

# Computational complexity – Homework

Marc CHEVALIER

October 29, 2014

## 1 NP-Hardness

### 1.1 Halting problem

Let be  $\varphi$  an instance of SAT problem. We denote by  $n$  the number of variables.

Let be  $M$  a TURING machine which tests in a cycle all the  $2^n$  possible assignments of the previous formula : when  $M$  has tested all assignments, it starts again. This machine halts if and only if  $\varphi$  is satisfiable. This reduction is polynomial, therefore  $SAT \leq_p HALT$ , ie.  $HALT$  is  $NP$ -hard since  $SAT$  is  $NP$ -hard.

$HALT$  is not  $NP$ -complete otherwise it was decidable by a TURING-machine, but  $HALT$  is undecidable.

**Theorem 1.**  $HALT$  is  $NP$ -hard but not  $NP$ -complete

### 1.2 TQBF

All instance of  $SAT$  problem is an instance of  $TQBF$ . Without transformation, we have a polynomial reduction, ie.  $SAT \leq_p TQBF$  so  $TQBF$  is  $NP$ -hard.

This problem is known for being PSPACE-complete. It's maybe  $NP$ -complete.

**Theorem 2.**  $TQBF$  is  $NP$ -hard.

### 1.3 $NAE - 3 - SAT$

Let be  $\varphi$  an instance of  $NAE - 3 - SAT$ .

$$\varphi = \bigwedge_{i=1}^n (x_{i,1} \vee x_{i,2} \vee x_{i,3})$$

We will describe the "not all equal" condition in term of formula.

$$\bigwedge_{i=1}^n \neg(x_{i,1} \wedge x_{i,2} \wedge x_{i,3}) \wedge \neg(\neg x_{i,1} \wedge \neg x_{i,2} \wedge \neg x_{i,3})$$

using DE MORGAN's law:

$$\psi := \bigwedge_{i=1}^n (\neg x_{i,1} \vee \neg x_{i,2} \vee \neg x_{i,3}) \wedge (x_{i,1} \vee x_{i,2} \vee x_{i,3})$$

$$|\psi| \sim 2|\varphi| \Rightarrow |\psi| = \mathcal{O}(|\varphi|).$$

Let  $\omega := \varphi \wedge \psi$ .  $\omega$  is an instance of SAT and the reduction is polynomial. If there is an solution to the SAT problem  $\xi$ , then  $\varphi$  is satisfied and, thanks to  $\psi$ , the "not all equal" condition is true.

Reciprocally, if there is a solution of the NAE-3-SAT problem  $\varphi$ , then this assignation makes  $\xi$  true.

Consequently,  $SAT \leq_p NAE-3-SAT$  and NAE-3-SAT is NP-hard.

Moreover, NAE-3-SAT is clearly NP: a valid assignation is a sufficient witness. We can check in polynomial time if this assignation makes the formula true and if the "not all equal" condition is satisfied. Then NAE-3-SAT is NP-complete.

**Theorem 3.** NAE-3-SAT is NP-complete

## 1.4 MAXCUT

Let  $F$  be an instance of NAE-3-SAT

$$F = \bigwedge_{i=1}^m C_i$$

We produce a graph  $G = (V, E)$  which has a vertex for each literal of  $F$ . There is a edge between two vertices if there is a clause which contains this two literals. So each clause is described by a triangle. Moreover, we add  $|F|_{x_i}$  (the number of occurrences of  $x_i$  in  $F$ ) edges between  $x_i$  and  $\neg x_i$ . The size of the cut we search is at least  $5m$ .

If we have an assignment of the NAE-3-SAT, we take the vertices which are true in  $S$  and the other in  $\bar{S}$ . So, we have  $2m$  from the triangles due to the clauses and  $3m$  from the edges between all pair  $(x_i, \neg x_i)$ .

Reciprocally, if we have a cut of size  $\geq 5m$ .

If we have no pair  $(x_i, \neg x_i)$  on the same size, we have a valid assignment.

