P versus NP

Frank Vega
Joysonic, Uzun Mirkova 5, Belgrade, 11000, Serbia
vega.frank@gmail.com

Abstract

P versus NP is considered as one of the most important open problems in computer science. This consists in knowing the answer of the following question: Is P equal to NP? A precise statement of the P versus NP problem was introduced independently by Stephen Cook and Leonid Levin. Since that date, all efforts to find a proof for this problem have failed. Another major complexity classes are L and NL. We demonstrate if L is not equal to NL, then P = NP. In addition, we show if L is equal to NL, then P = NP. In this way, we prove the complexity class P is equal to NP.

2012 ACM Subject Classification Theory of computation → Complexity classes; Theory of computation → Problems, reductions and completeness

Keywords and phrases complexity classes, completeness, polynomial time, reduction, logarithmic space, one-way

1 Introduction

In previous years there has been great interest in the verification or checking of computations [15]. Interactive proofs introduced by Goldwasser, Micali and Rackoff and Babi can be viewed as a model of the verification process [15]. Dwork and Stockmeyer and Condon have studied interactive proofs where the verifier is a space bounded computation instead of the original model where the verifier is a time bounded computation [15]. In addition, Blum and Kannan has studied another model where the goal is to check a computation based solely on the final answer [15]. More about probabilistic logarithmic space verifiers and the complexity class NP has been investigated on a technique of Lipton [15]. In this work, we show some results about the logarithmic space verifiers applied to the class NP and logarithmic space disqualifiers applied to the class $coNP$ which solve one of the most important open problems in computer science, that is P versus NP.

The P versus NP problem is a major unsolved problem in computer science [5]. This is considered by many to be the most important open problem in the field [5]. It is one of the seven Millennium Prize Problems selected by the Clay Mathematics Institute to carry a US$1,000,000 prize for the first correct solution [5]. It was essentially mentioned in 1955 from a letter written by John Nash to the United States National Security Agency [1]. However, the precise statement of the $P = NP$ problem was introduced in 1971 by Stephen Cook in a seminal paper [5]. In 2012, a poll of 151 researchers showed that 126 (83%) believed the answer to be no, 12 (9%) believed the answer is yes, 5 (3%) believed the question may be independent of the currently accepted axioms and therefore impossible to prove or disprove, 8 (5%) said either do not know or do not care or don't want the answer to be yes nor the problem to be resolved [10]. It is fully expected that $P \neq NP$ [18]. Indeed, if $P = NP$ then there are stunning practical consequences [18]. For that reason, $P = NP$ is considered as a very unlikely event [18]. Certainly, P versus NP is one of the greatest open problems in science and a correct solution for this incognita will have a great impact not only in computer science, but for many other fields as well [1]. Whether $P = NP$ or not is still a controversial and unsolved problem [1]. We show some results that prove this outstanding problem with the unexpected solution of $P = NP$.

2 Theory and Methods

2.1 Preliminaries

In 1936, Turing developed his theoretical computational model [20]. The deterministic and nondeterministic Turing machines have become in two of the most important definitions related to this theoretical model for computation [20]. A deterministic Turing machine has only one next action for each step defined in its program or transition function [20]. A nondeterministic Turing machine could contain more than one action defined for each step of its program, where this one is no longer a function, but a relation [20].

Let Σ be a finite alphabet with at least two elements, and let Σ^* be the set of finite strings over Σ [3]. A Turing machine M has an associated input alphabet Σ [3]. For each string w in Σ^* there is a computation associated with M on input w [3]. We say that M accepts w if this computation terminates in the accepting state, that is $M(w) =$ "yes" [3]. Note that M fails to accept w either if this computation ends in the rejecting state, that is $M(w) =$ "no", or if the computation fails to terminate, or the computation ends in the halting state with some output, that is $M(w) = y$ (when M outputs the string y on the input w) [3].

Another relevant advance in the last century has been the definition of a complexity class. A language over an alphabet is any set of strings made up of symbols from that alphabet [6]. A complexity class is a set of problems, which are represented as a language, grouped by measures such as the running time, memory, etc [6]. The language accepted by a Turing machine M, denoted $L(M)$, has an associated alphabet Σ and is defined by:

$$L(M) = \{w \in \Sigma^* : M(w) = \text{“}yes\text{”}\}.$$

We denote by $t_M(w)$ the number of steps in the computation of M on input w [3]. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we denote by $T_M(n)$ the worst case run time of M; that is:

