the output of this portion of code) is initially assigned value **true** (line 29) and this value may be updated to **false** in the

foreach-loop in case $\text{NegSem}(\mathcal{M}, t, \psi)$ holds for some $t \in \bigcup \Sigma[s]$ (lines 30-32). Translating this condition in mathematical formulas, this corresponds to the following expression:

$$\forall t \in \Sigma[s]. \mathcal{M}, t \models \psi$$

which is the semantic condition corresponding to $\mathcal{M}, s \models \boxplus \psi$.

- **Case $\phi = \boxplus \psi$ in NegSem :** The pseudo-code for this case consists of the following lines:

```

26  define result := true
27  foreach i in {0, ..., n-1}:
28      if  $w_i \in s$  then:
29          define  $t := \bigcup \Sigma(w_i)$ 
30          if  $\text{NegSem}(\mathcal{M}, t, \psi)$  then result := false
31  return result

```

This portion of code is exactly the same as the portion for $\boxplus \psi$ in the algorithm PosSem (lines 29-33), but with the values assigned to the variable **result** reversed. Thus applying an analogous reasoning as in the previous point, the piece of code returns the Boolean value corresponding to the following expression:

$$\exists t \in \Sigma[s]. \mathcal{M}, t \not\models \psi$$

which is the semantic condition corresponding to $\mathcal{M}, s \not\models \boxplus \psi$.

□

We leave to the eager reader the task to show that both algorithms have complexity $\mathcal{O}((n(l+m))^2 \cdot |\phi|)$, where $|\phi|$ denotes the size of the encoding of the formula ϕ . Since the input consists of an encoding of the model together with an encoding of the formula (plus overhead), the size of the input is linear in $t = n(l+m) + |\phi|$. So the previous analysis shows that the problems $\text{MC}(\text{InqM})$ and $\overline{\text{MC}}(\text{InqM})$ both lie in $\text{ATIME}(t^3) \subseteq \text{PSPACE}$.⁴

Theorem 6. *The problems $\text{MC}(\text{InqM})$ and $\overline{\text{MC}}(\text{InqM})$ are in PSPACE.*

4 Complexity of Model Checking for InqB

In this section we provide a polynomial reduction of the PSPACE-complete problem TQBF (the set of *true quantified Boolean formulas*) to $\text{MC}(\text{InqB})$. Combined with the results from the previous section, this shows that $\text{MC}(\text{InqB})$ and $\text{MC}(\text{InqM})$ are PSPACE-complete problems. Moreover, since the problem $\text{MC}(\text{InqB})$ trivially reduces to $\overline{\text{MC}}(\text{InqB})$, this suffices to show that also $\overline{\text{MC}}(\text{InqB})$ and $\overline{\text{MC}}(\text{InqM})$ are also PSPACE-complete. Since we are working with the logic InqB, we will work only with models for InqB (recall that we introduced the graphical representation of these models in Figure 1).

⁴Recall that $\text{PSPACE} = \text{AP} := \bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \text{ATIME}(t^i)$ (see [7, Th. 10.21]).




Figure 3: The switching model \mathcal{S}_l . The circles represent the worlds of the model (w_1^+, w_1^-, \dots) . The extension of the atomic propositions is depicted by the colored rectangles (in green the atoms p_i , in blue the atoms q_i). For example, the set $V_l(p_2) = \{w_2^+\}$ corresponds to the second (from the left) green rectangle.

The section is divided in several parts. Firstly we introduce the family of *switching models* and show how to use them to encode Boolean valuations.⁵ Secondly, we introduce some special formulas, later used to encode an instance of the TQBF problem (i.e., a quantified Boolean sentence) into an instance of MC(InqB). These formulas allow to simulate the steps of a non-deterministic search to solve the TQBF problem. Thirdly, we employ the formulas previously defined to define the encoding and show that it is a reduction of the TQBF problem into the MC(InqB) problem. Finally, we show that the encoding proposed is polynomially bounded in size, thus proving that it preserves PSPACE-hardness.

4.1 Switching models

We introduce *switching models*, a family of inquisitive models. These models allows us to encode Boolean valuations as information states. These models were originally employed in [5] and later in [9, Ch. 7] to study the model checking problem for different team semantics.

Definition 7 (Switching model). *Given $l \in \mathbb{N}$ a positive natural number, we define the model $\mathcal{S}_l = \langle W_l, V_l \rangle$ over the set of propositional atoms $\{p_0, \dots, p_{l-1}, q_0, \dots, q_{l-1}\}$ by the following clauses:*

- $W_l = \{w_0^+, w_0^-, w_1^+, w_1^-, \dots, w_{l-1}^+, w_{l-1}^-\}$;
- $V_l(p_i) = \{w_i^+\}$;
- $V_l(q_i) = \{w_i^+, w_i^-\}$.

