

1. Let  $X$  and  $Y$  be two decision problems. Suppose we know that  $X$  reduces to  $Y$  in polynomial time. Which of the following can we infer? Explain.
  - a. If  $Y$  is NP-complete then so is  $X$ .
  - b. If  $X$  is NP-complete then so is  $Y$ .
  - c. If  $Y$  is NP-complete and  $X$  is in NP then  $X$  is NP-complete.
  - d. If  $X$  is NP-complete and  $Y$  is in NP then  $Y$  is NP-complete.
  - e.  $X$  and  $Y$  can't both be NP-complete.
  - f. If  $X$  is in P, then  $Y$  is in P.
  - g. If  $Y$  is in P, then  $X$  is in P.

(d) and (g) are the only statements we can infer. This is because “ $X$  reduces to  $Y$ ” means that if we had a way to solve  $Y$  efficiently, without previous knowledge of what exactly the method is, we can use it to solve  $X$  efficiently.  $X$  is no harder than  $Y$ .

2. Consider the problem **COMPOSITE**: given an integer  $y$ , does  $y$  have any factors other than one and itself? For this exercise, you may assume that **COMPOSITE** is in NP, and you will be comparing it to the well-known NP-complete problem **SUBSET-SUM**: given a set  $S$  of  $n$  integers and an integer target  $t$ , is there a subset of  $S$  whose sum is exactly  $t$ ? Clearly explain whether or not each of the following statements follows from that fact that **COMPOSITE** is in NP and **SUBSET-SUM** is NP-complete:
  - a. **SUBSET-SUM  $\leq_p$  COMPOSITE.**

This doesn't follow from what is given. NP-complete doesn't always reduce to a problem in NP.
  - b. **If there is an  $O(n^3)$  algorithm for SUBSET-SUM, then there is a polynomial time algorithm for COMPOSITE.**

This is true because, since SUBSET-SUM is NP-complete, all problems in NP reduce to it. The existence of a polynomial time algorithm for SUBSET-SUM implies that there is a polynomial time algorithm for all problems in NP. Since we know that COMPOSITE is in NP, then COMPOSITE has a polynomial time algorithm.
  - c. **If there is a polynomial algorithm for COMPOSITE, then  $P = NP$ .**

$P=NP$  can't be concluded. COMPOSITE has a polynomial time algorithm. However, we only know that COMPOSITE is in NP, but not that it is NP-complete, so we can't conclude that  $P=NP$ .
  - d. **If  $P \neq NP$ , then no problem in NP can be solved in polynomial time.**

This doesn't follow from what is given.  $P \neq NP$  means that  $P$  is a subset of  $NP$  and there is a polynomial time algorithm for each problem in  $P$ . The only conclusion that can be drawn if  $P \neq NP$  is that no  $NP$ -complete problem can be solved in polynomial time.

3. **Two well-known  $NP$ -complete problems are 3-SAT and TSP, the traveling salesman problem. The 2-SAT problem is a SAT variant in which each clause contains at most two literals. 2-SAT is known to have a polynomial-time algorithm. Is each of the following statements true or false? Justify your answer.**

- a. **3-SAT  $\leq_p$  TSP.**

True. 3-SAT is  $NP$ -complete, so it is in  $NP$ . Since TSP is  $NP$ -complete, it follows that all problems in  $NP$  reduce to it.

- b. **If  $P \neq NP$ , then 3-SAT  $\leq_p$  2-SAT.**

False. It is given that there is a polynomial time algorithm for 2-SAT. If there was a reduction from 3-SAT to 2-SAT then it would follow that  $P=NP$ . Because  $P \neq NP$ , the supposition is false.

- c. **If  $P \neq NP$ , then no  $NP$ -complete problem can be solved in polynomial time.**

True. Since all problems in  $NP$  can be reduced to every  $NP$ -complete problem, if any  $NP$ -complete problems can be solved in polynomial time then it would imply  $P=NP$ . The contrapositive says that if  $P \neq NP$  then no  $NP$ -complete problem can be solved in polynomial time.

4. **LONG-PATH is the problem of, given  $(G, u, v, k)$  where  $G$  is a graph,  $u$  and  $v$  vertices and  $k$  an integer, determining if there is a simple path in  $G$  from  $u$  to  $v$  of length at least  $k$ . Show that LONG-PATH is  $NP$ -complete.**

Long Path is in  $NP$  since the path is the certificate (we can easily check in polynomial time that it is a path, and that its length is  $k$  or more), and  $NP$ -complete since Hamiltonian Path (the variant where we specify a start and end node) is a special case of Long Path, namely where  $k$  equals the number of vertices of  $G$  minus 1.

5. **Graph-Coloring. Mapmakers try to use as few colors as possible when coloring countries on a map, as long as no two countries that share a border have the same color. We can model this problem with an undirected graph  $G = (V, E)$  in which each vertex represents a country and vertices whose respective countries share a border are adjacent. A  $k$ -coloring is a function  $c: V \rightarrow \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$  such that  $c(u) \neq c(v)$  for every edge  $(u, v) \in E$ . In other words the number 1, 2, ...,  $k$  represent the  $k$  colors and adjacent vertices must have different colors. The graph-coloring problem is to determine the minimum number of colors needed to color a given graph.**

- a. **State the graph-coloring problem as a decision problem K-COLOR. Show that your decision problem is solvable in polynomial time if and only if the graph-coloring problem is solvable in polynomial time.**

The decision problem is: Given an undirected graph  $G$  and an integer  $k$ , can we color  $G$  with  $k$  colors such that adjacent vertices have different colors?

- i. If we have solution to this problem in polynomial time, we can assign  $k$  values from  $|V|$  down to 2 and check if it is colorable, and stop when  $k$  reaches some value that it is not colorable. Then we choose the minimum number from all those numbers make the graph colorable, that is the number we want in Graph-coloring problem. It is easy to know the time is still polynomial.
- ii. If Graph-coloring problem is solvable in polynomial time, then we know the minimum number of colors needed, say  $l$ , then we can just compare the given number  $k$  in decision problem with  $l$ , if  $k < l$ , then we can answer NO, in decision problem; if  $k \geq l$ , then we can answer YES in decision problem. It must be polynomial time solvable.

- b. **It has been proven that 3-COLOR is NP-complete by using a reduction from SAT. Use the fact that 3-COLOR is NP-complete to prove that 4-COLOR is NP-complete.**

- i. 4-COLOR is in NP: The coloring is the certificate. The following is a verifier  $V$  for 4-COLOR.  $V =$  On input  $(G, c)$ 
  1. Check that  $c$  includes  $\leq 4$  colors.
  2. Color each node of  $G$  as specified by  $c$ .
  3. For each node, check that it has a unique color from each of its neighbors.
  4. If all checks pass, accept; otherwise, reject.
- ii. 4-COLOR is NP-hard: We give a polynomial-time reduction from 3-COLOR to 4-COLOR. The reduction maps a graph  $G$  into a new graph  $G'$  such that  $G \in 3\text{-COLOR}$  if and only if  $G' \in 4\text{-COLOR}$ . We do so by setting  $G'$  to  $G$ , and then adding a new node  $y$  and connecting  $y$  to each node in  $G'$ . If  $G$  is 3-colorable, then  $G'$  can be 4-colored exactly as  $G$  with  $y$  being the only node colored with the additional color. Similarly, if  $G'$  is 4-colorable, then we know that node  $y$  must be the only node of its color – this is because it is connected to every other node in  $G'$ . Thus, we know that  $G$  must be 3-colorable.

Since 4-COLOR is in NP and NP-hard, we know it is NP-complete.