

Computational Complexity

Take-home exam

Hand in via Canvas before Monday June 3, 2024, at 23:59

<https://canvas.uva.nl/courses/42595/assignments/496120>

Definition 1 (NP/poly). A decision problem $L \subseteq \Sigma^*$ is in the complexity class NP/poly if there exists:

- polynomials $p, q : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$;
- a polynomial-time Turing machine \mathbb{M} (the *verifier*); and
- a sequence $\{\alpha_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ with $\alpha_n \in \{0, 1\}^{q(n)}$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ (a family of *advice strings*)

such that for every $x \in \Sigma^*$:

$$x \in L \quad \text{if and only if} \quad \text{there exists some } u \in \{0, 1\}^{p(|x|)} \text{ such that } \mathbb{M}(x, u, \alpha_{|x|}) = 1.$$

One can equivalently define NP/poly as the class of all decision problems decidable by a polynomial-time nondeterministic Turing machine that has access to a polynomial-length family of advice strings. (You may use either definition (or both) in your solutions.)

Definition 2 (coNP/poly).

$$\text{coNP/poly} = \{ L \subseteq \Sigma^* \mid \bar{L} = (\Sigma^* \setminus L) \in \text{NP/poly} \}.$$

Definition 3 ($\Sigma_i^{\text{P}}/\text{poly}$ and $\Pi_i^{\text{P}}/\text{poly}$). The complexity classes $\Sigma_i^{\text{P}}/\text{poly}$ and $\Pi_i^{\text{P}}/\text{poly}$, for $i \geq 2$, are defined analogously—by taking the definitions of Σ_i^{P} and Π_i^{P} and adding a polynomial-size family of advice strings that the verifier machine is given access to.

Question 1 (3pts; a: 2pts, b: 1pt). In this question, you will prove that if $\text{NP} \subseteq \text{coNP/poly}$, then the Polynomial Hierarchy collapses. The general proof line will be as follows.

You will show that if $\text{NP} \subseteq \text{coNP/poly}$, then $\Sigma_3^{\text{P}} \subseteq \text{NP/poly}$. The following (true) statement, which you do not have to prove, can then be used to show that the Polynomial Hierarchy collapses.

If $\Sigma_3^{\text{P}} \subseteq \text{NP/poly}$, then $\Sigma_3^{\text{P}} = \Pi_3^{\text{P}}$.

Complete the proof by doing the following.

(a) Prove that if $\text{NP} \subseteq \text{coNP/poly}$, then $\Sigma_2^{\text{P}}/\text{poly} \subseteq \text{NP/poly}$.

– *Hint:* as an intermediate step, show that if $\text{NP} \subseteq \text{coNP/poly}$, then $\Sigma_2^{\text{P}} \subseteq \text{NP/poly}$.

(b) Prove that if $\text{NP} \subseteq \text{coNP/poly}$, then $\Sigma_3^{\text{P}} \subseteq \text{NP/poly}$.

– *Hint:* use the statement that you proved for (a).

Definition 4. Consider the following problem **CLAUSE ENTAILMENT**:

Input: A propositional formula φ , and a propositional clause c (i.e., a disjunction of literals).

Question: $\varphi \models c$? I.e., is it the case that all truth assignments α that make φ true also make c true?

Definition 5. We say that there is a *hint system* for **CLAUSE ENTAILMENT** if there exists a computable function $f : \Sigma^* \rightarrow \Sigma^*$ (called the *hint function*) and a polynomial-time decidable problem Q such that for each input (φ, c) of **CLAUSE ENTAILMENT** it holds that $\varphi \models c$ if and only if $(\varphi, f(\varphi), c) \in Q$.

Definition 6. Let $f : \Sigma^* \rightarrow \Sigma^*$ be a function. We say that f is *polynomial-size* if there exists a polynomial p such that for all $x \in \Sigma^*$ it holds that $|f(x)| \leq p(|x|)$.

Question 2 (4pts; a: 1pt, b: 1pt; c: 2pts).

- (a) Prove that the function f_0 that for any propositional formula φ outputs its truth table (over the variables appearing in φ) leads to a hint system for **CLAUSE ENTAILMENT**. That is, if $f_0(\varphi)$ consists of a list mentioning for each truth assignment $\alpha : \text{Var}(\varphi) \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ whether or not α makes φ true.