A representation of a switching model is depicted in Figure 3. For a fixed switching model \mathcal{S}_l , we define special states to encode Boolean valuations over

⁵We remark here that we use the terminology *Boolean valuations* to indicate functions with codomain $\{0, 1\}$, not to be confused with the valuation of an information model.

the set of atoms $\text{AP}_k := \{x_0, \dots, x_{k-1}\}$ for $k \leq l$: we will call these states *k-switchings*.⁶

Definition 8. Consider a number $k \leq l$. A *k-switching* of \mathcal{S}_l is an information state s with the following two properties:

- For every $i < k$, s contains exactly one world among w_i^+ and w_i^- ;
- For every i with $k \leq i < l$, s contains both w_i^+ and w_i^- .

Two examples of switchings are depicted in Figure 4. Notice that there exists only one 0-switching, that is, the info state W_l . There is a natural correspondence between *k-switchings* of \mathcal{S}_l and Boolean valuations over AP_k . Given a *Boolean valuation* $\sigma : \text{AP}_k \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$, we define the corresponding *k-switching* s_σ by the following clauses (for $i < k$):

$$\begin{aligned} w_i^+ \in s_\sigma &\iff \sigma(x_i) = 1 \\ w_i^- \in s_\sigma &\iff \sigma(x_i) = 0 \end{aligned}$$

This correspondence also holds for the particular case of $k = 0$: the set AP_0 is empty, so there is only one valuation over this set (the empty function); and the only 0-switching of \mathcal{S}_l is W_l , the set of all worlds of the model.

Let us also highlight the following properties, which will come in handy to later define the encoding of a quantified Boolean formula. For $i \leq k$ we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma(x_i) = 1 &\iff s_\sigma \models q_i \rightarrow p_i \\ \sigma(x_i) = 0 &\iff s_\sigma \models q_i \rightarrow \neg p_i \end{aligned}$$

This map from Boolean valuations σ to *k-switchings* s_σ is bijective. Its inverse $s \mapsto \sigma_s$ is defined by the following two equivalent conditions:

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_s(x_i) = 1 &\iff w_i^+ \in s \\ \sigma_s(x_i) = 0 &\iff w_i^- \in s \end{aligned}$$

4.2 Some special formulas

We now introduce several formulas that will help us in our endeavors. Each of these formulas has a characteristic semantics when interpreted on the switching model \mathcal{S}_l .

$$C_k^+ := q_k \wedge p_k \quad \text{and} \quad C_k^- := q_k \wedge \neg p_k \quad \text{for } 0 \leq k < l \quad (1)$$

These two formulas characterize the singleton states $\{w_k^+\}$ and $\{w_k^-\}$ respectively. A depiction of their semantics is given in Figure 5.

$$D_k := q_k \rightarrow ?p_k \quad \text{for } 0 \leq k < l \quad (2)$$

The maximal states satisfying D_k are depicted in Figure 6. We give a short proof that this is indeed their semantics.

⁶Notice that we are using two distinct families of propositional atoms: the p_i s and q_i s are the atoms evaluated on the switching model, while the x_i s (the elements of AP_k) are the atoms used to define the Boolean valuations encode by information states.




Figure 4: A 4-switching s (on the left) and a 2-switching t (on the right) over the model \mathcal{S}_4 . s corresponds to the Boolean valuation $\sigma : \text{AP}_4 \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ defined as $\sigma(x_0) = 1, \sigma(x_1) = 0, \sigma(x_2) = 1$ and $\sigma(x_3) = 1$. t corresponds to the Boolean valuation $\tau : \text{AP}_2 \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ defined as $\tau(x_0) = 1$ and $\tau(x_1) = 0$.




Figure 5: Semantics of C_k^+ and C_k^- .

Lemma 9. *Let s be a state of \mathcal{S}_l . Then the maximal substates of s satisfying D_k are $t^+ = s_\sigma \setminus \{w_k^-\}$ and $t^- = s_\sigma \setminus \{w_k^+\}$.*

Proof. The only state of \mathcal{S}_l satisfying q_k and not satisfying $?p_k$ is $\{w_k^+, w_k^-\}$. So by definition of D_k for every $t \subseteq s$ we have that $\mathcal{S}_l, t \models D_k$ iff $\{w_k^+, w_k^-\} \not\subseteq t$. In particular, t^+ and t^- are the maximal substates of s with these property. \square




Figure 6: The two maximal states satisfying D_1 in the model \mathcal{S}_4 .

$$S_0 := \bigvee_{i=0}^{l-1} (\neg C_i^+ \vee \neg C_i^-) \quad (3)$$

$$S_k := \bigvee_{i=0}^{k-1} (\neg C_i^+ \wedge \neg C_i^-) \vee \bigvee_{i=k}^{l-1} (\neg C_i^+ \vee \neg C_i^-) \quad \text{for } 0 < k < l \quad (4)$$

$$S_l := \bigvee_{i=0}^{l-1} (\neg C_i^+ \wedge \neg C_i^-) \quad (5)$$

The semantics of the formulas S_k is more complex to describe, but we omit a thorough analysis since we only need the following technical lemma.

Lemma 10. *Let s be a k -switching of the model S_l . Then $S_l, s \not\models S_k$, but for every proper subset $t \subsetneq s$ it holds $S_l, t \models S_k$.*

Proof. Firstly, let us show that $s \not\models S_k$ (for ease of read, in the rest of the proof we will omit the model S_l). Since S_k is a disjunction, we just need to check that each disjunct is not satisfied at s .

