34.3-7

Show that, with respect to polynomial-time reductions (see Exercise 34.3-6), L is complete for NP if and only if $\overline{L}$ is complete for co-NP.

34.3-8

The reduction algorithm F in the proof of Lemma 34.6 constructs the circuit $C = f(x)$ based on knowledge of x, A, and k. Professor Sartre observes that the string x is input to F, but only the existence of A, k, and the constant factor implicit in the $O(n^k)$ running time is known to F (since the language L belongs to NP), not their actual values. Thus, the professor concludes that F can't possibly construct the circuit C and that the language CIRCUIT-SAT is not necessarily NP-hard. Explain the flaw in the professor's reasoning.

34.4   NP-completeness proofs

We proved that the circuit-satisfiability problem is NP-complete by a direct proof that $L \leq_P$ CIRCUIT-SAT for every language $L \in$ NP. In this section, we shall show how to prove that languages are NP-complete without directly reducing *every* language in NP to the given language. We shall illustrate this methodology by proving that various formula-satisfiability problems are NP-complete. Section 34.5 provides many more examples of the methodology.

The following lemma is the basis of our method for showing that a language is NP-complete.

Lemma 34.8

If L is a language such that $L' \leq_P L$ for some $L' \in$ NPC, then L is NP-hard. If, in addition, $L \in$ NP, then $L \in$ NPC.

Proof   Since L' is NP-complete, for all $L'' \in$ NP, we have $L'' \leq_P L'$. By supposition, $L' \leq_P L$, and thus by transitivity (Exercise 34.3-2), we have $L'' \leq_P L$, which shows that L is NP-hard. If $L \in$ NP, we also have $L \in$ NPC.   ∎

In other words, by reducing a known NP-complete language L' to L, we implicitly reduce every language in NP to L. Thus, Lemma 34.8 gives us a method for proving that a language L is NP-complete:

1. Prove $L \in$ NP.

2. Select a known NP-complete language L'.

3. Describe an algorithm that computes a function f mapping every instance $x \in \{0, 1\}^*$ of L' to an instance $f(x)$ of L.

4. Prove that the function f satisfies $x \in L'$ if and only if $f(x) \in L$ for all $x \in \{0, 1\}^*$.

5. Prove that the algorithm computing f runs in polynomial time.

(Steps 2–5 show that L is NP-hard.) This methodology of reducing from a single known NP-complete language is far simpler than the more complicated process of showing directly how to reduce from every language in NP. Proving CIRCUIT-SAT $\in$ NPC has given us a "foot in the door." Because we know that the circuit-satisfiability problem is NP-complete, we now can prove much more easily that other problems are NP-complete. Moreover, as we develop a catalog of known NP-complete problems, we will have more and more choices for languages from which to reduce.

Formula satisfiability

We illustrate the reduction methodology by giving an NP-completeness proof for the problem of determining whether a boolean formula, not a circuit, is satisfiable. This problem has the historical honor of being the first problem ever shown to be NP-complete.

We formulate the *(formula) satisfiability* problem in terms of the language SAT as follows. An instance of SAT is a boolean formula ϕ composed of

1. n boolean variables: $x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n$;

2. m boolean connectives: any boolean function with one or two inputs and one output, such as $\wedge$ (AND), $\vee$ (OR), $\neg$ (NOT), $\rightarrow$ (implication), $\leftrightarrow$ (if and only if); and

3. parentheses. (Without loss of generality, we assume that there are no redundant parentheses, i.e., a formula contains at most one pair of parentheses per boolean connective.)

We can easily encode a boolean formula ϕ in a length that is polynomial in $n + m$. As in boolean combinational circuits, a *truth assignment* for a boolean formula ϕ is a set of values for the variables of ϕ, and a *satisfying assignment* is a truth assignment that causes it to evaluate to 1. A formula with a satisfying assignment is a *satisfiable* formula. The satisfiability problem asks whether a given boolean formula is satisfiable; in formal-language terms,

SAT $= \{\langle \phi \rangle : \phi$ is a satisfiable boolean formula$\}$.

As an example, the formula

$$\phi = ((x_1 \rightarrow x_2) \lor \neg((\neg x_1 \leftrightarrow x_3) \lor x_4)) \land \neg x_2$$

has the satisfying assignment $\langle x_1 = 0, x_2 = 0, x_3 = 1, x_4 = 1 \rangle$, since

$$
\begin{aligned}
\phi &= ((0 \rightarrow 0) \lor \neg((\neg 0 \leftrightarrow 1) \lor 1)) \land \neg 0 & (34.2)\\
&= (1 \lor \neg(1 \lor 1)) \land 1 \\
&= (1 \lor 0) \land 1 \\
&= 1 \,,
\end{aligned}
$$

and thus this formula ϕ belongs to SAT.