$$T_M(n) = max\{t_M(w) : w \in \Sigma^n\}$$

where Σ^n is the set of all strings over Σ of length n [3]. We say that M runs in polynomial time if there is a constant k such that for all n, $T_M(n) \leq n^k + k$ [3]. In other words, this means the language $L(M)$ can be decided by the Turing machine M in polynomial time. Therefore, P is the complexity class of languages that can be decided by deterministic Turing machines in polynomial time [6]. A verifier for a language L_1 is a deterministic Turing machine M, where:

$$L_1 = \{w : M(w, c) = \text{“}yes\text{”} \textit{ for some string } c\}.$$

We measure the time of a verifier only in terms of the length of w, so a polynomial time verifier runs in polynomial time in the length of w [3]. A verifier uses additional information, represented by the symbol c, to verify that a string w is a member of L_1. This information is called certificate. NP is the complexity class of languages defined by polynomial time verifiers [18]. If NP is the class of problems that have succinct certificates, then the complexity class $coNP$ must contain those problems that have succinct disqualifications [18]. That is, a "no" instance of a problem in $coNP$ possesses a short proof of its being a "no" instance [18].

2.2 First Hypothesis

A function $f : \Sigma^* \to \Sigma^*$ is a polynomial time computable function if some deterministic Turing machine M, on every input w, halts in polynomial time with just $f(w)$ on its tape

[20]. Let $\{0,1\}^*$ be the infinite set of binary strings, we say that a language $L_1 \subseteq \{0,1\}^*$ is polynomial time reducible to a language $L_2 \subseteq \{0,1\}^*$, written $L_1 \leq_p L_2$, if there is a polynomial time computable function $f : \{0,1\}^* \to \{0,1\}^*$ such that for all $x \in \{0,1\}^*$:

$x \in L_1$ *if and only if* $f(x) \in L_2$.

An important complexity class is *NP–complete* [9]. A language $L_1 \subseteq \{0,1\}^*$ is *NP–complete* if:

- $L_1 \in NP$, and
- $L' \leq_p L_1$ for every $L' \in NP$.

If L_1 is a language such that $L' \leq_p L_1$ for some $L' \in$ *NP–complete*, then L_1 is *NP–hard* [6]. Moreover, if $L_1 \in NP$, then $L_1 \in$ *NP–complete* [6]. A principal *NP–complete* problem is SAT [9]. An instance of SAT is a Boolean formula ϕ which is composed of:

1. Boolean variables: $x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n$;
2. 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);
3. and parentheses.

A truth assignment for a Boolean formula ϕ is a set of values for the variables in ϕ. A satisfying truth assignment is a truth assignment that causes ϕ to be evaluated as true. A formula with a satisfying truth assignment is a satisfiable formula. The problem SAT asks whether a given Boolean formula is satisfiable [9]. We define a CNF Boolean formula using the following terms:

A literal in a Boolean formula is an occurrence of a variable or its negation [6]. 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 [6]. A Boolean formula is in 3-conjunctive normal form or $3CNF$, if each clause has exactly three distinct literals [6].

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 $3CNF$. 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 $\neg x_2$. Another relevant *NP–complete* language is $3CNF$ satisfiability, or $3SAT$ [6]. In $3SAT$, it is asked whether a given Boolean formula ϕ in $3CNF$ is satisfiable.

A logarithmic space Turing machine has a read-only input tape, a write-only output tape, and read/write work tapes [20]. The work tapes may contain at most $O(\log n)$ symbols [20]. In computational complexity theory, L is the complexity class containing those decision problems that can be decided by a deterministic logarithmic space Turing machine [18]. NL is the complexity class containing the decision problems that can be decided by a nondeterministic logarithmic space Turing machine [18].

A logarithmic space transducer is a Turing machine with a read-only input tape, a write-only output tape, and read/write work tapes [20]. The work tapes must contain at most $O(\log n)$ symbols [20]. A logarithmic space transducer M computes a function $f : \Sigma^* \to \Sigma^*$, where $f(w)$ is the string remaining on the output tape after M halts when it is started with w on its input tape [20]. We call f a logarithmic space computable function [20]. We say that a language $L_1 \subseteq \{0,1\}^*$ is logarithmic space reducible to a language $L_2 \subseteq \{0,1\}^*$, written $L_1 \leq_l L_2$, if there exists a logarithmic space computable function $f : \{0,1\}^* \to \{0,1\}^*$ such that for all $x \in \{0,1\}^*$,

$x \in L_1$ *if and only if* $f(x) \in L_2$.