- For $i < k$, by Definition 8 s contains exactly one world among w_i^+ and w_i^- . This means that $s \models C_i^+$ or $s \models C_i^-$. In either case we have $s \not\models \neg C_i^+ \wedge \neg C_i^-$.
- For $i \geq k$, by Definition 8 s contains both worlds w_i^+ and w_i^- . This means that $s \not\models \neg C_i^+$ (since it contains w_i^+) and $s \not\models \neg C_i^-$ (since it contains w_i^-). So we have $s \not\models \neg C_i^+ \vee \neg C_i^-$.

Since these are all the disjuncts of S_k , the formula is not satisfied at s .

Secondly, let us show that every $t \subsetneq s$ satisfies S_k . Since S_k is a disjunction, we just need to find a disjunct satisfied by t . And since the containment $t \subsetneq s$ is strict, there exists a world in w_i^e in s and not in t . We consider two cases, depending whether $i < k$ or $i \geq k$.

- If $i < k$, by Definition 8 t does not contain w_i^+ nor w_i^- (one of them was already missing from s). So $t \models \neg C_i^+ \vee \neg C_i^-$, which is a disjunct of S_k , thus $t \models S_k$.
- If $i \geq k$, by Definition 8 t contains exactly one among w_i^+ and w_i^- (s being a k -switching contains both of them). This means that either $t \models \neg C_i^+$ (if $w_i^+ \notin t$) or $t \models \neg C_i^-$ (if $w_i^- \notin t$). In both cases we have $t \models \neg C_i^+ \vee \neg C_i^-$, which is a disjunct of S_k , thus $t \models S_k$.

So it follows that $t \models S_k$, as desired. \square

4.3 The translation

We have all the elements to define our encoding of an instance of TQBF into an instance of MC(InqB), that is, an information model, a state and an *inquisitive*

formula. We firstly focus on the most complex part: defining the inquisitive formula.

For ease of read, we use the symbols ζ, ξ, η to indicate propositional formulas (without quantifiers, so that an arbitrary QBF is of the form $Q_0x_0 \dots Q_{l-1}x_{l-1}\zeta$) and the symbols ϕ, ψ, χ to indicate inquisitive formulas. Moreover, we assume that propositional formulas contain only propositional variables from the set $\text{AP}_l = \{x_0, \dots, x_{l-1}\}$. Finally, we assume that all propositional formulas are in *negation normal form*, that is, for negations only appear in front of atomic propositions.⁷

We give the translation in two steps: firstly, we define by recursion *two* translations of *propositional formulas* into inquisitive formulas with an associated polarity, a *positive translation* ζ^p and a *negative translation* ζ^n . Then we provide, again by mutual recursion, two translations for quantified Boolean formulas with an associated polarity, $(Q_0x_0 \dots Q_{l-1}x_{l-1}\zeta)^p$ and $(Q_0x_0 \dots Q_{l-1}x_{l-1}\zeta)^n$.

The translations ζ^p and ζ^n are defined by the following clauses:

$$\begin{array}{ll} (x_i)^p & := q_i \rightarrow p_i & (x_i)^n & := q_i \rightarrow \neg p_i \\ (\neg x_i)^p & := q_i \rightarrow \neg p_i & (\neg x_i)^n & := q_i \rightarrow p_i \\ (\zeta \wedge \xi)^p & := \zeta^p \wedge \xi^p & (\zeta \wedge \xi)^n & := \zeta^n \vee \xi^n \\ (\zeta \vee \xi)^p & := \zeta^p \vee \xi^p & (\zeta \vee \xi)^n & := \zeta^n \wedge \xi^n \end{array}$$

This translation allows us to encode the semantics of ζ in terms of switching states instead of Boolean valuations. In particular, the formula ζ is satisfied under a certain Boolean valuation σ iff ζ^p is supported by the corresponding switching s_σ (recall Definition 8).

Lemma 11. *Let $\sigma : \text{AP}_l \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ be a Boolean valuation and let s_σ be the corresponding switching of \mathcal{S}_l . Then for every propositional formula ζ we have that:*

$$\begin{array}{llll} \sigma(\zeta) = 1 & \text{iff} & s_\sigma \models \zeta^p & \text{iff} & s_\sigma \not\models \zeta^n \\ \sigma(\zeta) = 0 & \text{iff} & s_\sigma \models \zeta^n & \text{iff} & s_\sigma \not\models \zeta^p \end{array}$$

Proof. We proceed by induction on the structure of the formula ζ . We firstly prove that $\sigma(\zeta) = 1 \iff s_\sigma \models \zeta^p$ and $\sigma(\zeta) = 0 \iff s_\sigma \models \zeta^n$.

