

TIME MATTERS

- For some $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, a Turing machine $M = (K, \Sigma, \Delta, s, \{h\})$ is **f -time bounded** iff for any $w \in \Sigma^*$: there is no configuration C such that $(s, \#w\#) \vdash_M^{f(|w|)+1} C$
- M is **polynomially (time) bounded** iff M is p -time bounded for some polynomial p .
- $L \subseteq \Sigma^*$ is **polynomially decidable** iff there exists a **deterministic**, polynomially bounded Turing machine that decides $L \Rightarrow$ **complexity class \mathcal{P}**
 - \mathcal{P} is the class of exactly all the polynomially decidable languages
 - \mathcal{P} is closed under complementation
 - There are recursive languages that are not in \mathcal{P} (page 277)
$$E = \{\text{enc}(M)\# \text{enc}(w) : M \text{ accepts } w \text{ after at most } 2^{|w|} \text{ steps}\}$$
 - \mathcal{P} (as well as subsequent complexity classes) are based on **worst-case analysis**
- **Complexity class \mathcal{NP}** : the class of exactly all the languages decided by **nondeterministic**, polynomially bounded Turing machines
- **Complexity class $\mathcal{EXPTIME}$** : exactly all the languages decided by exponentially-bounded, **deterministic** Turing machines
- $\mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathcal{NP} \subseteq \mathcal{EXPTIME}$

LANGUAGES? PROBLEMS?

- Given some computational problem that requires certain resource (time) bounds to solve, it is generally easy to find a language that requires the same resource bounds to decide
 - Sometime (but not always) finding an algorithm for deciding the language immediately implies an algorithm for solving the problem
- **Traveling salesman (TSP)**: Given $n \geq 2$, a matrix $(d_{ij})_{1 \leq i, j \leq n}$ with $d_{ij} > 0$ and $d_{ii} = 0$, find a permutation π of $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ such that $c(\pi)$, the cost of π is minimal, where $c(\pi) = d_{\pi_1 \pi_2} + d_{\pi_2 \pi_3} + \dots + d_{\pi_{n-1} \pi_n} + d_{\pi_n \pi_1}$
 - TSP the language (take 1): $\{(d_{ij})_{1 \leq i, j \leq n}, B) : n \geq 2, B \geq 0, \text{ there exists a permutation } \pi \text{ such that } c(\pi) \leq B\}$
 - TSP the language (take 2), or the **Hamiltonian graphs**: Exactly all the graphs that have a (Hamiltonian) cycle that goes through all the vertices exactly once
 - **Note**: A cycle that uses all the **edges** exactly once is **Eulerian**; a graph G is Eulerian iff
 1. There is a path between any two vertices that are not isolated, and
 2. Every vertex has an in-degree equal to its out-degree

ALTERNATIVE DEFINITION OF \mathcal{NP} : CERTIFICATES

- $L \in \Sigma^*$; Σ^* is **polynomially balanced** iff there exists a polynomial p such that $\forall x; y \in L : |y| \leq p(|x|)$
- $L \in \mathcal{NP}$ iff there exists a polynomially balanced language L' such that
 1. $L' \in \mathcal{P}$, and
 2. $L = \{x \in \Sigma^* : \exists y \in \Sigma^* : x; y \in L'\}$
- L' is the language of **succinct certificates** for L (every $x \in L$ has a succinct certificate y)
- An \mathcal{NP} problem has solutions that are **easy to check**


LANGUAGES? PROBLEMS? (CONT'D)

- **Clique**: Given an undirected graph $G = (V, E)$, find the maximal set $C \subseteq V$ such that $\forall v_i, v_j \in C : (v_i, v_j) \in E$ (C is a **clique** of G)
 - Clique, the language: $\{(G = (V, E), K) : K \geq 2 : \text{there exists a clique } C \text{ of } V \text{ such that } |C| \geq K\}$
- **SAT**: Fix a set of **variables** $X = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n\}$ and let $\bar{X} = \{\bar{x}_1, \bar{x}_2, \dots, \bar{x}_n\}$
 - An element of $X \cup \bar{X}$ is called a **literal**
 - A **formula** (or set/conjunction of **clauses**) is $\alpha_1 \wedge \alpha_2 \wedge \dots \wedge \alpha_m$ where $\alpha_i = x_{a_i} \vee x_{a_2} \vee \dots \vee x_{a_k}$, $1 \leq i \leq m$, and $x_{a_i} \in X \cup \bar{X}$
 - An **interpretation** (or truth assignment) is a function $I : X \rightarrow \{\top, \perp\}$
 - A formula F is **satisfiable** iff there exists an interpretation under which F evaluates to \top .
 - **SAT** = $\{F : F \text{ is satisfiable}\}$
- **2-SAT, 3-SAT** are variants of SAT (with the number of literals in every clause restricted to a maximum of 2 and 3, respectively)

