Computational Complexity Theory

Lecture 7: Class co-NP and EXP; Diagonalization

Department of Computer Science,
Indian Institute of Science

Recap: Search version of NP

- Recall: A language $L \subseteq \{0,1\}^*$ is in NP if
  - There's a *poly-time verifier* M and *poly. function* p s.t.
  - $x \in L$ iff there's a $u \in \{0,1\}^{p(|x|)}$ s.t $M(x, u) = 1$.

- Search version of L: Given an input $x \in \{0,1\}^*$, *find* a $u \in \{0,1\}^{p(|x|)}$ such that $M(x, u) = 1$, if such a u exists.

- Example: Given a 3CNF ϕ, find a satisfying assignment for ϕ if such an assignment exists.

Recap: Decision versus Search

- Is the search version of an NP-problem more difficult than the corresponding decision version?

- Theorem. Let $L \subseteq \{0,1\}^*$ be NP-complete. Then, the <u>search version of L</u> can be solved in poly-time <u>if and only if</u> the decision version can be solved in poly-time.

w.r.t any verifier M !

Recap: Decision versus Search

- Is *search* equivalent to *decision* for every NP problem?

- Theorem. *(Bellare & Goldwasser 1994)* If EE $\neq$ NEE then there's a language in NP for which search does not reduce to decision.

Recap: Cook reductions

- Definition. A language $L_1 \subseteq \{0,1\}^*$ is *polynomial-time (Karp or many-one) reducible* to a language $L_2 \subseteq \{0,1\}^*$ if there's a polynomial time computable function f s.t.

$$x \in L_1 \Leftrightarrow f(x) \in L_2$$

- Definition. A language $L_1 \subseteq \{0,1\}^*$ is *polynomial-time (Cook or Turing) reducible* to a language $L_2 \subseteq \{0,1\}^*$ if there's a TM that decides L_1 in poly-time using poly-many calls to a "subroutine" for deciding L_2 .

Will be called an Oracle later

Recap: NTMs

- A *nondeterministic Turing machine* is like a deterministic Turing machines but with two transition functions.
- It is formally defined by a tuple $(\Gamma, Q, \delta_0, \delta_1)$. It has a special state q_{accept} in addition to q_{start} and q_{halt}.
- At every step of computation, the machine applies one of two functions δ_0 and δ_1 *arbitrarily*.

also called *nondeterministically*

Recap: NTMs

- A *nondeterministic Turing machine* is like a deterministic Turing machines but with two transition functions.
- It is formally defined by a tuple $(\Gamma, Q, \delta_0, \delta_1)$. It has a special state q_{accept} in addition to q_{start} and q_{halt}.
- At every step of computation, the machine applies one of two functions δ_0 and δ_1 *arbitrarily*.
- Unlike DTMs, NTMs are **not intended to be physically realizable** (because of the arbitrary nature of application of the transition functions).

Recap: NTMs

- Definition. An NTM M *accepts* a string $x \in \{0,1\}^*$ iff on input x there ***exists*** a sequence of applications of the transition functions δ_0 and δ_1 (beginning from the start configuration) that makes M reach q_{accept}.

- Defintion. An NTM M *decides* a language $L \subseteq \{0,1\}^*$ if
  - M accepts $x \Longleftrightarrow x \in L$
  - On every sequence of applications of the transition functions on input x, M either reaches q_{accept} or q_{halt}.

Recap: NTMs

- Definition. An NTM M *accepts* a string $x \in \{0,1\}^*$ iff on input x there ***exists*** a sequence of applications of the transition functions δ_0 and δ_1 (beginning from the start configuration) that makes M reach q_{accept}.

- Defintion. An NTM M *decides* L in $T(|x|)$ time if
  - M accepts $x \Longleftrightarrow x \in L$
  - On <u>every sequence</u> of applications of the transition functions on input x, M either reaches q_{accept} or q_{halt} within $T(|x|)$ steps of computation.

Recap: A characterization of NP

- Definition. A language L is in $\mathrm{NTIME}(T(n))$ if there's an NTM M that decides L in $c.\,T(n)$ time on inputs of length n, where c is a constant.

- Theorem. $\mathrm{NP} = \bigcup_{c>0} \mathrm{NTIME}(n^c)$.

Class co-NP and EXP

Class co-NP

- Definition. For every $L \subseteq \{0,1\}^*$ let $\overline{L} = \{0,1\}^* \setminus L$.
  A language L is in co-NP if $\overline{L}$ is in NP.

- Example. $\overline{\text{SAT}} = \{\phi : \phi$ is *not* satisfiable$\}$.

Class co-NP

- Definition. For every $L \subseteq \{0,1\}^*$ let $\overline{L} = \{0,1\}^* \setminus L$.