- If $\zeta = x_i$, we have

$$\begin{array}{ll} \sigma(x_i) = 1 \iff s_\sigma \models r_i \rightarrow p_i & \sigma(x_i) = 0 \iff s_\sigma \models r_i \rightarrow \neg p_i \\ \iff s_\sigma \models (x_i)^p & \iff s_\sigma \models (x_i)^n \end{array}$$

- If $\zeta = \neg x_i$, we have

$$\begin{array}{ll} \sigma(\neg x_i) = 1 \iff \sigma(x_i) = 0 & \sigma(\neg x_i) = 0 \iff \sigma(x_i) = 1 \\ \iff s_\sigma \models r_i \rightarrow \neg p_i & \iff s_\sigma \models r_i \rightarrow p_i \\ \iff s_\sigma \models (\neg x_i)^p & \iff s_\sigma \models (\neg x_i)^n \end{array}$$

⁷Translating a formula in negation normal form is an operation linear in time, thus this assumption does not affect our complexity analysis.

- If $\zeta = \eta \wedge \xi$, we have

$$\begin{array}{ll}
\sigma(\eta \wedge \xi) = 1 & \sigma(\eta \wedge \xi) = 0 \\
\iff \sigma(\eta) = \sigma(\xi) = 1 & \iff \sigma(\eta) = 0 \text{ or } \sigma(\xi) = 0 \\
\iff s_\sigma \models \eta^p \wedge \xi^p & \iff s_\sigma \models \eta^n \text{ or } s_\sigma \models \xi^n \\
\iff s_\sigma \models (\eta \wedge \xi)^p & \iff s_\sigma \models (\eta \wedge \xi)^n
\end{array}$$

- If $\zeta = \eta \vee \xi$, we have

$$\begin{array}{ll}
\sigma(\eta \vee \xi) = 1 & \sigma(\eta \vee \xi) = 0 \\
\iff \sigma(\eta) = 1 \text{ or } \sigma(\xi) = 1 & \iff \sigma(\eta) = \sigma(\xi) = 0 \\
\iff s_\sigma \models \eta^p \vee \xi^p & \iff s_\sigma \models \eta^n \wedge \xi^n \\
\iff s_\sigma \models (\eta \vee \xi)^p & \iff s_\sigma \models (\eta \vee \xi)^n
\end{array}$$

Secondly, we notice that:

$$\begin{array}{l}
s_\sigma \models \zeta^p \iff \sigma(\zeta) = 1 \iff \sigma(\zeta) \neq 0 \iff s_\sigma \not\models \zeta^n \\
s_\sigma \models \zeta^n \iff \sigma(\zeta) = 0 \iff \sigma(\zeta) \neq 1 \iff s_\sigma \not\models \zeta^p
\end{array}$$

This concludes the proof. \square

Now we shift our attention to quantified Boolean formulas, and in particular to the formulas $\theta_k := Q_k x_k \dots Q_{l-1} x_{l-1} \zeta$. Notice that the lower the value k , the more quantifiers appear in the formula θ_k , with the limit case being $\theta_l := \zeta$.

As for propositional formulas we define two translations by mutual recursion. The two translations are indicated with θ_k^P and θ_k^N . These translations involve the formulas D_i and S_i introduced in Subsection 4.2.

$$\begin{array}{l}
\zeta^P = \zeta^p \\
\zeta^N = \zeta^n \\
\theta_{k-1}^P = \begin{cases} D_{k-1} \rightarrow \theta_k^P & \text{if } Q_{k-1} = \forall \\ (D_{k-1} \rightarrow \theta_k^N) \rightarrow S_k & \text{if } Q_{k-1} = \exists \end{cases} \\
\theta_{k-1}^N = \begin{cases} (D_{k-1} \rightarrow \theta_k^P) \rightarrow S_k & \text{if } Q_{k-1} = \forall \\ D_{k-1} \rightarrow \theta_k^N & \text{if } Q_{k-1} = \exists \end{cases}
\end{array}$$

Similarly to the translations ζ^p and ζ^n , we can prove a preservation result for these translations.

Lemma 12. *Consider the quantified Boolean formula $\theta_k = Q_k x_k \dots Q_{l-1} x_{l-1} \zeta$ with variables in AP_l . Let $\sigma : \text{AP}_k \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ be a Boolean valuation and s_σ the corresponding k -switching of \mathcal{S}_l . We have that:*

$$\begin{array}{l}
\sigma(\theta_k) = 1 \quad \text{iff } \mathcal{S}_l, s_\sigma \models (\theta_k)^P \\
\sigma(\theta_k) = 0 \quad \text{iff } \mathcal{S}_l, s_\sigma \models (\theta_k)^N
\end{array} \tag{6}$$

Proof. We prove the result by induction on the number of quantifiers preceding ζ . The base case is

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma(\zeta) = 1 & \text{ iff } \mathcal{S}_l, s_\sigma \models (\zeta)^P \\ \sigma(\zeta) = 0 & \text{ iff } \mathcal{S}_l, s_\sigma \models (\zeta)^N\end{aligned}$$

and this is the statement of Lemma 11.

As for the inductive step, suppose the equivalences to hold for formulas with $l-k-1$ quantifiers. We want to show that the equivalences hold also for formulas with $l-k$ quantifiers. So consider the formula $\theta_{k-1} = Q_{k-1}x_{k-1} \dots Q_{l-1}x_{l-1}\zeta$. As a useful shorthand, we will write $Q_{k-1}x_{k-1}\theta_k$ for the formula θ_{k-1} , making explicit reference to the relation between the two formulas.

