6.045J/18.400J: Automata, Computability and Complexity

Nancy Lynch

Homework 10.5 (Fake)

Due: Never

Vinod Vaikuntanathan

Readings: Sipser, Sections 8.5, 8.6, and 10.2.

**Problem 1**: (Sipser 8.13) Show that TQBF restricted to formulas where the part following the quantifiers is in conjunctive normal form is still PSPACE-complete.

**Problem 2**: (Sipser 8.27) Recall that a directed graph is *strongly connected* if every two nodes are connected by a directed path in each direction. Let

STRONGLY-CONNECTED = { $\langle G \rangle$  | G is a strongly connected graph}.

Show that STRONGLY-CONNECTED is NL-complete.

**Problem 3**: This problem uses the ideas in the proof of Theorem 8.27.

Describe a nondeterministic log-space Turing machine M that decides the language

 $L = \{ \langle G, s, m, k \rangle | G \text{ is a directed graph, } s \text{ is a node in } G, m, k \in \mathbb{N}, \text{ and exactly} \}$ m nodes of G are reachable from  $s \in G$  by paths consisting of at most k edges.

That is, if exactly m nodes are reachable from  $s \in G$  by paths of length at most k, than M must accept  $\langle G, s, m, k \rangle$  on some computation path. On the other hand, if more or fewer than m nodes are reachable from  $s \in G$  by paths of length at most k, then M must reject  $\langle G, s, m, k \rangle$  on all computation paths.

Explain why your Turing machine M works correctly and why it works in log space.

**Problem 4**: Define the language class PP as follows: A language  $L \in PP$  if and only if there exists a probabilistic polynomial time Turing machine such that:

 $\begin{array}{l} \cdot \ \, \mathrm{If} \ w \in L, \ \mathrm{then} \ \mathrm{Pr}[M \ \mathrm{accepts} \ w] \geq \frac{1}{2}. \\ \cdot \ \, \mathrm{If} \ w \not\in L, \ \mathrm{then} \ \mathrm{Pr}[M \ \mathrm{accepts} \ w] < \frac{1}{2}. \end{array}$ 

Prove that:

1. BPP  $\subseteq$  PP. 2. NP  $\subseteq$  PP.

3.  $PP \subseteq PSPACE$ .

Hint for (2): Consider a nondeterministic TM for L, and replace rejections with probabilistic decisions.

**Problem 5**: The class RP is the class of languages L for which there is a probabilistic Turing machine M that always terminates in polynomial time, and such that for all  $w \notin L$ , M always reject w, and for all  $w \in L$ , M accepts w with probability at least  $\frac{2}{3}$ . The class coRP is the class of languages whose complement is in RP.

So far, we have only discussed machines that *always* terminate in polynomial time, but that give a correct answer only with some probability. Here we consider machines that *always* give the right answer when they terminate, but that run in time that is only polynomial on average.

Show that for any language  $L \in \mathbb{RP} \cap \operatorname{coRP}$  there is a probabilistic Turing machine M that runs in expected polynomial time (i.e., the expected number of steps until M terminates is bounded by a polynomial), and that when w terminates it accepts if and only if  $w \in L$ .

This class  $RP \cap coRP$  is called ZPP for "zero probability polynomial".

Problem 6: (Fermat's test) Sipser 10.15. Prove Fermat's little theorem. That is, prove that

If p is prime, and  $a \in \mathbb{Z}_p^+$ , then  $a^{p-1} \equiv 1 \pmod{p}$ 

(Hint: Consider the sequence  $a, a^2, \ldots$  What must happen, and how ?)

**Problem 7**: (Branching program example) Show that the majority function can be computed by a branching program that has  $O(n^2)$  nodes.

Problem 8: (Branching program equivalence test)

- 1. Give a read-once branching program  $B_1$  that computes the function of three Boolean variables,  $x_1, x_2$ , and  $x_3$ , that has value 1 if and only if exactly one or exactly three of the variables have value 1.
- 2. Give a different read-once branching program  $B_2$  that computes the same function as in part (a).
- 3. Compute the polynomials  $p_1$  and  $p_2$  associated with the output 1 box for programs  $B_1$  and  $B_2$ , respectively, using the rules given in Sipser's book, p. 378.
- 4. Choose arbitrary values from  $Z_7$  for the three variables, and evaluate  $p_1$  and  $p_2$  to check that they indeed give the same result.