If there is a such pair, we can move one of them on the opposite side without decreasing the size of the cut. Let  $n_i$  the number of edges between  $x_i$  and  $\neg x_i$ . We note  $a$  the number of edges which  $x_i$  is an extremity and which the other is in the opposite side. We note  $b$  the number of edges between  $b$  and a vertex of the opposite size. We know that  $a + b \leq 2n_i$ . If we move  $x_i$  in the opposite size, the cut gains  $n_i - a$  edges. If  $\neg x_i$  go to the opposite side, it gains  $n_i - b$ .  $\max(n_i - a, n_i - b) \geq 0$ , so we can move one of these vertices to the opposite side without decreasing the size of the cut. We redo this transformation until we reach a cut of the first case (at most  $m$  times).

We proved that  $NAE-3-SAT \leq_p MAXCUT$ .

Moreover, MAXCUT is in NP. Indeed, a witness is the list of the vertices of  $S$  (or  $\bar{S}$ ). The size is actually polynomial with respect of the size of  $G$  and we can check the solution in a polynomial time : we check easily that the cut has a size  $\geq k$  in a quadratic time.

So, MAXCUT  $\in$  NP.

**Theorem 4.** MAXCUT is NP-complete

## 2 Reductions

**Proposition 5.** The set of the recursive languages is closed under polynomial-time KARP reduction.

*Proof.* That is obvious, isn't it ?

□

**Proposition 6.** DLOGTIME is not closed under polynomial-time KARP reduction.

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{L} \in \text{DLOGTIME}$  such that  $|\mathcal{L}| \geq 2$ . For all  $\mathcal{L}' \in \text{PTIME} \setminus \text{DLOGTIME}$  (there is at least one), there is a polynomial time function  $g : \mathcal{L}' \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ ,  $x \in \mathcal{L}' \Leftrightarrow g(x) = 1$ . Let  $\varphi$  a bijection between  $\{0, 1\}$  and  $\{a, b\}$  where  $(a, b) \in \mathcal{L} \times \overline{\mathcal{L}}$ . We have  $x \in \mathcal{L}' \Leftrightarrow \varphi \circ g(x) = \varphi(a)$  ie.  $x \in \mathcal{L}' \Leftrightarrow \varphi \circ g(x) \in \mathcal{L}$ .

So, DLOGTIME is not close under polynomial-time KARP reduction.  $\square$

**Proposition 7.** TAUTOLOGY is NP-hard.

*Proof.* Let  $M$  a TURING machine with oracle TAUTOLOGY. We will make that machine decide SAT in polynomial time.

This machine take a formula  $\varphi$  compute the negation  $\neg\varphi$  and test with its oracle if  $\neg\varphi$  is a tautology. If it is not, there is a assignment which make  $\neg\varphi$  false, so this assignment make  $\varphi$  true and  $\varphi$  is satisfiable. If  $\neg\varphi$  is a tautology,  $\varphi$  is not satisfiable.

So  $M$  decide SAT and TAUTOLOGY is NP-hard.  $\square$

### 3 Difference of NP problems

**Proposition 8.** EXACTINDSET is in DP.

*Proof.* Let  $A$  be the set of all pairs  $(G, k)$  such that  $G$  has an independent set of size at least  $k$ , and let  $B$  be the set of all pairs  $(G, k)$  such  $G$  has a independent set of size at least  $k + 1$ . Then  $\text{EXACTINDSET} = A \setminus B$  and  $A$  is in NP and  $B$  is in NP. Hence by definition of DP, EXACTINDSET is in DP.  $\square$

**Proposition 9.**  $\forall L \in \text{DP}$ ,  $L$  is polynomial-time reducible to EXACTINDSET.

*Proof.*

**Lemma 10.**  $\text{INDSET} \geq_p 3 - \text{SAT}$

*Proof.* Suppose we have an instance  $F$  of 3 - SAT problem where  $F = \bigwedge_{i=1}^m C_i$  where  $C_i$  is the disjunction of 3 variables. We note  $x_1, \dots, x_n$  the variables. We create the graph  $G$  as follows:

- For each variable in each clause, create a vertex, which we will label with the name of the variable. Therefore there may be multiple vertexs with the label  $x_i$  or  $\neg x_i$ , if these variables appear in multiple clauses.
- For each clause, add an edge between the three vertices corresponding the variables from that clause.
- For all  $i$ , add an edge between every pair of vertexs with one is labelled with  $x_i$  and the other labelled with  $x_i$ .