The naive algorithm to determine whether an arbitrary boolean formula is satisfiable does not run in polynomial time. A formula with n variables has 2^n possible assignments. If the length of $\langle \phi \rangle$ is polynomial in n, then checking every assignment requires $\Omega(2^n)$ time, which is superpolynomial in the length of $\langle \phi \rangle$. As the following theorem shows, a polynomial-time algorithm is unlikely to exist.

Theorem 34.9
Satisfiability of boolean formulas is NP-complete.

Proof   We start by arguing that SAT $\in$ NP. Then we prove that SAT is NP-hard by showing that CIRCUIT-SAT $\leq_P$ SAT; by Lemma 34.8, this will prove the theorem.

To show that SAT belongs to NP, we show that a certificate consisting of a satisfying assignment for an input formula ϕ can be verified in polynomial time. The verifying algorithm simply replaces each variable in the formula with its corresponding value and then evaluates the expression, much as we did in equation (34.2) above. This task is easy to do in polynomial time. If the expression evaluates to 1, then the algorithm has verified that the formula is satisfiable. Thus, the first condition of Lemma 34.8 for NP-completeness holds.

To prove that SAT is NP-hard, we show that CIRCUIT-SAT $\leq_P$ SAT. In other words, we need to show how to reduce any instance of circuit satisfiability to an instance of formula satisfiability in polynomial time. We can use induction to express any boolean combinational circuit as a boolean formula. We simply look at the gate that produces the circuit output and inductively express each of the gate's inputs as formulas. We then obtain the formula for the circuit by writing an expression that applies the gate's function to its inputs' formulas.

Unfortunately, this straightforward method does not amount to a polynomial-time reduction. As Exercise 34.4-1 asks you to show, shared subformulas—which arise from gates whose output wires have fan-out of 2 or more—can cause the size of the generated formula to grow exponentially. Thus, the reduction algorithm must be somewhat more clever.

Figure 34.10 illustrates how we overcome this problem, using as an example the circuit from Figure 34.8(a). For each wire x_i in the circuit C, the formula ϕ

Figure 34.10   Reducing circuit satisfiability to formula satisfiability. The formula produced by the reduction algorithm has a variable for each wire in the circuit.

has a variable x_i. We can now express how each gate operates as a small formula involving the variables of its incident wires. For example, the operation of the output AND gate is $x_{10} \leftrightarrow (x_7 \wedge x_8 \wedge x_9)$. We call each of these small formulas a *clause*.

The formula ϕ produced by the reduction algorithm is the AND of the circuit-output variable with the conjunction of clauses describing the operation of each gate. For the circuit in the figure, the formula is

$$
\begin{aligned}
\phi \; = \; x_{10} \; &\wedge \; (x_4 \leftrightarrow \neg x_3) \\
&\wedge \; (x_5 \leftrightarrow (x_1 \vee x_2)) \\
&\wedge \; (x_6 \leftrightarrow \neg x_4) \\
&\wedge \; (x_7 \leftrightarrow (x_1 \wedge x_2 \wedge x_4)) \\
&\wedge \; (x_8 \leftrightarrow (x_5 \vee x_6)) \\
&\wedge \; (x_9 \leftrightarrow (x_6 \vee x_7)) \\
&\wedge \; (x_{10} \leftrightarrow (x_7 \wedge x_8 \wedge x_9)) \; .
\end{aligned}
$$

Given a circuit C, it is straightforward to produce such a formula ϕ in polynomial time.

Why is the circuit C satisfiable exactly when the formula ϕ is satisfiable? If C has a satisfying assignment, then each wire of the circuit has a well-defined value, and the output of the circuit is 1. Therefore, when we assign wire values to variables in ϕ, each clause of ϕ evaluates to 1, and thus the conjunction of all evaluates to 1. Conversely, if some assignment causes ϕ to evaluate to 1, the circuit C is satisfiable by an analogous argument. Thus, we have shown that CIRCUIT-SAT $\leq_{\mathrm{P}}$ SAT, which completes the proof. ∎

3-CNF satisfiability

We can prove many problems NP-complete by reducing from formula satisfiability. The reduction algorithm must handle any input formula, though, and this requirement can lead to a huge number of cases that we must consider. We often prefer to reduce from a restricted language of boolean formulas, so that we need to consider fewer cases. Of course, we must not restrict the language so much that it becomes polynomial-time solvable. One convenient language is 3-CNF satisfiability, or 3-CNF-SAT.