The logarithmic space reduction is used in the definition of the complete languages for the classes L and NL [18]. A Boolean formula is in 2-conjunctive normal form, or $2CNF$, if it is in CNF and each clause has exactly two distinct literals. There is a problem called $2SAT$, where we asked whether a given Boolean formula ϕ in $2CNF$ is satisfiable. $2SAT$ is complete for NL [18]. Another special case is the class of problems where each clause contains XOR (i.e. exclusive or) rather than (plain) OR operators. This is in P, since an *XOR SAT* formula can also be viewed as a system of linear equations mod 2, and can be solved in cubic time by Gaussian elimination [17]. We denote the XOR function as $\oplus$. The *XOR 2SAT* problem will be equivalent to *XOR SAT*, but the clauses in the formula have exactly two distinct literals. *XOR 2SAT* is in L [2], [19].

We can give a certificate-based definition for NL [3]. The certificate-based definition of NL assumes that a logarithmic space Turing machine has another separated read-only tape [3]. On each step of the machine the machine's head on that tape can either stay in place or move to the right [3]. In particular, it cannot reread any bit to the left of where the head currently is [3]. For that reason this kind of special tape is called "read-once" [3].

▶ **Definition 1.** *A language L_1 is in NL if there exists a deterministic logarithmic space Turing machine M with an additional special read-once input tape polynomial $p : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ such that for every $x \in \{0,1\}^*$,*

$$x \in L_1 \Leftrightarrow \exists u \in \{0,1\}^{p(|x|)} \text{ such that } M(x,u) = \text{“}yes\text{”}$$

where by $M(x,u)$ we denote the computation of M where x is placed on its input tape and the certificate u is placed on its special read-once tape, and M uses at most $O(\log |x|)$ space on its read/write tapes for every input x where $|\ldots|$ is the bit-length function [3]. M is called a logarithmic space verifier [3].

We state the following Hypothesis:

▷ Hypothesis 2. Given a nonempty language $L_1 \in L$, there is a language L_2 in *NP–complete* with a deterministic Turing machine M, where:

$$L_2 = \{w : M(w,u) = y, \exists \text{ string } u \text{ such that } y \in L_1\}$$

when M runs in logarithmic space in the length of w, u is placed on the special read-once tape of M, and u is polynomially bounded by w. In this way, there is an *NP–complete* language defined by a logarithmic space verifier M such that when the input is an element of the language with its certificate, then M outputs a string which belongs to a single language in L.

From the early days of automata and complexity theory, two different models of Turing machines are considered, the offline and online machines [14]. Each model has a read-only input tape and some work tapes [14]. The offline machines may read their input two-way while the online machines are not allowed to move the input head to the left [14]. In the terminology of the (generalized) Turing machine models are called two-way and one-way Turing machines, respectively [14].

Hartmanis and Mahaney have investigated the classes $1L$ and $1NL$ of languages recognizable by deterministic one-way logarithmic space Turing machine and nondeterministic one-way logarithmic space Turing machine, respectively [11]. They have shown that $1L \neq 1NL$ (by looking at a uniform variant of the string non-equality problem from communication complexity theory) and have defined a natural complete problem for $1NL$ under deterministic one-way logarithmic space reductions [11]. Furthermore, they have proven that $1NL \subseteq L$ if and only if $L = NL$ [11].

▶ **Theorem 3.** *If the Hypothesis 2 is true, therefore if $L \neq NL$, then $P = NP$.*

Proof. We can simulate the computation $M(w, u) = y$ in the Hypothesis 2 by a nondeterministic logarithmic space Turing machine N, such that $N(w) = y$ since we can read the certificate string u within the read-once tape by a work tape in a nondeterministic logarithmic space generation of symbols contained in u [18]. Certainly, we can simulate the reading of one symbol from the string u into the read-once tape just nondeterministically generating the same symbol in the work tapes using a logarithmic space [18].

If we suppose that $L \subset 1NL$, then we can accept the elements of the language $L_1 \in L$ by a nondeterministic one-way logarithmic space Turing machine M'. In this way, there is a nondeterministic logarithmic space Turing machine $M''(w) = M'(N(w))$ which will accept when $w \in L_2$. Consequently, M'' is a nondeterministic logarithmic space Turing machine which decides the language L_2. The reason is because we can simulate the output string of $N(w)$ within a read-once tape and thus, we can compute in a nondeterministic logarithmic space the logarithmic space composition using the same techniques of the logarithmic space composition reduction, but without any reset of the computation [18]. Certainly, we do not need to reset the computation of $N(w)$ for the reading at once of a symbol in the output string of $N(w)$ by the nondeterministic one-way logarithmic space Turing machine M'. Therefore, L_2 is in NL and thus, $L_2 \in P$ due to $NL \subseteq P$ [18]. If any single *NP–complete* problem can be solved in polynomial time, then $P = NP$ [6]. Since $L_2 \in P$ and $L_2 \in$ *NP–complete*, then we obtain the complexity class P is equal to NP under the assumption that $L \subset 1NL$.