  A language L is in co-NP if $\overline{L}$ is in NP.

- Example. $\overline{\text{SAT}} = \{\phi : \phi$ is *not* satisfiable$\}$.

- Note: co-NP is ***not*** complement of NP. Every language in P is in both NP and co-NP.

Class co-NP

- **Definition.** For every $L \subseteq \{0,1\}^*$ let $\overline{L} = \{0,1\}^* \setminus L$.
  A language L is in co-NP if $\overline{L}$ is in NP.

- **Example.** $\overline{\text{SAT}} = \{\phi : \phi$ is *not* satisfiable$\}$.



Class co-NP

- Definition. For every $L \subseteq \{0,1\}^*$ let $\overline{L} = \{0,1\}^* \setminus L$. A language L is in co-NP if $\overline{L}$ is in NP.

- Example. $\overline{\text{SAT}} = \{\phi : \phi$ is *not* satisfiable$\}$.

- Note: $\overline{\text{SAT}}$ is Cook reducible to SAT. But, there's a fundamental difference between the two problems that is captured by the fact that $\overline{\text{SAT}}$ is not known to be Karp reducible to SAT. In other words, there's no known poly-time verification process for $\overline{\text{SAT}}$.

Class co-NP : Alternate definition

- Recall, a language $L \subseteq \{0,1\}^*$ is in NP if there's a *poly-time verifier* M such that

$$x \in L \iff \exists u \in \{0,1\}^{p(|x|)} \text{ s.t. } M(x, u) = 1$$

Class co-NP : Alternate definition

- Recall, a language $L \subseteq \{0,1\}^*$ is in NP if there's a *poly-time verifier* M such that

$$x \in L \iff \exists u \in \{0,1\}^{p(|x|)} \text{ s.t. } M(x, u) = 1$$

$$x \in \overline{L} \iff \forall u \in \{0,1\}^{p(|x|)} \text{ s.t. } M(x, u) = 0$$

Class co-NP : Alternate definition

- Recall, a language $L \subseteq \{0,1\}^*$ is in NP if there's a *poly-time verifier* M such that

$$x \in L \iff \exists u \in \{0,1\}^{p(|x|)} \text{ s.t. } M(x, u) = 1$$

$$x \in \overline{L} \iff \forall u \in \{0,1\}^{p(|x|)} \text{ s.t. } M(x, u) = 0$$

$$x \in \overline{L} \iff \forall u \in \{0,1\}^{p(|x|)} \text{ s.t. } \overline{M}(x, u) = 1$$

$\overline{M}$ outputs the *opposite* of M

Class co-NP : Alternate definition

- Recall, a language $L \subseteq \{0,1\}^*$ is in NP if there's a *poly-time verifier* M such that

$$x \in L \iff \exists u \in \{0,1\}^{p(|x|)} \text{ s.t. } M(x,u) = 1$$

$$x \in \bar{L} \iff \forall u \in \{0,1\}^{p(|x|)} \text{ s.t. } M(x,u) = 0$$

$$x \in \bar{L} \iff \forall u \in \{0,1\}^{p(|x|)} \text{ s.t. } \bar{M}(x,u) = 1$$

$\bar{M}$ is a poly-time TM

Class co-NP : Alternate definition

- Recall, a language $L \subseteq \{0,1\}^*$ is in NP if there's a *poly-time verifier* M such that

$$x \in L \iff \exists u \in \{0,1\}^{p(|x|)} \text{ s.t. } M(x,u) = 1$$

$$x \in \overline{L} \iff \forall u \in \{0,1\}^{p(|x|)} \text{ s.t. } M(x,u) = 0$$

$$x \in \overline{L} \iff \forall u \in \{0,1\}^{p(|x|)} \text{ s.t. } \overline{M}(x,u) = 1$$

is in co-NP

Class co-NP : Alternate definition

- Recall, a language $L \subseteq \{0,1\}^*$ is in NP if there's a *poly-time verifier* M such that

$$x \in L \iff \exists u \in \{0,1\}^{p(|x|)} \text{ s.t. } M(x,u) = 1$$

$$x \in \overline{L} \iff \forall u \in \{0,1\}^{p(|x|)} \text{ s.t. } M(x,u) = 0$$

$$x \in \overline{L} \iff \forall u \in \{0,1\}^{p(|x|)} \text{ s.t. } \overline{M}(x,u) = 1$$

- Definition. A language $L \subseteq \{0,1\}^*$ is in co-NP if there's a polynomial function p and a *poly-time TM* M such that

$$x \in L \iff \forall u \in \{0,1\}^{p(|x|)} \text{ s.t. } M(x,u) = 1$$

for NP this was $\exists$

co-NP-completeness

- Definition. A language $L' \subseteq \{0,1\}^*$ is co-NP-complete if
  - L' is in co-NP
  - Every language L in co-NP is polynomial-time (Karp) reducible to L'.