There is a independent set of size  $m$  in  $G$  if and only if  $F$  is satisfiable.  $\square$

We note that this reduction from 3 - SAT to INDSET took an instance  $\varphi$  of 3 - SAT consisting of  $m$  clauses each of three literals and produced a graph  $G_\varphi$  with  $3m$  vertexs such that if  $\varphi$  is satisfiable then the largest independent set in  $G$  has  $m$  vertexs, and if  $G$  is unsatisfiable then the largest independent set of  $G$  has at most  $m - 1$  vertexs.

Now suppose that  $A$  is in DP. We want to show that  $A \leq_p \text{EXACTINDSET}$ . By definition of DP,  $A = L_1 \setminus L_2$  for  $(L_1, L_2) \in \text{NP}^2$ . Since 3 - SAT is NP-complete, there are polytime functions  $f_1, f_2$  such that for  $i = 1, 2$  and for all  $x \in \{0, 1\}^*$  we have  $x \in L_i \Leftrightarrow f_i(x) \in 3\text{SAT}$ . Hence for each fixed  $x \in \{0, 1\}^*$ , setting  $\varphi_i = f_i(x)$ , we have  $x \in L_i \Leftrightarrow \varphi_i$  is satisfiable. Thus from the above reduction to INDSET, there is a polytime function which takes  $x$  to a pair of graphs  $G_1, G_2$  such that if  $m_i$  is the number of clauses

in  $\varphi_i$ , then for  $i = 1, 2$ , no independent set in  $G_i$  has more than  $m_i$  vertices, and  $x \in L_i \Leftrightarrow$  the largest independent set in  $G_i$  has size  $m_i$ .

Now we use the notation  $G \sqcup H$  for the disjoint union of graphs  $G$  and  $H$ . That is, the vertices in  $G \sqcup H$  are the disjoint union of those in  $G$  and  $H$ , and similarly for the edges. Now let  $G'_1 = G_1 \sqcup G_1$ . Then a maximum independent set in  $G'_1$  is the union of maximum independent sets in the two copies of  $G_1$ . Thus  $x \in L_1 \Rightarrow$  maximum independent set of  $G'_1$  is  $2m_1$  and  $x \in \overline{L_1} \Rightarrow$  maximum independent set of  $G'_1$  is  $\leq 2m_1 - 2$ . Now define  $G'_2$  so that its vertices are those of  $G_2$  together with  $m_2 - 1$  new vertices, and the edges consist of those of  $G_2$  together with an edge from each of the new vertices to every vertex of  $G_2$ . Then we have designed  $G'_2$  so that no independent set can contain both vertices of  $G_2$  and new vertices, so  $x \in L_2 \Rightarrow$  maximum independent set of  $G'_2$  is  $m_2$ ,  $x \in \overline{L_2} \Rightarrow$  maximum independent set of  $G'_2$  is  $m_2 - 1$ . Now let  $G_3 = G'_1 \sqcup G'_2$  and let  $k = 2m_1 + m_2 - 1$ . To finish the proof that  $A \leq_p DP$ , it suffices to show that

**Lemma 11.**

$$x \in A \Leftrightarrow (G_3, k) \in DP$$

( $\Rightarrow$ ): Suppose  $x \in A$ . Then by (2)  $x \in L_1 \cap L_2$ , so by (3) and (6) we conclude the maximum independent set of  $G_3 = G'_1 \sqcup G'_2$  is  $2m_1 + m_2 - 1 = k$ .

( $\Leftarrow$ ): Suppose  $x \notin A$ . There are three cases:

- $x \in L_1 \cap L_2 \Rightarrow \maxindset(G_3) = 2m_1 + m_2 > k$ .
- $x \in L_1 \cap \overline{L_2} \Rightarrow \maxindset(G_3) \leq 2m_1 + m_2 - 2 < k$
- $x \in \overline{L_1} \cap L_2 \Rightarrow \maxindset(G_3) = 2m_1 + m_2 - 3 < k$

□

**Theorem 12.** EXACTINDSET is DP-complete.

*Proof.* EXACTINDSET is in DP (proposition 8) and it is DP-hard (proposition 9). □

## 4 Classes with exponential resources

We name BOUNDEDHALT the language of 3-tuples  $\langle M, x, k \rangle$  where the machine  $M$  halts on input  $x$  in  $k$  steps.

