



HAL
open science

Avoidance games are PSPACE-Complete.

Valentin Gledel, Nacim Oijid

► **To cite this version:**

Valentin Gledel, Nacim Oijid. Avoidance games are PSPACE-Complete.. Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics , 2023, 254 (40), pp.34:1–34:19. 10.4230/LIPIcs.STACS.2023.34 . hal-03787958v2

HAL Id: hal-03787958

<https://hal.science/hal-03787958v2>

Submitted on 20 Mar 2023

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Avoidance games are PSPACE-Complete

Valentin Gledel ✉

Department of Mathematics and Mathematical Statistics, Umeå University, Sweden

Nacim Ojjid ✉

Univ. Lyon, Université Lyon 1, LIRIS UMR CNRS 5205, F-69621, Lyon, France

Abstract

Avoidance games are games in which two players claim vertices of a hypergraph and try to avoid some structures. These games have been studied since the introduction of the game of SIM in 1968, but only few complexity results have been found out about them. In 2001, Slany proved some partial results on Avoider-Avoider games complexity, and in 2017 Bonnet *et al.* proved that short Avoider-Enforcer games are Co-W[1]-hard. More recently, in 2022, Miltzow and Stojaković proved that these games are NP-hard. As these games correspond to the misère version of the well-known Maker-Breaker games, introduced in 1963 and proven PSPACE-complete in 1978, one could expect these games to be PSPACE-complete too, but the question has remained open since then. Here, we prove here that both Avoider-Avoider and Avoider-Enforcer conventions are PSPACE-complete. Using the PSPACE-hardness of Avoider-Enforcer, we provide in appendix proofs that some particular Avoider-Enforcer games also are.

2012 ACM Subject Classification Theory of computation → Problems, reductions and completeness

Keywords and phrases Games, Avoider-Enforcer, Maker-Breaker, Complexity, Avoider-Avoider, PSPACE-complete

Funding *Valentin Gledel*: supported by the Kempe Foundation Grant No. JCK-2022.1 (Sweden).

Nacim Ojjid: supported by the ANR project P-GASE (ANR-21-CE48-0001-01)

Acknowledgements We want to thank Eric Duchêne, Marianne Fortin, Aline Parreau and the anonymous referees for their help in the writing of this article

1 Introduction

1.1 Related works

Avoidance games belong to the class of positional games, that were introduced by Hales and Jewett in 1963 [14] and popularized by Erdős and Selfridge in 1973 [11]. In this class of games, the board is a hypergraph and two players alternately claim a vertex of the hypergraph that has not been claimed before. Winning conditions depend on the convention and are related to the hyperedges. TIC-TAC-TOE and HEX are two famous examples of positional games. To learn more about positional games, we refer the reader to the recent survey of Hefetz *et al.* [18].

Among positional games, a natural dichotomy exists: on the one hand, there are games in which players seek to build a structure, and on the other hand, there are games in which players want to avoid a structure. The former set contains both Maker-Maker and Maker-Breaker conventions, in which the hyperedges are winning sets, and the player either wants to fill up a winning set (Maker role), or to play at least once in each of them (Breaker role). The latter contains Avoider-Avoider and Avoider-Enforcer conventions, that can be seen as the misère version of the former. In these games, the hyperedges are losing sets, and the players either want not to fill up one losing set (Avoider role), or to force their opponent to fill up one of them (Enforcer role).

When positional games were introduced, the focus was on Maker-Breaker games, *i.e.* games in which one player, Maker, aims to fill up a hyperedge, and the second one, Breaker,

45 wants to prevent it by claiming at least one vertex in each hyperedge. This convention is
 46 the most popular one, and several games have been studied according to this convention. In
 47 particular, the survey of Beck [5] presents several results obtained for Maker-Breaker games.
 48 The field of Maker-Breaker games is still well investigated today, and some Maker-Breaker
 49 games were introduced recently [10, 25].

50 The first Avoider-Avoider game was introduced in 1968 with the game of SIM and is
 51 presented in [28], but the first study of the complexity of Avoidance games was done by
 52 Schaefer in 1978 [27]. Avoider-Enforcer games were introduced later by Lu in 1991 [22, 23]
 53 under the name of Antimaker-Antibreaker games and correspond to the misère version
 54 of Maker-Breaker games. The standard name for this convention, Avoider-Enforcer, was
 55 popularized by Hefetz and different co-authors in 2007 [15, 16, 19, 20]. In this game, Enforcer
 56 wins if at some point during the game, Avoider has claimed all the vertices of a hyperedge,
 57 otherwise Avoider wins.

58 Even if most of the studies of positional games are focused on Maker-Breaker games,
 59 Avoider-Enforcer games have become more and more relevant: the famous Ramsey game was
 60 introduced in Avoider-Enforcer convention by Beck in 2002 [4] as a generalization of SIM.
 61 As it was done in the Maker-Breaker convention, some games on graphs were introduced in
 62 Avoider-Enforcer or Avoider-Avoider conventions, where the losing sets correspond to some
 63 structure in the graph, see [2, 3, 13, 17].

64 In terms of complexity, an overview of the field is proposed by Demaine [9]. In positional
 65 games, as they are perfect information games, one player always has a winning strategy
 66 (or both players can ensure a draw). The natural decision problem related to games is
 67 therefore: does the first player have a winning strategy? This problem was quickly proven to
 68 be PSPACE-complete for Maker-Breaker games by Schaefer in 1978 [27] even restricted to
 69 11-uniform hypergraphs (i.e. hypergraphs in which all hyperedges have size 11). This bound
 70 was recently improved by Rahman and Watson in 2021 [26], proving that the problem is still
 71 PSPACE-complete if the hypergraph is 6-uniform. These two proofs are very technical and
 72 a simpler proof of the PSPACE-completeness was provided by Byskov in 2004 [8], proving
 73 at the same time that Maker-Maker games are also PSPACE-complete. The complexity
 74 of Maker-Breaker games is still studied today, as Galliot *et al.* [12] have proven that the
 75 winner of a 3-uniform Maker-Breaker game can be computed in polynomial time, but the
 76 gap between the complexity of 6-uniform hypergraphs and 3-uniform hypergraphs remains
 77 to be closed.

78 Despite the fact that Avoidance games were introduced at the same time as Maker-Breaker
 79 games, only partial results on complexity are known: determining the winner in Avoider-
 80 Avoider games, was proven to be PSPACE-complete by Slany in 2002 [29] for endgames,
 81 i.e. games in which some vertices are already attributed to the players, but there are no
 82 results yet in the general case. Concerning Avoider-Enforcer, Bonnet *et al.* in 2017 [6]
 83 mentioned that the complexity of this problem is still open, when they proved that short
 84 games, i.e. games in which a player only has few moves to make, are co-W[1]-hard, with the
 85 number of moves taken as a parameter. The best known result today is due to Miltzow and
 86 Stojaković in 2022 [24] that states the NP-hardness of this decision problem and conjectures
 87 its PSPACE-completeness.

88 1.2 Presentation of the results

89 The Avoider-Enforcer game is played as follows: given a hypergraph H , two players, called
 90 *Avoider* and *Enforcer*, alternately claim an unclaimed vertex of H with *Avoider* starting. The
 91 game ends when all the vertices have been claimed. If *Avoider* has claimed all the vertices of

92 a hyperedge, Enforcer wins. Otherwise, Avoider wins. The related decision problem is the
 93 following one.

94 ► **Problem 1.** AVOIDER-ENFORCER

95 *Input:* A hypergraph H .

96 *Output:* True if and only if Avoider has a winning strategy in the Avoider-Enforcer game on
 97 H .

98 This paper will focus on the proof of the following result:

99 ► **Theorem 2.** *The AVOIDER-ENFORCER problem is PSPACE-complete, even when the entry
 100 is restricted to hypergraphs with hyperedges of size at most 6.*

101 Our proof of Theorem 2 follows a similar idea to the proof of Rahman and Watson [26]
 102 and the proof of Schaefer [27], by constructing some hyperedges forcing the order of the
 103 moves. Contrary to Maker-Breaker games, in Avoider-Enforcer convention, there is no vertex
 104 in which the players are urged to play, as in general, players do not want to move in avoidance
 105 games. The key idea of this reduction is to create some structures in which playing first is a
 106 losing move. In the provided construction, at any moment of the game, only few moves are
 107 not losing moves. Thus, we can control the vertices played by the two players.

108 The proof provided for PSPACE-completeness of Avoider-Enforcer games, enables us to
 109 state the following corollary for Avoider-Avoider games that will also be proven later:

110 ► **Problem 3.** AVOIDER-AVOIDER

111 *Input:* A hypergraph H .

112 *Output:* True if and only if the second player has a winning strategy in the Avoider-Avoider
 113 game on H .