- Theorem. $\overline{\text{SAT}}$ is co-NP-complete.

co-NP-completeness

- Definition. A language $L' \subseteq \{0,1\}^*$ is co-NP-complete if
  - L' is in co-NP
  - Every language L in co-NP is polynomial-time (Karp) reducible to L'.

- Theorem. $\overline{\text{SAT}}$ is co-NP-complete.

  Proof. Let $L \in$ co-NP. Then

  $\overline{L} \in$ NP

co-NP-completeness

- Definition. A language $L' \subseteq \{0,1\}^*$ is co-NP-complete if
  - L' is in co-NP
  - Every language L in co-NP is polynomial-time (Karp) reducible to L'.

- Theorem. $\overline{\text{SAT}}$ is co-NP-complete.

Proof. Let $L \in$ co-NP. Then

$$\overline{L} \in NP$$

$$\Rightarrow \overline{L} \leq_p \text{SAT}$$

co-NP-completeness

- Definition. A language $L' \subseteq \{0,1\}^*$ is co-NP-complete if
  - L' is in co-NP
  - Every language L in co-NP is polynomial-time (Karp) reducible to L'.

- Theorem. $\overline{\text{SAT}}$ is co-NP-complete.

Proof. Let $L \in$ co-NP. Then

$\overline{L} \in NP$

$\Rightarrow \overline{L} \leq_p \text{SAT}$

$\Rightarrow L \leq_p \overline{\text{SAT}}$

co-NP-completeness

- Definition. A language $L' \subseteq \{0,1\}^*$ is co-NP-complete if
  - L' is in co-NP
  - Every language L in co-NP is polynomial-time (Karp) reducible to L'.

- Theorem. Let

$$\text{TAUTOLOGY} = \{\phi : \text{ every assignment satisfies } \phi \}.$$

TAUTOLOGY is co-NP-complete.

Proof. Similar (homework)

co-NP-completeness

- Definition. A language $L' \subseteq \{0,1\}^*$ is co-NP-complete if
  - L' is in co-NP
  - Every language L in co-NP is polynomial-time (Karp) reducible to L'.

- Theorem. If L in NP-complete then $\overline{L}$ is co-NP-complete

  Proof. Similar (homework)

The diagram again



If a co-NP-complete language belongs to NP then

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

$\Rightarrow$ $$\text{co-NP} = \text{NP}$$

Let C_1 and C_2 be two complexity classes.

If $C_1 \subseteq C_2$, then $\text{co-}C_1 \subseteq \text{co-}C_2$.

Obs. $\text{co-}(\text{co-}C) = C$.

The diagram again



If an NP-complete language belongs to co-NP then

$\mathrm{NP} \subseteq \text{co-NP}$

$\Rightarrow$ $\mathrm{NP} = \text{co-NP}$

Let C_1 and C_2 be two complexity classes.

If $C_1 \subseteq C_2$, then $\text{co-}C_1 \subseteq \text{co-}C_2$.

Obs. $\text{co-(co-}C) = C$.

The diagram again



If an NP-complete language belongs to co-NP then

$\Rightarrow$ NP $\subseteq$ co-NP

NP $=$ co-NP

Let C_1 and C_2 be two complexity classes.

If $C_1 \subseteq C_2$, then co-$C_1 \subseteq$ co-C_2.

Obs. co-(co-C) = C .

Integer factoring in NP ∩ co-NP

- Integer factoring.

  FACT = {(N, U): there's a prime in [U] dividing N}

- Claim. FACT ∈ NP ∩ co-NP

- So, FACT is NP-complete implies NP = co-NP.

Integer factoring in NP $\cap$ co-NP

- Integer factoring.

  FACT = {(N, U): there's a prime in [U] dividing N}

- Claim. FACT $\in$ NP $\cap$ co-NP
- Proof. FACT $\in$ NP : Give p as a certificate. The verifier checks if p is prime (AKS test), $1 \leq p \leq U$ and p divides N.

Integer factoring in NP ∩ co-NP

- Integer factoring.

  FACT = {(N, U): there's a prime in [U] dividing N}

- Claim. FACT $\in$ NP ∩ co-NP
- Proof. FACT $\in$ NP : Give the complete prime factorization of N as a certificate. The verifier checks the correctness of the factorization, and then checks if none of the prime factors is in [U].

Integer factoring in NP ∩ co-NP

- Integer factoring.

