

## COMP-170: Homework #8

Ben Tanen - April 09, 2017

### Problem 4

Barely Legal 3SAT is similar to NTGSAT except that only one literal can be true in *each and every* clause.

$\text{BLSAT} = \{\langle \phi \rangle \mid \phi \text{ is 3CNF and is satisfiable with a formula where only one literal in each clause is true}\}$

Prove that BLSAT is in NP-complete. Do a reduction from 3SAT.

\* \* \*

To prove BLSAT is NP-complete, we will show that  $\text{BLSAT} \in \text{NP}$  and that  $3\text{SAT} \leq_m^p \text{BLSAT}$ . Given that 3SAT is NP-complete, we will then be able to see that BLSAT is NP-complete.

First, we will prove  $\text{BLSAT} \in \text{NP}$ . In order to prove this, we can construct a polynomial time verifier  $V$  for BLSAT. Once we show that  $V$  does indeed verify in polynomial time, we will then be able to see that  $\text{BLSAT} \in \text{NP}$ . We can define  $V$  as follows:

**$V$  on input  $\langle \phi, \mathcal{A} \rangle$ :**

//  $\mathcal{A}$  is an assignment for  $\phi$  to be verified

1. Let  $V_{3\text{SAT}}$  be a polynomial time verifier for 3SAT (we know this exists because 3SAT is NP-complete). Using  $V_{3\text{SAT}}$ , verify that  $\phi \in 3\text{SAT}$  using  $\mathcal{A}$ . If  $V_{3\text{SAT}}$  accepts, continue. If  $V_{3\text{SAT}}$  rejects, return *REJECT*.
2. Scan through the clauses of  $\phi$  and check if there exists some  $C_i \in C(\phi)$  (where  $C(\phi)$  is the set of clauses in  $\phi$ ) such that  $C_i$  has more than one literal set to true in  $\mathcal{A}$ . If there does exist such a  $C_i$ , return *REJECT*.
3. Return *ACCEPT*.

Given our definition of  $V$ , we claim  $V$  runs in polynomial time. Because 3SAT is NP-complete, we know there exists a polynomial time verifier for 3SAT. Thus, using  $V_{3\text{SAT}}$  in step 1 takes polynomial time. Steps 2 takes  $O(m)$  time because we are simply scanning through the  $m$  clauses of  $\phi$ . Thus,  $V$  takes polynomial time overall.

Finally, to show that  $V$  correctly verifies solutions, consider the following cases:

1. Suppose  $\phi \in \text{BLSAT}$  such that  $\phi$  is in conjunctive normal form with exactly 3 literals in each clause and no clause in  $\phi$  has more than one literal set to true. Also suppose  $\mathcal{A}$  is a satisfying assignment for  $\phi$ . Given  $\phi$ , we know that  $V_{3\text{SAT}}$  would accept  $\langle \phi, \mathcal{A} \rangle$  and we know that  $\phi$  would pass step 2 (by definition of  $\phi$ ). Thus,  $V$  would correctly accept  $\langle \phi, \mathcal{A} \rangle$ .
2. Suppose  $\phi \in \text{BLSAT}$  but  $\mathcal{A}$  is not a satisfying assignment for  $\phi$ . Because of this, we can see that  $V_{3\text{SAT}}$  would reject  $\langle \phi, \mathcal{A} \rangle$ , causing  $V$  to correctly reject  $\langle \phi, \mathcal{A} \rangle$ .

3. Suppose  $\phi \notin \text{BLSAT}$  such that  $\phi$  is not in conjunctive normal form with exactly 3 literals in each clause. Given  $\phi$ , we know that  $V_{3\text{SAT}}$  would reject  $\langle \phi, \mathcal{A} \rangle$  so  $V$  would correctly reject  $\phi$ .
4. Suppose  $\phi \notin \text{BLSAT}$  such that  $\phi$  has at least one clause where two or more literals evaluate to true. Given this, we can see that  $V$  would halt on either step 2 and correctly reject  $\langle \phi, \mathcal{A} \rangle$ .

