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## Overview

Topics:

- Solving problems using oracles
- Proving the answer to a decision problem is YES
- The SAT problem
- $\mathcal{N P}$
- co- $\mathcal{N} \mathcal{P}$
- $\mathcal{P}$
- $\mathcal{N P}$-hard and $\mathcal{N} \mathcal{P}$-complete


## SAT

SAT (Satisfiability) is a decision problem.

- Input: Boolean formula
- Output: YES (if there is an assignment of T/F to the variables that makes the expression True) or NO (if no such assignment exists)

What is the construction problem?

Suppose you have an ORACLE that correctly answers the decision problem.

Can you use it to find a satisfying assignment (when the formula is satisfiable)?

How many calls to the ORACLE do we need?

## Conjunctive Normal Form (CNF)

Propositional formulas that are the "and" of a collection of clauses, where each clause is the "or" of literals.

A "literal" is a variable, which can be negated
See the webpage at wikipedia, for example... https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Conjunctive_normal_form

- 2-CNF: all the clauses have at most two literals
- 3-CNF: all the clauses have at most three literals

Can we determine in polynomial time if a 2-CNF formula is satisfiable?

What about 3-CNF?

## Using Oracles

Recall the definitions of the decision problem, $k$-colorability (i.e., does the given graph have a proper vertex coloring with at most $k$ colors?).

- Suppose we have an Oracle that solves 3-coloring. Can we use it to solve 4-colorability?
- Suppose we have an oracle that solves 4 -coloring. Can we use it to solve 3-coloring?


## Decision Problems

A decision problem returns YES or NO on every input. Hence, a decision problem is usually described by a YES/NO question.

- 2-colorability (Can the input graph be vertex-colored with red and blue, so that no edge connects vertices of the same color?)
- 3-colorability (Can the input graph be vertex-colored with red, blue, and green, so that no edge connects vertices of the same color?)
- 2-SAT (Is the input 2CNF formula satisfiable?)
- 3-SAT (Is the input 3CNF formula satisfiable?)
- Hamiltonian Graph (Does the input graph have a cycle that visits every vertex exactly once?)
- Eulerian Graph (Does the input graph have a cycle that visits every edge exactly once?)


## 3-colorability

Suppose I want to figure out if a graph $G=(V, E)$ has a proper 3 -coloring of the vertices.

My friend says it does but I'm not sure, and my graph is too big for me to look at all the possible colorings.

Question to class: How many possible colorings are there, as a function of the number of vertices?

How can my friend convince me?

## 3-colorability: proving YES

The proof that $G=(V, E)$ has a 3-coloring is simple:

- show the assignment of colors to the vertices
- verify no two adjacent vertices have the same color

Note:

- The time to prove YES is polynomial once the coloring is found
- This is not relevant to the case where the graph cannot be 3-colored.


## 3-colorability: proving NO

Now suppose I have another large graph $G=(V, E)$, and my friend says it doesn't have a proper 3-coloring of its vertices.

How can my friend convince me that she is right?
Certainly she can list all the possible colorings and we can check them all (exhaustive search) to see if any of them are proper.

This would work, but it is really expensive.
Question to class: how expensive?

## Decision Problems

Remember that a decision problem returns YES or NO for every input.

- The YES-instances are the inputs for which the answers are YES.
- The NO-instances are the inputs for which the answers are NO.

$$
\mathcal{N P}=\text { "Non-deterministic Polynomial Time" }
$$

Definition: $\mathcal{N P}$ is the set of decision problems for which you can prove YES-instances are YES-instances in polynomial time.

## $\mathcal{N P}$

Which of these decision problems are in $\mathcal{N} \mathcal{P}$ ?

- 2-colorability (Can the input graph be vertex-colored with red and blue, so that no edge connects vertices of the same color?)
- 3-colorability (Can the input graph be vertex-colored with red, blue, and green, so that no edge connects vertices of the same color?)
- 2-SAT (Is the input 2CNF formula satisfiable?)
- 3-SAT (Is the input 3CNF formula satisfiable?)
- Hamiltonian Graph (Does the input graph have a cycle (or path) that visits every vertex exactly once?)
- Eulerian Graph (Does the input graph have a circuit (or path) that visits every edge exactly once?)