Hartmanis and Mahaney have also shown with their result that if $1NL \subseteq L$ or even $1NL \subset L$, then $L = NL$, because they proved there is a complete problem for both $1NL$ and NL at the same time [11]. If this way, if $L \neq NL$, then $L \subset 1NL$ by contraposition [18]. Since we already obtained that $P = NP$ under the assumption that $L \subset 1NL$, therefore if $L \neq NL$, then $P = NP$. ◀

2.3 Second Hypothesis

An important complexity class is *coNP–complete* [9]. A language $L_1 \subseteq \{0, 1\}^*$ is *coNP–complete* if:

- $L_1 \in coNP$, and
- $L' \leq_p L_1$ for every $L' \in coNP$.

If L_1 is a language such that $L' \leq_p L_1$ for some $L' \in$ *coNP–complete*, then L_1 is *coNP–hard* [6]. Moreover, if $L_1 \in coNP$, then $L_1 \in$ *coNP–complete* [6]. A principal *coNP–complete* problem is $UNSAT$ [9]. A Boolean formula without any satisfying truth assignment is unsatisfiable. The problem $UNSAT$ asks whether a given Boolean formula is unsatisfiable [9].

$coNL$ is the complexity class containing the languages such that their complements belong to NL [18]. We can give a disqualification-based definition for $coNL$ [3]. The disqualification-based definition of $coNL$ assumes that a logarithmic space Turing machine has another separated read-only tape, that is the same kind of special tape called "read-once" that we use in the certificate-based definition for NL [3]. Besides, in the disqualification-based definition of $coNL$, we assume the disqualification string is appropriated for the instance [18]. For example, a truth assignment for a Boolean formula ϕ in $3CNF$ is appropriated for the instance when every possible variable in ϕ could be evaluated in that truth assignment string, but we cannot affirm the same for every possible binary string.

▶ **Definition 4.** *A language L_1 is in coNL if there exists a deterministic logarithmic space Turing machine M with an additional special read-once input tape polynomial $p : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ such that for every $x \in \{0,1\}^*$,*

$$x \in L_1 \Leftrightarrow \forall \text{ appropriated } u \in \{0,1\}^{p(|x|)} \text{ then } M(x,u) = \text{“}yes\text{”}$$

where by $M(x,u)$ we denote the computation of M where x is placed on its input tape and the disqualification u is placed on its special read-once tape, and M uses at most $O(\log |x|)$ space on its read/write tapes for every input x where $|\ldots|$ is the bit-length function [3]. M is called a logarithmic space disqualifier.

We state the following Hypothesis:

▷ Hypothesis 5. Given a nonempty language $L_1 \in 1NL$, there is a language L_2 in *coNP–complete* with a deterministic Turing machine M, where:

$$L_2 = \{w : M(w,u) = y, \forall \text{ appropriated string } u \text{ such that } y \in L_1\}$$

when M runs in logarithmic space in the length of w, u is placed on the special read-once tape of M, and u is polynomially bounded by w. In this way, there is a *coNP–complete* language defined by a logarithmic space disqualifier M such that when the input is an element of the language with any of its appropriated disqualification, then M always outputs a string which belongs to a single language in $1NL$.

▶ **Theorem 6.** *If the Hypothesis 5 is true, therefore if $L = NL$, then $P = NP$.*

Proof. We can accept the elements of the language $L_1 \in 1NL$ by a nondeterministic one-way logarithmic space Turing machine M'. In this way, there is a nondeterministic logarithmic space Turing machine $M''(w,u) = M'(M(w,u))$ which will accept when $w \in L_2$ for all the appropriated disqualification u. The reason is because we can simulate the output string of $M(w,u)$ within a read-once tape and thus, we can compute in a nondeterministic logarithmic space the logarithmic space composition using the same techniques of the logarithmic space composition reduction, but without any reset of the computation [18]. Certainly, we do not need to reset the computation of $M(w,u)$ for the reading at once of a symbol in the output string of $M(w,u)$ by the nondeterministic one-way logarithmic space Turing machine M'. Consequently, M'' can be converted into a logarithmic space disqualifier for the language L_2 just assuming that $L = NL$, because of the nondeterministic logarithmic space Turing machine M'' could be simulated by a deterministic logarithmic space Turing machine. Therefore, L_2 is in $coNL$ and thus, $L_2 \in P$ due to $coNL \subseteq P$ [18]. If any single *coNP–complete* problem can be solved in polynomial time, then $P = NP$ [18]. Since $L_2 \in P$ and $L_2 \in$ *coNP–complete*, then we obtain the complexity class P is equal to NP under the assumption that $L = NL$. ◀

3 Results

3.1 First Hypothesis

We show a previous known *NP–complete* problem:

▶ **Definition 7.** ***NAE 3SAT***

INSTANCE: A Boolean formula ϕ in $3CNF$.