In particular, identify a polynomial-time decidable problem Q such that for each formula φ and each clause c it holds that $\varphi \models c$ if and only if $(\varphi, f_0(\varphi), c) \in Q$. Make sure to prove that Q is polynomial-time decidable. You do not have to prove that f_0 is computable.

– *Note:* f_0 is not a polynomial-size function.

- (b) Prove that if there is a hint system for **CLAUSE ENTAILMENT** with a polynomial-time computable hint function f , then $\text{P} = \text{NP}$.
- (c) Prove that if there is a hint system for **CLAUSE ENTAILMENT** with a polynomial-size hint function f , then the Polynomial Hierarchy collapses.

– *Hint:* use the fact that $\text{NP} \subseteq \text{coNP}/\text{poly}$ implies that $\text{PH} = \Sigma_3^{\text{P}}$. (This statement you proved in Question 1. You may use this statement, regardless of whether you have a (correct) solution for Question 1.)

– *Hint:* for different values of $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$, consider the formula:

$$\varphi_\ell = \bigwedge_{1 \leq i \leq (2\ell)^3} (y_i \rightarrow c_i),$$

where $c_1, \dots, c_{(2\ell)^3}$ is an enumeration of all possible clauses of size 3 over the variables x_1, \dots, x_ℓ .

Definition 7. Consider the following problem **SET PACKING**:

Input: A finite set U , a set $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(U)$ of subsets of U , and a positive integer $k \in \mathbb{N}$ (given in unary).

Question: Are there k sets S_1, \dots, S_k in \mathcal{S} that are pairwise-disjoint—that is, such that $S_i \cap S_{i'} = \emptyset$ for all $1 \leq i < i' \leq k$?

Question 3 (3pts; a: 1/2pt, b: 1 1/2pts, c: 1pt).

- (a) Prove that there exists an algorithm that solves **SET PACKING** in time $n^{O(k)}$, where n denotes the size of the input.

- (b) Prove that there does not exist an algorithm that solves **SET PACKING** in time $2^k \cdot n^{o(k)}$, assuming the ETH.

– *Hint:* Consider the following reduction from **3COL** to **SET PACKING**. Let $G = (V, E)$ be an instance of **3COL** with $|V| = n$. The reduction partitions the nodes (arbitrarily) into $\log n$ groups $V_1, \dots, V_{\log n}$ consisting each of at most $n/\log n$ nodes.

It then constructs an instance (U, \mathcal{S}, k) of **SET PACKING** as follows. We set $k = \log n$. The set C consists of all 3-colorings μ that are defined on exactly one of $V_1, \dots, V_{\log n}$ and that do not assign any two nodes connected by an edge in E to the same color. That is, $C = \bigcup_{1 \leq i \leq \log n} C_i$ where C_i is the set of all colorings $\mu : V_i \rightarrow \{1, 2, 3\}$ such that for no edge $\{u, v\} \in E$ it holds that $u \in V_i, v \in V_i$ and $\mu(u) = \mu(v)$. The set U consists of all size-2 sets $\{\mu_1, \mu_2\} \subseteq C$ of colorings in C .

Finally, the set \mathcal{S} is constructed as follows. For each $\mu \in C$, we construct a set $S_\mu \subseteq U$ as follows. Remember that each element of C corresponds to some 3-coloring of a subset of V . Take an arbitrary $\mu \in C$. Then S_μ contains $\{\mu, \mu'\}$ for all colorings $\mu' \neq \mu$ such that either (1) μ and μ' are defined on the same set of nodes, or (2) μ and μ' are defined on different sets of nodes and there is some edge $\{u, v\} \in E$ such that μ and μ' combined assign the same color to both u and v .

– *Note:* you still have to prove that this reduction is correct.

- (c) Prove that there does not exist an algorithm that solves **SET PACKING** in time $2^{2^k} \cdot n^{o(k)}$, assuming the ETH.

– *Note:* for (c), it suffices to indicate where (and how exactly) your solution for (b) needs to be adapted.