Theory of Formal Languages and Automata Lecture 23

Mahdi Dolati

Sharif University of Technology

Fall 2023

December 25, 2023

The Class NP

- We were able to find a polynomial time algorithm for **PATH** problem.
 - Avoided the brute-force search.
- We have not been able to find a polynomial time algorithm for certain other problems,
 - Some of these problems are interesting and useful.



The Class NP

We don't know why we were unsuccessful in finding polynomial time algorithms for certain problems.

- Maybe these problems have polynomial time algorithms. Or, they are intrinsically difficult.
- We know the complexity of many of such problems are **linked**. A polynomial time algorithm for one such problem can be used to solve an entire class of problems.
- They have a feature called polynomial verifiability.
 - One can verify a membership in polynomial time:
 - Provide the solution to them.

• Definition:

A verifier for a language A is an algorithm V, where

 $A = \{w | V \text{ accepts } \langle w, c \rangle \text{ for some string } c \}.$

We measure the time of a verifier only in terms of the length of w, so a **polynomial time verifier** runs in polynomial time in the length of w. A language A is **polynomially verifiable** if it has a polynomial time verifier.

- We call c a certificate or proof of membership in A.
- Since the verifier runs in polynomial time, the certificate has polynomial length (in the length of w).
- Observe that a Hamiltonian path from s to t is a certificate for the HAMPATH problem.

• Definition:

A verifier for a language A is an algorithm V, where

 $A = \{w | V \text{ accepts } \langle w, c \rangle \text{ for some string } c\}.$

We measure the time of a verifier only in terms of the length of w, so a **polynomial time verifier** runs in polynomial time in the length of w. A language A is **polynomially verifiable** if it has a polynomial time verifier.

- Some problems may not be polynomially verifiable:
- Example:
 - HAMPATH
 - Need to verify a nonexistence.

• Definition:

NP is the class of languages that have polynomial time verifiers.

- NP: Nondeterministic polynomial time.
- Alternative way to characterize problems in NP (NPproblems): Solvable in polynomial time with a nondeterministic Turing machine.

• Example: HAMPATH: All stages run in poly. time.

 $N_1 =$ "On input $\langle G, s, t \rangle$, where G is a directed graph with nodes s and t:

- 1. Write a list of m numbers, p_1, \ldots, p_m , where m is the number of nodes in G. Each number in the list is nondeterministically selected to be between 1 and m.
- 2. Check for repetitions in the list. If any are found, reject.
- 3. Check whether $s = p_1$ and $t = p_m$. If either fail, reject.
- 4. For each *i* between 1 and m 1, check whether (p_i, p_{i+1}) is an edge of *G*. If any are not, *reject*. Otherwise, all tests have been passed, so *accept*."

The Class NP

Theorem

A language is in NP iff it is decided by some nondeterministic polynomial time Turing machine.

- Proof Idea: Convert a polynomial time verifier to an equivalent polynomial time nondeterministic Turing machine and vice versa:
 - TM simulates the verifier by guessing the certificate.
 - The verifier simulates the TM by using the accepting branch as the certificate.

The Class NP

Theorem

A language is in NP iff it is decided by some nondeterministic polynomial time Turing machine.

- Proof: Let A be an NP-problem.
 - N: A nondeterministic Turing machine (NTM),
 - V: A polynomial time verifier. V is a TM that runs in time n^k .
 - Given V, construct N:
 - N = "On input w of length n:
 - 1. Nondeterministically select string c of length at most n^k .
 - **2.** Run V on input $\langle w, c \rangle$.
 - 3. If V accepts, accept; otherwise, reject."

The Class NP

Theorem

A language is in NP iff it is decided by some nondeterministic polynomial time Turing machine.

- Proof Cont.: Let A be an NP-problem.
 - N: A nondeterministic Turing machine (NTM),
 - V: A polynomial time verifier. V is a TM that runs in time n^k .
 - Given N, construct V:
 - V = "On input $\langle w, c \rangle$, where w and c are strings:
 - 1. Simulate N on input w, treating each symbol of c as a description of the nondeterministic choice to make at each step (as in the proof of Theorem 3.16).
 - 2. If this branch of N's computation accepts, *accept*; otherwise, *reject*."

The Class NP

Theorem

A language is in NP iff it is decided by some nondeterministic polynomial time Turing machine.

- Proof Cont.: Let A be an NP-problem.
 - N: A nondeterministic Turing machine (NTM),
 - V: A polynomial time verifier. V is a TM that runs in time n^k .
 - Given N, construct V:
 - V = "On input $\langle w, c \rangle$, where w and c are strings:
 - 1. Simulate N on input w, treating each symbol of c as a detion of the nondeterministic choice to make at each step (the proof of Theorem 3.16).
 - 2. If this branch of N's computation accepts, accept; otherwise, reject."

Given the correct certificate, V runs the accepting branch of N and accepts.

• Definition:

 $\mathbf{NTIME}(t(n)) = \{L | L \text{ is a language decided by an } O(t(n)) \text{ time nondeterministic Turing machine} \}.$

• Definition:

NP =
$$\bigcup_k \text{NTIME}(n^k)$$
.

The P versus NP Question

• We learned that:

P = the class of languages for which membership can be *decided* quickly. NP = the class of languages for which membership can be *verified* quickly.

- Polynomial verifiability seems more powerful than polynomial decidability.
- However, we have been unable to **prove** the there is a problem that has a polynomial verifier but it has not a polynomial decider.
- P=NP? is one of the greatest unsolved problems in theoretical computer science.
- Most researchers believe $P \neq NP$.

The P versus NP Question



- The Clay Mathematics Institute (a US\$1 million prize):
 - Birch and Swinnerton-Dyer conjecture,
 - Hodge conjecture,
 - Navier–Stokes existence and smoothness,
 - P versus NP problem,
 - Riemann hypothesis,
 - Yang-Mills existence and mass gap, and
 - Poincaré conjecture