

# Complexity Theory

## Lecture 5

Anuj Dawar

<http://www.cl.cam.ac.uk/teaching/2223/Complexity>

# Resource Bounded Reductions

If  $f$  is computable by a polynomial time algorithm, we say that  $L_1$  is *polynomial time reducible* to  $L_2$ .

$$L_1 \leq_P L_2$$

If  $f$  is also computable in  $\text{SPACE}(\log n)$ , we write

$$L_1 \leq_L L_2$$

## Reductions 2

If  $L_1 \leq_P L_2$  we understand that  $L_1$  is no more difficult to solve than  $L_2$ , at least as far as polynomial time computation is concerned.

That is to say,

*If  $L_1 \leq_P L_2$  and  $L_2 \in P$ , then  $L_1 \in P$*

We can get an algorithm to decide  $L_1$  by first computing  $f$ , and then using the polynomial time algorithm for  $L_2$ .

# Completeness

The usefulness of reductions is that they allow us to establish the *relative* complexity of problems, even when we cannot prove absolute lower bounds.

Cook (1972) first showed that there are problems in **NP** that are maximally difficult.

A language  $L$  is said to be *NP-hard* if for every language  $A \in \text{NP}$ ,  $A \leq_P L$ .

A language  $L$  is *NP-complete* if it is in **NP** and it is **NP-hard**.

# SAT is NP-complete

Cook and Levin independently showed that the language SAT of satisfiable Boolean expressions is NP-complete.

To establish this, we need to show that for every language  $L$  in NP, there is a polynomial time reduction from  $L$  to SAT.

Since  $L$  is in NP, there is a nondeterministic Turing machine

$$M = (Q, \Sigma, s, \delta)$$

and a bound  $k$  such that a string  $x$  of length  $n$  is in  $L$  if, and only if, it is accepted by  $M$  within  $n^k$  steps.

# Boolean Formula

We need to give, for each  $x \in \Sigma^*$ , a Boolean expression  $f(x)$  which is satisfiable if, and only if, there is an accepting computation of  $M$  on input  $x$ .

$f(x)$  has the following variables:

$$\begin{array}{ll} S_{i,q} & \text{for each } i \leq n^k \text{ and } q \in Q \\ T_{i,j,\sigma} & \text{for each } i,j \leq n^k \text{ and } \sigma \in \Sigma \\ H_{i,j} & \text{for each } i,j \leq n^k \end{array}$$

Intuitively, these variables are intended to mean:

- $S_{i,q}$  – the state of the machine at time  $i$  is  $q$ .
- $T_{i,j,\sigma}$  – at time  $i$ , the symbol at position  $j$  of the tape is  $\sigma$ .
- $H_{i,j}$  – at time  $i$ , the tape head is pointing at tape cell  $j$ .

We now have to see how to write the formula  $f(x)$ , so that it enforces these meanings.

# Consistency

The head is never in two places at once

$$\bigwedge_i \bigwedge_j (H_{i,j} \rightarrow \bigwedge_{j' \neq j} (\neg H_{i,j'}))$$

The machine is never in two states at once

$$\bigwedge_q \bigwedge_i (S_{i,q} \rightarrow \bigwedge_{q' \neq q} (\neg S_{i,q'}))$$

Each tape cell contains only one symbol

$$\bigwedge_i \bigwedge_j \bigwedge_\sigma (T_{i,j,\sigma} \rightarrow \bigwedge_{\sigma' \neq \sigma} (\neg T_{i,j,\sigma'}))$$



# Computation

The tape does not change except under the head

$$\bigwedge_i \bigwedge_j \bigwedge_{j' \neq j} \bigwedge_\sigma (H_{i,j} \wedge T_{i,j',\sigma}) \rightarrow T_{i+1,j',\sigma}$$

Each step is according to  $\delta$ .

$$\bigwedge_i \bigwedge_j \bigwedge_\sigma \bigwedge_q (H_{i,j} \wedge S_{i,q} \wedge T_{i,j,\sigma}) \\ \rightarrow \bigvee_{\Delta} (H_{i+1,j'} \wedge S_{i+1,q'} \wedge T_{i+1,j,\sigma'})$$

where  $\Delta$  is the set of all triples  $(q', \sigma', D)$  such that  $((q, \sigma), (q', \sigma', D)) \in \delta$  and

$$j' = \begin{cases} j & \text{if } D = S \\ j - 1 & \text{if } D = L \\ j + 1 & \text{if } D = R \end{cases}$$

Finally, the accepting state is reached

$$\bigvee_i S_{i, \text{acc}}$$

# Initialization

Initial state is  $s$  and the head is initially at the beginning of the tape.

$$S_{1,s} \wedge H_{1,1}$$

The initial tape contents are  $x$

$$\bigwedge_{j \leq n} T_{1,j,x_j} \wedge \bigwedge_{n < j} T_{1,j,\sqcup}$$

# CNF

A Boolean expression is in *conjunctive normal form* if it is the conjunction of a set of *clauses*, each of which is the disjunction of a set of *literals*, each of these being either a *variable* or the *negation* of a variable.

For any Boolean expression  $\phi$ , there is an equivalent expression  $\psi$  in conjunctive normal form.

$\psi$  can be exponentially longer than  $\phi$ .

However, **CNF-SAT**, the collection of satisfiable **CNF** expressions, is **NP**-complete.

# 3SAT

A Boolean expression is in **3CNF** if it is in conjunctive normal form and each clause contains at most **3** literals.

**3SAT** is defined as the language consisting of those expressions in **3CNF** that are satisfiable.

**3SAT** is **NP**-complete, as there is a polynomial time reduction from **CNF-SAT** to **3SAT**.

## Composing Reductions

Polynomial time reductions are clearly closed under composition.  
So, if  $L_1 \leq_P L_2$  and  $L_2 \leq_P L_3$ , then we also have  $L_1 \leq_P L_3$ .

If we show, for some problem  $A$  in  $NP$  that

$$SAT \leq_P A$$

or

$$3SAT \leq_P A$$

it follows that  $A$  is also  $NP$ -complete.