- 2-SAT $\in \mathcal{P}$


- Algorithm **purge**($F, x_i \in X$): Erase from F \bar{x}_i , erase from F all the clauses that contain x_i
- Algorithm **satisfy**(F, X):
 1. For every singleton clause x_i : Set $I(x_i) = \top$, **purge**(F, x_i)
 2. For every singleton clause \bar{x}_i : Set $I(x_i) = \perp$, **purge**(F, \bar{x}_i)
 3. If we have an empty clause then report F as unsatisfiable and stop
 4. Pick $x_i \in X$, set X to $X \setminus \{x_i\}$, and copy F into F'
 5. Set $I(x_i) = \top$, **purge**(F, x_i)
 6. If we have an empty clause, then
 - (a) Set $I(x_i) = \perp$, **purge**(F', \bar{x}_i)
 - (b) If we have an empty clause then report F as unsatisfiable and stop
 - (c) Set F to F'
 7. If $x = \emptyset$ then report F as satisfiable and stop, otherwise repeat from Step 4

- The general idea of reductions:



- Reductions can be used in **proofs by contradiction**:
 - If L has property \mathbb{P} and reduction τ from L to L' preserves \mathbb{P}
 - Then L' has \mathbb{P}
- Example: Turing reductions and undecidable problems

- The general idea of reductions:



- Reductions can also be used in **direct/constructive proofs**:
 - If L' has property \mathbb{P} and reduction τ from L to L' preserves \mathbb{P}
 - Then L has \mathbb{P}

- A function $f : \Sigma^* \rightarrow \Sigma^*$ is **polynomially computable** iff there exists a polynomially time bounded, **deterministic** Turing machine that computes it
- Let $L_1, L_2 \in \Sigma^*$; the function $\tau : \Sigma^* \rightarrow \Sigma^*$ is a **polynomial reduction** if it is polynomially computable, and $\forall x \in \Sigma^* : x \in L_1$ iff $\tau(x) \in L_2$
- **Theorem**: Polynomial reductions are closed under (functional) composition
 - Direct, constructive proof
- A problem L is **\mathcal{NP} -hard** iff for every language $L' \in \mathcal{NP}$ there exists a polynomial reduction from L' to L
- A problem L is **\mathcal{NP} -complete** iff L is \mathcal{NP} -hard and $L \in \mathcal{NP}$
- **Theorem**: Let L be **some** \mathcal{NP} -complete problem; then $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{NP}$ iff $L \in \mathcal{P}$
 - \Rightarrow : L is \mathcal{NP} -complete, so $L \in \mathcal{NP}$; however, $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{NP}$ and so $L \in \mathcal{P}$
 - \Leftarrow : $L \in \mathcal{P}$, so L is decided by a polynomially time bounded deterministic machine M ; for any $L' \in \mathcal{NP}$ we have a polynomial reduction τ from L to L' , decided by a polynomially time bounded, deterministic machine M_τ ; then L' is simply decided by the deterministic, polynomially time bounded machine $M_\tau M$

REDUCTION EXAMPLE

- Reduction from Hamiltonian cycle to SAT
 - Graph G given as adjacency matrix: $G = V \times V$, $V = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$
 - G has a Hamiltonian cycle iff $\tau(G)$ is satisfiable
- Variables: x_{ij} , $1 \leq i, j \leq n$; $x_{ij} = \top$ iff vertex i is number j in the Hamiltonian cycle
- Clauses: need to specify that x_{ij} represent a permutation (or bijection) over V ; need ten to specify that all the vertices in the cycle are actually connected
 1. at least one vertex is number j
 2. no vertex can be in two places at once
 3. every vertex must be in the cycle
 4. a place in the cycle can only have one vertex
- 5. The permutation given by x_{ij} is a Hamiltonian cycle

REDUCTION EXAMPLE

- Reduction from Hamiltonian cycle to SAT
 - Graph G given as adjacency matrix: $G = V \times V$, $V = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$
 - G has a Hamiltonian cycle iff $\tau(G)$ is satisfiable
- Variables: x_{ij} , $1 \leq i, j \leq n$; $x_{ij} = \top$ iff vertex i is number j in the Hamiltonian cycle
- Clauses: need to specify that x_{ij} represent a permutation (or bijection) over V ; need ten to specify that all the vertices in the cycle are actually connected
 1. at least one vertex is number $j \quad \forall 1 \leq j \leq n : x_{1j} \vee x_{2j} \vee \dots \vee x_{nj}$
 2. no vertex can be in two places at once
 3. every vertex must be in the cycle
 4. a place in the cycle can only have one vertex
- 5. The permutation given by x_{ij} is a Hamiltonian cycle