114 ► **Corollary 4.** *The AVOIDER-AVOIDER problem is PSPACE-complete, even when the entry
 115 is restricted to 7-uniform hypergraphs.*

116 This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce two lemmas that will be
 117 used in the proof of Theorem 2. In particular, we show that pairing strategies that are
 118 often used in Maker-Breaker conventions can also be applied to Avoider-Enforcer games.
 119 Section 3 describes the reduction used to prove the PSPACE-completeness and define an
 120 order on the move that we call the *legitimate order*. We also show in this section that the
 121 proof holds if both players follow the legitimate order. In Section 4, we show that if a player
 122 does not follow the legitimate order then it cannot be a disadvantage to the other player,
 123 completing the proof of Theorem 2. Finally, in Section 5, we reduce the AVOIDER-ENFORCER
 124 PROBLEM to 6-uniform hypergraphs and prove Corollary 4. One use of these results is to
 125 prove the PSPACE-completeness of particular Avoider-Enforcer games. In appendix we give
 126 two examples of such reductions with the cases of the Avoider-Enforcer domination game
 127 and the Avoider-Enforcer vertex H -game

128 2 Preliminaries

129 In Maker-Breaker games, if a vertex is in all the hyperedges, it is always an optimal move for
 130 both players to play it. Here, we present a similar result for Avoider-Enforcer games. This
 131 result was proved by Miltzow and Stojaković [24], and intuitively states that if a vertex v is
 132 in all the hyperedges that contains another vertex u , then claiming v before u cannot benefit
 133 any player.

4 Avoidance games are PSPACE-Complete

134 ► **Lemma 5.** *Let H be a hypergraph, and u, v two vertices of H such that, for every hyperedge*
135 *e containing u , e also contains v . If a player has a winning strategy, then this player has a*
136 *winning strategy in which he never claims v while u is unclaimed.*

137 The second tool we introduce here is *pairing strategies* in Avoider-Enforcer games. In
138 Maker-Breaker convention, these strategies are often described by using the fact that a player
139 can claim at least one vertex in each pair of vertices. Here in Avoider-Enforcer convention,
140 the main idea of pairing strategies is that this is always possible to force the opponent to
141 claim at least one vertex in each pair.

142 In this section, we will refer to the players as Alice and Bob, as the strategy can be
143 applied both by Avoider and by Enforcer.

144 ► **Lemma 6.** *Let $H = (V, E)$ be a hypergraph. Suppose that Alice plays last in H , i.e. if*
145 *the game is played until all the vertices have been claimed, Alice will claim the last one. Let*
146 *$(a_1, b_1), \dots, (a_n, b_n)$ be pairwise disjoint pairs of vertices, and let $v \notin \bigcup_{i=1}^n \{a_i, b_i\}$.*

147 *Alice has a strategy which forces Bob to claim at least one vertex in each pair (a_i, b_i) .*
148 *Bob has a strategy which forces Alice to claim v and at least one vertex in each pair (a_i, b_i) .*

149 A strategy satisfying the hypothesis of Lemma 6 will be called a *pairing strategy*.

150 **Proof.** Consider the following strategy for Alice:

- 151 ■ If Bob claims a vertex in a pair (a_i, b_i) , she claims the other vertex of the pair.
- 152 ■ Otherwise, she claims any vertex that is not in a pair.

153 By construction; when it is Bob's turn, in any pair in which he has played, Alice has also
154 played. Therefore, when it is Alice's turn, there is at most one pair of vertices in which she
155 has to play. As Alice plays the last move, whenever it is her turn to play, the number of
156 remaining vertices is odd. Therefore, if Bob does not play in a pair, at least one vertex in no
157 pair will be available for Alice. Thus, Alice has a strategy to force Bob to claim at least one
158 vertex in each pair (a_i, b_i) .

159 Now, consider the following strategy for Bob:

- 160 ■ If Alice claims a vertex in a pair (a_i, b_i) , he claims the other vertex of the pair.
- 161 ■ If Alice claims v , if there exists at least one pair (a, b) in which Alice has not played, he
162 claims a and he considers now that b is the new vertex that Alice will be forced to claim.
- 163 ■ Otherwise, he claims any vertex that is not in a pair nor v .

164 For the same reason, with this strategy, when it is Alice's turn, in any pair in which she
165 has played, Bob has played too. When it is Bob's turn, note that the number of remaining
166 moves is even, and there always exists exactly one vertex that is not in a pair, and that Bob
167 wants Alice to claim. Thus, the number of vertices on which Bob cannot play before Alice is
168 odd. Therefore, he always has an available move that fulfills this strategy. ◀

169 **3 Proof of the main theorem**

170 In this section, we begin the proof of Theorem 2 by describing the reduction from 3-QBF,
171 introducing an order on the move of Avoider and Enforcer called the *legitimate order* and
172 providing a sketch of the general proof.

173 ► **Theorem 2.** *The AVOIDER-ENFORCER problem is PSPACE-complete, even when the entry*
174 *is restricted to hypergraphs with hyperedges of size at most 6.*

175 The first step of the proof is to prove that this game is in PSPACE.

176 ▶ **Lemma 7.** *The AVOIDER-ENFORCER problem is in PSPACE.*

177 **Proof.** Let $H = (V, E)$ be a hypergraph. As the players are not allowed to play an already
 178 claimed vertex, any game ends after at most $|V|$ moves. Therefore, according to Lemma 2.2
 179 of Schaefer [27], as the game has a polynomial length and a polynomial number of moves, its
 180 winner can be computed with polynomial space. ◀

181 3.1 Construction of the hypergraph

182 We reduce the problem 3-QBF to an AVOIDER-ENFORCER game. This problem has been
 183 proven PSPACE-complete by Stockemeyer and Meyer [30], and we use the gaming version
 184 of this problem as it was formulated by Rahman and Watson [26]. The game is played
 185 on a quantified formula φ of the form $\forall X_1 \exists X_2 \dots \forall X_{2n-1} \exists X_{2n} \psi$, with ψ a 3-SAT formula.
 186 Alternately, two players, namely Falsifier and Satisfier, chose valuation for the variables,
 187 Falsifier for the odd variables (quantified with a \forall) and Satisfier for the even ones (quantified
 188 with a \exists). When all the variables have a valuation Satisfier wins if ψ is satisfied, otherwise,
 189 Falsifier wins.

190 ▶ **Problem 8.** *3-QBF*

191 *Input:* A 3-SAT quantified formula φ of the form $\forall X_1 \exists X_2 \dots \forall X_{2n-1} \exists X_{2n} \psi$.

192 *Output:* True if and only if Satisfier has a winning strategy in the 3-QBF game on φ

193 Given a 3-QBF formula of the form defined in Problem 8, we construct a hypergraph
 194 with $10n$ vertices $x_1, \overline{x_1}, \dots, x_{2n}, \overline{x_{2n}}, u_1, u_2, \dots, u_{6n}$.

195 A round in a 3-QBF formula corresponds to a step i during which Falsifier gives a valuation
 196 to X_{2i-1} and then Satisfier gives a valuation to X_{2i} . In this reduction, any round corresponds
 197 to ten vertices and eight hyperedges. Four of the ten vertices are $\{x_{2i-1}, \overline{x_{2i-1}}, x_{2i}, \overline{x_{2i}}\}$, and
 198 the six others are $u_{6i-5}, u_{6i-4}, u_{6i-3}, u_{6i-2}, u_{6i-1}, u_{6i}$. The eight hyperedges are constructed
 199 as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
 A_{2i} &= (x_{2i}, \overline{x_{2i}}, u_{6i+1}, u_{6i+3}) & B_{2i-1} &= (x_{2i-1}, \overline{x_{2i-1}}, u_{6i-1}) \\
 C_{6i}^+ &= (u_{6i}, u_{6i+1}, u_{6i+3}, x_{2i}) & C_{6i}^- &= (u_{6i}, u_{6i+1}, u_{6i+3}, \overline{x_{2i}}) \\
 C_{6i-2}^+ &= (u_{6i-2}, u_{6i-1}, u_{6i+1}, x_{2i}) & C_{6i-2}^- &= (u_{6i-2}, u_{6i-1}, u_{6i+1}, \overline{x_{2i}}) \\
 C_{6i-4}^+ &= (u_{6i-4}, u_{6i-3}, u_{6i-1}, x_{2i-1}) & C_{6i-4}^- &= (u_{6i-4}, u_{6i-3}, u_{6i-1}, \overline{x_{2i-1}})
 \end{aligned}$$

201 If some of these vertices do not exist, we still add the hyperedges, but with fewer vertices in
 202 them. For instance, $A_{2n} = \{x_{2n}, \overline{x_{2n}}\}$. Moreover, for each clause $F_j = l_1^j \vee l_2^j \vee l_3^j \in \psi$ where
 203 the vertices l_1^j, l_2^j and l_3^j are literals either positive or negative, we add a hyperedge D_j . For
 204 $k = 1, 2, 3$, if l_k^j is a positive variable X_p , then x_p is in D_j , if l_k^j is a negative one $\neg X_p$, then
 205 $\overline{x_p}$ is in D_j . Moreover, If p is odd, then u_{6p-1} is in D_j , if p is even, then u_{6p+1} is in D_j .