Given these cases, we can see that  $V$  correctly verifies solutions, thus showing  $V$  is indeed a polynomial time verifier for BLSAT. Thus, the existence and validity of  $V$  shows that  $\text{BLSAT} \in \text{NP}$ .

Next, we will prove  $3\text{SAT} \leq_m^p \text{BLSAT}$ . In order to prove this, we can construct a function  $f : \Sigma_{3\text{SAT}}^* \rightarrow \Sigma_{\text{BLSAT}}^*$  such that  $\phi \in 3\text{SAT} \Leftrightarrow f(\phi) \in \text{BLSAT}$ . Once we show that  $f$  satisfies this condition, we will have proven that  $3\text{SAT} \leq_m^p \text{BLSAT}$ .

Given this, we can define  $f : \Sigma_{3\text{SAT}}^* \rightarrow \Sigma_{\text{BLSAT}}^*$  as follows:

**$f$  on input  $\phi$  outputs  $\phi'$ , where  $\phi'$  is defined as follows:**

Suppose  $\phi = C_1 \wedge C_2 \wedge \dots \wedge C_m$  where  $C_1, C_2, \dots, C_m$  are all three-literal clauses. Given this, initially set  $\phi' = \phi$ .

For each clause  $C_i$  from  $\phi'$ , where  $C_i = a_i \vee b_i \vee c_i$  for some literals  $a_i, b_i, c_i$ , replace  $C_i$  with  $(\overline{a_i} \vee x_{i1} \vee x_{i2}) \wedge (b_i \vee x_{i2} \vee x_{i3}) \wedge (\overline{c_i} \vee x_{i3} \vee x_{i4})$ , where  $x_{i1}, x_{i2}, x_{i3}$ , and  $x_{i4}$  are dummy variables that does not appear anywhere else in  $\phi'$ .

Output  $\phi'$

Given our definition of  $f$ , we claim that  $f$  is computable in polynomial time. We can see that we could construct a Turing machine  $M$  that outputs  $\phi'$  when given  $\phi$ .  $M$  would iterate through each of our clauses and replace each three-literal clause with three three-literal clauses, which takes  $O(1)$  time per clause and takes  $O(m)$  time overall. Thus, we can see  $f$  is indeed computable in polynomial time.

Next, we must verify that  $f$  satisfies the condition that  $\phi \in 3\text{SAT} \Leftrightarrow f(\phi) \in \text{BLSAT}$ . We can first consider the “in-cases” (i.e. when there is a satisfying assignment  $\mathcal{A}$  for  $\phi$ , there is a satisfying assignment  $\mathcal{A}'$  for  $f(\phi)$ ). To show this, we can show that for each clause  $C_i$  of  $\phi$ , we map  $C_i$  to a series of three clauses  $C'_i$  in  $\phi'$  that maintains the same truth value. A satisfying assignment for  $C_i$  exists when at least one of  $a_i, b_i, c_i$  evaluate to true. In order for a satisfying assignment of  $\phi'$  to exist, we must show only one arrangement of  $x_{i1}, x_{i2}, x_{i3}$ , and  $x_{i4}$  for each case where  $C_i$  evaluates to true. Thus, consider the following truth table:

$a_i$	$b_i$	$c_i$	$x_{i1}$	$x_{i2}$	$x_{i3}$	$x_{i4}$	$C_i$	$C'_i = (\overline{a_i} \vee x_{i1} \vee x_{i2}) \wedge (b_i \vee x_{i2} \vee x_{i3}) \wedge (\overline{c_i} \vee x_{i3} \vee x_{i4})$
$F$	$F$	$T$	$T$	$F$	$T$	$T$	$T$	$T \wedge T \wedge T = T$
$F$	$T$	$F$	$F$	$F$	$T$	$T$	$T$	$T \wedge T \wedge T = T$
$F$	$T$	$T$	$F$	$F$	$T$	$T$	$T$	$T \wedge T \wedge T = T$
$T$	$F$	$F$	$T$	$F$	$T$	$T$	$T$	$T \wedge T \wedge T = T$
$T$	$F$	$T$	$T$	$F$	$T$	$T$	$T$	$T \wedge T \wedge T = T$
$T$	$T$	$F$	$T$	$F$	$T$	$T$	$T$	$T \wedge T \wedge T = T$
$T$	$T$	$T$	$T$	$F$	$T$	$T$	$T$	$T \wedge T \wedge T = T$