**Theorem 13.** BOUNDEDHALT is EXP-complete.

*Proof.*

**Lemma 14.** BOUNDEDHALT  $\in$  EXP.

*Proof.* Let  $\langle M, x, k \rangle$  an instance of BOUNDEDHALT.

We simulate  $M$  on  $x$  for  $k$  steps and accepts if and only if  $M$  halts and rejects otherwise. The running time is  $m^{O(1)}$ . Let  $n = |\langle \alpha, x, k \rangle| \geq \log k$ . Therefore, the running time  $\leq m^c = 2^{c \log m} \leq 2^{cn}$ . □

**Lemma 15.** BOUNDEDHALT is EXP-hard.

*Proof.* For each language  $\mathcal{L} \in \text{EXP}$ , we need to give polytime reduction from  $\mathcal{L}$  to BOUNDEDHALT. For a given language  $\mathcal{L} \in \text{EXP}$ , we know there is a TURING MACHINE  $M_{\mathcal{L}}$  that decides  $A$  in time  $g(n) \leq 2^{n^c}$  for a  $c \in \mathbb{N}$ .

Let  $f$  such that  $f(w) = \langle M_{\mathcal{L}}, w, m \rangle$  where  $m = 2^{|w|^c}$ .

$f$  is polytime computable and  $w \in \mathcal{L} \Rightarrow \langle M_{\mathcal{L}}, w, m \rangle \in \text{BOUNDEDHALT}$  and  $w \notin \mathcal{L} \Rightarrow \langle M_{\mathcal{L}}, w, m \rangle \notin \text{BOUNDEDHALT}$  □

BOUNDEDHALT is in EXP (lemma 14) and it is EXP-hard (lemma 15).  $\square$

**Theorem 16.**

$$L = P \Rightarrow PSPACE = EXP$$

*Proof.* Take an arbitrary  $\mathcal{L} \in EXP$ , decided by a TURING machine in time  $2^{n^c}$ .

Let  $L_{pad} := \{x \diamond^{2^{|x|^c}} \mid x \in \mathcal{L}\}$ . We have  $L_{pad} \in P$  and, by the assumption  $P = L$ , we found that  $L_{pad} \in L$ . So, there is some TURING machine  $M_0$  deciding  $L_{pad}$  in space  $\log n$ .  $M_0$  can be used to decide  $L$ : on input  $x$ , simulate  $M_0$  on the padded input  $x \diamond^{2^{|x|^c}}$  accept if and only if  $M_0$  accepts.

The space we used on input  $x$  ( $|x| = n$ ) is the space used by  $M_0$  on the padded input  $x \diamond^{2^{|x|^c}}$  of size  $n + 2^{n^c}$ , which is at most  $\log(2^{n^c+1}) = n^c + 1$ , a polynomial. Hence, we have that  $\mathcal{L} \in PSPACE$ .

If we actually write the padded input  $x \diamond^{2^{|x|^c}}$  on the work tape, this would make the space usage exponential in  $n$ . But, we don't need to write entirely this padded input. We know what it looks like to the right of  $x$ . So we can simulate  $M_0$  on the virtual padded input  $x \diamond^{2^{|x|^c}}$  by using a counter which tells the position on the tape of  $M_0$ . If  $M_0$  enquires about the position to the right of  $x$ , we respond with the symbol  $\diamond$  (or the blank, if  $M_0$  goes to the right of the entire padded input). Since the counter can assume the value at most  $2^{n^c}$ , we need at most  $n^c$  bits for the counter. Thus, this new TURING machine uses space at most polynomial in  $n$ .  $\square$

## 5 Downward self-reducibility

**Notation 1.** We note DSR the set of downward self-reducible languages.

**Proposition 17.**  $P \subseteq DSR$

*Proof.* Without query to the oracle, we can decide every language of  $P$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 18.**  $SAT \in DSR$

*Proof.* Let  $F$  a CNF-formula.

$$F = \bigwedge_{i=1}^m \bigvee_{j=1}^{n_i} x_{i,j}^*$$

where  $x_{i,j}^*$  represent  $x_{i,j}$  or  $\neg x_{i,j}$  according with the indexes  $i$  and  $j$ .