206 Finally, the CNF game φ is reduced to the hypergraph $H = (V, E)$ with

$$\begin{aligned}
 V &= \{\{x_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq 2n} \cup \{\overline{x_i}\}_{1 \leq i \leq 2n} \cup \{u_j\}_{1 \leq j \leq 6n}\} \\
 E &= \{\{A_{2i}\}_{1 \leq i \leq n} \cup \{C_{2i}^+\}_{1 \leq i \leq 3n} \cup \{C_{2i}^-\}_{1 \leq i \leq 3n} \cup \{B_{2i-1}\}_{1 \leq i \leq n} \cup \{D_j\}_{1 \leq j \leq m}\}
 \end{aligned}$$

207 With this construction, we say that Avoider and Enforcer follow a *legitimate order* if they
 208 claim board elements in the following order for increasing i :

209 **Legitimate order during round i**

- 210 1. Avoider starts and claims u_{6i-5} .
- 211 2. Enforcer claims u_{6i-4} .
- 212 3. Avoider claims u_{6i-3} .
- 213 4. Enforcer claims one of x_{2i-1} or $\overline{x_{2i-1}}$.

6 Avoidance games are PSPACE-Complete

- 214 5. Avoider claims the remaining vertex in $(x_{2i-1}, \overline{x_{2i-1}})$
- 215 6. Enforcer claims u_{6i-2} .
- 216 7. Avoider claims u_{6i-1} .
- 217 8. Enforcer claims u_{6i} .
- 218 9. Avoider claims one of x_{2i} or $\overline{x_{2i}}$.
- 219 10. Enforcer claims the remaining vertex in $(x_{2i}, \overline{x_{2i}})$.

220 3.2 Sketch of the proof

221 To prove that, with our construction, Avoider wins the AVOIDER-ENFORCER game, if and
222 only if Satisfier wins the QBF game, we first prove that this statement is true if the order
223 of the moves is legitimate, as the moves will correspond to a valuation obtained in QBF.
224 To force the players to play in the legitimate order, the main idea of the construction is
225 that players want to claim some vertices as late as possible. Therefore, we prove that it is
226 always optimal to respect the legitimate order of the moves. We introduce the following
227 three lemmas that will be proved in the next section.

228 ► **Lemma 9.** *When the game is restricted to the legitimate order, Avoider has a winning
229 strategy in the Avoider-Enforcer game on H if and only if Satisfier has a winning strategy
230 for the 3-QBF game on φ .*

231 ► **Lemma 10.** *If Enforcer has a winning strategy in H when the legitimate order is respected
232 by the two players, then he has a winning strategy in H .*

233 ► **Lemma 11.** *If Avoider has a winning strategy in H when the legitimate order is respected
234 by the two players, then she has a winning strategy in H .*

235 We first admit these lemmas and we prove Theorem 2.

236 **Proof.** First, according to Lemma 7, we know that Avoider-Enforcer is in PSPACE. We now
237 prove the PSPACE-hardness of the problem by reduction from 3-QBF.

238 Let φ be a 3-SAT quantified boolean formula of the form described in Problem 8.
239 Consider the hypergraph H obtained from φ by following the construction of Section 3.1.
240 This construction has polynomial size. According to Lemma 9, when the order is respected, if
241 Satisfier (Falsifier resp.) has a winning strategy in φ , Avoider (Enforcer resp.) has a winning
242 strategy in H . Thus, according to Lemma 11 (Lemma 10 resp.), if Avoider (Enforcer resp.)
243 has a winning strategy on H when the legitimate order is respected, she (he resp.) has one
244 in general in H . Thus, Satisfier wins on φ if and only if, Avoider wins on H . Therefore, the
245 AVOIDER-ENFORCER PROBLEM is PSPACE-complete.

246 As all the construction provides a hypergraph H in which all the hyperedges have of
247 size at most six, the AVOIDER-ENFORCER PROBLEM is PSPACE-complete even restricted to
248 hypergraphs in which all the hyperedges have size at most six. ◀

249 3.3 Game in legitimate order

250 In this section, we suppose that both players follow a legitimate order of moves.

251 If the order of moves is legitimate, the only choices available for Avoider and Enforcer are
252 on the vertices x_i and $\overline{x_i}$. For each $1 \leq i \leq 2n$, Avoider claims one of $x_i, \overline{x_i}$ and Enforcer
253 the other. Therefore, if both Avoider and Enforcer play one vertex in $\{x_i, \overline{x_i}\}$, we define the
254 *underlying valuation* given to ψ as the following one:

$$X_i = \begin{cases} True & \text{if Avoider has claimed } \overline{x_i} \text{ and Enforcer has claimed } x_i \\ False & \text{if Avoider has claimed } x_i \text{ and Enforcer has claimed } \overline{x_i} \end{cases}$$

We now prove Lemma 9

Proof. Consider a game played on H for which both Avoider and Enforcer respected the legitimate order through the whole game.

▷ **Claim 12.** Avoider won the game on H if and only if the formula ψ is satisfied by the underlying valuation of the X_i s.

Proof. Since the legitimate order is respected, Enforcer claimed all the vertices u_{2i} and thus played at least once in all the hyperedges C_{2i}^+ and C_{2i}^- . Moreover, for each pair of variables $(x_i, \overline{x_i})$, Enforcer claimed one of the vertices of the pair, and so he has claimed at least one vertex in all the hyperedges A_i and B_i . Thus, the only hyperedges that could possibly be fully played by Avoider are the hyperedges D_j .

Since, in the legitimate order, Avoider claimed all the vertices u_{2i+1} , a hyperedge D_j corresponding to a clause F_j is fully played by Avoider if and only if she played on all the vertices $x(l_k^j)$ for $l_k \in F_j$, where $x(l_k^j) = x_p$ if $l_k^j = X_p$ and $x(l_k^j) = \overline{x_p}$ if $l_k^j = \neg X_p$. If this is the case, then this means that the formula ψ is not satisfied by the underlying valuation because the clause F_j has all its literals assigned to False. On the contrary, if the formula ψ is satisfied by the underlying valuation, then, for all clause F_j , at least one of the literals in it is assigned to True and so Enforcer played at least once in each hyperedge D_j .

Therefore, Avoider won the game on H if and only if ψ is satisfied. ◁

Suppose Satisfier has a winning strategy \mathcal{S} on φ . We define a strategy for Avoider as follows: Whenever Avoider has to play a vertex x_{2k} or $\overline{x_{2k}}$, Avoider considers the underlying valuation given to the X_i s with $i < 2k$. Then, if Satisfier had put X_{2k} to True, she claims $\overline{x_{2k}}$. Otherwise, she claims x_{2k} . With this strategy, at the end of the game, the underlying valuation of the variables of H will be the same as the valuation given by the game that Satisfier played on φ . Since Satisfier has a winning strategy on φ , the underlying valuation satisfies ψ and so Avoider wins the game.

Similarly, if Falsifier has a winning strategy, Enforcer can follow the strategy in such a way that at the end the valuation of variables in the game played by Falsifier correspond to the underlying valuation in H . Since Falsifier wins on φ , Enforcer wins the game on H . ◀

4 Proofs of Lemma 10 and Lemma 11

The first part of our constructions showed that, if the legitimate order is respected, Avoider wins if and only if Satisfier wins the 3-QBF game. We now prove that, if a player has a winning strategy when the order is respected, he has one even if his opponent does not respect the order. We introduce here different sets of variables. These sets will be the main tools of the proofs of Lemma 10 and Lemma 11.

For $i = 1$ to $4n$, we define the set of vertices S_i as $S_{4n} = \{u_{6n}, x_{2n}, \overline{x_{2n}}\}$ and for $i < 4n$:

- if $i = 4k$, $S_i = \{u_{6k}, x_{2k}, \overline{x_{2k}}, u_{6k+1}\} \cup S_{i+1}$
- if $i = 4k - 1$, $S_i = \{u_{6k-2}, u_{6k-1}\} \cup S_{i+1}$
- if $i = 4k - 2$, $S_i = \{x_{2k-1}, \overline{x_{2k-1}}\} \cup S_{i+1}$
- if $i = 4k - 3$, $S_i = \{u_{6k-4}, u_{6k-3}\} \cup S_{i+1}$

296 4.1 Proof of Lemma 10

297 We now prove Lemma 10

298 **Proof.** Suppose Enforcer has a winning strategy when the legitimate order is respected.
 299 Consider a strategy for Enforcer in which he plays according to the legitimate order until
 300 Avoider does not. If Avoider respects the order until all the vertices are played, by assumption,
 301 Enforcer wins. Otherwise, the proof of the following claim provides a winning strategy for
 302 Enforcer.

303 \triangleright **Claim 13.** If, during the game, Avoider plays in a set S_i in which Enforcer has not played
 304 yet, then, after this move, Enforcer has a strategy to win the game.

305 **Proof.** The proof is by induction on i .

306 First, notice that each S_i has an odd number of vertices and, as the total number of
 307 vertices in H is $10n$, there is also an odd number of vertices outside S_i . Therefore, if Avoider
 308 plays first in an S_i , Enforcer answers by playing an arbitrary vertex that is not in S_i and
 309 considers an arbitrary pairing outside S_i , which exists as there is an even number of vertices
 310 outside S_i after his move. This way, Avoider has to be the next player to play in S_i .