## co- $\mathcal{N} \mathcal{P}$

co- $\mathcal{N P}$ is the set of decision problems where there are polynomial time proofs that NO-INSTANCES are NO-INSTANCES.

We won't discuss co- $\mathcal{N} \mathcal{P}$ very much.
$\mathcal{P}$ is the set of decision problems that can be solved in polynomial time.
Which of these decision problems are in $\mathcal{P}$ ?

- 2-colorability (Can the input graph be vertex-colored with red and blue, so that no edge connects vertices of the same color?)
- 3-colorability (Can the input graph be vertex-colored with red, blue, and green, so that no edge connects vertices of the same color?)
- 2-SAT (Is the input 2CNF formula satisfiable?)
- 3-SAT (Is the input 3CNF formula satisfiable?)
- Hamiltonian Graph (Does the input graph have a cycle that visits every vertex exactly once?)
- Eulerian Graph (Does the input graph have a cycle that visits every edge exactly once?)


## $\mathcal{P}$ and $\mathcal{N} \mathcal{P}$

- Note that $\mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathcal{N} \mathcal{P}$.
- Hence $\mathcal{N P}$ contains easy problems and perhaps not so easy problems.
- Does $\mathcal{N P}$ contain problems that cannot be solved in polynomial time? If so then $\mathcal{P} \neq \mathcal{N} \mathcal{P}$. Otherwise, $\mathcal{P}=\mathcal{N} \mathcal{P}$.


## Reducing between Problems

Suppose you have two decision problems, $\pi$ and $\pi^{\prime}$.
Suppose $\pi^{\prime} \in \mathcal{P}$, and that $\mathcal{A}$ is an algorithm to solve $\pi^{\prime}$.
We would like to use $\mathcal{A}$ to help solve $\pi$ in polynomial time.
To do this, we try to make the inputs to $\pi$ look like inputs to $\pi^{\prime}$. What else do we need?


Figure: Steve Cook, see https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Stephen_Cook


Figure: Richard Karp, inventor of Karp Reductions. See https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Richard_M._Karp.

## Karp Reductions

Suppose you have two decision problems, $\pi$ and $\pi^{\prime}$.
Suppose $\pi^{\prime} \in \mathcal{P}$, and that $\mathcal{A}$ is a polynomial time algorithm to solve $\pi^{\prime}$.
Suppose we have a function $F$ that maps inputs to $\pi$ to inputs to $\pi^{\prime}$, so that:

- YES-instances of $\pi$ map to YES-instances of $\pi^{\prime}$
- NO-instances of $\pi$ map to NO-instances of $\pi^{\prime}$
- The function $F$ takes polynomial time to compute
- The size of $F(I)$ is polynomial in the size of $I$ for any input $I$

Such a function $F$ is called a Karp reduction, after Dick Karp
(Berkeley) who came up with them.

## Karp Reduction

If $\pi$ and $\pi^{\prime}$ are two decision problems in NP and there is a Karp reduction from $\pi$ to $\pi^{\prime}$, we write this as

$$
\pi \propto \pi^{\prime}
$$

and say that " $\pi$ reduces to $\pi^{\prime \prime}$.
Note that if $\pi_{1} \propto \pi_{2}$ and $\pi_{2} \propto \pi_{3}$, then $\pi_{1} \propto \pi_{3}$. That is, Karp Reductions are transitive.

## Karp Reductions

Suppose $\pi^{\prime} \in \mathcal{P}$, and that $\mathcal{A}$ is a polynomial time algorithm to solve $\pi^{\prime}$.
Suppose $\pi \propto \pi^{\prime}$, and that $F$ is the Karp Reduction.
Given instance I to $\pi$,

- Compute $F(I)$, which is an instance of $\pi^{\prime}$.
- Run algorithm $\mathcal{A}$ on $F(I)$
- If $\mathcal{A}$ says YES, then return YES; otherwise return NO.

So: if you can find a Karp Reduction from $\pi$ to $\pi^{\prime}$, then if $\pi^{\prime}$ can be solved in polynomial time then so can $\pi$ !

## Karp reduction

We can summarize the previous discussion as follows:
Theorem: If $\pi^{\prime} \in P$ and $\pi \propto \pi^{\prime}$ then $\pi \in P$.