Let $\sigma : \text{AP}_{k-1} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ and s_σ be as in the statement of the lemma. We have two cases to consider, depending on whether $Q_{k-1} = \forall$ or $Q_{k-1} = \exists$.

- Suppose $Q_{k-1} = \forall$ and let us firstly focus on the first equivalence of 6. We have:

$$\begin{aligned}& \mathcal{S}_l, s_\sigma \models (\forall x_{k-1}\theta_k)^P \\ \iff & \mathcal{S}_l, s_\sigma \models D_{k-1} \rightarrow \theta_k^P \\ \iff & \text{For every } t \subseteq s_\sigma, \text{ if } \mathcal{S}_l, t \models D_{k-1} \text{ then } \mathcal{S}_l, t \models \theta_k^P\end{aligned}$$

By persistency of the logic (Proposition 4), we just need to check the condition for the *maximal* substates of s_σ satisfying D_{k-1} . By Lemma 9 these maximal substates are $t^+ = s_\sigma \setminus \{w_{k-1}^-\}$ and $t^- = s_\sigma \setminus \{w_{k-1}^+\}$, which are both k -switchings and substates of s_σ . These switchings correspond respectively to the Boolean valuations $\tau^+, \tau^- : \text{AP}_k \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ defined as

$$\begin{aligned}\tau^+(x_i) &= \begin{cases} \sigma(x_i) & \text{if } i < k \\ 1 & \text{if } i = k \end{cases} \\ \tau^-(x_i) &= \begin{cases} \sigma(x_i) & \text{if } i < k \\ 0 & \text{if } i = k \end{cases}\end{aligned}$$

By inductive hypothesis, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{S}_l, t^+ \models \theta_k^P & \iff \tau^+(\theta_k) = 1 \\ \mathcal{S}_l, t^- \models \theta_k^P & \iff \tau^-(\theta_k) = 1\end{aligned}$$

So in conclusion we have

$$\begin{aligned}& \mathcal{S}_l, s_\sigma \models (\forall x_{k-1}\theta_k)^P \\ \iff & \tau^+(\theta_k) = \tau^-(\theta_k) = 1 \\ \iff & \sigma(\forall x_{k-1}\theta_k) = \sigma(\theta_{k-1}) = 1\end{aligned}$$

As for the second equivalence of 6, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}& \mathcal{S}_l, s_\sigma \models (\forall x_{k-1}\theta_k)^N \\ \iff & \mathcal{S}_l, s_\sigma \models (D_{k-1} \rightarrow \theta_k^P) \rightarrow S_k \\ \iff & \text{For every } t \subseteq s_\sigma, \text{ if } \mathcal{S}_l, t \models D_{k-1} \rightarrow \theta_k^P \text{ then } \mathcal{S}_l, t \models S_k\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 10, the only substate of s_σ not satisfying S_k is s_σ itself. So the chain of equivalences above can be extended as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathcal{S}_l, s_\sigma \models (\forall x_{k-1} \theta_k)^N \\
\iff & \mathcal{S}_l, s_\sigma \not\models D_{k-1} \rightarrow \theta_k^P \\
\iff & \text{For some } t \subseteq s_\sigma, \mathcal{S}_l, t \models D_{k-1} \text{ and } \mathcal{S}_l, t \not\models \theta_k^P \\
\iff^* & \mathcal{S}_l, t^+ \not\models \theta_k^P \text{ or } \mathcal{S}_l, t^- \not\models \theta_k^P \\
\iff^{**} & \tau^+(\theta_k) = 0 \text{ or } \tau^-(\theta_k) = 0 \\
\iff & \sigma(\forall x_{k-1} \theta_k) = \sigma(\theta_{k-1}) = 0
\end{aligned}$$

where the equivalence (*) follows by persistency and the equivalence (**) follows by two applications of the inductive hypothesis applied to the k -switchings t^+ and t^- respectively.

- Suppose $Q_k = \exists$. Most of the arguments and passages follow closely the structure of the previous case, so we will omit comments to most of them.

Let us firstly focus on the first equivalence of 6. We have:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathcal{S}_l, s_\sigma \models (\exists x_{k-1} \theta_k)^P \\
\iff & \mathcal{S}_l, s_\sigma \models (D_{k-1} \rightarrow \theta_k^N) \rightarrow S_k \\
\iff & \text{For every } t \subseteq s_\sigma, \text{ if } \mathcal{S}_l, t \models D_{k-1} \rightarrow \theta_k^N \text{ then } \mathcal{S}_l, t \models S_k \\
\iff & \mathcal{S}_l, s_\sigma \not\models D_{k-1} \rightarrow \theta_k^N \\
\iff & \text{For some } t \subseteq s_\sigma, \mathcal{S}_l, t \models D_{k-1} \text{ and } \mathcal{S}_l, t \not\models \theta_k^N \\
\iff & \mathcal{S}_l, t^+ \not\models \theta_k^N \text{ or } \mathcal{S}_l, t^- \not\models \theta_k^N \\
\iff^* & \tau^+(\theta_k) = 1 \text{ or } \tau^-(\theta_k) = 1 \\
\iff & \sigma(\exists x_{k-1} \theta_k) = \sigma(\theta_{k-1}) = 1
\end{aligned}$$

where the equivalence (*) follows by inductive hypothesis.