QUESTION: Is there a truth assignment for ϕ such that each clause has at least one true literal and at least one false literal?

REMARKS: NAE 3SAT $\in$ NP–complete [9].

We define a new problem:

▶ **Definition 8.** ***MAXIMUM EXCLUSIVE-OR 2-SATISFIABILITY***

INSTANCE: A positive integer K and a Boolean formula ϕ that is an instance of XOR 2SAT.

QUESTION: Is there a truth assignment in ϕ such that at most K clauses are unsatisfied?

REMARKS: We denote this problem as $MAX \oplus 2SAT$.

▶ **Theorem 9.** *$MAX \oplus 2SAT \in$ NP–complete.*

Proof. It is trivial to see $MAX \oplus 2SAT \in NP$ [18]. Given a Boolean formula ϕ in $3CNF$ with n variables and m clauses, we create three new variables a_{c_i}, b_{c_i} and d_{c_i} for each clause $c_i = (x \vee y \vee z)$ in ϕ, where x, y and z are literals, in the following formula:

$$P_i = (a_{c_i} \oplus b_{c_i}) \wedge (b_{c_i} \oplus d_{c_i}) \wedge (a_{c_i} \oplus d_{c_i}) \wedge (x \oplus a_{c_i}) \wedge (y \oplus b_{c_i}) \wedge (z \oplus d_{c_i}).$$

We can see P_i has at most one unsatisfied clause for some truth assignment if and only if at least one member of $\{x, y, z\}$ is true and at least one member of $\{x, y, z\}$ is false for the same truth assignment. Hence, we can create the Boolean formula ψ as the conjunction of the P_i formulas for every clause c_i in ϕ, such that $\psi = P_1 \wedge \ldots \wedge P_m$. Finally, we obtain that

$$\phi \in \textit{NAE 3SAT if and only if } (\psi, m) \in MAX \oplus 2SAT.$$

Consequently, we prove $NAE\ 3SAT \leq_p MAX \oplus 2SAT$ where we already know the language $NAE\ 3SAT \in$ *NP–complete* [9]. To sum up, we show $MAX \oplus 2SAT \in$ *NP–hard* and $MAX \oplus 2SAT \in NP$ and thus, $MAX \oplus 2SAT \in$ *NP–complete.* ◀

▶ **Theorem 10.** *There is a deterministic Turing machine M, where:*

$$MAX \oplus 2SAT = \{w : M(w, u) = y, \exists \textit{ string } u \textit{ such that } y \in XOR\ 2SAT\}$$

when M runs in logarithmic space in the length of w, u is placed on the special read-once tape of M, and u is polynomially bounded by w.

Proof. Given a valid instance (ψ, K) for $MAX \oplus 2SAT$ when ψ has m clauses, we can create a certificate array A which contains K different natural numbers in ascending order which represents the indexes of the clauses in ψ that we are going to remove from the instance. We read at once the elements of the array A and we reject whether this is not an appropriated certificate: That is when the numbers are not sorted in ascending order, or the array A does not contain exactly K elements, or the array A contains a number that is not between 1 and m. While we read the elements of the array A, we remove the clauses from the instance (ψ, K) for $MAX \oplus 2SAT$ just creating another instance ϕ for $XOR\ 2SAT$ where the Boolean formula ϕ does not contain the K different indexed clauses ψ represented by the numbers in A. Therefore, we obtain the array A would be valid according to the Theorem 10 when:

$$(\psi, K) \in MAX \oplus 2SAT \textit{ if and only if } \phi \in XOR\ 2SAT.$$

Furthermore, we can make this verification in logarithmic space such that the array A is placed on the special read-once tape, because we read at once the elements in the array A and we assume the clauses in the input ψ are indexed from left to right. Hence, we only need to iterate from the elements of the array A to verify whether the array is an appropriated certificate and also remove the K different clauses from the Boolean formula ψ when we write the final clauses to the output. This logarithmic space verification will be the Algorithm 1.

We assume whether a value does not exist in the array A into the cell of some position i when $A[i] = \textit{undefined}$. In addition, we reject immediately when the following comparisons

$$A[i] \leq max \vee A[i] < 1 \vee A[i] > m$$

hold at least into one single binary digit. Note, in the loop j from min to $max - 1$, we do not output any clause when $max - 1 < min$.