311 **Base cases:**

- 312 \blacksquare Case $i = 4n$: If Avoider plays first in S_{4n} , by pairing the two other vertices in S_{4n} , by
 313 using Lemma 6, Enforcer can force Avoider to play another vertex in S_{4n} . Hence, as
 314 (u_{6n}, x_{2n}) , $(u_{6n}, \overline{x_{2n}})$ and $(x_{2n}, \overline{x_{2n}})$ are three hyperedges, Avoider will claim the two
 315 vertices of one of them and thus lose.
- 316 \blacksquare Case $i = 4n - 1$: As shown previously, Enforcer has a strategy such that Avoider is the
 317 next player to play in S_{4n-1} . If Avoider has played at least one of her two first moves
 318 in S_{4n} , she has lost by the case $i = 4n$. Otherwise, she has claimed exactly u_{6n-2} and
 319 u_{6n-1} . In this case, Enforcer claims u_{6n} and pairs x_{2n} and $\overline{x_{2n}}$ and by Lemma 6 he forces
 320 Avoider to claim all the vertices of C_{6n-2}^+ or C_{6n-2}^- .

321 **Induction steps:** Suppose that the first time Avoider does not respect the order of the
 322 move, she plays in a set S_i for $i \leq 4n - 2$. If the second move of Avoider in S_i is in S_{i+1} ,
 323 Enforcer wins by induction hypothesis. Thus, we can suppose that Avoider has claimed two
 324 vertices in $S_i \setminus S_{i+1}$. Moreover, as Enforcer has arbitrarily paired the vertices outside S_i ,
 325 we describe here the strategy in S_i , and Enforcer plays according to the pairing outside S_i .
 326 This strategy ensures that the moves in S_i alternate between both players.

- 327 \blacksquare Case $i = 4k$: Avoider has played twice in $\{u_{6k}, x_{2k}, \overline{x_{2k}}, u_{6k+1}\}$. At least one of
 328 $\{u_{6k}, x_{2k}, \overline{x_{2k}}\}$ is available. Enforcer claims it. Avoider has to claim the third ver-
 329 tex in this quadruple, otherwise, she plays first in S_{i+1} and loses by induction, and
 330 necessarily one of the three vertices she has claimed is u_{6k+1} . Enforcer claims u_{6k+2} .
 331 Avoider either plays first in S_{i+2} and loses by induction hypothesis, or claims u_{6k+3} . At
 332 this moment, Avoider has played on the vertices u_{6k+1} and u_{6k+3} , and two of the vertices of
 333 $\{u_{6k}, x_{2k}, \overline{x_{2k}}\}$. So she has completed one of the hyperedges $C_{6k}^+ = (u_{6k}, u_{6k+1}, u_{6k+3}, x_{2k})$,
 334 $C_{6k}^- = (u_{6k}, u_{6k+1}, u_{6k+3}, \overline{x_{2k}})$ or $A_{2k} = (x_{2k}, \overline{x_{2k}}, u_{6k+1}, u_{6k+3})$.
- 335 \blacksquare Case $i = 4k - 1$: Avoider has claimed u_{6k-2} and u_{6k-1} . Enforcer claims u_{6k} . Avoider
 336 has to play on vertex in $\{x_{2k}, \overline{x_{2k}}, u_{6k+1}\}$, (otherwise she plays first in S_{i+2} and loses by
 337 induction). Enforcer claims either x_{2k} or $\overline{x_{2k}}$, as at least one of them is available. If Avoider
 338 plays a vertex in S_{i+2} she loses by induction. So she has to play the last vertex available
 339 in $S_i \setminus S_{i+1}$. With this strategy, Avoider has necessarily claimed u_{6k+1} and one of x_{2k} and
 340 $\overline{x_{2k}}$. Thus, she has played all the vertices of either $C_{6k-2}^+ = (u_{6k-2}, u_{6k-1}, u_{6k+1}, x_{2k})$ or
 341 $C_{6k-2}^- = (u_{6k-2}, u_{6k-1}, u_{6k+1}, \overline{x_{2k}})$.

- 342 ■ Case $i = 4k - 2$: Avoider has claimed x_{2k-1} and $\overline{x_{2k-1}}$. Enforcer claims u_{6k-2} . Either
 343 Avoider plays first in S_{i+2} and loses by induction, or she claims u_{6k-1} , the last available
 344 vertex in S_{i+1} and loses by having played all the vertices in $B_{2k-1} = (x_{2k-1}, \overline{x_{2k-1}}, u_{6k-1})$.
 345 ■ Case $i = 4k - 3$: Avoider has claimed u_{6k-4} and u_{6k-3} . Enforcer claims x_{2k-1} . Avoider
 346 has to claim $\overline{x_{2k-1}}$, otherwise she plays first in S_{i+2} and loses by induction. Then
 347 Enforcer claims u_{6k-2} . If Avoider plays in S_{i+3} she loses by induction. The last vertex
 348 available in $S_i \setminus S_{i+3}$ is u_{6k-1} , and if Avoider claims it, she loses by playing all the vertices
 349 $C_{6k-4}^- = (u_{6k-4}, u_{6k-3}, u_{6k-1}, \overline{x_{2k-1}})$.

350 By applying this induction, at any moment of the game, if Avoider plays first in a set S_i ,
 351 she loses. \triangleleft

352 Finally, if Enforcer has played according to the legitimate order, at any moment of the
 353 game, Avoider has to play in a set S_i in which Enforcer has already played. Therefore, she
 354 has to respect the order of the moves. The only moment when she can change this order is
 355 by claiming u_{6k+1} instead of one of the vertices $x_{2k}, \overline{x_{2k}}$. But if she does so, Enforcer can
 356 claim one of them, for instance x_{2k} , and Avoider will be forced to claim $\overline{x_{2k}}$. If this happens,
 357 everything happens as if Avoider has claimed $\overline{x_{2k}}$ first and u_{6k+1} after. Since these moves
 358 could have occurred in the legitimate order, the strategy can then continue as if the order
 359 has been respected.

360 To conclude, if Enforcer has a winning strategy when the legitimate order is respected,
 361 Enforcer has a winning strategy in H even without this restriction. \blacktriangleleft

362 4.2 Proof of Lemma 11

363 In this section, we prove that if Avoider has a winning strategy when the legitimate order
 364 is respected, she also has one if Enforcer does not respect the order. The main idea of the
 365 strategy is to respect the order, and if Enforcer does not respect the order, Avoider has a
 366 pairing strategy to force Enforcer to claim a vertex in some pair $(x_i, \overline{x_i})$, or the odd u_j that
 367 follows them. By construction, any hyperedge containing a vertex x_i or $\overline{x_i}$ also contains the
 368 next odd vertex u_j in the legitimate order, and this will prove that whenever Enforcer does
 369 not respect the order, it benefits Avoider. We now will prove Lemma 11.

370 **Proof.** Suppose Avoider has a winning strategy when the legitimate order is respected. We
 371 now describe a winning strategy for Avoider in the general case.

372 While Enforcer respects the legitimate order, Avoider also respects it. Suppose that at
 373 some moment of the game, Enforcer does not respect the legitimate order. Denote by y_A the
 374 vertex he would have played according to the legitimate order, and by y_E the vertex he has
 375 claimed instead. If y_A is a vertex x_{2i} or $\overline{x_{2i}}$, Avoider pairs it with u_{6i+1} and continues as if
 376 Enforcer had to play u_{6i+2} . If this is the case, consider $y_A = u_{6i+2}$. Note that, according to
 377 Lemma 5, we can suppose that y_E is not a vertex u_j with j odd. Indeed, for each vertex
 378 u_{2i+1} , the hyperedges that contain the previous vertex in the legitimate order (if this vertex
 379 is a vertex x_j or $\overline{x_j}$ this is true for either of them) also contain u_{2i+1} . As any hyperedge
 380 containing x_{2i} or $\overline{x_{2i}}$ also contains u_{6i+1} which is the next vertex Avoider should have played
 381 according to the legitimate order, it benefits her if Enforcer finally claims u_{6i+1} instead of
 382 x_{2i} or $\overline{x_{2i}}$ according to Lemma 5.

383 Denote by k the smallest integer such that $y_E \notin S_k$, and by k' the largest integer such
 384 that $y_A \in S_{k'}$. We consider $k = 4n + 1$ if $y_E \in S_{4n}$, with $S_{4n+1} = \emptyset$. Note that all the
 385 vertices outside $S_{k'}$ have already been played or are paired, and that $S_{k'} \setminus S_k$ is then the
 386 set of vertices perturbed by the move of Enforcer. As all the sets S_i have an odd number

387 of vertices, we know that the number of remaining vertices outside S_k is odd, as an even
 388 number of moves have been played in it. By assumption, Avoider was following a winning
 389 strategy for the legitimate order. She can then consider an arbitrary sequence of moves for
 390 Enforcer following the legitimate order and her answers according to her strategy until all the
 391 vertices in $S_{k'} \setminus S_k$ are played. According to these moves, we will denote by x_j^E the vertex
 392 among (x_j, \bar{x}_j) claimed by Enforcer and by x_j^A the vertex played by Avoider.