We define 3-CNF satisfiability using the following terms. A *literal* in a boolean formula is an occurrence of a variable or its negation. A boolean formula is in *conjunctive normal form*, or *CNF*, if it is expressed as an AND of *clauses*, each of which is the OR of one or more literals. A boolean formula is in *3-conjunctive normal form*, or *3-CNF*, if each clause has exactly three distinct literals.

For example, the boolean formula

$$(x_1 \vee \neg x_1 \vee \neg x_2) \wedge (x_3 \vee x_2 \vee x_4) \wedge (\neg x_1 \vee \neg x_3 \vee \neg x_4)$$

is in 3-CNF. The first of its three clauses is $(x_1 \vee \neg x_1 \vee \neg x_2)$, which contains the three literals x_1, $\neg x_1$, and $\neg x_2$.

In 3-CNF-SAT, we are asked whether a given boolean formula ϕ in 3-CNF is satisfiable. The following theorem shows that a polynomial-time algorithm that can determine the satisfiability of boolean formulas is unlikely to exist, even when they are expressed in this simple normal form.

Theorem 34.10
Satisfiability of boolean formulas in 3-conjunctive normal form is NP-complete.

Proof   The argument we used in the proof of Theorem 34.9 to show that SAT $\in$ NP applies equally well here to show that 3-CNF-SAT $\in$ NP. By Lemma 34.8, therefore, we need only show that SAT $\leq_P$ 3-CNF-SAT.

We break the reduction algorithm into three basic steps. Each step progressively transforms the input formula ϕ closer to the desired 3-conjunctive normal form.

The first step is similar to the one used to prove CIRCUIT-SAT $\leq_P$ SAT in Theorem 34.9. First, we construct a binary "parse" tree for the input formula ϕ, with literals as leaves and connectives as internal nodes. Figure 34.11 shows such a parse tree for the formula

$$\phi = ((x_1 \rightarrow x_2) \vee \neg((\neg x_1 \leftrightarrow x_3) \vee x_4)) \wedge \neg x_2 . \tag{34.3}$$

Should the input formula contain a clause such as the OR of several literals, we use associativity to parenthesize the expression fully so that every internal node in the resulting tree has 1 or 2 children. We can now think of the binary parse tree as a circuit for computing the function.

Figure 34.11 The tree corresponding to the formula $\phi = ((x_1 \to x_2) \vee \neg((\neg x_1 \leftrightarrow x_3) \vee x_4)) \wedge \neg x_2$.

Mimicking the reduction in the proof of Theorem 34.9, we introduce a variable y_i for the output of each internal node. Then, we rewrite the original formula ϕ as the AND of the root variable and a conjunction of clauses describing the operation of each node. For the formula (34.3), the resulting expression is

$$
\begin{aligned}
\phi' = \ & y_1 \wedge (y_1 \leftrightarrow (y_2 \wedge \neg x_2)) \\
& \wedge (y_2 \leftrightarrow (y_3 \vee y_4)) \\
& \wedge (y_3 \leftrightarrow (x_1 \to x_2)) \\
& \wedge (y_4 \leftrightarrow \neg y_5) \\
& \wedge (y_5 \leftrightarrow (y_6 \vee x_4)) \\
& \wedge (y_6 \leftrightarrow (\neg x_1 \leftrightarrow x_3)) \ .
\end{aligned}
$$

Observe that the formula ϕ' thus obtained is a conjunction of clauses ϕ_i', each of which has at most 3 literals. The only requirement that we might fail to meet is that each clause has to be an OR of 3 literals.

The second step of the reduction converts each clause ϕ_i' into conjunctive normal form. We construct a truth table for ϕ_i' by evaluating all possible assignments to its variables. Each row of the truth table consists of a possible assignment of the variables of the clause, together with the value of the clause under that assignment. Using the truth-table entries that evaluate to 0, we build a formula in **_disjunctive normal form_** (or **_DNF_**)—an OR of ANDs—that is equivalent to $\neg \phi_i'$. We then negate this formula and convert it into a CNF formula ϕ_i'' by using **_DeMorgan's_**

y_1	y_2	x_2	$(y_1 \leftrightarrow (y_2 \wedge \neg x_2))$
1	1	1	0
1	1	0	1
1	0	1	0
1	0	0	0
0	1	1	1
0	1	0	0
0	0	1	1
0	0	0	1

Figure 34.12   The truth table for the clause $(y_1 \leftrightarrow (y_2 \wedge \neg x_2))$.

laws for propositional logic,

$$\neg(a \wedge b) \;=\; \neg a \vee \neg b \,,$$
$$\neg(a \vee b) \;=\; \neg a \wedge \neg b \,,$$

to complement all literals, change ORs into ANDs, and change ANDs into ORs.

