CSC3160: Design and Analysis of Algorithms

Week 10: NP-completeness

Instructor: Shengyu Zhang

Tractable

- While we have introduced many problems with polynomial-time algorithms…
- …not all problems enjoy fast computation.

- Among those “hard” problems, an important class is **NP**.

P, NP

- **P**: Decision problems solvable in deterministic polynomial time
- **NP**: two definitions
  - Decision problems solvable in nondeterministic polynomial time.
  - Decision problems (whose valid instances are) checkable in deterministic polynomial time
- Let's use the second definition.
- Recall: A language L is just a subset of $\{0,1\}^*$, the set of all strings of bits.
  - $\{0,1\}^* = \bigcup_{n \geq 0} \{0,1\}^n$.

Formal definition of **NP**

- Def. A language $L \subseteq \{0,1\}^*$ is in **NP** if there exists a polynomial $p: \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ and a polynomial-time Turing machine M such that for every $x \in \{0,1\}^*$,

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

- M: the verifier for L.
- For $x \in L$, the u on the RHS is called a certificate for x (with respect to the language L and machine M).
- So **NP** contains those problems easy to check.

SAT and k-SAT

- SAT formula: AND of m clauses
  - n variables (taking values 0 and 1)
  - a literal: a variable x_i or its negation $\overline{x_i}$
  - m clauses, each being OR of some literals.
- SAT Problem: Is there an assignment of variables s.t. the formula evaluates to 1?
- k-SAT: same as SAT but each clause has at most k literals.
- SAT and k-SAT are in **NP**.
- Given any assignment, it's easy to check whether it satisfies all clauses.

Examples of **NP** problems

- Factoring: factor a given number n.
- Decision version: Given (n, k), decide whether n has a factor less than k.

- Factoring is in **NP**: For any candidate factor $m \le k$, it's easy to check whether $m|n$.

Examples of **NP** problems

- TSP (travelling salesperson): On a weighted graph, find a closed cycle visiting each vertex exactly once, with the total weight on the path no more than k.

- Easy to check: Given a cycle, easy to calculate the total weight.

- Graph Isomorphism: Given two graphs G_1 and G_2, decide whether we can permute vertices of G_1 to get G_2.



- Easy to check: For any given permutation, easy to permute G_1 according to it and then compare to G_2.

Question of **P** vs. **NP**

- Is **P** = **NP**?
- The most famous (and notoriously hard) question in computer science.
  - Staggering philosophical and practical implications
  - Withstood a great deal of attacks
- Clay Mathematics Institute recognized it as one of seven great mathematical challenges of the millennium. US$1M.
  - Want to get rich (and famous)? Here is a "simple" way!

The **P** vs. **NP** question: intuition

- Is producing a solution essentially harder than checking a solution?
  - Coming up with a proof vs. verifying a proof.
  - Composing a song vs. appreciating a song.
  - Cooking good food vs. recognizing good food
  - …

What if **P** = **NP**?

- The world becomes a Utopia.
  - Mathematicians are replaced by efficient theorem-discovering machines.
  - It becomes easy to come up with the simplest theory to explain known data
  - …
- But at the same time,
  - Many cryptosystems are insecure.

Completeness

- [Cook-Levin] There is a class of **NP** problems, such that

  solve any of them in polynomial time,
  ⇒ solve all **NP** problems in polynomial time.



Reduction and completeness

- Decision problem for language A is reducible to that for language B in time t if $\exists f: Domain(A) \rightarrow Domain(B)$ s.t. $\forall$ input instance x for A,
  1. $x \in A \Leftrightarrow f(x) \in B$, and
  2. one can compute $f(x)$ in time $t(|x|)$
- Thus to solve A, it is enough to solve B.
  - First compute $f(x)$
  - Run algorithm for B on $f(x)$.
  - If the algorithm outputs $f(x) \in B$, then output $x \in A$.

