CS310 : Automata Theory 2019

Lecture 38: Efficiency in computation Classifying problems by their complexity

Instructor: S. Akshay

IITB, India

09-04-2019



Turing machines and computability

- 1. Turing machines
 - (i) Definition & variants
 - (ii) Decidable and Turing recognizable languages
 - (iii) Church-Turing Hypothesis



Turing machines and computability

- 1. Turing machines
 - (i) Definition & variants
 - (ii) Decidable and Turing recognizable languages
 - (iii) Church-Turing Hypothesis
- 2. Undecidability
 - (i) A proof technique by diagonalization
 - (ii) Via reductions
 - (iii) Rice's theorem



Turing machines and computability

- 1. Turing machines
 - (i) Definition & variants
 - (ii) Decidable and Turing recognizable languages
 - (iii) Church-Turing Hypothesis
- 2. Undecidability
 - (i) A proof technique by diagonalization
 - (ii) Via reductions
 - (iii) Rice's theorem

3. Applications: showing (un)decidability of other problems

- (i) A string matching problem: Post's Correspondance Problem
- (ii) A problem for compilers: Unambiguity of Context-free languages
- (iii) Between TM and PDA: Linear Bounded Automata



Turing machines and computability

- 1. Turing machines
 - (i) Definition & variants
 - (ii) Decidable and Turing recognizable languages
 - (iii) Church-Turing Hypothesis
- 2. Undecidability
 - (i) A proof technique by diagonalization
 - (ii) Via reductions
 - (iii) Rice's theorem
- 3. Applications: showing (un)decidability of other problems
 - (i) A string matching problem: Post's Correspondance Problem
 - (ii) A problem for compilers: Unambiguity of Context-free languages
 - (iii) Between TM and PDA: Linear Bounded Automata
- 4. Efficiency in computation: run-time complexity.
 - (i) Running time complexity
 - (ii) Polynomial and exponential time complexity



So, *k*-tape to 1-tape involves a polynomial blow-up, while non-det to det requires an exponential blow-up.

Definition

P is the class of languages that are decidable in polynomial time on a deterministic single-tape Turing machine, i.e.,

$$P = \bigcup_k TIME(n^k)$$



So, *k*-tape to 1-tape involves a polynomial blow-up, while non-det to det requires an exponential blow-up.

Definition

P is the class of languages that are decidable in polynomial time on a deterministic single-tape Turing machine, i.e.,

$$P = \bigcup_k TIME(n^k)$$

Examples:

▶ Given a graph G, is there a path from s to t?



Definition

P is the class of languages that are decidable in polynomial time on a deterministic single-tape Turing machine, i.e.,

$$P = \bigcup_k TIME(n^k)$$

Examples:

- Given a graph G, is there a path from s to t?
- Are two given numbers relatively prime?



PATH: Given directed graph G = (V, E) and nodes s, t, is there a path between s and t



PATH: Given directed graph G = (V, E) and nodes s, t, is there a path between s and tBrute force algo?



- PATH: Given directed graph G = (V, E) and nodes s, t, is there a path between s and t
 - Mark s
 - Repeat until no additional nodes are marked:
 - scan all edges of G and if (a, b) is an edge with a marked and b unmarked, then mark b,
 - ▶ if *t* is marked, accept, else reject.



- PATH: Given directed graph G = (V, E) and nodes s, t, is there a path between s and t
 - Mark s
 - Repeat until no additional nodes are marked: at most |V| times
 - scan all edges of G and if (a, b) is an edge with a marked and b unmarked, then mark b,
 - if t is marked, accept, else reject.



- PATH: Given directed graph G = (V, E) and nodes s, t, is there a path between s and t
- RELPRIME: Given $x, y \in \mathbb{N}$, is gcd(x, y) = 1



PATH: Given directed graph G = (V, E) and nodes s, t, is there a path between s and t

RELPRIME: Given $x, y \in \mathbb{N}$, is gcd(x, y) = 1

Euclid's algo!