As for the second equivalence of 6, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathcal{S}_l, s_\sigma \models (\exists x_{k-1} \theta_k)^N \\
\iff & \mathcal{S}_l, s_\sigma \models D_{k-1} \rightarrow \theta_k^N \\
\iff & \text{For every } t \subseteq s_\sigma, \text{ if } \mathcal{S}_l, t \models D_{k-1} \text{ then } \mathcal{S}_l, t \models \theta_k^N \\
\iff & \mathcal{S}_l, t^+ \models \theta_k^N \text{ and } \mathcal{S}_l, t^- \models \theta_k^N \\
\iff^* & \tau^+(\theta_k) = \tau^-(\theta_k) = 0 \\
\iff & \sigma(\exists x_{k-1} \theta_k) = \sigma(\theta_{k-1}) = 0
\end{aligned}$$

where the equivalence (*) follows from inductive hypothesis.

And this concludes the proof of the inductive step. Thus the result follows by induction. \square

As a direct corollary of the previous lemma we obtain the desired result: we can reduce an instance of TQBF to an instance of MC(InqB).

Corollary 13. *Let $\theta := Q_0 x_0 \dots Q_{l-1} x_{l-1} \zeta$ be a closed quantified Boolean formula. Then θ is valid iff $\mathcal{S}_l, W_l \models \theta^P$. In other terms:*

$$\theta \in \text{TQBF} \quad \text{iff} \quad \langle \mathcal{S}_l, W_l, \theta^P \rangle \in \text{MC(InqB)}$$

Proof. Recall that the set W_l of all the worlds of \mathcal{S}_l is a 0-switching, and that the corresponding valuation is the empty function. By Lemma 12 (applied for $k = 0$) we have that θ is valid (i.e., satisfied by the empty function) iff $\mathcal{S}_l, W_l \models \theta^P$. \square

4.4 Complexity

It remains to show that the reduction of TQBF to MC(InqB) presented in Corollary 13 is polynomially bounded in size. This entails that MC(InqB) is a PSPACE-hard problem, since so is TQBF.

Let θ be the formula $Q_0x_0 \dots Q_{l-1}x_{l-1}\zeta$ with $|\zeta| = h$, and thus $|\theta| = \Theta(l+h)$. Using the encoding of information models presented in Section 3, the size of \mathcal{S}_l is $|\{p_0, \dots, p_{l-1}, q_0, \dots, q_{l-1}\}| \cdot |W_l| = 2l^2$, which is indeed polynomially bounded by $l+h$. And the same goes for the encoding of the information state W_l , which is of size $2l$.

As for the size of θ^P , the computations are slightly more involved, so we proceed one step at a time. Since there are several summations and an inductive proof involved, the \mathcal{O} notation may easily lead to errors. For this reason, we firstly present a semi-formal analysis of the complexity involving \mathcal{O} s in the current section, and we give a more thorough analysis in Appendix A.

Firstly, we find bounds for the size of the special formulas presented in Subsection 4.2. Recall that we indicate with $|\phi|$ the size of the encoding of a formula ϕ .

- $|C_k^+| = |q_k \wedge p_k| = \mathcal{O}(\log(l))$ and $|C_k^-| = |q_k \wedge \neg p_k| = \mathcal{O}(\log(l))$.
- $|\neg C_k^+ \wedge \neg C_k^-| = |\neg C_k^+ \vee \neg C_k^-| = \mathcal{O}(\log(l))$.
- $|S_0| = \mathcal{O}(l) + \sum_{i=0}^{l-1} |\neg C_i^+ \vee \neg C_i^-| = \mathcal{O}(l) + \mathcal{O}(l \log(l)) = \mathcal{O}(l \log(l))$.
- For $k > 0$ we have $|S_k| = \mathcal{O}(l) + \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} |\neg C_i^+ \wedge \neg C_i^-| + \sum_{i=k}^{l-1} |\neg C_i^+ \vee \neg C_i^-| = \mathcal{O}(l) + \mathcal{O}(k \log(l)) + \mathcal{O}((l-k) \log(l)) = \mathcal{O}(l \log(l))$.
- $|D_k| = |q_k \rightarrow (p_k \vee \neg p_k)| = \mathcal{O}(\log(l))$.
- A straightforward inductive argument on the construction of ζ^P (resp., ζ^N) shows that $|\zeta^P| = \mathcal{O}(h)$ (resp., $|\zeta^N| = \mathcal{O}(h)$).