393 Avoider claims y_A , the vertex that Enforcer should have claimed according to the legitimate
 394 order, and will consider one strategy in S_k and another one outside S_k :

- 395 ■ In $H \setminus S_k$, she plays according to a pairing strategy, that is presented in the next paragraph.
- 396 ■ In S_k , Avoider considers the strategy she would have played if all the vertices outside S_k
 397 were played according to the legitimate order, with the vertices x_j^E claimed by Enforcer
 398 and the vertices x_j^A claimed by Avoider.

399 The pairing we define is the following one: (u_{6i-4}, x_{2i-1}^A) , (u_{6i-3}, u_{6i-6}) , (x_{2i-1}^E, u_{6i-1}) ,
 400 (u_{6i-2}, x_{2i}^A) , (u_{6i+1}, x_{2i}^E) . This pairing concerns all the vertices that have to be played after y_A
 401 in the legitimate order that are not in S_k , and we consider only pairs containing at least one
 402 vertex outside S_k . Note that, by construction, exactly one vertex of this pairing is already
 403 played, and exactly one paired with a vertex in S_k . Therefore, to make the pairing contain
 404 only vertices not played and outside S_k , some modifications are done. These modifications
 405 are presented in Figure 1. By applying Lemma 6, Avoider can ensure that Enforcer plays at
 406 least one in each of these pairs.

y_A	changes	y_E	changes
u_{6i-4}	$u_{6i-3} \longleftrightarrow x_{2i-1}^A$	u_{6i-4}	no changes
x_{2i-1} OR \bar{x}_{2i-1}	$x_{2i-1}^* \longleftrightarrow u_{6i-1}$	x_{2i-1} OR \bar{x}_{2i-1}	$x_{2i-1}^* \longleftrightarrow u_{6i-4}$
u_{6i-2}	$u_{6i-1} \longleftrightarrow x_{2i}^A$	u_{6i-2}	no changes
u_{6i}	$u_{6i+3} \longleftrightarrow x_{2i}^A$	u_{6i}	no changes
		x_{2i} OR \bar{x}_{2i}	$x_{2i}^* \longleftrightarrow u_{6i+1}, u_{6i-2} \longleftrightarrow u_{6i}$

■ **Figure 1** Changes of the matching. x_j^* refers to the variable in $\{x_k, \bar{x}_k\}$ that has not been played, arrows represent new pairs of vertices in the matching.

407 \triangleright **Claim 14.** The pairing strategy ensures that Enforcer plays at least once in each hyperedge
 408 A_i, B_i or C_i containing all their vertices in $S_{k'}$ and at least one outside S_k .

409 **Proof.** First, if the hyperedge contains no vertex whose pairing has been modified because of
 410 their belonging to y_A or y_E , it contains two paired vertices. We show in bold text the paired
 411 vertices:

$$\begin{aligned}
 A_{2i} &= (x_{2i}^A, \mathbf{x_{2i}^E}, \mathbf{u_{6i+1}}, u_{6i+3}) & C_{6i-2}^E &= (u_{6i-2}, u_{6i-1}, \mathbf{u_{6i+1}}, \mathbf{x_{2i}^E}) \\
 C_{6i}^A &= (\mathbf{u_{6i}}, u_{6i+1}, \mathbf{u_{6i+3}}, x_{2i}^A) & B_{2i-1} &= (x_{2i-1}^A, \mathbf{x_{2i-1}^E}, \mathbf{u_{6i-1}}) \\
 C_{6i}^E &= (u_{6i}, \mathbf{u_{6i+1}}, u_{6i+3}, \mathbf{x_{2i}^E}) & C_{6i-4}^A &= (\mathbf{u_{6i-4}}, u_{6i-3}, u_{6i-1}, \mathbf{x_{2i-1}^A}) \\
 C_{6i-2}^A &= (\mathbf{u_{6i-2}}, u_{6i-1}, u_{6i+1}, \mathbf{x_{2i}^A}) & C_{6i-4}^E &= (u_{6i-4}, u_{6i-3}, \mathbf{u_{6i-1}}, \mathbf{x_{2i-1}^E})
 \end{aligned}$$

413 For the first hyperedges of the matching, there are two paired vertices.

414 Recall first that if Enforcer was supposed to play in $\{x_{2i}, \bar{x}_{2i}\}$, Avoider pairs this vertex
 415 with u_{6i+1} and considers $y_A = u_{6i+2}$. The only one hyperedge among the A_i, B_i and C_i that
 416 was concerned with this change is A_{2i} , in which two vertices are now paired. In any other
 417 case, the following vertices are paired:

- 418 ■ If $y_A = u_{6i-4}$, only the hyperedges C_{6i-4}^E and C_{6i-4}^A are concerned by the changes. In
 419 the former x_{2i-1}^E is paired with u_{6i-1} , in the latter x_{2i-1}^A is paired with u_{6i-3} .

- 420 ■ If $y_A \in \{x_{2i-1}, \overline{x_{2i-1}}\}$, the only hyperedges concerned by the change is B_{2i-1} . In it, the
 421 other vertex in $\{x_{2i-1}, \overline{x_{2i-1}}\}$ is paired with u_{6i-1}
- 422 ■ If $y_A = u_{6i-2}$, only the hyperedges C_{6i-2}^E and C_{6i-2}^A are concerned by the changes. In
 423 the former x_{2i}^E is paired with u_{6i+1} , in the latter x_{2i}^A is paired with u_{6i-1} .
- 424 ■ If $y_A = u_{6i}$, only the hyperedges C_{6i}^E and C_{6i}^A are concerned by the changes. In the former
 425 x_{2i}^E is paired with u_{6i+1} , in the latter x_{2i}^A is paired with u_{6i+3} .

426 For the last hyperedges that contain vertices of the matching, the following happens:

- 427 ■ If $y_E = u_{6i-4}$, the pairing stops at u_{6i-3} . The only two hyperedges that contain at least
 428 one vertex in S_k and one vertex outside S_k are C_{6i-4}^+ and C_{6i-4}^- , in which Enforcer has
 429 claimed y_E .
- 430 ■ If $y_E = x_{2i-1}$ or $\overline{x_{2i-1}}$, the pairing stops after the second vertex in $\{x_{2i-1}, \overline{x_{2i-1}}\}$. The
 431 only one hyperedge containing at least one vertex in S_k and one outside S_k is B_{2i-1} , in
 432 which Enforcer has already claimed y_E .
- 433 ■ If $y_E = u_{6i-2}$, the pairing stops at u_{6i-1} . The only two hyperedges that contain at least
 434 one vertex in S_k and one vertex outside S_k are C_{6i-2}^+ and C_{6i-2}^- , in which Enforcer has
 435 claimed y_E .
- 436 ■ If $y_E = u_{6i}$, the pairing stops at u_{6i+1} . The three hyperedges that contain both vertices
 437 in S_k and vertices outside S_k are C_{6i}^+ , C_{6i}^- and A_{2i} . In C_{6i}^+ , C_{6i}^- , Enforcer has claimed
 438 y_E , and in A_{2i} , Enforcer will play one of x_{2i}^E or u_{6i+1} as these two vertices are paired
 439 together.
- 440 ■ If $y_E = x_{2i}$ or $\overline{x_{2i}}$, the pairing stops at u_{6i+1} . The three hyperedges that contain vertices
 441 inside S_k and outside S_k are C_{6i}^+ , C_{6i}^- and A_{2i} . As the second vertex in $\{x_{2i}, \overline{x_{2i}}\}$ is
 442 paired with u_{6i+1} , either Enforcer has claimed both x_{2i} and $\overline{x_{2i}}$, and any of these three
 443 hyperedges contains at least one of them; or Enforcer has claimed u_{6i+1} which is in these
 444 three hyperedges.

445 If the pairing stops because it goes until the end (i.e. $k = 4n + 1$), one vertex is not
 446 paired. According to Lemma 6, as Enforcer plays the last move in H , Avoider can force him
 447 to play it and still play once in each pair of the pairing.

448 Finally, in any hyperedge A_i, B_i or C_i containing at least one vertex of the matching,
 449 Enforcer has played at least one vertex. ◀

450 Now, we can prove that the strategy we defined for Avoider is a winning strategy. In all
 451 the hyperedges A_i, B_i or C_i , Enforcer played at least once. Indeed, if Enforcer has respected
 452 the order until he plays in one of these hyperedges, there is nothing to do. Otherwise, by
 453 Claim 14, Avoider can force Enforcer to play in it as this hyperedge is considered in a set
 454 of hyperedges in which Enforcer has not respected the order, and thus contains two paired
 455 vertices.

456 In the hyperedges D_j , as the strategy in the legitimate order is a winning strategy, it
 457 forces at least one vertex x_i or $\overline{x_i}$ to be claimed by Enforcer in D_j (since all the vertices u_k
 458 of odd indices are played by Avoider in the legitimate order). Then, by construction, if when
 459 this vertex has to be claimed the order was respected, Enforcer has played it. If the order
 460 was not respected, then Avoider has paired this vertex with the next vertex u_k of odd index,
 461 forcing Enforcer to play one of them. In both cases, Enforcer has played in D_j . ◀

462 **5** Uniform hypergraphs and applications

463 The construction provided in Section 3.1 provided a hypergraph in which any hyperedge have
 464 size at most six. We prove here that the PSPACE-hardness can be generalized to uniform
 465 hypergraphs.