NP-completeness

- **NP-completeness**: A language L is **NP**-complete if
  - $L \in \mathbf{NP}$
  - $\forall L' \in \mathbf{NP}$, L' is reducible to L in polynomial time.
- Such problems L are the hardest in **NP**.
- Once you can solve L, you can solve any other problem in **NP**.
- **NP**-hard: any **NP** language can reduce to it.
  - i.e. satisfies 2^{nd} condition in **NP**-completeness def.

Completeness

- The hardest problems in **NP**.
- Cook-Levin: SAT.
- Karp: 21 other problems such as TSP are also **NP**-complete
- Later: thousands of **NP**-complete problems from various sciences.



Meanings of **NP**-completeness

- Reduce the number of questions without increasing the number of answers.
- Huge impacts on almost all other sciences such as physics, chemistry, biology, …
  - Now given a computational problem in **NP**, the first step is usually to see whether it's in **P** or NPC.
- "The biggest export of Theoretical Computer Science."

- SAT
- Clique
- Subset Sum
- TSP
- Vertex Cover
- Integer Programming

Not known to be in **P** or **NP**-complete:
- Factoring
- Graph Isomorphism
- Nash Equilibrium
- Local Search

- Shortest Path
- MST
- Maximum Flow
- Maximum Matching
- PRIMES
- Linear Programming



The 1st **NP**-complete problem: 3-SAT

- Any **NP** problem can be verified in polynomial time, by definition.
- Turn the verification algorithm into a formula which checks every step of computation.
- Note that in either circuit definition or Turing machine definition, computation is local.
  - The change of configuration is only at several adjacent locations.

- Thus the verification can be encoded into a sequence of local consistency checks.
- The number of clauses is polynomial
  - The verification algorithm is of polynomial time.
  - Polynomial time also implies polynomial space.
- This shows that SAT is **NP**-complete.
- It turns out that any SAT can be further reduced to 3-SAT problem.

NP-complete problem 1: Clique

- Clique: Given a graph G and a number k, decide whether G has a clique of size $\geq k$.
  - Clique: a complete subgraph.
- Fact: Clique is in **NP**.
- Theorem: If one can solve Clique in polynomial time, then one can also solve 3SAT in polynomial time.
  - So Clique is at least as hard as 3-SAT.
- Corollary: Clique is **NP**-complete.

Approach: reduction

- Given a 3-SAT formula $\varphi = C_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge C_k$, we construct a graph G s.t.
  - if φ is satisfiable, then G has a clique of size k.
  - if φ is unsatisfiable, then G has no clique of size $\geq k$.
  - Note: k is the number of clauses of φ.

- If you can solve the Clique problem, then you can also solve the 3-SAT problem.

Construction

- Put each literal appearing in the formula as a vertex.
  - Literal: x_i and $\overline{x_i}$
  - e.g. $\varphi = (\overline{x_1} \vee x_2 \vee x_3) \wedge (\overline{x_2} \vee x_4 \vee \overline{x_5}) \wedge (x_1 \vee x_3 \vee x_5) \wedge (x_3 \vee \overline{x_4} \vee x_5)$
- Literals from the same clause are not connected.
- Two literals from different clauses are connected if they are not the negation of each other.



φ is satisfied $\Rightarrow G$ has a k-clique

- If φ is satisfied,
- then there is a satisfying assignment $x_1 \dots x_n$ s.t. each clause has at least one literal being 1.
  - E.g. $x = 00111$, then pick $\overline{x_1}, x_4, x_3, x_5$
- And those literals (one from each clause) are consistent.
  - Because they all evaluate to 1
- So the subgraph with these vertices is complete. --- A clique of size k.



G has a k-clique ⇒ φ is satisfied

- If the graph has a clique of size k:
- It must be one vertex from each clause.
  - Vertices from the same clause don't connect.
- And these literals are consistent.
  - Otherwise they don't all connect.
- So we can pick the assignment by these vertices. It satisfies all clauses by satisfying at least one vertex in each clause.



NP-complete problem 2: Vertex Cover

- Vertex Cover: Given a graph G and a number k, decide whether G has a vertex cover of size $\leq k$.
  - V' is a vertex cover if all edges in G are "touched" by vertices from V'.