$F \in SAT$  if and only if one of the  $\left( x_{m,k} \wedge \bigwedge_{i=1}^{m-1} \bigvee_{j=1}^{n_i} x_{i,j}^* \right)_{k \in \llbracket 1, n_m \rrbracket} \in (SAT^{<|F|})^{n_m}$  is in SAT. We can test that in polynomial time.  $\square$

**Corollary 19.**  $NP\text{-complete} \subseteq DSR$

**Proposition 20.**  $DSR \subseteq PSPACE$

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{L} \in DSR$ . Given an input  $x$ , we simulate the polyntime computation that (with queries) decides  $\mathcal{L}$ , and recursively compute the answer to the each query as it is made. Since the recursive calls are all on strings shorter than  $|x|$ , we will eventually reach the base case in which we query strings of length 1. The program we are describing will simply have the answers to these (constant number of) length 1 queries hard-coded. The depth of the recursion is at most  $|x|$ , and at each level of recursion, we need to remember the state which requires space at most  $p(|x|)$  where  $p$  is a polynomial. This last point holds because the basic computation runs in polynomial time, and hence polynomial space. Thus the overall procedure runs in PSPACE.  $\square$

## 6 Space hierarchy theorem

**Theorem 21.** *There is a universal TURING machine  $\mathcal{U}$  such that  $\mathcal{U}(\alpha, x) = M_\alpha(x)$  and  $\mathcal{U}$  halts on every input  $(\alpha, x)$  after using at most  $cS(|x|)$  space, where  $S$  is the computation space of  $M_\alpha$  and  $c$  is some constant not depending on  $x$ .*

**Theorem 22.** *For every space-constructible function  $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ ,*

$$\text{DSpace}(o(f(n))) \subsetneq \text{DSpace}(f(n))$$

*Proof.* Let  $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  be a space constructible function and  $g : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  such that  $g = o(f)$

We note  $M$  a deterministic TURING machine.  $M$ 's computation:

- $M$  writes  $1^{f(n)}$  symbols on a work tape, where  $n$  is the input's size.
- Simulate  $\mathcal{U}(\alpha, (\alpha, x))$ , and stops at most when the machine go out of the previous marks.
- If the computation of  $\mathcal{U}(\alpha, (\alpha, x))$  is not terminated  $M$  rejects.
- Otherwise, outputs the opposite result of  $\mathcal{U}(\alpha, (\alpha, x))$

The first step takes a space  $f(n)$ . The second step takes also a space  $f(n)$  (thanks to the restriction). Finally,  $M$  runs in space  $\mathcal{O}(f(n))$ .

We note  $\mathcal{L}(M)$  the language recognized by  $M$  ( $\mathcal{L}(M) \in \text{DSpace}(f(n))$ ) and assume that there is a deterministic machine  $N$  such that  $\mathcal{L}(M) = \mathcal{L}(N)$  and  $N$  runs in space  $g(n)$ . We denote by  $\alpha_0$  the code of  $N$ .

According to the theorem 21, for every word  $x$ ,  $\mathcal{U}(\alpha_0, (\alpha_0, x))$  uses less than  $cg(|(\alpha_0, x)|)$  space. And, by hypothesis,  $cg(|(\alpha_0, x)|) \leq f(|(\alpha_0, x)|)$  for large enough  $x$ .

Thus, for large enough  $x$  we have  $M(\alpha_0, x) = \neg \mathcal{U}(\alpha_0, (\alpha_0, x)) = \neg N(\alpha_0, x)$ . This is a contradiction since we have assumed  $\mathcal{L}(M) = \mathcal{L}(N)$ .

In conclusion, there exists no machine  $N$  that runs in space  $\mathcal{O}(g(n))$  and recognizes  $\mathcal{L}(M)$ . Since we have proved  $\mathcal{L}(M) \in \text{DSpace}(f(n))$ , we obtained  $\text{DSpace}(g(n)) \subsetneq \text{DSpace}(f(n))$ .  $\square$

## 7 Polynomial hierarchy