- repeat till y = 0;
- $\blacktriangleright \text{ assign } x := x \mod y$
- exchange x and y;
- At end if result is x = 1 accept, else reject.



PATH: Given directed graph G = (V, E) and nodes s, t, is there a path between s and t

```
RELPRIME: Given x, y \in \mathbb{N}, is gcd(x, y) = 1
```

Euclid's algo!

- repeat till y = 0; how many times is this done?
- assign $x := x \mod y$
- exchange x and y;
- At end if result is x = 1 accept, else reject.



Definition

EXP is the class of languages that are decidable in exponential time on a deterministic single-tape Turing machine, i.e.,

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



Definition

EXP is the class of languages that are decidable in exponential time on a deterministic single-tape Turing machine, i.e.,

1

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

Examples



Definition

EXP is the class of languages that are decidable in exponential time on a deterministic single-tape Turing machine, i.e.,

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

Examples

▶ All *P* time problems! i.e., $P \subseteq EXP$.

1



Definition

EXP is the class of languages that are decidable in exponential time on a deterministic single-tape Turing machine, i.e.,

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

Examples

- All P time problems! i.e., $P \subseteq EXP$.
- HAMILTONIAN-PATH: G, s, t: is there a path from s to t that goes through each node of G exactly once?



Definition

EXP is the class of languages that are decidable in exponential time on a deterministic single-tape Turing machine, i.e.,

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

Examples

- All P time problems! i.e., $P \subseteq EXP$.
- HAMILTONIAN-PATH: G, s, t: is there a path from s to t that goes through each node of G exactly once?
- (Generalized) CHESS



Definition

EXP is the class of languages that are decidable in exponential time on a deterministic single-tape Turing machine, i.e.,

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

Examples

All P time problems! i.e., $P \subseteq EXP$.

I

- HAMILTONIAN-PATH: G, s, t: is there a path from s to t that goes through each node of G exactly once?
- (Generalized) CHESS
- COMPOSITIES: is a number composite?



NTIME(t(n)) is set of all languages decidable by a O(t(n)) 1-tape non-det Turing machine



NTIME(t(n)) is set of all languages decidable by a O(t(n)) 1-tape non-det Turing machine

Definition

NP is the class of languages that are decidable in polynomial time on a non-deterministic single-tape Turing machine, i.e.,

$$NP = \bigcup_{k} NTIME(n^k)$$



NTIME(t(n)) is set of all languages decidable by a O(t(n)) 1-tape non-det Turing machine

Definition

NP is the class of languages that are decidable in polynomial time on a non-deterministic single-tape Turing machine, i.e.,

$$NP = \bigcup_{k} NTIME(n^k)$$

Verifier

for language A is an algorithm V s.t. $w \in A$ iff V accepts $\langle w, c \rangle$ for some witness or proof string c.



NTIME(t(n)) is set of all languages decidable by a O(t(n)) 1-tape non-det Turing machine

Definition

NP is the class of languages that are decidable in polynomial time on a non-deterministic single-tape Turing machine, i.e.,

$$NP = \bigcup_k NTIME(n^k)$$

Verifier

for language A is an algorithm V s.t. $w \in A$ iff V accepts $\langle w, c \rangle$ for some witness or proof string c. Examples: HAMPATH, Composities



NTIME(t(n)) is set of all languages decidable by a O(t(n)) 1-tape non-det Turing machine

Definition

NP is the class of languages that are decidable in polynomial time on a non-deterministic single-tape Turing machine, i.e.,

$$NP = \bigcup_{k} NTIME(n^k)$$

Verifier

for language A is an algorithm V s.t. $w \in A$ iff V accepts $\langle w, c \rangle$ for some witness or proof string c. Examples: HAMPATH, Composities

Theorem



Theorem



Theorem





Theorem

- ▶ \implies Suppose *N* is the NTM that decides *L* ∈ *NP*, we define verifier *V*:
- On input $\langle w, c \rangle$, where w, c are strings,



Theorem

- Suppose N is the NTM that decides $L \in NP$, we define verifier V:
- On input $\langle w, c \rangle$, where w, c are strings,
 - 1. Simulate N on w, with c as a description of the non-det choice.
 - 2. If this branch of N's computation accepts, accept, else reject.



