

NP is asymmetric. “Yes” instances of a language can be easily verified. “No” instances not so easily.

What about the class where “No” answers can be easily verified?

TAUT =  $\{ \varphi \mid \varphi \text{ is a tautology} \}$  vs TAUT' =  $\{ \varphi \mid \varphi \text{ is not a tautology} \}$ .

HAMCYCLE =  $\{ G \mid G \text{ contains a hamiltonian cycle} \}$ , vs HAMCYCLE'.

### 2.6.1 coNP

If  $L \subseteq \{0, 1\}^*$  is a language, then we denote by  $\overline{L}$  the *complement* of  $L$ . That is,  $\overline{L} = \{0, 1\}^* \setminus L$ . We make the following definition:

**Definition 2.19**  $\text{coNP} = \{ L : \overline{L} \in \text{NP} \}$ .

◇

**Theorem:** Each co-NP-complete problem is the **complement** of an **NP-complete** problem.

Prove that TAUT is coNP-Complete.

$$\text{SAT}' \leq_p \text{TAUT}$$

**Definition 2.20 (coNP, alternative definition)** For every  $L \subseteq \{0, 1\}^*$ , we say that  $L \in \text{coNP}$  if there exists a polynomial  $p : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  and a polynomial-time TM  $M$  such that for every  $x \in \{0, 1\}^*$ ,

$$x \in L \Leftrightarrow \forall u \in \{0, 1\}^{p(|x|)}, M(x, u) = 1$$

◇

Note the use of the “ $\forall$ ” quantifier in this definition where Definition 2.1 used  $\exists$ .

We can define **coNP**-completeness in analogy to **NP**-completeness: A language is **coNP**-complete if it is in **coNP** and every **coNP** language is polynomial-time Karp reducible to it.

**Theorem.**  $P \subseteq \text{NP} \cap \text{coNP}$

**Theorem.** If  $P = \text{NP}$ , then  $\text{NP} = \text{coNP}$ .

**FACTOR** =  $\{ (m, r) \mid r \text{ is prime, } \exists s < r, s \text{ is prime, } s \text{ divides } m \}$

**Integer Factorization** is both in NP and co-NP but not known to be in P.

**Proof that** *Each co-NP-complete problem is the complement of an NP-complete problem:*

Consider  $L \in \text{coNP-complete}$ , i.e.  $L \in \text{coNP}$  and all problems in  $\text{coNP}$  reduce to  $L$

$L' \in \text{NP}$  by definition. The definition of karp-reduction ensures that a valid function  $f$  is one such that

$$\forall x \quad x \in A \text{ iff } f(x) \in L$$

which is logically equivalent to

$$x \notin A \text{ iff } f(x) \notin L, \text{ i.e. } x \in A' \text{ iff } f(x) \in L'$$

Therefore, the same reduction function can be used to reduce  $A'$  to  $L'$ , and  $L'$  is NP-Hard as well.