

# CSCE 629-601 Analysis of Algorithms

Fall 2022

**Instructor:** Dr. Jianer Chen

**Office:** PETR 428

**Phone:** (979) 845-4259

**Email:** chen@cse.tamu.edu

**Office Hours:** MWF 3:50pm–5:00pm

**Teaching Assistant:** Vaibhav Bajaj

**Office:** EABC 107B

**Phone:** (979) 739-2707

**Email:** vaibhavbajaj@tamu.edu

**Office Hours:** T; 2pm–3pm, TR: 4pm–5pm

## Quick References on NP-Completeness Theory

### Definitions.

1. A problem  $Q$  is solvable in **polynomial time** if there is an algorithm that solves the problem  $Q$  in time  $O(n^c)$ , where  $c$  is a constant.
2. The class  $\mathcal{P}$  consists of all (decision) problems that can be solved in polynomial time. Thus,  $\mathcal{P}$  is the collection of all “easy” (or, feasible) problems.
3.  $\mathcal{NP}$  is the class of all (decision) problems whose solutions, though perhaps not easy to construct, but can be verified in polynomial time. Formally, a problem  $Q$  is in  $\mathcal{NP}$  if there is an algorithm  $A(x, y)$  on two parameters  $x$  and  $y$  such that
  - (a) If  $x$  is a yes-instance of  $Q$ , then there is a  $y$  such that  $A(x, y) = 1$ ;
  - (b) If  $x$  is a no-instance of  $Q$ , then for all  $y$ ,  $A(x, y) = 0$ ; and
  - (c)  $A(x, y)$  runs in time polynomial in  $|x|$  (i.e., in time  $O(|x|^c)$  for a constant  $c$ ).
4. For two decision problems  $Q_1$  and  $Q_2$ , we say that  $Q_1$  is **polynomial-time reducible to**  $Q_2$ , written  $Q_1 \leq_m^p Q_2$ , if there is a polynomial-time algorithm  $R$  such that  $x$  is a yes-instance of  $Q_1$  if and only if  $R(x)$  is a yes-instance of  $Q_2$ .
5. A problem  $Q$  is  **$\mathcal{NP}$ -hard** if for every problem  $Q'$  in  $\mathcal{NP}$ , we have  $Q' \leq_m^p Q$ . A problem  $Q$  is  **$\mathcal{NP}$ -complete** if it is in  $\mathcal{NP}$  and is  $\mathcal{NP}$ -hard.
6. The SATISFIABILITY problem (SAT): given a CNF formula  $F$ , decide if  $F$  is satisfiable (i.e., if there is an assignment to  $F$  that makes  $F = \text{TRUE}$ ).
7. The INDEPENDENT-SET problem (IS): given a graph  $G$  and an integer  $k$ , decide if  $G$  contains an independent set  $I$  of  $k$  vertices (i.e., a set  $I$  of  $k$  vertices in which no two vertices are adjacent).
8. The VERTEX-COVER problem (VC): given a graph  $G$  and an integer  $k$ , decide if  $G$  contains a vertex cover  $C$  of  $k$  vertices (i.e., a set  $C$  of  $k$  vertices such that every edge in  $G$  has at least one end in  $C$ ).
9. The PARTITION problem: given a set  $S = \{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n\}$  of  $n$  integers, can  $S$  be partitioned into two sets  $L$  and  $R$ , i.e.,  $S = L \cup R$  and  $L \cap R = \emptyset$ , such that  $\sum_{a_i \in L} a_i = \sum_{a_j \in R} a_j$ ?
10. The problems SATISFIABILITY, INDEPENDENT-SET, VERTEX-COVER, CLIQUE, PARTITION, SUBSET-SUM, and KNAPSACK are all  $\mathcal{NP}$ -complete.

