

# Cook's Theorem

Jason Belt  
CIS 890

Lecture material adapted from Dr. Howell's CIS 770 lecture notes

October 26, 2010

# Computational Complexity

**Defn:** Let  $T : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ . A TM  $M$  is said to have time complexity  $T(n)$  if on every input string  $w$ ,  $M$  takes no more than  $T(|w|)$  transitions.

**Defn:**  $\mathcal{P}$  is the set of all languages  $L \subseteq \{0, 1\}^*$  such that there is a polynomial  $p(n)$  and a TM  $M$  with time complexity  $p(n)$  such that  $L(M) = L$ .

**Defn:**  $\mathcal{NP}$  is the set of all languages  $L \subseteq \{0, 1\}^*$  such that there is a polynomial  $p(n)$  and a nondeterministic TM  $M$  with the time complexity  $p(n)$  such that  $L(M) = L$ .

# $\mathcal{NP}$ Classes

**Defn:** A language  $L$  is said to be  $\mathcal{NP}$ -hard if for every  $L' \in \mathcal{NP}$ ,  $L' \leq_m^p L$ .

# $\mathcal{NP}$ Classes

**Defn:** A language  $L$  is said to be  $\mathcal{NP}$ -hard if for every  $L' \in \mathcal{NP}$ ,  $L' \leq_m^p L$ .

$$L_1 \leq_m^p L_2$$

Let  $L_1 \subseteq \Sigma^*$ ,  $L_2 \subseteq \Delta^*$ . We say  $L_1 \leq_m^p L_2$  if there exists a TM  $M = (Q, \Sigma, \Gamma, \delta, q_0, B, \{q\})$  with polynomial running time complexity such that

- ▶  $\Delta \subseteq \Gamma$ ;
- ▶ on every input,  $M$  halts on an ID  $qy$  for some  $y \in \Delta^*$ ; and
- ▶ if  $q_0x \vdash_M^* qy$ , then  $x \in L_1$  iff  $y \in L_2$

# $\mathcal{NP}$ Classes

**Defn:** A language  $L$  is said to be  $\mathcal{NP}$ -hard if for every  $L' \in \mathcal{NP}$ ,  $L' \leq_m^p L$ .

$$L_1 \leq_m^p L_2$$

Let  $L_1 \subseteq \Sigma^*$ ,  $L_2 \subseteq \Delta^*$ . We say  $L_1 \leq_m^p L_2$  if there exists a TM  $M = (Q, \Sigma, \Gamma, \delta, q_0, B, \{q\})$  with polynomial running time complexity such that

- ▶  $\Delta \subseteq \Gamma$ ;
- ▶ on every input,  $M$  halts on an ID  $qy$  for some  $y \in \Delta^*$ ; and
- ▶ if  $q_0x \vdash_M^* qy$ , then  $x \in L_1$  iff  $y \in L_2$

**Defn:** If  $L \in \mathcal{NP}$ -hard and  $L \in \mathcal{NP}$  then  $L$  is said to be  $\mathcal{NP}$ -complete.

# Boolean Satisfiability (SAT)

**Input:** A boolean formula  $\mathcal{F}$  consisting of boolean variables and the operators  $\wedge, \vee, \neg$

**Question:** Is there an assignment of boolean values to the variables in  $\mathcal{F}$  that causes  $\mathcal{F}$  to evaluate to **true**

**Claim:**  $L_{SAT} \in \mathcal{NP}$ -complete, where  $L_{SAT}$  denotes the language of satisfiable formulas encoded over  $\{0, 1\}$

# Cook's Theorem: $SAT \in \mathcal{NP}$ -complete

## Proof:

### 1. $L_{SAT} \in \mathcal{NP}$ .

- ▶ Use a NTM to guess a truth assignment  $T$  for a given expression  $E$ . If  $|E| = n$  then  $O(n)$  time suffices on a multitape NTM. Note that there may be as many as  $2^n$  unique truth assignments.
- ▶ Evaluate  $E$  for the truth assignment  $T$ . Can be done in  $O(n^2)$  time on a multitape NTM

### 2. $L_{SAT} \in \mathcal{NP}$ -hard

## Proof idea:

- ▶ For each language  $L$  in  $\mathcal{NP}$ , there is a polynomial  $p(n)$  and a nondeterministic TM  $M$  with time complexity  $p(n)$  such that  $L(M) = L$
- ▶ From  $w \in \{0, 1\}^*$ , we construct a formula  $\mathcal{F}$  that is satisfiable iff there is an accepting computation of  $M$  on  $w$
- ▶ The time for the construction will be polynomial in  $p(n)$