  FACT = {(N, U): there's a prime in [U] dividing N}

- Claim. FACT ∈ NP ∩ co-NP
- Proof. FACT ∈ NP : Give the complete prime factorization of N as a certificate. The verifier checks the correctness of the factorization, and then checks if none of the prime factors is in [U].

- Homework: If FACT ∈ P, then there's a algorithm to find the prime factorization a given n-bit integers in poly(n) time.

Integer factoring in NP ∩ co-NP

- Integer factoring.

  FACT = {(N, U): there's a prime in [U] dividing N}

- Factoring algorithm. Dixon's randomized algorithm factors an n-bit number in $\exp(O(\sqrt{n} \log n))$ time.

Class EXP

- Definition. Class EXP is the exponential time analogue of class P.

$$\mathrm{EXP} = \bigcup_{c \geq 1} \mathrm{DTIME}\left(2^{n^c}\right)$$

Class EXP

- **Definition.** Class EXP is the exponential time analogue of class P.

$$\text{EXP} = \bigcup_{c \geq 1} \text{DTIME}\left(2^{n^c}\right)$$

- **Observation.** $P \subseteq \boxed{NP \subseteq EXP}$



Class EXP

- Definition. Class EXP is the exponential time analogue of class P.

$$EXP = \bigcup_{c \geq 1} DTIME\left(2^{n^c}\right)$$

- Observation. $P \subseteq NP \subseteq EXP$

- *Exponential Time Hypothesis.* *(Impagliazzo & Paturi 1999)* Any algorithm for 3-SAT takes $\geq 2^{\delta . n}$ time, where $\delta > 0$ is some fixed constant and n is the no. of variables.

In other words, δ cannot be made arbitrarily close to 0.

Class EXP

- Definition. Class EXP is the exponential time analogue of class P.

$$EXP = \bigcup_{c \geq 1} DTIME(2^{n^c})$$

- Observation. $P \subseteq NP \subseteq EXP$

- *Exponential Time Hypothesis.* *(Impagliazzo & Paturi 1999)* Any algorithm for 3-SAT takes $\geq 2^{\delta . n}$ time, where $\delta > 0$ is some fixed constant and n is the no. of variables.

$$ETH \Rightarrow P \neq NP$$

Class EXP

- **Definition.** Class EXP is the exponential time analogue of class P.

$$\mathrm{EXP} = \bigcup_{c \geq 1} \mathrm{DTIME}\left(2^{n^c}\right)$$

- **Observation.** $P \subseteq NP \subseteq EXP$

- ***<u>Exponential Time Hypothesis.</u>*** *(Impagliazzo & Paturi 1999)* Any algorithm for 3-SAT takes $\geq 2^{\delta.n}$ time, where $\delta > 0$ is some fixed constant and n is the no. of variables.

Homework: Read about Strong Exponential Time Hypothesis (SETH).

Class EXP

- Definition. Class EXP is the exponential time analogue of class P.

$$\mathrm{EXP} = \bigcup_{c \geq 1} \mathrm{DTIME}\left(2^{n^c}\right)$$

- Observation. $\mathrm{P} \subseteq \mathrm{NP} \subseteq \mathrm{EXP}$

  Is $\mathrm{P} \subsetneq \mathrm{EXP}$?

- *Exponential Time Hypothesis.* *(Impagliazzo & Paturi 1999)* Any algorithm for 3-SAT takes $\geq 2^{\delta.n}$ time, where $\delta > 0$ is some fixed constant and n is the no. of variables.

  ETH $\Rightarrow$ $\mathrm{P} \neq \mathrm{NP}$

Diagonalization

Diagonalization

- *Diagonalization* refers to a class of techniques used in complexity theory to separate complexity classes.

Diagonalization

- *Diagonalization* refers to a class of techniques used in complexity theory to separate complexity classes.
- These techniques are characterized by <u>two</u> main features:

Diagonalization

- *Diagonalization* refers to a class of techniques used in complexity theory to separate complexity classes.
- These techniques are characterized by <u>two</u> main features:
    1. There's a universal TM U that when given strings α and x, simulates M_α on x with only a <u>*small*</u> overhead.

Diagonalization

- *Diagonalization* refers to a class of techniques used in complexity theory to separate complexity classes.
- These techniques are characterized by two main features:
  1. There's a universal TM U that when given strings α and x, simulates M_α on x with only a *small* overhead.

     If M_α takes T time on x then U takes $O(T \log T)$ time to simulate M_α on x.

Diagonalization

- *Diagonalization* refers to a class of techniques used in complexity theory to separate complexity classes.
- These techniques are characterized by <u>two</u> main features:

    1. There's a universal TM U that when given strings α and x, simulates M_α on x with only a <u>*small*</u> overhead.

    2. Every string represents some TM, and every TM can be represented by <u>*infinitely many*</u> strings.