



- 1 (a) The ground solver will return the model  $M$  containing  $\neg P(a)$ ,  $R(b)$ ,  $S(c)$  together with the quantified literals  $\forall x.R(x) \vee S(x) \forall x.\neg R(x) \vee P(x) \forall x.P(x) \vee \neg S(x)$ .

We first consider E-matching using the instantiation patterns  $P(x)$ . This generates the instances

$$R(a) \vee S(a) \qquad \neg R(a) \vee P(a) \qquad \neg P(a) \vee \neg S(a)$$

such that in the next iteration the ground solver can conclude unsatisfiability.

Second, for enumerative instantiation we can consider the order  $a < b < c$ . The smallest instances of the three literals with quantifiers are thus  $R(a) \vee S(a)$ ,  $\neg R(a) \vee P(a)$ , and  $\neg P(a) \vee \neg S(a)$ . None of these clauses follows from  $M$ , so they are returned by the instantiation module. In fact these instances suffice for the ground solver to conclude unsatisfiability.

- (b) This problem is satisfiable. Suppose an order where  $a < f(a) < f(f(a)) < \dots$  are smaller than all terms with  $b$  or  $g$ .

We assume the ground solver returned the model  $a = b$ ,  $g(a) = g(b)$ ,  $f(a) = g(a)$  together with  $\forall x.f(f(x)) \neq x$ . Consider the series

$$\begin{aligned} E_0 &= \{a = b, g(a) = g(b), f(a) = g(a)\} \\ Q_i &= \{f^{i+2}(a) \neq f^i(a)\} \\ E_{i+1} &= E_i \cup Q_i \end{aligned}$$

where all  $E_i$  are satisfiable, e.g. by taking the model  $a_{\mathbb{N}} = b_{\mathbb{N}} = 0$ ,  $g_{\mathbb{N}}(x) = 1$ , and  $f_{\mathbb{N}}(x) = x + 1$  for all  $x$ . Thus the series satisfies the conditions of the lemma on Slide 19 of Week 12 and hence witnesses satisfiability of the quantified problem.

- 2 For instance, consider the problem  $a = b$ ,  $g(a) = a$ ,  $f(a) \neq b$ ,  $\forall x.f(x) = x$ . Using instantiation pattern  $g(x)$ , no instance is generated that can be used to show unsatisfiability.

On the other hand, enumerative instantiation with  $a < b < f(a) < \dots$  will immediately generate  $f(a) = a$  such that unsatisfiability can be concluded.

- 3 (a) Using a quantified formula, one can check

```
(assert (forall ((x (_ BitVec 4)))
  (= (bvsb (bvxor (bvadd x #x2) #x3) #x2) (bvadd (bvxor (bvsb x #x2) #x3) #x2)))
))
(check-sat)
```

- (b) There are 128 solutions, see `knuth.py`.

- 5 See `rushhour.py`.