# Cook's Theorem: $SAT \in \mathcal{NP}$ -complete

## Construction overview:

- ▶ We will view a computation as a sequence of IDs  $\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_{p(n)}$  such that either  $\alpha_i \vdash \alpha_{i+1}$  or  $\alpha_i = \alpha_{i+1}$ .
- ▶ Each  $\alpha_i$  will be of the form  $X_{-p_n} \cdots X_0 \cdots X_{p(n)+1}$  where  $X_j$  is either a tape symbol or a state.
- ▶ We use boolean variable  $y_{ijA}$  to denote whether  $X_j$  of  $\alpha_j$  is  $A$ .
- ▶  $\mathcal{F}$  will constrain the sequence of IDs to be an accepting computation of  $w$ .



# Cook's Theorem: $SAT \in \mathcal{NP}$ -complete

We will describe a set of formulas, each enforcing certain constraints on the variables  $y_{ijA}$ , for  $0 \leq i \leq p(n)$ ,  $-p(n) \leq j \leq p(n) + 1$ ,  $A \in Q \cup \Gamma$ .

$\mathcal{F}$  will be the conjunction of these formulas.

$\alpha_0$  is the initial ID:

- ▶  $y_{00q_0}$
- ▶  $y_{0ja_j}$  for  $1 \leq j \leq n$ , where  $a_1 \cdots a_n = w$ .
- ▶  $y_{0jB}$  for  $-p(n) \leq j < 0$ ,  $n < j \leq p(n) + 1$ .

$\alpha_{p(n)}$  contains a final state

$$\bigvee_{j=-p(n)}^{p(n)+1} \bigvee_{q \in F} y_{p(n)jq}$$

## Cook's Theorem: $SAT \in \mathcal{NP}$ -complete

- ▶ We still need to enforce that  $\alpha_i \vdash \alpha_{i+1}$  or  $\alpha_i = \alpha_{i+1}$  for  $0 \leq i \leq p(n)$ .
- ▶ For  $0 \leq i \leq p(n)$ ,  $-p(n) \leq j \leq p(n) + 1$ , we construct a formula enforcing one of the following
  1.  $X_{ij}$  is a state and  $X_{i+1,j-1}X_{i+1,j}X_{i+1,j+1}$  results from doing nothing or taking a transition of  $M$  from  $X_{i,j-1}X_{ij}X_{i,j+1}$  (if  $j = -p(n)$  or  $j = p(n) + 1$ , this is omitted); or
  2.  $X_{i,j-1}$ ,  $X_{ij}$ , and  $X_{i,j+1}$  are not states, and  $X_{i+1,j} = X_{ij}$

# Cook's Theorem: $SAT \in \mathcal{NP}$ -complete

Constraint 1 is enforced by the disjunction of the following formulas:

- ▶ For each  $q \in Q$ ,  $X, Y \in \Gamma$ , and  $(q', Z, R) \in \delta(q, Y)$ :  
 $y_{i,j-1,X} \wedge y_{i+1,j-1,X} \wedge y_{ijq} \wedge y_{i+1,j,Z} \wedge y_{i,j+1,Y} \wedge y_{i+1,j+1,q'}$ .
- ▶ For each  $q \in Q$ ,  $X, Y \in \Gamma$ , and  $(q', Z, L) \in \delta(q, Y)$ :  
 $y_{i,j-1,X} \wedge y_{i+1,j-1,q'} \wedge y_{ijq} \wedge y_{i+1,j,X} \wedge y_{i,j+1,Y} \wedge y_{i+1,j+1,Z}$ .
- ▶ For each  $q \in Q$ ,  $X, Y \in \Gamma$ :  
 $y_{i,j-1,X} \wedge y_{i+1,j-1,X} \wedge y_{ijq} \wedge y_{i+1,j,q} \wedge y_{i,j+1,Y} \wedge y_{i+1,j+1,Y}$ .

# Cook's Theorem: $SAT \in \mathcal{NP}$ -complete

Constraint 2 is enforced by the conjunction of:

- ▶  $\bigvee_{X \in \Gamma} y_{i,j-1,X}$ ;
- ▶  $\bigvee_{X \in \Gamma} (y_{ijX} \wedge y_{i+1,j,X})$ ; and
- ▶  $\bigvee_{X \in \Gamma} y_{i,j+1,X}$ .

Conjuncts containing out-of-bounds subscripts are omitted.

- ▶ The formula can be constructed in polynomial time.
- ▶ The formula is satisfiable iff  $M$  has an accepting computation on  $w$
- ▶ Therefore, SAT is  $\mathcal{NP}$ -hard.