Algorithm 1 Logarithmic space verifier

```
1: /*A valid instance for MAX ⊕ 2SAT with its certificate*/
2: procedure VERIFIER((ψ, K), A)
3:     /*Initialize minimum and maximum values*/
4:     min ← 1
5:     max ← 0
6:     /*Iterate for the elements of the certificate array A*/
7:     for i ← 1 to K + 1 do
8:         if i = K + 1 then
9:             /*There exists a K + 1 element in the array*/
10:            if A[i] ≠ undefined then
11:                /*Reject the certificate*/
12:                return "no"
13:            end if
14:            /*m is the number of clauses in ψ*/
15:            max ← m + 1
16:        else if A[i] = undefined ∨ A[i] ≤ max ∨ A[i] < 1 ∨ A[i] > m then
17:            /*Reject the certificate*/
18:            return "no"
19:        else
20:            max ← A[i]
21:        end if
22:        /*Iterate for the clauses of the Boolean formula ψ*/
23:        for j ← min to max − 1 do
24:            /*Output the indexed j^th clause in ψ*/
25:            output " ∧ c_j"
26:        end for
27:        min ← max + 1
28:    end for
29: end procedure
```

◀

▶ **Theorem 11.** *The Hypothesis 2 is true.*

Proof. This is a consequence of Theorems 9 and 10. ◀

3.2 Second Hypothesis

We show a previous known *coNP–complete* problem:

▶ **Definition 12.** ***3UNSAT***

INSTANCE: A Boolean formula ϕ in $3CNF$.
QUESTION: Is ϕ unsatisfiable?
REMARKS: $3UNSAT \in$ coNP–complete [9].

We define a new problem:

▶ **Definition 13.** ***SUM ZERO***

INSTANCE: A collection of integers C such that $0 \notin C$ and every integer in C has the same bit-length of the number that represents the cardinality of C multiplied by 3 (we do not take into account the symbol minus in counting the bit-length of the negative integers).
QUESTION: Are there two elements $a, b \in C$, such that $a + b = 0$?
REMARKS: We denote this problem as SUM–ZERO.

▶ **Theorem 14.** *SUM–$ZERO \in 1NL$.*

Proof. Given a collection of integers C, we can read its elements from left to right, verify that every element is not equal to 0, check that every element in C has the same bit-length and count the amount of elements in C to finally multiply it by 3 and compare its bit-length with the single bit-length from the elements in C. In addition, we can nondeterministically pick two elements a and b from C and accept in case of $a + b = 0$ otherwise we reject. We can make all this computation in a nondeterministic one-way using logarithmic space. Certainly, the calculation and store of the bit-length of the elements in C could be done in logarithmic space since this is a unique value. On the one hand, we can count and store the number of elements that we read from the input and multiply it by 3 to finally compare its bit-length with the stored bit-length, since the cardinality of C multiplied by 3 could be stored in a binary number of bit-length that is logarithmic in relation to the encoded length of C. On the other hand, the two elements a and b that we pick from C have a logarithmic space in relation to the encoded length of C, because of every integer in C has the same bit-length of the number that represents the cardinality of C multiplied by 3. Indeed, we never need to read to the left on the input for the acceptance of the elements in *SUM–ZERO* in a nondeterministic logarithmic space. ◀

▶ **Theorem 15.** *There is a deterministic Turing machine M, where:*

$$3UNSAT = \{w : M(w, u) = y, \forall \text{ appropriated string } u \text{ such that } y \in SUM\text{–}ZERO\}$$

when M runs in logarithmic space in the length of w, u is placed on the special read-once tape of M, and u is polynomially bounded by w.

Proof. Given a Boolean formula ϕ in $3CNF$ with n variables and m clauses, we can create a disqualification array A which contains m positive integers between 1 and 3 which represents the literals of the clauses in ϕ which appear from left to right. We read at once the elements of the array A and we reject whether this is not an appropriated disqualification: That is when the array A does not contain exactly m elements, or the array A contains a number that is not between 1 and 3. While we read the elements of the array A, we select from the clauses ϕ the literals such that these ones occupy the position that represents the number between 1 and 3, that is the first, second or third place within the clause from left to right. In this way, we output the selected literals that are represented by a positive or negative (in case of a negated variable) integer just creating another instance C for *SUM–ZERO* where the collection C contains those integers which are the selected literals for each clause in

