1 Known Theorems and Definitions

Notation 1.1 P is the set of problems that are in polynomial time. Just think *can be solved quickly*.

Note that if P = NP that means that one can determine quickly if a formula has a satisfying assignment. Can one also *find* a satisfying assignment if one exists? Yes:

Lemma 1.2 If P = NP then there exists a poly-time algorithm that will, on input ϕ , do the following.

- 1. If $\phi \notin SAT$ then the output is NO
- 2. If $\phi \in SAT$ then the output is \vec{a} where $\phi(\vec{a}) = T$ (so the output is a satisfying assignment).

Note that SAT is a \exists question: Does THERE EXIST a satisfying assignment? But what about a $\exists \forall$ question? If P = NP then are those also easy? Yes:

Lemma 1.3 Assume P = NP then the following are true.

1. Let B be a set of pairs that is in P. (Think given x, y, determining $(x, y) \in B$ can be done quickly). Let q be a polynomial. Then the following problem is in P

$$A = \{x \colon (\exists y, |y| \le q(|x|)) [(x, y) \in B\}.$$

Example Let

$$B = \{(\phi, \vec{y}) \colon \phi(\vec{y}) = T\}.$$

Then

$$A = \{\phi \colon (\exists y, |y| \le q(|x|)) [(\phi, y) \in B\}.$$

Note that A is SAT.

Non-SAT Example G is a set of cities and a table that tells you how much it costs to go from one to the other. c is a cost so just a natural number. y is a sequence of cities so that you hit every one once.

$$B = \{(G, c), y)\}: The sequence y costs \le c \}.$$

Then

$$A = \{ (G, c) \colon (\exists y) [The sequence y \ costs \le c \}.$$

HENCEFORTH $(\exists^p x)$ and $(\forall^p x)$ WILL MEAN THAT THE DOMAIN OF x IS STRINGS BOUNDED BY SOME POLY IN THE LENGTH OF THE PREVIOUS VARIABLES.

2. Let B be a set of triples that are in P (just think given x, y, z, determining $(x, y, z) \in B$ can be done quickly). Let q be a polynomial. Then the following problem is in P

$$A = \{x \colon (\exists^p y)(\forall^p z) [(x, y, z) \in B].\}$$

Example Let $\phi(\vec{x}, \vec{y})$ be a formula with variables in \vec{x} and \vec{y} . So its really $\phi(x_1, \ldots, x_n, y_1, \ldots, y_m)$.

$$B = \{ (\phi, \vec{x}, \vec{y}) \colon \phi(\vec{x}, \phi y) = T \}.$$

Then

$$A = \{\phi(\vec{x}, \vec{y}) \colon (\exists \vec{x}) (\forall \vec{y}) [\phi(\vec{x}, \vec{y})].$$

Note that A is not SAT, its a $\exists \forall$ version of SAT.

3. Let B be a set of four-tuples (or five-tuples etc.) that are in P. Similar to last part.

Say we have that SAT is in Poly Time but perhaps with a large polynomial. Can we ASK if there is a better program? Yes, though in a limited domain:

Lemma 1.4 If P = NP then there exists a poly-time algorithm that will, on input program M, a poly q, and a number n will do the following.

- If M is an algorithm for SAT restricted to ≤ n variables such that on any input on k ≤ n variables runs in time ≤ q(k) then output YES. (So if M is a FAST algorithm for SAT restricted to ≤ n variables then output YES.)
- 2. Otherwise output NO

Proof:

For this problme we take the number of variables to be the size of a formula .

Let A be the set of all (M, q, n) such that the following are true

- 1. $(\forall \phi, |\phi| = m \le n)[M(\phi) \text{ runs in time } \le q(m)].$
- 2. $(\forall \phi, |\phi| = m \le n)[M(\phi) = \vec{a} \to \phi(\vec{a}) = T].$

If $M(\phi)$ outputs a vector, its a satisfying assignment.

3. $(\forall \phi, |\phi| = m \le n)[M(\phi) = NO \to (\forall \vec{a})[\phi(\vec{a}) = F].$ If $M(\phi)$ outputs NO then ϕ is NOT satisfiable.

This can be written with quantifiers and fit into the form of Lemma 1.3. Hence the problem is in P.

Can we actually FIND a better algorithm? Yes.

Lemma 1.5 If P = NP then there exists a poly-time algorithm that will, on input a poly q, and a number n will do the following: Determine if there exists an Algorithm M as in the last lemma, and if so then OUTPUT THE ALGORITHM.

Theorem 1.6 Assume P = NP (though perhaps with a terrible algorithm). Assume there exists a better algorithm that works when the number of variables is $\leq 10^{10}$. Then we can find that algorithm.

Proof:

Run the algorithm in Lemma 1.4 on smaller and smaller polynomials (and $n = 10^{10}$) until you find a small polynomial (small enough for your purposes) where it says YES.

Note the following

- 1. Since you may have P = NP but with a terrible algorithm, finding the better algorithm will take a long time. But its a one-time cost.
- 2. The inventor of the terrible P = NP algorithm probably understood the algorithm, as did others who looked at it. But the new much-better algorithm was machine generated and hence it is possible, indeed likely, that nobody understands it.
- 3. I am assuming that there exists a good algorithm. If this is incorrect, thats sad, but the approach above will verify that there is no good algorithm.