466 **5.1** From 6-hypergraphs to 6-uniform hypergraphs

467 A hypergraph $H = (V, E)$ is a k -hypergraph if any hyperedge $e \in E$ has size at most k . It is
 468 said to be k -uniform if any hyperedge $e \in E$ has size exactly k .

469 ► **Lemma 15.** *Let $H = (V, E)$ be a k -hypergraph. Let $m = \min_{e \in E} |e|$. If $m < k$, there exists
 470 a k -hypergraph $H' = (V', E')$ where $\min_{e \in E'} |e| = m + 1$, having $|E'| \leq 2|E|$ and $|V'| \leq |V| + 2$
 471 such that Avoider has a winning strategy in the Avoider-Enforcer game on H if and only if
 472 she has one in H' .*

473 **Proof.** Let $H = (V, E)$ be a k -hypergraph. Let $m = \min_{e \in E} |e|$. We define $H' = (V', E')$ as
 474 follows. We start from $V' = V$. We add two vertices $\{a_1, a_2\}$ in V' . For each hyperedge
 475 $e \in E$, we add hyperedges in E' as follows:

- 476 ■ If $|e| > m$, we add a copy of e in E' .
- 477 ■ If $|e| = m$, we add two hyperedges $e_1 = e \cup \{a_1\}$ and $e_2 = e \cup \{a_2\}$ in E' .

478 We have $|V'| = |V| + 2$, $|E'| \leq 2|E|$ and $\min_{e \in E'} |e| = m + 1$.

479 Now, if Avoider (Enforcer resp.) had a winning strategy \mathcal{S} in E , we can define a strategy
 480 \mathcal{S}' in E' as follows:

- 481 ■ If the opponent plays a vertex in V , or if it is the first move of the player, play as in \mathcal{S} .
- 482 ■ If the opponent plays a vertex in $\{a_1, a_2\}$, or if there is no vertex in V available, play an
 483 available vertex in $\{a_1, a_2\}$.

484 Following this strategy, Avoider (Enforcer resp.) has played exactly the same vertices in H'
 485 as he (she resp.) would have played in H according to \mathcal{S} with, in addition, exactly one of
 486 $\{a_1, a_2\}$.

487 Therefore, if Avoider had a winning strategy in H , then for each $e \in E$, there exists one
 488 vertex $v \in e$, that Enforcer has played. Let $e' \in E'$ be a hyperedge. If e' is a copy of some
 489 hyperedge $e \in E$, then Enforcer has played in it, as he would have played in e according to \mathcal{S} .
 490 If e' is a hyperedge e_1 or e_2 created from a hyperedge $e \in E$, as Enforcer would have played
 491 in e according to \mathcal{S} , he has played the same vertex in e' .

492 If Enforcer had a winning strategy in H , following this strategy, there exists a hyperedge
 493 $e \in E$ in which Avoider has claimed all the vertices. If $|e| \geq m + 1$, Avoider has also played
 494 all the vertices of $e \in E'$, so Enforcer has won. If $|e| = m$, as the strategy \mathcal{S}' forces Avoider
 495 to play at least one of $\{a_1, a_2\}$, suppose without loss of generality that she has claimed a_1 .
 496 Then, she has claimed a_1 and all the vertices of e , so she has filled up the edge e_1 . Therefore,
 497 this strategy is a winning strategy for Enforcer.

498 Finally, H' has the same outcome as H and $\min_{e \in E'} |e| = m + 1$. ◀

499 ► **Corollary 16.** *Avoider-Enforcer is PSPACE-complete even restricted to 6-uniform hyper-*
 500 *graphs*

501 **Proof.** The construction provided in the proof of Theorem 2 builds a 6-hypergraphs in which
 502 all hyperedges have size at least two. Therefore, by applying Lemma 15 four times, with
 503 $m = 2, 3, 4, 5$, we obtain a hypergraph having at most eight more vertices and eight times

504 more hyperedges. Thus, this construction is still polynomial and the hypergraph obtained is
 505 6-uniform. ◀

506 5.2 Avoider-Avoider games

507 We prove Corollary 4, i.e. that Avoider-Avoider games are PSPACE-complete, even restricted
 508 to 7-uniform hypergraphs.

509 **Proof.** Consider the construction provided in the proof of Corollary 16. Consider H' the
 510 hypergraph obtained by adding a vertex v_0 in H and adding it in all the hyperedges of H .
 511 Note that, as any hyperedge of H has size six, any hyperedge of H' have size exactly seven.
 512 According to Lemma 5 (note that the result also apply to Avoider-Avoider games), both
 513 players have an optimal strategy in which v_0 will be played last, and as the graph has an
 514 odd number of vertices, the first player will play it. Therefore, the second player cannot fill
 515 up a hyperedge and plays as Enforcer would in the Avoider-Enforcer game. By applying the
 516 same strategy as in Avoider-Enforcer, if Avoider wins in Avoider-Enforcer, the game ends by
 517 a draw, otherwise the second player wins. ◀

518 References

- 519 1 Noga Alon, József Balogh, Béla Bollobás, and Tamás Szabó. Game domination number.
 520 *Discrete mathematics*, 256(1-2):23–33, 2002.
- 521 2 V Anuradha, Chinmay Jain, Jack Snoeyink, and Tibor Szabó. How long can a graph be kept
 522 planar? *the electronic journal of combinatorics*, 15(1), 2008.
- 523 3 János Barát and Miloš Stojaković. On winning fast in Avoider-Enforcer games. *the electronic*
 524 *journal of combinatorics*, 17, 2008.
- 525 4 József Beck. Ramsey games. *Discrete mathematics*, 249(1-3):3–30, 2002.
- 526 5 József Beck. *Combinatorial games: tic-tac-toe theory*, volume 114. Cambridge University
 527 Press Cambridge, 2008.
- 528 6 Edouard Bonnet, Serge Gaspers, Antonin Lambilliotte, Stefan Rümmele, and Abdallah
 529 Saffidine. The Parameterized Complexity of Positional Games. In *ICALP*, Varsovie, Poland,
 530 July 2017.
- 531 7 Boštjan Brešar, Sandi Klavžar, and Douglas F Rall. Domination game and an imagination
 532 strategy. *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics*, 24(3):979–991, 2010.
- 533 8 Jesper Makhholm Byskov. Maker-Maker and Maker-Breaker games are PSPACE-complete.
 534 *BRICS Report Series*, 11(14), 2004.
- 535 9 Erik D Demaine. Playing games with algorithms: Algorithmic combinatorial game theory. In
 536 *International Symposium on Mathematical Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 18–33.
 537 Springer, 2001.
- 538 10 Eric Duchene, Valentin Gledel, Aline Parreau, and Gabriel Renault. Maker-Breaker domination
 539 game. *Discrete Mathematics*, 343(9):111955, 2020.
- 540 11 P Erdős and J.L Selfridge. On a combinatorial game. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series*
 541 *A*, 14(3):298–301, 1973.
- 542 12 Florian Galliot, Sylvain Gravier, and Isabelle Sivignon. Maker-Breaker is solved in polynomial
 543 time on hypergraphs of rank 3, 2022.
- 544 13 Andrzej Grzesik, Mirjana Mikalački, Zoltán Lóránt Nagy, Alon Naor, Balázs Patkós, and Fiona
 545 Skerman. Avoider-Enforcer star games. In *The Seventh European Conference on Combinatorics,*
 546 *Graph Theory and Applications*, pages 375–379. Springer, 2013.
- 547 14 R.I. Hales and A.W. Jewett. Regularity and positional games. *Trans. Am. Math. Soc.*,
 548 106:222–229, 1963.
- 549 15 Dan Hefetz. *Positional games on graphs*. PhD thesis, Citeseer, 2007.