- Vertex Cover is in **NP**
  - Given a candidate subset $S \subseteq V$, it is easy to check whether "$|S| \leq k$ and S touches whole E".

NP-complete

- Vertex Cover is **NP**-complete.
- Reducing Clique to Vertex Cover.
- For any graph G, the complement of G is $\overline{G}$.
  - If $G = (V, E)$, then $\overline{G} = (V, \overline{E})$.
- Theorem. G has a k-clique

  $\Leftrightarrow \overline{G}$ has a vertex cover of size $n - k$.
- Given this theorem, Clique can be reduced to Vertex Cover.
- So Vertex Cover is **NP**-complete.

Proof of the theorem

- G has a k-clique

$\Leftrightarrow \exists V' \subseteq V, |V'| = k, V'$ is a clique in G

$\Leftrightarrow \exists V' \subseteq V, |V'| = k, V'$ is independent set in $\overline{G}$

  - independent set: $\forall$ two vertices $u, v \in V'$ are not connected in $\overline{G}$.

$\Leftrightarrow \exists V' \subseteq V, |V'| = k, V \backslash V'$ is a vertex cover of $\overline{G}$

$\Leftrightarrow \exists V'' \subseteq V, |V''| = n - k, V''$ is a vertex cover of $\overline{G}$

A related problem: Independent Set

- Independent Set: Decide whether a given graph has an independent set of size at least k.

- The above argument shows that the Independent Set problem is also **NP**-Complete.

Exercise

- *Dominating Set* problem: Given a graph $G = (V, E)$ and an integer K, decide whether G contains a dominating set of size at most K.
  - Dominating set: $S \subseteq V$ s.t. $\forall v \in V$, either $v \in S$ or v has a neighbor in S.
  - Namely, S and S's neighbors cover the entire V.
- Prove that Dominating Set is NP-complete.
- Hint: Reduction from Vertex Cover.

NP-complete problem 3: Integer Programming (IP)

- Any 3-SAT formula can be expressed by integer programming.
- Consider a clause, for example, $\overline{x_1} \vee x_2 \vee x_3$
- $$\overline{x_1} \vee x_2 \vee x_3 = 1, \qquad x_1, x_2, x_3 \in \{0,1\}$$
  $$\Leftrightarrow (1 - x_1) + x_2 + x_3 \geq 1, \qquad x_1, x_2, x_3 \in \{0,1\}$$
- Indeed, when all $x_1, x_2, x_3 \in \{0,1\}$,
  $$\overline{x_1} \vee x_2 \vee x_3 = 0$$
  $$\Leftrightarrow x_1 = 1, x_2 = 0, x_3 = 0$$
  $$\Leftrightarrow (1 - x_1) + x_2 + x_3 = 0$$

- So the satisfiability problem on a 3SAT formula like $(\overline{x_1} \vee x_2 \vee x_3) \wedge (\overline{x_2} \vee x_4 \vee \overline{x_5}) \wedge (x_1 \vee x_3 \vee x_5) \wedge (x_3 \vee \overline{x_4} \vee x_5)$ is reduced to the feasibility problem of the following IP:
- $(1 - x_1) + x_2 + x_3 \geq 1,$
  $(1 - x_2) + x_4 + (1 - x_5) \geq 1,$
  $x_1 + x_3 + x_5 \geq 1,$
  $x_3 + (1 - x_4) + x_5 \geq 1,$
  $x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, x_5 \in \{0,1\}$
- So if one can solve IP efficiently, then one can also solve 3SAT efficiently.

Summary

- **NP**: problems that can be verified in polynomial time.
- An important concept: **NP**-complete.
  - The hardest problems in **NP**.
- Whether **P**=**NP** is the biggest open question in computer science.
- Proofs of **NP**-completeness usually use reduction.

Next

- Next class: April 14th.
- Make-up Class:
  - To be decided.
- Either class: Nothing about final exam.

- Final: Open book and lecture notes.
  - Again, no ipad/iphone/Internet…