

Complexity Theory

Lecture 11

Anuj Dawar

University of Cambridge Computer Laboratory
Easter Term 2015

<http://www.cl.cam.ac.uk/teaching/1415/Complexity/>

Inclusions

We have the following inclusions:

$$L \subseteq NL \subseteq P \subseteq NP \subseteq PSPACE \subseteq NPSPACE \subseteq EXP$$

where $EXP = \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} TIME(2^{n^k})$

Moreover,

$$L \subseteq NL \cap \text{co-NL}$$

$$P \subseteq NP \cap \text{co-NP}$$

$$PSPACE \subseteq NPSPACE \cap \text{co-NPSPACE}$$

Reachability

Recall the **Reachability** problem: given a *directed* graph $G = (V, E)$ and two nodes $a, b \in V$, determine whether there is a path from a to b in G .

A simple search algorithm solves it:

1. mark node a , leaving other nodes unmarked, and initialise set S to $\{a\}$;
2. while S is not empty, choose node i in S : remove i from S and for all j such that there is an edge (i, j) and j is unmarked, mark j and add j to S ;
3. if b is marked, accept else reject.

NL Reachability

We can construct an algorithm to show that the **Reachability** problem is in **NL**:

1. write the index of node a in the work space;
2. if i is the index currently written on the work space:
 - (a) if $i = b$ then accept, else
guess an index j ($\log n$ bits) and write it on the work space.
 - (b) if (i, j) is not an edge, reject, else replace i by j and return to (2).

$O((\log n)^2)$ space **Reachability** algorithm:

$\text{Path}(a, b, i)$

if $i = 1$ and $a \neq b$ and (a, b) is not an edge reject

else if (a, b) is an edge or $a = b$ accept

else, for each node x , check:

1. is there a path $a - x$ of length $i/2$; and
2. is there a path $x - b$ of length $i/2$?

if such an x is found, then accept, else reject.

The maximum depth of recursion is $\log n$, and the number of bits of information kept at each stage is $3 \log n$.

Savitch's Theorem

The space efficient algorithm for reachability used on the configuration graph of a nondeterministic machine shows:

$$\text{NSPACE}(f(n)) \subseteq \text{SPACE}(f(n)^2)$$

for $f(n) \geq \log n$.

This yields

$$\text{PSPACE} = \text{NSPACE} = \text{co-NSPACE}.$$

Complementation

A still more clever algorithm for [Reachability](#) has been used to show that nondeterministic space classes are closed under complementation:

If $f(n) \geq \log n$, then

$$\text{NSPACE}(f(n)) = \text{co-NSPACE}(f(n))$$

In particular

$$\text{NL} = \text{co-NL}.$$

Logarithmic Space Reductions

We write

$$A \leq_L B$$

if there is a reduction f of A to B that is computable by a deterministic Turing machine using $O(\log n)$ workspace (with a *read-only* input tape and *write-only* output tape).

Note: We can compose \leq_L reductions. So,

$$\text{if } A \leq_L B \text{ and } B \leq_L C \text{ then } A \leq_L C$$

NP-complete Problems

Analysing carefully the reductions we constructed in our proofs of NP-completeness, we can see that SAT and the various other NP-complete problems are actually complete under \leq_L reductions.

Thus, if $SAT \leq_L A$ for some problem A in L then not only $P = NP$ but also $L = NP$.

P-complete Problems

It makes little sense to talk of complete problems for the class P with respect to polynomial time reducibility \leq_P .

There are problems that are complete for P with respect to *logarithmic space* reductions \leq_L .

One example is CVP —the circuit value problem.

- If $CVP \in L$ then $L = P$.
- If $CVP \in NL$ then $NL = P$.

CVP

CVP - the *circuit value problem* is, given a circuit, determine the value of the result node n .

CVP is solvable in polynomial time, by the algorithm which examines the nodes in increasing order, assigning a value **true** or **false** to each node.

CVP is complete for **P** under **L** reductions.

That is, for every language A in **P**,

$$A \leq_L \text{CVP}$$

Reachability

Similarly, it can be shown that **Reachability** is, in fact, **NL**-complete.

For any language $A \in \text{NL}$, we have $A \leq_L \text{Reachability}$

$L = \text{NL}$ if, and only if, $\text{Reachability} \in L$

Note: it is known that the reachability problem for *undirected* graphs is in L .

Provable Intractability

Our aim now is to show that there are languages (*or, equivalently, decision problems*) that we can prove are not in P .

This is done by showing that, for every *reasonable* function f , there is a language that is not in $\text{TIME}(f)$.

The proof is based on the diagonal method, as in the proof of the undecidability of the halting problem.

Constructible Functions

A complexity class such as $\text{TIME}(f)$ can be very unnatural, if f is.

We restrict our bounding functions f to be proper functions:

Definition

A function $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ is *constructible* if:

- f is non-decreasing, i.e. $f(n + 1) \geq f(n)$ for all n ; and
- there is a deterministic machine M which, on any input of length n , replaces the input with the string $0^{f(n)}$, and M runs in time $O(n + f(n))$ and uses $O(f(n))$ work space.

Inclusions

The inclusions we proved between complexity classes:

- $\text{NTIME}(f(n)) \subseteq \text{SPACE}(f(n))$;
- $\text{NSPACE}(f(n)) \subseteq \text{TIME}(k^{\log n} + f(n))$;
- $\text{NSPACE}(f(n)) \subseteq \text{SPACE}(f(n)^2)$

really only work for *constructible* functions f .

The inclusions are established by showing that a deterministic machine can simulate a nondeterministic machine M for $f(n)$ steps.

For this, we have to be able to compute f within the required bounds.

Time Hierarchy Theorem

For any constructible function f , with $f(n) \geq n$, define the f -bounded *halting language* to be:

$$H_f = \{[M], x \mid M \text{ accepts } x \text{ in } f(|x|) \text{ steps}\}$$

where $[M]$ is a description of M in some fixed encoding scheme.

Then, we can show

$$H_f \in \text{TIME}(f(n)^2) \text{ and } H_f \notin \text{TIME}(f(\lfloor n/2 \rfloor))$$

Time Hierarchy Theorem

For any constructible function $f(n) \geq n$, $\text{TIME}(f(n))$ is properly contained in $\text{TIME}(f(2n + 1)^2)$.