

Homework 16

Austin Frownfelter Matthew Bialecki

February 19, 2018

1 Problem 25

Show that if a sparse language is NP-complete, then $P=NP$.

Let S be an NP-complete sparse language. Since S is NP-complete, there exists a polytime reduction f from LSAT to S .

Define LSAT to be a variant of SAT where $(\phi, x) \in \text{LSAT}$ iff $\phi \in \text{SAT} \wedge x \in S$.

Since f is polytime, $|f(x)| \leq |x|^k$ for some k .

The input of LSAT (ϕ, x) is converted by $f(x)$ to be the input of S . Since f is polytime, the output of $f \leq p(n)$ where $n = |x|$ and $p(n)$ is a polynomial upper bound. Assign $q(x)$ to be the size of the intersection of the set S and the set of strings $\{0, 1\}^{\leq p(n)}$. $q(x)$ is polynomial by sparseness of f .

Imagine an algorithm for LSAT as a tree. The root's children are decided by a variable assignment of the remaining ϕ . If the number of children (elements in the next row of the tree) is greater than $q(n)$, then prune the branches until the row is $q(n)$ wide using the following policy:

if any branches yield the same string, keep only 1 of them

if there are more than $q(x)$ unique strings, choose $q(x)$ to keep

Repeat this process until all variables have been assigned. Accept if there exists a child in the final row of the tree that satisfies the formula.

Since f is polytime, deciding the children takes polytime. Since there are n levels (n variables), and the width of the tree (number of paths) is at most $q(n)$, the runtime is $nq(n)$ which is polynomial.

Therefore, if there is an NP-complete sparse language, NP-complete languages can be reduced to it to run them in polynomial time, implying $P=NP$.

(Note: the following websites were used to understand this problem)

1. <https://math.stackexchange.com/questions/235162/if-an-unary-language-exists-in-npc-then-p-np>
2. <http://www.cs.umd.edu/~jkatz/complexity/f05/lecture6.pdf>

2 Problem 26

Show that $ZPP = RP \cap coRP$

$ZPP = RP \cap CoRP$

$ZPP \supseteq RP \cap CoRP$

Let language L be in RP and $CoRP$:

There exists a TM A that accepts x with probability ≥ 0.6 if $x \in L$

There exists a TM B that rejects x with probability ≥ 0.6 if $x \notin L$

TM C on input x :

for k iterations:

Run A on x . If accept, accept

Run B on x . If reject, reject

reject

The probability C accepts if $x \in L = 1 - P[A(x) \text{ is wrong}]^k$, rejects if $x \notin L = 1 - P[B(x) \text{ is wrong}]^k$. As $k \rightarrow \infty$, the probability C is wrong exponentially shrinks to 0. Thus, the probability of C being correct is 1 if $k = \infty$.

The expected runtime for C is polynomial. Therefore, ZPP contains RP and $CoRP$.

$ZPP \subseteq RP \cap CoRP$

$ZPP \subseteq RP$.

Run C on input x for at least double its expected runtime. If it hasn't halted in this time, reject.

By Markov's inequality, the probability C yields a result in this time is at least $\frac{1}{2}$. If it hasn't decided by then, reject, since the probability it is wrong when $x \in L$ is less than $\frac{1}{2}$, matching the definition of RP .

$ZPP \subseteq CoRP$.

Run C on input x for at least double its expected runtime. If it hasn't halted in this time, accept.

By Markov's inequality, the probability C yields a result in this time is at least $\frac{1}{2}$. If it hasn't decided by then, accept, since the probability it is wrong when $x \notin L$ is less than $\frac{1}{2}$, matching the definition of $CoRP$.

Therefore, $ZPP \subseteq RP \cap CoRP$.