

## Computing against the clock

**Classification of languages:** so far have:

- Recursive (decidable),
- Non-recursive (undecidable),
  - r.e.,
  - not r.e.

Now focus on recursive languages and ask about *cost* of solving membership problem.

**Time bounded machines:**  $M$  a TM with input alphabet  $\Sigma$ . Say that  $M$  is  $T(n)$  time bounded (or of time complexity  $T(n)$ ) if

- $M$  halts within  $T(n)$  steps on *all* inputs  $x \in \Sigma^n$ , i.e., all inputs of length  $n$ .

**Note:**  $T(n)$  is just an upper bound,  $M$  could halt in fewer steps.

Say  $M$  is *polynomial time* if it is of time complexity  $p(n)$  for some polynomial  $p$ .

**Example:**  $M_{\text{palin}}$  time bound  $\frac{1}{2}(n+1)(n+2)$ .

**The class P:** Consists of all languages over  $\{0, 1\}$  that can be recognized by some polynomial time TM.

**Examples:**

1. Palindromes.
2.  $\{0, 1\}^*$ .
3.  $\{0^n 1^n \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ .

## Observations about P:

1. P is invariant under changes of model.
2. Languages in P regarded as *tractable*.
3. Languages outside P regarded as *intractable*.
4. Really P is an idealization, or approximation, of 'practically solvable'.
5. Even so point (1) shows P is of great interest (cf. recursive languages).
6. Forced to allow all of P unless we fix a model.
7. P helps us to make precise a question about naive search (look at this later).

**Polynomial-time reductions:**  $L_1, L_2$  be languages over alphabets  $\Sigma_1$  and  $\Sigma_2$ . A *polynomial-time reduction from  $L_1$  to  $L_2$*  is a function

$$f : \Sigma_1^* \rightarrow \Sigma_2^*$$

satisfying:

(a)  $x \in L_1 \iff f(x) \in L_2$ , for all  $x \in \Sigma_1^*$ ;

(b) there is a polynomial-time Turing machine transducer that computes  $f$ .

Same definition as a reduction but now  $f$  must be computed in polynomial time.

Say  $L_1$  is *polynomial-time reducible to  $L_2$* , if there is a polynomial-time reduction from  $L_1$  to  $L_2$ . Write as:

$$L_1 \leq_P L_2.$$

## Satisfying assignments and cliques:

- SAT, taken from propositional logic:

INSTANCE: A Boolean formula  $\phi$  in conjunctive normal form (CNF).

QUESTION: Is there an assignment of truth values to the variables of  $\phi$  that makes  $\phi$  true?

- CLIQUE, a problem from graph theory:

INSTANCE: An undirected graph  $G = (V, E)$ , and an integer  $k$ .

QUESTION: Does  $G$  possess a  $k$ -clique?

**Claim:**  $\text{SAT} \leq_P \text{CLIQUE}$ .

**Given:** CNF Boolean formula  $\phi$ .

**Produce:** Undirected graph  $G$  and integer  $k$   
s.t.

$\phi$  is satisfiable  $\iff G$  has a  $k$ -clique.

Must be able to build  $G, k$  in polynomial time  
in the size of  $\phi$ .

**The reduction:** Let

$$\begin{aligned}\phi &= C_1 \wedge C_2 \wedge \cdots \wedge C_r, \\ C_i &= (\alpha_{i1} \vee \alpha_{i2} \vee \cdots \vee \alpha_{i,s_i}).\end{aligned}$$

each  $\alpha_{ij}$  is a literal.

A pair of literals is *complementary* if it consists of the negated and un-negated forms of the *same* variable, e.g.,  $x$  and  $\neg x$ .

Reduction maps  $\phi$  to graph  $G = (V, E)$  and integer  $k$ :

$$\begin{aligned}V &= \{\alpha_{ij} \mid 1 \leq i \leq r \text{ and } 1 \leq j \leq s_i\}, \\ E &= \{\{\alpha_{ij}, \alpha_{hk}\} \mid i \neq h, \text{ and the pair } \alpha_{ij}, \alpha_{hk} \\ &\quad \text{is not complementary}\},\end{aligned}$$

$$k = r.$$