REDUCTION EXAMPLE

- Reduction from Hamiltonian cycle to SAT
 - Graph G given as adjacency matrix: $G = V \times V$, $V = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$
 - G has a Hamiltonian cycle iff $\tau(G)$ is satisfiable
- Variables: x_{ij} , $1 \leq i, j \leq n$; $x_{ij} = \top$ iff vertex i is number j in the Hamiltonian cycle
- Clauses: need to specify that x_{ij} represent a permutation (or bijection) over V ; need ten to specify that all the vertices in the cycle are actually connected
 1. at least one vertex is number $j \quad \forall 1 \leq j \leq n : x_{1j} \vee x_{2j} \vee \dots \vee x_{nj}$
 2. no vertex can be in two places at once $\quad \forall 1 \leq i, j, k \leq n, j \neq k : \overline{x_{ij}} \vee \overline{x_{ik}}$
 3. every vertex must be in the cycle $\quad \forall 1 \leq i \leq n : x_{i1} \vee x_{i2} \vee \dots \vee x_{in}$
 4. a place in the cycle can only have one vertex $\quad \forall 1 \leq i, j, k \leq n, i \neq k : \overline{x_{ij}} \vee \overline{x_{kj}}$
- 5. The permutation given by x_{ij} is a Hamiltonian cycle

REDUCTION EXAMPLE

- Reduction from Hamiltonian cycle to SAT
 - Graph G given as adjacency matrix: $G = V \times V$, $V = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$
 - G has a Hamiltonian cycle iff $\tau(G)$ is satisfiable
- Variables: x_{ij} , $1 \leq i, j \leq n$; $x_{ij} = \top$ iff vertex i is number j in the Hamiltonian cycle
- Clauses: need to specify that x_{ij} represent a permutation (or bijection) over V ; need ten to specify that all the vertices in the cycle are actually connected
 1. at least one vertex is number $j \quad \forall 1 \leq j \leq n : x_{1j} \vee x_{2j} \vee \dots \vee x_{nj}$
 2. no vertex can be in two places at once $\quad \forall 1 \leq i, j, k \leq n, j \neq k : \overline{x_{ij}} \vee \overline{x_{ik}}$
 3. every vertex must be in the cycle $\quad \forall 1 \leq i \leq n : x_{i1} \vee x_{i2} \vee \dots \vee x_{in}$
 4. a place in the cycle can only have one vertex $\quad \forall 1 \leq i, j, k \leq n, i \neq k : \overline{x_{ij}} \vee \overline{x_{kj}}$
- 5. The permutation given by x_{ij} is a Hamiltonian cycle For all i and k such that $(i, k) \notin G$ and assuming that $x_{kn+1} = x_{k1}$, we add $\overline{x_{ij}} \vee \overline{x_{kj+1}}$

REDUCTION EXAMPLE (CONT'D)

- We have $O(n^3)$ clauses with at most $O(n)$ literals each
- Each clause may depend on G and n but nothing else
- The whole set is clearly polynomially computable, as desired
- Remains to prove that G has a Hamiltonian cycle iff $\tau(G)$ is satisfiable
 - Suppose that some interpretation I satisfies $\tau(G)$
 - Then for each i exactly one $I(x_{ij})$ is \top and for each j exactly one $I(x_{ij})$ is \top (because of 1-4)
 - This goes both ways
 - **if**
 - * $\overline{x_{ij}} \vee \overline{x_{kj+1}}$ is true whenever $(i, j) \notin G$
 - * Whenever $i = \pi_j$ and $k = \pi_{j+1}$ we have $I(x_{ij}) = \top$ and $I(x_{kj+1}) = \top$
 - * Therefore the clause $\overline{x_{ij}} \vee \overline{x_{kj+1}}$ is false, so (i, k) **must** be an edge in G
 - **only if**
 - * Let π be a Hamiltonian cycle
 - * We then set $I(x_{ij}) = \top$ iff $j = \pi_i$, which makes $\tau(G)$ true