ϕ. Therefore, we obtain that all the appropriated array A would be valid according to the Theorem 15 when:

$$\phi \in 3UNSAT \text{ if and only if } C \in SUM\text{–}ZERO$$

since we assume the positive and negated literals of some variable in the input ϕ correspond to a positive integer and its negative value. Furthermore, we can make this verification in logarithmic space such that the array A is placed on the special read-once tape, because we read at once the elements in the array A. Hence, we only need to iterate from the elements of the array A to verify whether the array is an appropriated disqualification and pick the m literals from the Boolean formula ϕ when we write the final integers that represent these literals to the output. This logarithmic space verification will be the Algorithm 2. We assume whether a value does not exist in the array A into the cell of some position i when $A[i] = \textit{undefined}$. In addition, we reject immediately when the following comparisons

$$A[i] < 1 \vee A[i] > 3$$

hold at least into one single binary digit. Note, that every possible literal in ϕ could have a representation by an integer between $-3 \times m$ and $3 \times m$ with the exception of 0, where m is the cardinality of the collection C. In this way, we guarantee the output collection C is an appropriated instance of *SUM–ZERO* just filling with zeroes to the left the elements with bit-length lesser than $|3 \times m|$ where $|\ldots|$ is the bit-length function.

◀

▶ **Theorem 16.** *The Hypothesis 5 is true.*

Proof. This is a consequence of Theorems 14 and 15. ◀

3.3 Consequences

▶ **Theorem 17.** *If $L \neq NL$ then $P = NP$.*

Proof. This is a direct consequence of Theorems 3 and 11. ◀

▶ **Theorem 18.** *If $L = NL$ then $P = NP$.*

Proof. This is a direct consequence of Theorems 6 and 16. ◀

▶ **Theorem 19.** *$P = NP$.*

Proof. Since we have either $L \neq NL$ or $L = NL$ is true, then the complexity class P is equal to NP. ◀

4 Conclusions

No one has been able to find a polynomial time algorithm for any of more than 300 important known *NP–complete* problems [9]. A proof of $P = NP$ will have stunning practical consequences, because it leads to efficient methods for solving some of the important problems in NP [5]. The consequences, both positive and negative, arise since various *NP–complete* problems are fundamental in many fields [5]. The following consequences are assuming that we have a practical solution for the *NP–complete* problems where such existence was proven with our nonconstructive result:

Algorithm 2 Logarithmic space disqualifier

```
1: /*A valid instance for 3UNSAT with its disqualification*/
2: procedure DISQUALIFIER(φ, A)
3:     /*Initialize an index*/
4:     j ← 0
5:     /*m is the number of clauses in φ*/
6:     /*Iterate for the elements of the disqualification array A*/
7:     for i ← 1 to m + 1 do
8:         if i = m + 1 then
9:             /*There exists an m + 1 element in the array*/
10:            if A[i] ≠ undefined then
11:                /*Reject the disqualification*/
12:                return "no"
13:            end if
14:            /*Break the for loop*/
15:            break
16:        else if A[i] = undefined ∨ A[i] < 1 ∨ A[i] > 3 then
17:            /*Reject the disqualification*/
18:            return "no"
19:        else
20:            j ← A[i]
21:        end if
22:        /*From the indexed i^th clause c_i = (x_j ∨ y_k ∨ z_r) in φ*/
23:        /*Where x, y and z are literals with local indexes {j, k, r} = {1, 2, 3} in c_i*/
24:        /*Output the integer representation of the j^th literal*/
25:        /*Filled with zeroes to the left until a total of |3 × m| bits including the literal*/
26:        /*But, the bit-length of the symbol minus is ignored in filling the negated literals*/
27:        output ", x_j"
28:    end for
29: end procedure
```

1. Cryptography, for example, relies on certain problems being difficult. A constructive and efficient solution to an *NP–complete* problem such as $3SAT$ will break most existing cryptosystems including: Public-key cryptography [12], symmetric ciphers [16] and one-way functions used in cryptographic hashing [7]. These would need to be modified or replaced by information-theoretically secure solutions not inherently based on *P–NP* equivalence.
2. There are enormous positive consequences that will follow from rendering tractable many currently mathematically intractable problems. For instance, many problems in operations research are *NP–complete*, such as some types of integer programming and the traveling salesman problem [9]. Efficient solutions to these problems have enormous implications for logistics [5]. Many other important problems, such as some problems in protein structure prediction, are also *NP–complete*, so this will spur considerable advances in biology [4].
3. Since all the *NP–complete* optimization problems become easy, everything will be much more efficient [8]. Transportation of all forms will be scheduled optimally to move people and goods around quicker and cheaper [8]. Manufacturers can improve their production to increase speed and create less waste [8]. Learning becomes easy by using the principle of Occam's razor: We simply find the smallest program consistent with the data [8]. Near perfect vision recognition, language comprehension and translation and all other learning tasks become trivial [8]. We will also have much better predictions of weather and earthquakes and other natural phenomenon [8].
4. There would be disruption, including maybe displacing programmers [13]. The practice of programming itself would be more about gathering training data and less about writing code [13]. Google would have the resources to excel in such a world [13].
5. But such changes may pale in significance compared to the revolution an efficient method for solving *NP–complete* problems will cause in mathematics itself [5]. Research mathematicians spend their careers trying to prove theorems, and some proofs have taken decades or even centuries to find after problems have been stated [1]. For instance, Fermat's Last Theorem took over three centuries to prove [1]. A method that is guaranteed to find proofs to theorems, should one exist of a "reasonable" size, would essentially end this struggle [5].

