P -vs- NP

P = polynomial time
- There are many problems that can be solved correctly using algorithms that run in $O(n^c)$ time for some constant $c$.
- NOTE: We can say that an $n \log n$ algorithm is in $P$ since $n \log n \in O(n^2)$.

NP = non-deterministic polynomial time
- There are also many problems where you can look at a proposed solution to a problem and determine whether it is a valid solution in polynomial time.
- This “proposed solution” is typically called a certificate.
Non-Deterministic?

The “non-deterministic” part of the name “NP” comes from the idea that you could (in theory) run these verification checks on LOTS (all) potential solutions simultaneously on a non-deterministic machine.

We will just say that a problem is in NP if a “certificate” can be verified in polynomial time.

Satisfiability (SAT)

Given a Boolean expression over \( n \) variables in conjunctive normal form, is there a way to assign values to the \( n \) variables that will make the entire expression true?

For example, the following are each a simple example of that type of question on just two variables:

\[(u \text{ OR } \neg v) \text{ AND } (\neg u \text{ OR } v)\]
\[\neg u \text{ AND } (u \text{ OR } v) \text{ AND } (u \text{ OR } \neg v)\]

For the general problem on any type of Boolean expression there is no known polynomial time solution as of now but what about some general sub-cases?
**CNF**

Disjunction = “or’
Conjunction = “and”

We’ll define a **clause** as a **disjunction** of some number of Boolean variables.

When a Boolean expression is in “conjunctive normal form” that means that it contains an arbitrary number of clauses joined by conjunction.

Examples:
- \((A \lor C) \land (B \lor C)\)
- \((A \lor B \lor C) \land (A \land \neg C) \land (\neg B \lor C)\)

---

**#-CNF**

We’ll say that a Boolean expression is a #-CNF Boolean expression if every disjunctive clause is a disjunction of exactly # items (again, the clauses are joined by conjunction).

From our previous examples the first one of \((A \lor C) \land (B \lor C)\) is 2-CNF but the second one doesn’t have a consistent pattern so wouldn’t be any #-CNF as expressed.
2-SAT

In “2-SAT” you are given a 2-CNF Boolean expression and are asked whether there is a set of assignments to the variables that will cause the entire expression to evaluate to TRUE.

For example, given:
- \((A \lor C) \land (B \lor C)\)

one valid solution is \(A=\text{true}, B=\text{true}\).

Note that there MIGHT be more than one solution; we just care whether there IS a solution in this problem.

Is this satisfiable?

\[
(A \lor C) \land \\
(A \lor \sim D) \land \\
(B \lor \sim D) \land \\
(B \lor \sim E) \land \\
(C \lor \sim E) \land \\
(A \lor \sim F) \land \\
(B \lor \sim F) \land \\
(C \lor \sim F) \land \\
(D \lor \sim G) \land \\
(F \lor \sim G)
\]

I have no idea at a glance...
APT Algorithm

Aspvall, Plass, and Tarjan - 1979

Their idea was to construct a graph where each variable is a vertex and the negation of each variable is a vertex. Now, for each clause \((X \lor Y)\) add a pair of directed edges \(\neg X \rightarrow Y\) and \(\neg Y \rightarrow X\) to the graph.

– (think back to 250 for why this makes sense)

Then, run a strongly connected components algorithm (like the \(|V|+|E|\) one by Tarjan we saw earlier in the semester) on this graph.

We can now say that the 2-CNF expression that was used to construct the graph is satisfiable if and only if no variable and its negation appear in the same strongly connected component.

Let’s start with a small one…

\((\neg A \lor \neg B) \land (\neg A \lor \neg C) \land (A \lor \neg D) \land (\neg B \lor \neg C) \land (B \lor \neg D) \land (B \lor D)\)

Build the graph.
Identify the largest SCCs.
Check for a variable and its negation.

What’s the runtime in terms of the number of Boolean variables?
3-SAT

In “3-SAT” you are given a 3-CNF Boolean expression and are asked whether there is a set of assignments to the variables that will cause the entire expression to evaluate to TRUE.

Question: Do you think there is a similar technique for solving this variation in polynomial time?

There is currently no known polynomial time solution for this problem.

– Why do we care that this is the case?
  • In 1971 it was established as an NP-Complete problem by Cook.