And now we prove by (descending) induction on k that $|\theta_k^P|$ and $|\theta_k^N|$ are both in $\mathcal{O}((l-k-1)l \log(l) + h)$. The base step of the induction $k = l$ (i.e., when there are no quantifiers involved and the formulas are ζ^P and ζ^N respectively) was already considered. So assume that $|\theta_k^P|$ and $|\theta_k^N|$ are both in $\mathcal{O}((l-k-1)l \log(l) + h)$. We prove only that $|\theta_{k-1}^P|$ is in $\mathcal{O}((l-k)l \log(l) + h)$, since the other inequality follows similar computations. We consider two separate cases, depending on whether $Q_{k-1} = \forall$ or $Q_{k-1} = \exists$.

$$\begin{aligned} |(\forall x_{k-1} \theta_k)^P| &= |D_{k-1} \rightarrow \theta_k^P| \\ &= \mathcal{O}(\log(l)) + \mathcal{O}((l-k-1)l \log(l) + h) \\ &= \mathcal{O}((l-k)l \log(l) + h) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
|(\exists x_{k-1} \theta_k)^P| &= |(D_{k-1} \rightarrow \theta_k^N) \rightarrow S_k| \\
&= \mathcal{O}(l \log(l)) + \mathcal{O}((l-k-1)l \log(l) + h) + \mathcal{O}(l \log(l)) \\
&= \mathcal{O}((l-k)l \log(l) + h)
\end{aligned}$$

And this concludes the inductive proof. The salient results we thus obtain are the following.

Theorem 14. *For $\theta = Q_0 x_0 \dots Q_{l-1} x_{l-1} \zeta$ a closed quantified Boolean formula, the size of θ^P is in $\mathcal{O}(l^2 \log(l) + |\zeta|)$. In particular, the size of the translation is polynomially bounded by the size of the original formula.*

Corollary 15. *The problem $\text{MC}(\text{InqB})$ is PSPACE-hard.*

As anticipated, this was the last ingredient needed to show that the four problems considered are PSPACE-complete.

Theorem 16. *The problems $\text{MC}(\text{InqB})$, $\overline{\text{MC}}(\text{InqB})$, $\text{MC}(\text{InqM})$ and $\overline{\text{MC}}(\text{InqM})$ are PSPACE-complete.*

5 Conclusions

In this paper we formalized and studied the model checking problems $\text{MC}(\text{InqB})$ and $\text{MC}(\text{InqM})$ for inquisitive propositional logic and inquisitive modal logic, and studied their complexity. In Section 3 we provided an algorithm to solve the problem $\text{MC}(\text{InqM})$ and proved its correctness. This allowed us to show that the complexity of the problem is in the class PSPACE. In Section 4 we provided a polynomial-space reduction of the *true quantified Boolean formula* problem to $\text{MC}(\text{InqB})$, thus showing that the problem is also PSPACE-hard. Putting these results together, we inferred that both problems are PSPACE-complete.

This paper is the first investigation of computational complexity issues for inquisitive logics. A venue for further investigation is whether the proof presented adapts to other inquisitive logics, such as *inquisitive epistemic logic* [1, Ch. 7], *inquisitive intuitionistic logic* [2] or first-order versions of the system such as InqBQ [1, Ch. 4].

References

- [1] Ivano Ciardelli. *Questions in logic*. PhD thesis, Institute for Logic, Language and Computation, University of Amsterdam, 2016.
- [2] Ivano Ciardelli, Rosalie Iemhoff, and Fan Yang. Questions and dependency in intuitionistic logic. *Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic*, 61(1):75–115, 2020.
- [3] Ivano Ciardelli and Floris Roelofsen. Inquisitive dynamic epistemic logic. *Synthese*, 192(6):1643–1687, 2015.

- [4] Edmund M. Clarke and Bernd-Holger Schlingloff. Chapter 24 - model checking. In Alan Robinson and Andrei Voronkov, editors, *Handbook of Automated Reasoning*, Handbook of Automated Reasoning, pages 1635–1790. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 2001.
- [5] Johannes Ebbing and Peter Lohmann. Complexity of model checking for modal dependence logic. In Mária Bieliková, Gerhard Friedrich, Georg Gottlob, Stefan Katzenbeisser, and György Turán, editors, *SOFSEM 2012: Theory and Practice of Computer Science*, pages 226–237, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2012. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- [6] Johannes Ebbing, Peter Lohmann, and Fan Yang. Model checking for modal intuitionistic dependence logic. In Guram Bezhanishvili, Sebastian Löbner, Vincenzo Marra, and Frank Richter, editors, *Logic, Language, and Computation*, pages 231–256, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2013. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- [7] Michael Sipser. *Introduction to the Theory of Computation*. Course Technology, Boston, MA, third edition, 2013.
- [8] Moshe Y. Vardi. The complexity of relational query languages (extended abstract). In *Proceedings of the Fourteenth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, STOC '82, pages 137–146, New York, NY, USA, 1982. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [9] Fan Yang. *On extensions and variants of dependence logic: A study of intuitionistic connectives in the team semantics setting*. PhD thesis, University of Helsinki, 2014.
- [10] Max Zeuner. Model checking for inquisitive logic. Master Thesis, Ludwig Maximilian University, 2020.

A Explicit analysis

In this appendix we give an explicit analysis of the computations presented at the end of Section 4, leading to Theorem 14. Throughout this appendix, we indicate with c_i constants dependent only on the encoding used for formulas, chosen opportunely to satisfy the inequalities involved.