References

1 Scott Aaronson. P $\stackrel{?}{=}$ NP. *Electronic Colloquium on Computational Complexity, Report No. 4*, 2017.

2 Carme Álvarez and Raymond Greenlaw. A Compendium of Problems Complete for Symmetric Logarithmic Space. *Computational Complexity*, 9(2):123–145, 2000. doi:10.1007/PL00001603.

3 Sanjeev Arora and Boaz Barak. *Computational complexity: a modern approach*. Cambridge University Press, 2009.

4 Bonnie Berger and Tom Leighton. Protein Folding in the Hydrophobic-Hydrophilic (HP) Model is NP-complete. *Journal of Computational Biology*, 5(1):27–40, 1998. doi:10.1145/279069.279080.

5 Stephen A. Cook. The P versus NP Problem, April 2000. In Clay Mathematics Institute at http://www.claymath.org/sites/default/files/pvsnp.pdf.

6 Thomas H. Cormen, Charles E. Leiserson, Ronald L. Rivest, and Clifford Stein. *Introduction to Algorithms*. The MIT Press, 3rd edition, 2009.

7 Debapratim De, Abishek Kumarasubramanian, and Ramarathnam Venkatesan. Inversion Attacks on Secure Hash Functions Using SAT Solvers. In *International Conference on*

Theory and Applications of Satisfiability Testing, pages 377–382. Springer, 2007. doi:10.1007/978-3-540-72788-0_36.

8 Lance Fortnow. The Status of the P Versus NP Problem. *Commun. ACM*, 52(9):78–86, September 2009. doi:10.1145/1562164.1562186.

9 Michael R. Garey and David S. Johnson. *Computers and Intractability: A Guide to the Theory of NP-Completeness*. San Francisco: W. H. Freeman and Company, 1 edition, 1979.

10 William I. Gasarch. Guest column: The second P $\stackrel{?}{=}$ NP poll. *ACM SIGACT News*, 43(2):53–77, 2012. doi:10.1145/2261417.2261434.

11 Juris Hartmanis and Stephen R. Mahaney. Languages Simultaneously Complete for One-Way and Two-Way Log-Tape automata. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 10(2):383–390, 1981. doi:10.1137/0210027.

12 Satoshi Horie and Osamu Watanabe. Hard instance generation for SAT. *Algorithms and Computation*, pages 22–31, 1997. doi:10.1007/3-540-63890-3_4.

13 Russell Impagliazzo. A personal view of average-case complexity. In *Proceedings of Structure in Complexity Theory. Tenth Annual IEEE Conference*, pages 134–147. IEEE, 1995. doi:10.1109/SCT.1995.514853.

14 Martin Kutrib, Julien Provillard, György Vaszil, and Matthias Wendlandt. Deterministic One-Way Turing Machines with Sublinear Space. *Fundamenta Informaticae*, 136(1-2):139–155, 2015. doi:10.3233/FI-2015-1147.

15 Richard J. Lipton. Efficient checking of computations. In *STACS 90*, pages 207–215. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1990. doi:10.1007/3-540-52282-4_44.

16 Fabio Massacci and Laura Marraro. Logical Cryptanalysis as a SAT Problem. *Journal of Automated Reasoning*, 24(1):165–203, 2000. doi:10.1023/A:1006326723002.

17 Cristopher Moore and Stephan Mertens. *The Nature of Computation*. Oxford University Press, 2011.

18 Christos H. Papadimitriou. *Computational complexity*. Addison-Wesley, 1994.

19 Omer Reingold. Undirected Connectivity in Log-space. *J. ACM*, 55(4):1–24, September 2008. doi:10.1145/1391289.1391291.

20 Michael Sipser. *Introduction to the Theory of Computation*, volume 2. Thomson Course Technology Boston, 2006.