- 550 **16** Dan Hefetz, Michael Krivelevich, Miloš Stojaković, and Tibor Szabó. Fast winning strategies
551 in positional games. *Electronic Notes in Discrete Mathematics*, 29:213–217, 2007.
- 552 **17** Dan Hefetz, Michael Krivelevich, Miloš Stojaković, and Tibor Szabó. Avoider-Enforcer: The
553 rules of the game. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A*, 117(2):152–163, 2010.
- 554 **18** Dan Hefetz, Michael Krivelevich, Miloš Stojaković, and Tibor Szabó. *Positional games*,
555 volume 44. Springer, 2014.
- 556 **19** Dan Hefetz, Michael Krivelevich, and Tibor Szabó. Avoider-Enforcer games. *Journal of*
557 *Combinatorial Theory, Series A*, 114(5):840–853, 2007.
- 558 **20** Dan Hefetz, Michael Krivelevich, and Tibor Szabó. Bart–Moe games, JumbleG and discrepancy.
559 *European Journal of Combinatorics*, 28(4):1131–1143, 2007.
- 560 **21** Gal Kronenberg, Adva Mond, and Alon Naor. h -games played on vertex sets of random graphs.
561 *arXiv preprint arXiv:1901.00351*, 2019.
- 562 **22** Xiaoyun Lu. A matching game. *Discret. Math.*, 94(3):199–207, 1991.
- 563 **23** Xiaoyun Lu. A note on biased and non-biased games. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 60(1):285–
564 291, 1995.
- 565 **24** Tillmann Miltzow and Miloš Stojaković. Avoider-Enforcer Game is NP-hard. *arXiv preprint*
566 *arXiv:2208.06687*, 2022.
- 567 **25** Rajko Nenadov, Angelika Steger, and Miloš Stojaković. On the threshold for the Maker-Breaker
568 H-game. *Random Structures & Algorithms*, 49(3):558–578, 2016.
- 569 **26** Md Lutfar Rahman and Thomas Watson. 6-Uniform Maker-Breaker Game Is PSPACE-
570 Complete. In *38th International Symposium on Theoretical Aspects of Computer Science*
571 *(STACS 2021)*, volume 187 of *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs)*, pages
572 57:1–57:15, 2021.
- 573 **27** Thomas J. Schaefer. On the Complexity of Some Two-Person Perfect-Information Games.
574 *Journal of computer and system Sciences*, 16:185–225, 1978.
- 575 **28** Gustavus J Simmons. The Game of SIM. In *Mathematical Solitaires & Games*, pages 50–50.
576 Routledge, 1968.
- 577 **29** Wolfgang Slany. Endgame problems of Sim-like graph Ramsey avoidance games are PSPACE-
578 complete. *Theoretical computer science*, 289(1):829–843, 2002.
- 579 **30** Larry J Stockmeyer and Albert R Meyer. Word problems requiring exponential time (prelim-
580 inary report). In *Proceedings of the fifth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*,
581 pages 1–9, 1973.

A Particular Avoider-Enforcer games

Several games have been proven to be PSPACE-complete in the Maker-Breaker convention, thanks to the proofs of Schaefer or of Rahman and Watson. Due to the similarities between the two conventions, some reductions may be adapted to prove that these games are PSPACE-complete in the Avoider-Enforcer convention. In particular, we prove in this section that the domination game and the vertex H -Game are PSPACE-complete in Avoider-Enforcer convention.

A.1 Avoider-Enforcer domination game.

The Maker-Breaker domination game was introduced by Duchêne *et al.* in 2020 [10] and follows the study of domination games on graphs, which were investigated since 2002 [1, 7]. In Maker-Breaker, two players, namely Dominator and Staller alternately claim an unclaimed vertex of the graph, Dominator wins if he manages to claim all the vertices from a dominating set. Otherwise, Staller wins. They proved that determining whether Dominator or Staller has a winning strategy is PSPACE-complete using a reduction from the general Maker-Breaker game. The Avoider-Enforcer domination game can be similarly defined, with Anti-Staller winning if Anti-Dominator claims a dominating set and Anti-Dominator winning otherwise. We prove here that determining the winner of the Avoider-Enforcer domination game is PSPACE-complete. Note that the proof is very similar to the reduction from Maker-Breaker games to Maker-Breaker domination game.

► Problem 17. AVOIDER-ENFORCER DOMINATION GAME

Input: A graph G

Output: True if and only if Anti-Dominator wins the Avoider-Enforcer domination game on G .

► Theorem 18. The AVOIDER-ENFORCER DOMINATION GAME problem is PSPACE-complete

Proof. First, Avoider-Enforcer domination game is in PSPACE, as the number of moves in a game is the number of vertices, and as determining if a set is a dominating set or not can be done in polynomial time, the game is in PSPACE.

Let $H = (V_H, E_H)$ be a hypergraph. Without loss of generality, we can suppose that each vertex is in at least one hyperedge, otherwise the vertices in no hyperedge will be played first according to Lemma 5, and we can just remove them, up to change the first player to go. We construct the following graph $G = (V, E)$ as follows:

- For each vertex u_i in V_H , we add a vertex v_i in V .
- For each hyperedge C in E_H , we add two vertices v_C^1 and v_C^2 in V .
- If a vertex u_i of V_H belongs to a hyperedge C of E_H , we add the edges $v_i v_C^1$ and $v_i v_C^2$ to E .

Note that the graph created here is bipartite

Suppose Avoider (Enforcer resp.) has a winning strategy \mathcal{S} in H . We define a strategy \mathcal{S}' for Anti-Staller (Anti-Dominator resp.) in G as follows.


- If Avoider (Enforcer resp.) plays the first move in H , he claims first a vertex v_i such that u_i is the first vertex claimed in \mathcal{S} .
- If the opponent claims a vertex v_i , he claims a vertex v_j such that u_j is the answer to the vertex u_i in \mathcal{S} .

624 ■ If a player plays a vertex v_C^k for $k \in \{1, 2\}$, he claims the vertex $v_C^{k'}$ for $k' \neq k \in \{1, 2\}$.

625 Now if Avoider had a winning strategy in H , by applying the strategy S' , for any vertex
 626 v_C^i , Anti-Staller has not played all the v_j s adjacent to it. Therefore, Anti-Dominator has
 627 claimed one of them and all the v_C^i s are dominated. Moreover, all the vertex u_j s are in at
 628 least one edge C of H , and thus v_j is dominated by Anti-Dominator, as she has played one
 629 of (v_C^1, v_C^2) . Finally, Anti-Dominator has dominated the graph and Anti-Staller has won.

630 Reciprocally, if Enforcer had a winning strategy in H , by applying the strategy S' ,
 631 Anti-Dominator knows that there exists a pair of vertices (v_C^1, v_C^2) , such that Anti-Staller
 632 has played all the v_j s adjacent to them. As Anti-Staller has played one of them, and all its
 633 neighbors, this vertex is not dominated. Therefore, Anti-Dominator has won. ◀

634 In Figure 2 we provide an example of reduction. Note that the construction provided is
 635 exactly the same as the one used to prove the PSPACE-completeness in Maker-Breaker in
 636 [10].



■ **Figure 2** Reduction from Avoider-Enforcer game to Avoider-Enforcer domination game.

637 ▶ **Remark 19.** Up to add all the edges between the v_i s, the game is still PSPACE-complete
 638 on split graphs.

639 A.2 Avoider-Enforcer vertex H-Game

640 The vertex H -Game has been introduced by Kronenberg, Mond and Naor in [21] on random
 641 graphs. It is presented in several conventions, but we will focus here on the Avoider-Enforcer
 642 one. The game is played as follows:

643 Let H be a graph. Avoider and Enforcer play on the vertex set of another graph G .
 644 Alternately, Avoider and Enforcer claim an unclaimed vertex of G . Avoider wins if the set of
 645 vertices she has claimed do not contain H as a subgraph (not necessarily induced). Otherwise,
 646 Enforcer wins.

647 ▶ **Problem 20.** AVOIDER-ENFORCER VERTEX H -GAME

648 *Input:* A graph G

649 *Output:* True if and only if Avoider wins the Avoider-Enforcer vertex H -Game played on G .

650 We first need to define some graphs and operations that will be helpful to describe the
 651 graphs of this section:

652 ■ We will denote by I_k the graph being an independent set of size k , i.e. containing k
 653 vertices and no edge.

654 ■ If G and H are two graphs, we denote by $G \bowtie H$ their join, i.e. if $G = (V_G, E_G)$ and
 655 $H = (V_H, E_H)$, we have $G \bowtie H = (V, E)$ with $V = V_G \cup V_H$ and $E = E_G \cup E_H \cup$
 656 $\{(v_G, v_H) \mid v_G \in V_G, v_H \in V_H\}$.

657 ■ If G and H are two graphs, we denote by $G \boxtimes H$ their strong product, i.e. if $G = (V_G, E_G)$
 658 and $H = (V_H, E_H)$, we have $G \boxtimes H = (V, E)$ with $V = \{x_{u,v} \mid u \in V_G, v \in V_H\}$ and
 659 $E = \{(x_{u_1, v_1}, x_{u_2, v_2}) \mid (u_1 = u_2 \text{ or } (u_1, u_2) \in E_G) \text{ and } (v_1 = v_2 \text{ or } (v_1, v_2) \in E_H)\}$.

660 Remark that for any graph G , $G \boxtimes P_2$ (where P_2 design the path of length 2) is obtained
 661 by taking two copies of G and connecting each vertex to its copy and its copy's neighbors.

662 We prove here that determining the winner of the Avoider-Enforcer vertex H -Game is a
 663 PSPACE-complete problem for several graphs H .

664 ► **Theorem 21.** *Let H_0 be a graph containing at least one edge or at least 6 vertices, and*
 665 *let $k \geq 6$. Consider $H = I_k \bowtie H_0$. The AVOIDER-ENFORCER VERTEX H -GAME problem is*
 666 *PSPACE-complete.*

667 Note that complete bipartite graphs $K_{n,m}$, with $n, m \geq 6$, are of this type. Indeed,
 668 $K_{n,m} = I_k \bowtie H_0$ for $H_0 = I_m$ and $k = n$.