## Karp reduction

Question: If $\pi \in P$ and $\pi \propto \pi^{\prime}$, do we learn anything?

## Karp reduction

Remember the 2-colorability problem:

- Input: Graph $G=(V, E)$
- Question: Can we 2-color the vertices of $G$ so that no two adjacent vertices get the same color?
and consider the 3-colorability problem:
- Input: Graph $G=(V, E)$
- Question: Can we 3-color the vertices of $G$ so that no two adjacent vertices get the same color?
We will show that 2 -colorability $\propto 3$-colorability.


## 2-colorability $\propto 3$-colorability

Let $F$ map instances of 2-colorability to instances of 3-colorability as follows.
Given graph $G=(V, E)$, let $F(G)$ be the graph $G^{\prime}=\left(V^{\prime}, E^{\prime}\right)$ defined by

- $V^{\prime}=V \cup\left\{v^{*}\right\}$, where $v^{*}$ is a new vertex
- $E^{\prime}=E \cup\left\{\left(v^{*}, v\right): v \in V\right\}$

It is not hard to see that $F$ is a Karp reduction.
(In particular, $G$ can be 2-colored if and only if $F(G)$ can be 3-colored.)

Yet, 2-colorability is in $\mathcal{P}$.
Do we learn anything about 3-colorability?

## Karp reduction

When you show that a problem $\pi$ reduces to $\pi^{\prime}$, then you learn that $\pi$ is no harder than $\pi^{\prime}$.

Therefore, knowing that $\pi^{\prime}$ can be solved in polynomial time really tells you something - that $\pi$ can be solved in polynomial time.

However, if $\pi \in \mathcal{P}$ and $\pi \propto \pi^{\prime}$, you don't learn anything about $\pi^{\prime}$. It could be that $\pi^{\prime}$ is solvable in polynomial time, or maybe not!

## Karp reduction

In 1972, Dick Karp proved that every problem in $\mathcal{N P}$ reduces to 3-SAT using a Karp reduction.

Written differently: $\forall \pi \in \mathcal{N P}, \pi \propto 3$-SAT
What does this mean?
(See https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Karp\'s_21_ NP-complete_problems)

## Karp reduction

Suppose $\forall \pi^{\prime} \in \mathcal{N} \mathcal{P}, \pi^{\prime} \propto \pi$.
Further suppose that $\pi \in \mathcal{P}$.
What can you deduce from this?

## Karp reduction

Theorem: Suppose $\forall \pi^{\prime} \in \mathcal{N} \mathcal{P}, \pi^{\prime} \propto \pi$, and $\pi \in \mathcal{P}$. Then $\mathcal{P}=\mathcal{N} \mathcal{P}$.

## $\mathcal{N} \mathcal{P}$-hard

A problem $\pi$ is said to be $\mathcal{N} \mathcal{P}$-hard if a polynomial time algorithm to solve $\pi$ could be used to solve every problem in $\mathcal{N P}$ in polynomial time.
Notes:

- If $\pi$ satisfies $\forall \pi^{\prime} \in \mathcal{N} \mathcal{P}, \pi^{\prime} \propto \pi$, then $\pi$ is $\mathcal{N} \mathcal{P}$-hard.
- If any $\mathcal{N} \mathcal{P}$-hard problem can be solved in polynomial time, then so can all problems in $\mathcal{N P}$ !
- Karp already proved that 3 -SAT is $\mathcal{N} \mathcal{P}$-hard (as well as 20 other problems). Many other problems have been proven to be $\mathcal{N} \mathcal{P}$-hard.
- To prove that a new decision problem $\pi$ is $\mathcal{N} \mathcal{P}$-hard, you just have to find a known $\mathcal{N} \mathcal{P}$-hard problem $\pi^{\prime}$ and show that $\pi^{\prime} \propto \pi$.


## $\mathcal{N} \mathcal{P}$-complete

A problem $\pi$ is said to be $\mathcal{N} \mathcal{P}$-complete if and only if

- $\pi \in \mathcal{N} \mathcal{P}$
- $\pi$ is $\mathcal{N} \mathcal{P}$-hard


## Class Exercise

Provide a Karp reduction from 3-colorability to 4-colorability.