\mathcal{NP} -COMPLETENESS THEORY IN A NUTSHELL

- Are there \mathcal{NP} -complete problems at all?
 - Yes, SAT is one (cf. Stephen Cook, 1971)
- The first is the hard one (we have to show that the problem reduces to **every** problem in \mathcal{NP})
- Then in order to find other \mathcal{NP} -complete problems all we need to do is to find problems that reduces to **some** problem already known to be \mathcal{NP} -complete
 - This works because polynomial reductions are closed under composition = are transitive
- Then it is apparently easy to use the theorem stated earlier:


Let L be **some** \mathcal{NP} -complete problem; then $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{NP}$ iff $L \in \mathcal{P}$

TILING KITCHEN FLOORS

- **Tiling system:** $\mathcal{D} = (D, d_0, H, V)$
 - D is a finite set of tiles
 - $d_0 \in D$ is the initial corner tile
 - $H, V \in D \times D$ are the horizontal and vertical tiling restrictions
- **Tiling:** $f : \mathbb{N}_s \times \mathbb{N}_s \rightarrow D$ such that
 - $f(0, 0) = d_0$
 - $\forall 0 \leq m < s, 0 \leq n < s - 1 : (f(m, n), f(m, n + 1)) \in V$
 - $\forall 0 \leq m < s - 1, 0 \leq n < s : (f(m, n), f(m + 1, n)) \in H$
- **The bounded tiling problem:**
 - Given a tiling system \mathcal{D} , a positive integer s and an initial tiling $f_0 : \mathbb{N}_s \rightarrow D$
 - Find whether there exists a tiling function f that extends f_0

BOUNDED TILING IS \mathcal{NP} -COMPLETE

- We need to find reductions from **all** problems in \mathcal{NP} to bounded tiling
- The only thing in common to all the \mathcal{NP} problems is that each of them is decided by a nondeterministic, polynomially bounded Turing machine
- We therefore find a reduction from an arbitrary such a machine to bounded tiling
- We will need the following tiles:



1. SAT $\in \mathcal{NP}$

- We nondeterministically guess an interpretation and we check that the interpretation satisfies the formula
- Both of these take linear time

2. SAT is \mathcal{NP} -hard

- By reduction of bounded tiling to SAT
- Consider variables x_{nmd} standing for “tile d is at position (n, m) in the tiling”
- Construct clauses such that $x_{nmd} = \top$ iff $f(m, n) = d$
- We first specify that we have a function:
 - each position has at least one tile: $\forall 0 \leq m, n \leq s : x_{mnd_1} \vee x_{mnd_2} \vee \dots$
 - no more than one tile in a given position: $\forall 0 \leq m, n \leq s, d \neq d' : \overline{x_{mnd}} \vee \overline{x_{mnd'}}$
- Then we specify the restrictions H and V :
 - $(d, d') \in D^2 \setminus H \Rightarrow \overline{x_{mnd}} \vee \overline{x_{m+1nd}}$ $(d, d') \in D^2 \setminus V \Rightarrow \overline{x_{mnd}} \vee \overline{x_{mn+1d}}$

- In fact 3-SAT is also \mathcal{NP} -complete

- To show that a problem is \mathcal{NP} -complete we need to show that
- The problem is in \mathcal{NP}
 - Construct a Turing machine, or find succinct certificates
 - Usually quite straightforward
- The problem is \mathcal{NP} -hard
 - Exhibit a polynomial reduction from a known \mathcal{NP} -complete problem
 - Reduction can happen from any problem discussed in class and also from any problem discussed in Sections 7.2 and 7.3 (take those problems as solved exercises)
 - Make sure that you are comfortable with this way of thinking! There are numerous solved exercises to make you comfortable

OTHER ISSUES RELATED TO \mathcal{P} AND \mathcal{NP}

- **co- \mathcal{NP}** is the complement of \mathcal{NP} ($P \in \text{co-}\mathcal{NP}$ iff $\overline{P} \in \mathcal{NP}$)
 - Thought to be different from \mathcal{NP}
 - $\mathcal{P} \subseteq \text{co-}\mathcal{NP}, \mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathcal{NP}$
 - If $P \in \text{co-}\mathcal{NP}, P \in \mathcal{NP}$, and $P \in \mathcal{P}$ then P is suspected **not** to be \mathcal{NP} -complete
 - Example: the language of composite numbers (aka the integer factorization problem)
 - * in \mathcal{NP} and also in $\text{co-}\mathcal{NP}$
 - * suspected outside \mathcal{P}
 - * suspected outside \mathcal{NP} -complete
- **co- \mathcal{NP} -complete** problems also definable
 - integer factorization also suspected outside $\text{co-}\mathcal{NP}$ -complete