

# Complexity Theory

## Lecture 10

Anuj Dawar

University of Cambridge Computer Laboratory  
Easter Term 2013

<http://www.cl.cam.ac.uk/teaching/1213/Complexity/>

## One Way Functions

A function  $f$  is called a *one way function* if it satisfies the following conditions:

1.  $f$  is one-to-one.
2. for each  $x$ ,  $|x|^{1/k} \leq |f(x)| \leq |x|^k$  for some  $k$ .
3.  $f \in \text{FP}$ .
4.  $f^{-1} \notin \text{FP}$ .

We cannot hope to prove the existence of one-way functions without at the same time proving  $\text{P} \neq \text{NP}$ .

It is strongly believed that the RSA function:

$$f(x, e, p, q) = (x^e \bmod pq, pq, e)$$

is a one-way function.

## UP

Though one cannot hope to prove that the *RSA* function is one-way without separating  $\text{P}$  and  $\text{NP}$ , we might hope to make it as secure as a proof of  $\text{NP}$ -completeness.

### Definition

A nondeterministic machine is *unambiguous* if, for any input  $x$ , there is at most one accepting computation of the machine.

$\text{UP}$  is the class of languages accepted by unambiguous machines in polynomial time.

## UP

Equivalently,  $\text{UP}$  is the class of languages of the form

$$\{x \mid \exists y R(x, y)\}$$

Where  $R$  is polynomial time computable, polynomially balanced, *and* for each  $x$ , there is *at most one*  $y$  such that  $R(x, y)$ .

## UP One-way Functions

We have

$$P \subseteq UP \subseteq NP$$

It seems unlikely that there are any NP-complete problems in UP.

One-way functions exist *if, and only if*,  $P \neq UP$ .

## One-Way Functions Imply $P \neq UP$

Suppose  $f$  is a *one-way function*.

Define the language  $L_f$  by

$$L_f = \{(x, y) \mid \exists z(z \leq x \text{ and } f(z) = y)\}.$$

We can show that  $L_f$  is in UP but not in P.

## $P \neq UP$ Implies One-Way Functions Exist

Suppose that  $L$  is a language that is in UP but not in P. Let  $U$  be an *unambiguous* machine that accepts  $L$ .

Define the function  $f_U$  by

if  $x$  is a string that encodes an accepting computation of  $U$ , then  $f_U(x) = 1y$  where  $y$  is the input string accepted by this computation.

$f_U(x) = 0x$  otherwise.

We can prove that  $f_U$  is a one-way function.

## Space Complexity

We've already seen the definition  $SPACE(f)$ : the languages accepted by a machine which uses  $O(f(n))$  tape cells on inputs of length  $n$ . *Counting only work space.*

$NSPACE(f)$  is the class of languages accepted by a *non-deterministic* Turing machine using at most  $O(f(n))$  work space.

As we are only counting work space, it makes sense to consider bounding functions  $f$  that are less than linear.

## Classes

$$L = \text{SPACE}(\log n)$$

$$NL = \text{NSPACE}(\log n)$$

$$\text{PSPACE} = \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} \text{SPACE}(n^k)$$

The class of languages decidable in polynomial space.

$$\text{NPSPACE} = \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} \text{NSPACE}(n^k)$$

Also, define

co-NL – the languages whose complements are in NL.

co-NPSPACE – the languages whose complements are in NPSPACE.

## Inclusions

We have the following inclusions:

$$L \subseteq NL \subseteq P \subseteq NP \subseteq \text{PSPACE} \subseteq \text{NPSPACE} \subseteq \text{EXP}$$

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

Moreover,

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

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

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

## Establishing Inclusions

To establish the known inclusions between the main complexity classes, we prove the following.

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

The first two are straightforward from definitions.

The third is an easy simulation.

The last requires some more work.

## 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).

We can use the  $O(n^2)$  algorithm for [Reachability](#) to show that:

$$\text{NSPACE}(f(n)) \subseteq \text{TIME}(k^{\log n + f(n)})$$

for some constant  $k$ .

Let  $M$  be a nondeterministic machine working in space bounds  $f(n)$ .

For any input  $x$  of length  $n$ , there is a constant  $c$  (depending on the number of states and alphabet of  $M$ ) such that the total number of possible configurations of  $M$  within space bounds  $f(n)$  is bounded by  $n \cdot c^{f(n)}$ .

Here,  $c^{f(n)}$  represents the number of different possible contents of the work space, and  $n$  different head positions on the input.