In our example, we convert the clause $\phi_1' = (y_1 \leftrightarrow (y_2 \wedge \neg x_2))$ into CNF as follows. The truth table for ϕ_1' appears in Figure 34.12. The DNF formula equivalent to $\neg\phi_1'$ is

$$(y_1 \wedge y_2 \wedge x_2) \vee (y_1 \wedge \neg y_2 \wedge x_2) \vee (y_1 \wedge \neg y_2 \wedge \neg x_2) \vee (\neg y_1 \wedge y_2 \wedge \neg x_2) \,.$$

Negating and applying DeMorgan's laws, we get the CNF formula

$$
\begin{aligned}
\phi_1'' \;=\; & (\neg y_1 \vee \neg y_2 \vee \neg x_2) \wedge (\neg y_1 \vee y_2 \vee \neg x_2) \\
& \wedge (\neg y_1 \vee y_2 \vee x_2) \wedge (y_1 \vee \neg y_2 \vee x_2) \,,
\end{aligned}
$$

which is equivalent to the original clause ϕ_1'.

At this point, we have converted each clause ϕ_i' of the formula ϕ' into a CNF formula ϕ_i'', and thus ϕ' is equivalent to the CNF formula ϕ'' consisting of the conjunction of the ϕ_i''. Moreover, each clause of ϕ'' has at most 3 literals.

The third and final step of the reduction further transforms the formula so that each clause has *exactly* 3 distinct literals. We construct the final 3-CNF formula ϕ''' from the clauses of the CNF formula ϕ''. The formula ϕ''' also uses two auxiliary variables that we shall call p and q. For each clause C_i of ϕ'', we include the following clauses in ϕ''':

- If C_i has 3 distinct literals, then simply include C_i as a clause of ϕ'''.

- If C_i has 2 distinct literals, that is, if $C_i = (l_1 \vee l_2)$, where l_1 and l_2 are literals, then include $(l_1 \vee l_2 \vee p) \wedge (l_1 \vee l_2 \vee \neg p)$ as clauses of ϕ'''. The literals p and $\neg p$ merely fulfill the syntactic requirement that each clause of ϕ''' has

exactly 3 distinct literals. Whether $p = 0$ or $p = 1$, one of the clauses is equivalent to $l_1 \lor l_2$, and the other evaluates to 1, which is the identity for AND.

- If C_i has just 1 distinct literal l, then include $(l \lor p \lor q) \land (l \lor p \lor \neg q) \land (l \lor \neg p \lor q) \land (l \lor \neg p \lor \neg q)$ as clauses of ϕ'''. Regardless of the values of p and q, one of the four clauses is equivalent to l, and the other 3 evaluate to 1.

We can see that the 3-CNF formula ϕ''' is satisfiable if and only if ϕ is satisfiable by inspecting each of the three steps. Like the reduction from CIRCUIT-SAT to SAT, the construction of ϕ' from ϕ in the first step preserves satisfiability. The second step produces a CNF formula ϕ'' that is algebraically equivalent to ϕ'. The third step produces a 3-CNF formula ϕ''' that is effectively equivalent to ϕ'', since any assignment to the variables p and q produces a formula that is algebraically equivalent to ϕ''.

We must also show that the reduction can be computed in polynomial time. Constructing ϕ' from ϕ introduces at most 1 variable and 1 clause per connective in ϕ. Constructing ϕ'' from ϕ' can introduce at most 8 clauses into ϕ'' for each clause from ϕ', since each clause of ϕ' has at most 3 variables, and the truth table for each clause has at most $2^3 = 8$ rows. The construction of ϕ''' from ϕ'' introduces at most 4 clauses into ϕ''' for each clause of ϕ''. Thus, the size of the resulting formula ϕ''' is polynomial in the length of the original formula. Each of the constructions can easily be accomplished in polynomial time.   ∎

Exercises

34.4-1
Consider the straightforward (nonpolynomial-time) reduction in the proof of Theorem 34.9. Describe a circuit of size n that, when converted to a formula by this method, yields a formula whose size is exponential in n.

34.4-2
Show the 3-CNF formula that results when we use the method of Theorem 34.10 on the formula (34.3).

34.4-3
Professor Jagger proposes to show that SAT $\leq_P$ 3-CNF-SAT by using only the truth-table technique in the proof of Theorem 34.10, and not the other steps. That is, the professor proposes to take the boolean formula ϕ, form a truth table for its variables, derive from the truth table a formula in 3-DNF that is equivalent to $\neg\phi$, and then negate and apply DeMorgan's laws to produce a 3-CNF formula equivalent to ϕ. Show that this strategy does not yield a polynomial-time reduction.