

1:

$$a = \text{MAX}(r, l \cdot b)$$

$$n^r + n^{l \cdot b} = n^{\text{MAX}(r, l \cdot b)}, \text{ so we have } O(n^{\text{MAX}(r, l \cdot b)})$$

2:

We will show that this is not possible by showing that there is a polynomial time reduction from a problem in P to a known EXPTIME-complete problem, and then concluding that if the reduction worked both ways, then P would have to be equal to EXPTIME, which is known to be false.

AFSOC that the claim held.

Let B be the problem of determining whether a deterministic Turing machine completes in k steps for a TM with a non-unary alphabet, and outputting its result if it does complete. This is a problem known to be EXPTIME-Complete, but we could also intuitively justify this by realizing that k can be represented in $\log(k)$ bits, meaning that we would have to simulate the TM for a number of steps exponential in the input.

Let A be the Horn-Satisfiability problem from last week, which from OH we know to be P-Complete. We know that we have an algorithm to solve Horn-Satisfiability problem, from some known c , in $O(n^c)$.

We see that we can naively construct a polynomial time reduction from B to A by running a TM for $k=2^{(n^c)}$ steps, and outputting the result of the simulated TM. We see that $\log_2(2^{(n^c)})$ steps, which is thus polynomial with respect to the length of our input, meaning that this reduction can be completed in polynomial time as the value of c is known, so we only have to determine the length of the input which can be done in polynomial time.

Thus, because we have a polynomial time reduction from A to B, by our assumption, we can do a polynomial time reduction from B to A. So we have a polynomial time reduction from a P-Complete problem to an EXPTIME-Complete problem.

However, from the book, we know that EXP is a strict superset of P (this follows from the time hierarchy theorem). Thus, we have a contradiction. Thus, the claim is false.

3:

Suppose we have a TM with a non-unary alphabet.

The definition of NTIME is linear time non-deterministic. If each random number generation draws from a sample of size k , we must have that the number of bits to represent a single sample is at most $\log(k)$. So if we draw a number A of size $\log(k)$, we must require at least

$\log(k)$ work. So if we have linear time, non-deterministic work and we draw some series of samples to take this linear amount of work ($c \cdot n$), we must draw at most $c \cdot n / (\log(k))$ samples, where c is some constant, for the branch that correctly solves the problem. We thus have $k^{(cn/\log(k))}$ total work if we were to exhaustively try out every sample in our pool.

Because our TM has a non-unary alphabet, we have $k \leq c^{(\log(k))}$, where c is the number of characters in our alphabet.

We have $2^{(\log(k) \cdot (cn/\log(k)))} \leq 2^{cn}$.

Thus, $\text{NTIME}(n)$ is a subset of E .

4:

```
bool NOTAPERM(int& X) {
    for (int i=0; i<n; i++) {
        for (j=0; j<n; j++) {
            if (i == x[j]) {
                break;
            }
            else if (j == (n-1)) {
                return ACCEPT
            }
        }
    }
    RETURN REJECT
}
```

We see that the above checks every possible pair $(i, X[j])$ for each value possible for j and if it cannot find a match j for any j , we reject. We see that this is correct because if such a j cannot be found for a given i , we must not have a permutation because at least one of the correct numbers would be missing.