Firstly, we give an explicit analysis of the sizes of the formulas presented in Subsection 4.2.

- $|C_k^+| = |q_k \wedge p_k| \leq c_1 \log(l)$ and $|C_k^-| = |q_k \wedge \neg p_k| \leq c_1 \log(l)$.
- $|\neg C_i^+ \wedge \neg C_i^-| = |\neg C_i^+ \vee \neg C_i^-| \leq c_2 + |C_i^+| + |C_i^-| \leq c_3 \log(l)$.
- $|S_0| \leq c_4 l + \sum_{i=0}^{l-1} |\neg C_i^+ \vee \neg C_i^-| \leq c_4 l + l \cdot c_2 \log(l) \leq c_5 l \log(l)$.
- For $k > 0$ we have $|S_k| = c_6 l + \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} |\neg C_i^+ \wedge \neg C_i^-| + \sum_{i=k}^{l-1} |\neg C_i^+ \vee \neg C_i^-| \leq c_6 l + k \cdot c_3 \log(l) + (l - k) \cdot c_2 \log(l) \leq c_7 l \log(l)$.

- To make computations less tedious, we define $c_8 = \max(c_5, c_7)$, so that $|S_k| \leq c_8 l \log(l)$ independently from the value of k .
- $|D_k| = |q_k \rightarrow (p_k \vee \neg p_k)| \leq c_9 \log(l)$.
- A straightforward inductive argument on the construction of ζ^P (resp., ζ^N) shows that $|\zeta^P| = \mathcal{O}(h)$ (resp., $|\zeta^N| = \mathcal{O}(h)$).

Secondly, we provide an explicit analysis of the size of $|(Q_k x_k \dots Q_{l-1} x_{l-1} \zeta)^P|$ and $|(Q_k x_k \dots Q_{l-1} x_{l-1} \zeta)^N|$. As in Subsection 4.3 we use the shorthand $\theta_k := Q_k x_k \dots Q_{l-1} x_{l-1} \zeta$, and indicate with $Q_{k-1} x_{k-1} \theta_k$ the formula θ_{k-1} to make the relation between the formulas θ_k and θ_{k-1} explicit. We show by downward induction on k that both quantities are bounded by $c((l-k-1)l \log(l) + h)$ for an opportune choice of the constant c . The base step of the induction ($k = l$, i.e., when no quantifiers are involved and the formulas considered are ζ^P and ζ^N) has already been taken care of. So assume that $|\theta_k^P| \leq c((l-k)l \log(l) + h)$ and $|\theta_k^N| \leq c((l-k)l \log(l) + h)$.

As for the inductive step, we firstly prove the inequality $|\theta_{k-1}^P| \leq c((l-k-1)l \log(l) + h)$. We consider two separate cases, depending on whether $Q_{k-1} = \forall$ or $Q_{k-1} = \exists$.

$$\begin{aligned} |(\forall x_{k-1} \theta_k)^P| &= |D_{k-1} \rightarrow \theta_k^P| \\ &\leq c_{10} \log(l) + c((l-k)l \log(l) + h) \\ &\leq c \log(l) + c(l-k)l \log(l) + ch \quad (\text{if } c \geq c_{10}) \\ &\leq c((l-(k-1))l \log(l) + h) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} |(\exists x_{k-1} \theta_k)^P| &= |(D_{k-1} \rightarrow \theta_k^N) \rightarrow S_k| \\ &\leq c_{11} l \log(l) + c((l-k)l \log(l) + h) \\ &\leq c l \log(l) + c(l-k)l \log(l) + ch \quad (\text{if } c \geq c_{11}) \\ &\leq c((l-(k-1))l \log(l) + h) \end{aligned}$$

Secondly we prove the inequality $|\theta_{k-1}^N| \leq c((l-(k-1))l \log(l) + h)$. Also in this case we distinguish the cases $Q_{k-1} = \forall$ and $Q_{k-1} = \exists$.

$$\begin{aligned} |(\forall x_{k-1} \theta_k)^N| &= |(D_k \rightarrow \theta_k^P) \rightarrow S_k| \\ &\leq c_{12} l \log(l) + c((l-k)l \log(l) + h) \\ &\leq c l \log(l) + c(l-k)l \log(l) + ch \quad (\text{if } c \geq c_{12}) \\ &\leq c((l-(k-1))l \log(l) + h) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} |(\exists x_{k-1} \theta_k)^N| &= |D_k \rightarrow \theta_k^N| \\ &\leq c_{13} \log(l) + c((l-k)l \log(l) + h) \\ &\leq c \log(l) + c(l-k)l \log(l) + ch \quad (\text{if } c \geq c_{13}) \\ &\leq c((l-(k-1))l \log(l) + h) \end{aligned}$$

So by choosing $c := \max(c_{10}, c_{11}, c_{12}, c_{13})$ we meet all the conditions necessary for the inequality to hold. This concludes our inductive proof, and shows that both $|\theta_k^P|$ and $|\theta_k^N|$ are in $\mathcal{O}((l-k)l \log(l) + h)$, as desired.