Theorem

- ▶ \implies Suppose *N* is the NTM that decides *L* ∈ *NP*, we define verifier *V*:
- On input $\langle w, c \rangle$, where w, c are strings,
 - 1. Simulate N on w, with c as a description of the non-det choice.
 - 2. If this branch of N's computation accepts, accept, else reject.
- \leftarrow Given verifier V which runs in time n^k , we construct NTM N as follows:
- On input w of length n;



Theorem

- ▶ \implies Suppose *N* is the NTM that decides *L* ∈ *NP*, we define verifier *V*:
- On input $\langle w, c \rangle$, where w, c are strings,
 - 1. Simulate N on w, with c as a description of the non-det choice.
 - 2. If this branch of N's computation accepts, accept, else reject.
- \leftarrow Given verifier V which runs in time n^k , we construct NTM N as follows:
- On input w of length n;
 - 1. Guess (i.e., non-det choice) string c of length at most n^k
 - 2. Run V on $\langle w, c \rangle$
 - 3. Accept if V accepts, else reject



Examples of problems in NP class

Exercises

- CLIQUE: Does an undir graph G contain a clique of size k?
- SUBSET-SUM: Given a set of numbers, does some set add up to exactly S?



Examples of problems in NP class

Exercises

- CLIQUE: Does an undir graph G contain a clique of size k?
- SUBSET-SUM: Given a set of numbers, does some set add up to exactly S?

CLIQUE: {(G, k) | G is an undirected graph with a *k*-clique}. Give two proofs!





What about complementation?

► Is *CLIQUES* in NP?



- ▶ Is CLIQUES in NP?
- ▶ We define Co-NP for problems whose complement is in NP.



- ► Is CLIQUES in NP?
- ▶ We define Co-NP for problems whose complement is in NP.
- Give an example of a problem in Co-NP.



- ► Is CLIQUES in NP?
- ▶ We define Co-NP for problems whose complement is in NP.
- Give an example of a problem in Co-NP. COMPOSITES



- ► Is *CLIQUES* in NP?
- ▶ We define Co-NP for problems whose complement is in NP.
- Give an example of a problem in Co-NP. COMPOSITES
- Is NP separated from Co-NP?



What about complementation?

- ► Is *CLIQUES* in NP?
- We define Co-NP for problems whose complement is in NP.
- Give an example of a problem in Co-NP. COMPOSITES
- Is NP separated from Co-NP?

What about NP vs EXPTIME?



What about complementation?

- ► Is *CLIQUES* in NP?
- We define Co-NP for problems whose complement is in NP.
- Give an example of a problem in Co-NP. COMPOSITES
- Is NP separated from Co-NP?

What about NP vs EXPTIME?

▶ $NP \subseteq EXPTIME$, but is it strict?



What about complementation?

- ▶ Is *CLIQUES* in NP?
- We define Co-NP for problems whose complement is in NP.
- Give an example of a problem in Co-NP. COMPOSITES
- Is NP separated from Co-NP?

What about NP vs EXPTIME?

• $NP \subseteq EXPTIME$, but is it strict?

One question to rule them all: is P = NP?



What about complementation?

- ► Is *CLIQUES* in NP?
- ▶ We define Co-NP for problems whose complement is in NP.
- Give an example of a problem in Co-NP. COMPOSITES
- Is NP separated from Co-NP?

What about NP vs EXPTIME?

• $NP \subseteq EXPTIME$, but is it strict?

One question to rule them all: is P = NP?

If P = NP, then what about the earlier questions?