## Some (informal but intuitive and helpful) Statements

1.  $\mathcal{P}$  is the collection of all “easy” problems. A problem that cannot be solved in polynomial time (i.e., not in  $\mathcal{P}$ ) is regraded as being hard.
2. When we compare the “hardness” of problems, we compare them “up to polynomial time”. Thus, if the complexities of two problems differ by a polynomial factor (i.e., by  $n^c$  for a constant  $c$ ), we would regard them as having the “same” complexity, i.e., they are either both easy or both hard. For example, if problem  $Q_1$  is solvable in time  $O(n^2)$  while problem  $Q_2$  is solvable in time  $O(n^5)$ , then we regard  $Q_2$  as *not* harder than  $Q_1$ .
3.  $\mathcal{NP}$  is the collection of all (decision) problems whose solutions can be verified “easily.” Thus, when we say “a problem  $Q$  is in  $\mathcal{NP}$ ,” what we really wanted to emphasize is the “easiness” of the problem, i.e., the solutions of the problem are easily verified. The statement has nothing to do with the “hardness” of the problem. In particular, all easy problems (i.e., problems in  $\mathcal{P}$ ) are in  $\mathcal{NP}$ .
4.  $Q_1 \leq_m^p Q_2$  means that  $Q_1$  is not harder than  $Q_2$ , or that  $Q_2$  is not easier than  $Q_1$ . As a consequence, if  $Q_1$  is hard, then  $Q_2$  is also hard, and if  $Q_2$  is easy, then  $Q_1$  is also easy.
5. A problem is  $\mathcal{NP}$ -hard if it is not easier than any problems in  $\mathcal{NP}$ . A problem is  $\mathcal{NP}$ -complete if it is the hardest problem in  $\mathcal{NP}$ . There are  $\mathcal{NP}$ -hard problems that are not in  $\mathcal{NP}$  (i.e., they are not  $\mathcal{NP}$ -complete).
6. The logic of using  $\mathcal{NP}$ -hardness: Since  $\mathcal{NP}$  contains many known problems that seem hard (i.e., we do not know how to solve them in polynomial time), and since an  $\mathcal{NP}$ -hard problem is not easier than any problem in  $\mathcal{NP}$ , an  $\mathcal{NP}$ -hard (including  $\mathcal{NP}$ -complete) problem is believed to be hard, though there is no formal proof for this.
7. By definition, all (decision) problems in  $\mathcal{P}$  are in  $\mathcal{NP}$ , i.e.,  $\mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathcal{NP}$ . Whether all problems in  $\mathcal{NP}$  are easy (i.e., if  $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{NP}$ ) is the most famous open problem in computer science. It is commonly believed that  $\mathcal{P} \neq \mathcal{NP}$ . Under this hypothesis, all  $\mathcal{NP}$ -hard problems are hard (i.e., cannot be solved in polynomial time).
8. To show  $Q_1 \leq_m^p Q_2$ , you need to construct a polynomial-time algorithm  $R$  that computes a function  $f$  such that  $x$  is a yes-instance of  $Q_1$  if and only if  $f(x)$  is a yes-instance of  $Q_2$ . The algorithm  $R$  can be highly non-trivial, and in general heavily depends on the problems  $Q_1$  and  $Q_2$ .
9. To prove that a problem  $Q$  is in  $\mathcal{NP}$ , you need to construct a polynomial-time algorithm  $A(x, y)$  such that for any yes-instance  $x_1$  of  $Q$ , there is a  $y_1$  such that  $A(x_1, y_1) = 1$ , and for any no-instance  $x_2$  of  $Q$ ,  $A(x_2, y) = 0$  for all  $y$ . In most cases, the algorithm  $A$  is rather trivial and straightforward.
10. To prove that a problem  $Q$  is  $\mathcal{NP}$ -hard, you need to pick a problem  $Q_0$  that is known to be  $\mathcal{NP}$ -hard, and show  $Q_0 \leq_m^p Q$ .
11. To prove that a problem  $Q$  is  $\mathcal{NP}$ -complete, you need to prove both that  $Q$  is  $\mathcal{NP}$ -hard and that  $Q$  is in  $\mathcal{NP}$ .
12. Remember the definitions of the following  $\mathcal{NP}$ -complete problems: INDEPENDENT-SET, VERTEX-COVER, CLIQUE, PARTITION, SUBSET-SUM, KNAPSACK, and SATISFIABILITY.