669 **Proof.** First, the Avoider-Enforcer vertex H -game is in PSPACE. Indeed, as it is a positional
 670 game, if $G = (V, E)$ is a graph, the game ends after at most $|V|$ moves. After that, determining
 671 whether a graph H is a subgraph of a graph G can be done in polynomial space.

672 We do our reduction from AVOIDER-ENFORCER on 6-uniform hypergraphs (proven to be
 673 PSPACE-complete in Corollary 16). Let H_0 be a graph containing at least one edge or at
 674 least 6 vertices, and let $k \geq 6$. Let $H = I_k \bowtie H_0$. To avoid confusion while describing the
 675 strategies in the two games, we will call the players of the Avoider-Enforcer vertex H -Game
 676 Alice and Bob, with Alice avoiding creating a subgraph H and Bob forcing her to create one.

677 Let $H' = (V', E')$ be a 6-uniform hypergraph. Let H'_0 be the strong product $H_0 \boxtimes P_2$.
 678 We build $G = (V, E)$ an instance of the Avoider-Enforcer vertex H -Game as follows:

- 679 ■ **Step 1:** For any vertex $v'_i \in V'$, we add a vertex $v_i \in V$.
- 680 ■ **Step 2:** For any hyperedge $C \in E'$, we add $2(k-6)$ vertices $v_1^C, \dots, v_{2(k-6)}^C$ (note that
 681 if $k = 6$, no vertex is added during this step).
- 682 ■ **Step 3:** For any hyperedge $C \in E'$, we add a copy H_0^C of the graph H'_0 in G , and we
 683 connect any vertex of H_0^C to all the vertices v_i such that $v'_i \in C$ and to all the vertices
 684 v_j^C for $1 \leq j \leq 2k-6$.

685 ▷ **Claim 22.** If Avoider has a winning strategy in H' , Alice has a winning strategy in G .

686 **Proof.** Suppose Avoider has a winning strategy \mathcal{S}' in H' . We define Alice's strategy \mathcal{S} in G
 687 as follows:

- 688 ■ She starts by claiming the vertex v_i , corresponding to the vertex v'_i that Avoider would
 689 have claimed in H' according to \mathcal{S}' .
- 690 ■ If Bob claims a vertex v_i , she answers with the vertex v_j corresponding to the vertex v'_j
 691 that Avoider would have claimed by \mathcal{S}' in H' if Enforcer has claimed v'_i .
- 692 ■ In H_0^C , as it is a strong product $H_0 \boxtimes P_2$, Alice considers the pairing between any vertex
 693 of H_0 and its copy in the strong product. If Bob plays in one pair of this pairing, she
 694 claims the second vertex of this pair.
- 695 ■ For any hyperedge C in H' , Alice considers the set of vertices v_j^C for $1 \leq j \leq 2k-6$. If
 696 Bob claims one of them, she also claims one. As there is an even number of them, this is
 697 always possible.

698 At the end of the game, by the matching strategy, for each hyperedge C in H' , Alice
 699 will have played exactly a copy of H_0 in each H_0^C , exactly $k - 6$ vertices among the v_j^C for
 700 $1 \leq j \leq 2(k - 6)$, and the vertices v_i corresponding to the v_i' that Avoider would have played
 701 according to \mathcal{S}' in H' .

702 Now, consider any copy H_1 of H in G . Suppose that Alice has played all the vertices of
 703 H_1 .

704 Suppose that H_0 has at least one edge. We first prove that H_1 cannot contain two vertices
 705 v_C and $v_{C'}$ for $C \neq C'$ that have been created by the Steps 2 or Step 3 of our construction.
 706 Suppose it does. Consider a decomposition of $H_1 = I_k \bowtie H_0^1$. By construction, the v_C s and
 707 the $v_{C'}$ s are not adjacent. Therefore, as these two components are fully connected one to the
 708 other, they must either be both in I_k or both in H_0^1 .

709 Let $e = (u_1, u_2)$ be an edge of H_0^1 . v_C and $v_{C'}$ cannot be both adjacent to u_1 , otherwise,
 710 by construction, we would have $C = C'$. Therefore, as only vertices created during Step 1
 711 can be adjacent to both v_C and $v_{C'}$, any vertex in I_k must be a vertex v_i . Which is not
 712 possible otherwise, Alice would have play $k \geq 6$ vertices v_i adjacent to a same v_C , which
 713 means that, according to \mathcal{S}' she would have played $k \geq 6$ vertices in the same hyperedge in
 714 H' , which contradicts the fact that \mathcal{S}' was a winning strategy for Avoider in H' .

715 Now, as all the vertices of H_1 are either v_i s or were created by considering the same
 716 hyperedge C , and $|H_1| = |H_0| + k$, by the pairing, we know that exactly 6 of them are v_i s.
 717 As there are no edges between the v_i s, they must all be on the same side of the join, and
 718 therefore, they are all connected to a same vertex. By construction, this is only the case if
 719 these six vertices are in a same hyperedge of H' which contradicts that \mathcal{S}' was a winning
 720 strategy for Avoider in H' , as these six vertices would then form a hyperedge.

721 Suppose now that H_0 has no edges and has $k' \geq 6$ vertices.

722 This means that H can be written $I_k \bowtie I_{k'}$ for $k, k' \geq 6$ (note that H is a complete
 723 bipartite graph). Once again, consider two vertices v_C and $v_{C'}$ for $C \neq C'$ in H_1 . As
 724 they cannot be adjacent, they must be both in I_k or both in $I_{k'}$. Thus, v_C and $v_{C'}$ have
 725 $\min(k, k') \geq 6$ common neighbors. This implies that, if $C \neq C'$, at least one of their common
 726 neighbor is not a vertex v_i created during Step 1, otherwise Alice would have played six
 727 vertices in the same hyperedge of H' . This is not possible by construction. So once again,
 728 H_1 cannot contain v_C and $v_{C'}$ created from different hyperedges C and C' in H' . Now, if
 729 Alice has played all the vertices of H_1 , by construction as $|H_1| = k + k'$, and as her pairing
 730 strategy ensures her to play $k - 6$ vertices created during step 2 and k' created during step 3,
 731 necessarily, she has played six vertices v_i creating during step 1. As there are no edges
 732 between these six vertices, they must all be in the same independent set I_k or $I_{k'}$. Thus,
 733 they have a common neighbor. This common neighbor must then be a vertex v_C creating
 734 during step 3 as only them are connected to the v_i s. Finally, these six vertices corresponds
 735 to six vertices v_i' s that are in the same hyperedge C of H' . Once again, this contradicts the
 736 fact that \mathcal{S}' was a winning strategy for Avoider in H' .

737

◁

738 ▷ **Claim 23.** If Enforcer has a winning strategy \mathcal{S}' in H' , Bob has a winning strategy in G .

739 **Proof.** Let \mathcal{S}' be a winning strategy for Enforcer in H' . We consider a strategy \mathcal{S} for Bob in
 740 G as follows:

- 741 ■ If Alice claims a vertex v_i , he answers with the vertex v_j that corresponds to the vertex
 742 v_j' that Enforcer would have claimed in response to v_i' in \mathcal{S}' .

- 743 ■ In H_0^C , as it is a strong product $H_0 \boxtimes P_2$, Bob considers the pairing between any vertex
 744 and its copy in the strong product. If Alice plays in one pair of the pairing, he plays the
 745 second vertex of the pair.
- 746 ■ For any edge $C \in H'$, Bob pairs the vertices v_j^C for $1 \leq j \leq 2k - 6$. If Alice claims one of
 747 them, he claims one of them too.
- 748 ■ If at a certain moment of the game, it is Bob's turn and the remaining vertices are all in
 749 some H_0^C or vertices v_j^C s, he applies the pairing strategy, so that Alice plays once in any
 750 pair of the matching by Lemma 6.

751 Consider the graph at the end of the game. As \mathcal{S} was a winning strategy for Enforcer in
 752 H' , there exists a hyperedge $C \in H'$ in which Avoider has claimed the six vertices. Up to a
 753 renaming of the vertices, denote by v'_1, \dots, v'_6 be these six vertices. Alice has then claimed
 754 v_1, \dots, v_6 in G . According to the pairing strategy, Bob knows that Alice will play exactly
 755 on $k - 6$ vertices from the v_j^C , denote them v_7, \dots, v_k , and exactly one copy H_1 of H_0 from
 756 the vertices of H_0^C . Now, by construction, the vertices v_1, \dots, v_k are a stable set and all the
 757 edges exist between any v_i ($1 \leq i \leq k$) and any vertex v of H_1 . Thus, the subgraph formed
 758 by these vertices, which were all played by Alice, is isomorphic to $I_k \bowtie H_0 = H$. Thus, Bob
 759 has won. \triangleleft

760 Finally, Alice has a winning strategy in the Avoider-Enforcer vertex H -Game played on G
 761 if and only if Avoider has one in the Avoider-Enforcer game played on H' , and determining
 762 the winner of the Avoider-Enforcer vertex H -Game is PSPACE-complete. \blacktriangleleft