## $\mathcal{N} \mathcal{P}$-hard

We use the fact that 3 -colorability is $\mathcal{N} \mathcal{P}$-hard to prove that 4-colorability is $\mathcal{N} \mathcal{P}$-hard.

## Does $\mathcal{P}=\mathcal{N} \mathcal{P}$ ?

According to Wikipedia:
Nobody has yet been able to determine conclusively whether NP-complete problems are in fact solvable in polynomial time, making this one of the great unsolved problems of mathematics.

The Clay Mathematics Institute is offering a US \$1 million reward to anyone who has a formal proof that $\mathcal{P}=\mathcal{N} \mathcal{P}$ or that $\mathcal{P} \neq \mathcal{N} \mathcal{P}$.

## Dealing with NP-hard problems

Although we don't know if $\mathcal{P}=\mathcal{N} \mathcal{P}$, let's assume they aren't the same... and hence that $\mathcal{N} \mathcal{P}$-hard problems are going to be hard to solve!

What does this mean to you, as a programmer?

## Describing a real world problem

You want to partition the set of people into subsets so that every two people in any subset both like each other, and make the number of subsets as small as possible.

Solution: The graph $G=(V, E)$ is defined by

- $V$ is the set of people in the class
- E contains $(v, w)$ if and only if $v$ and $w$ like each other

We are looking for a partition of $V$ into a small number of sets so that every one of the sets is a clique.
In other words, we want to write $V=V_{1} \cup V_{2} \cup \ldots \cup V_{k}$, where $V_{i}$ is a clique in $G$ and where $k$ is minimized.

- Does a solution always exist?
- Does it have to be unique?
- What graph problem does this look like?


## A different solution

You want to partition the set of people into subsets so that every two people in any subset both like each other, and make the number of subsets as small as possible.

Solution: The graph $G=(V, E)$ is defined by

- $V$ is the set of people in the class
- E contains $(v, w)$ if and only if $v$ doesn't like $w$ or $w$ doesn't like $v$ (i.e., they don't like each other)
We are looking for a partition of $V$ into a small number of sets so that every one of the sets is an independent set. Note - this is the same thing as finding a minimum vertex coloring.


## Things to note

When you formulate a real world problem as a graph problem, you have to:

- Describe the graph precisely. What are the vertices? What are the edges? Do the edges have weights? Use correct terminology (don't be sloppy about language).
- Once the graph is defined, the problem (whether a decision problem, optimization problem, or construction problem) is then defined only in terms of the graph and not in terms of the original problem.
The power in making this formulation is that there are many algorithms (and software) for most natural graph problems, and so you can use those programs to solve your problem.

Many graph problems are NP-hard, but sometimes you have extra structure in your problem that allows you to solve the problem in polynomial time. (For example, MIN VERTEX COLORING is NP-hard, but solvable in polynomial time on trees.)

## Toy Example

You work for some spy agency, and you want to listen in on all the phone calls happening in Urbana.
You can put bugs in cellphones, and the bugs will let you listen to any conversation that takes place using that cellphone.
You know which people call which people, and so you can try to use that information to reduce the number of bugs you need to buy and install.
You assume everyone has exactly one cellphone and all calls are made using cellphones to cellphones.

Formulate this as a graph problem.

## Toy Example: Spy Agency

- What are the vertices? (Answer: Cellphones)
- What are the edges? (Answer: pairs of cellphones where their owners are known to call each other.)
- What are you looking for?
- Answer: the smallest number of cellphones so that all phone calls involve at least one cellphone in the set.
- Better answer: the smallest set $V_{0} \subseteq V$ of vertices so that every edge in $E$ has at least one endpoint in $V_{0}$.

Do you recognize this problem?

## What do you do when a problem is NP-hard?

Suppose you reduce your problem to a graph theoretic problem that a problem is NP-hard.

What does this mean?
What should you do?

## Class Exercises

Formulate each of these as a graph-theoretic problem:

- You want to pair people off in the class so that they will study together. You want to have as large a number of people able to be in study groups, but you have the following rules: study groups must have pairs of people who like each other, and no person can be in two study groups.
- You want to have a party and invite as many people as you can to it, subject to (a) they all like you, and (b) they all like each other.