Given this, we can see that if there exists an assignment to make  $C_i$  evaluate to true, there exists an assignment to make  $C'_i$  evaluate to true. Therefore, we can see that if  $\phi \in 3\text{SAT} \Rightarrow f(\phi) = \phi' \in \text{BLSAT}$ .

In order to show the “out-case” (i.e.,  $\phi \notin 3\text{SAT} \Rightarrow f(\phi) = \phi' \notin \text{BLSAT}$ ), we can use a proof by contradiction. Specifically, given some  $\phi \notin 3\text{SAT}$ , we will assume  $\phi' \in \text{BLSAT}$  and arrive at a contradiction.

Suppose  $\phi \notin 3\text{SAT}$  such that there exists no assignment that makes every clause in  $\phi$  evaluate to true. This means given any assignment, there exists some clause  $C_i$  that will evaluate to false. Given  $\phi$ , we will assume  $f(\phi) = \phi' \in \text{BLSAT}$ . Now, let  $\mathcal{A}$  be any assignment for  $\phi$  and  $C_i$  be any clause in  $\phi$  that evaluates to false given  $\mathcal{A}$  where  $C_i = a_i \vee b_i \vee c_i$ . Because  $C_i$  evaluates to false, we know that  $a_i, b_i$ , and  $c_i$  are all assigned to false in  $\mathcal{A}$ . Now consider  $C'_i$ , the clause triple in  $\phi'$  that  $C_i$  was transformed into, where  $C'_i = (\overline{a_i} \vee x_{i1} \vee x_{i2}) \wedge (b_i \vee x_{i2} \vee x_{i3}) \wedge (\overline{c_i} \vee x_{i3} \vee x_{i4})$ . Because  $C'_i$  comes from  $\phi'$ , which we've assumed to be in  $\text{BLSAT}$ , we know that each clause of  $C'_i$  contains exactly one literal that evaluates to true. Now, because  $a_i, b_i$ , and  $c_i$  are all false, we can see that the first clause of  $C'_i$  contains  $\overline{a_i}$ , which evaluates to true. Thus, we know, in order for  $\phi' \in \text{BLSAT}$ ,  $x_{i1}$  and  $x_{i2}$  must evaluate to false. Likewise, we can see that the third clause of  $C'_i$  contains  $\overline{c_i}$ , which evaluates to true. Thus, we know, in order for  $\phi' \in \text{BLSAT}$ ,  $x_{i3}$  and  $x_{i4}$  must also evaluate to false. Therefore, we are left with the middle clause of  $C'_i$  where  $b_i, x_{i2}$ , and  $x_{i3}$  have all previously been assigned to evaluate as false in order to guarantee  $\phi' \in \text{BLSAT}$ . However, this is impossible, because if  $b, x_2$ , and  $x_3$  all evaluate to false,  $b_i \vee x_{i2} \vee x_{i3}$  evaluates to false, which would make  $\phi' \notin \text{BLSAT}$ . Thus, we arrive at a contradiction, indicating that if  $\phi \notin 3\text{SAT}$ ,  $f(\phi) = \phi' \notin \text{BLSAT}$ .

Given this, we can thus see that  $f$  does indeed satisfy the claim  $\phi \in 3\text{SAT} \Leftrightarrow f(\phi) \in \text{BLSAT}$ . Therefore, we can see that  $3\text{SAT} \leq_m^p \text{BLSAT}$ .

Given that  $\text{BLSAT} \in \text{NP}$ ,  $3\text{SAT} \leq_m^p \text{BLSAT}$ , and  $3\text{SAT}$  is NP-complete, we can see that  $\text{BLSAT}$  is also NP-complete.  $\square$