

# PS Complexity of Polynomial-Time Problems

<https://www.cosy.sbg.ac.at/~sk/courses/polycomp/>

Exercise sheet 2

Due: Sunday, November 19, 2017

Total points : 40

Prove all your claims!

## Exercise 1 (10 points)

Prove the following: If there is a decision algorithm to check whether for a given pair of sets  $A, B \in \{0, 1\}^d$  there exists a pair of vectors  $a \in A, b \in B$  such that  $a \perp b$  with running time  $O(n^{2-\epsilon} \text{poly}(d))$  (for some constant  $\epsilon > 0$ ), then there also is an algorithm with running time  $O(n^{2-\delta} \text{poly}(d))$  (for some constant  $\delta > 0$ ) that, given pair of sets  $A, B \in \{0, 1\}^d$ , outputs a pair  $a \in A, b \in B$  such that  $a \perp b$  if such a pair exists.

## Exercise 2 (10 points)

Consider the **Longest Palindromic Subsequence** problem: Given a sequence  $S$  of length  $n$ , find the longest common subsequence which is a palindrome (i.e., a sequence of characters which reads the same forward and backward).

Prove that, assuming **OVH**, there is no algorithm for **Longest Palindromic Subsequence** with running time  $O(n^{2-\epsilon})$  (for any constant  $\epsilon > 0$ ).

## Exercise 3 (10 points)

Consider the **Hitting Set** problem: Given two lists of  $n$  subsets over a universe  $U$  of size  $d = |U|$ , determine if there is a set in the first list that intersects every set in the second list, i.e. a “hitting set”.

The **HSH** (Hitting Set Hypothesis) states that **Hitting Set** admits no algorithm with running time  $O(n^{2-\epsilon} \cdot \text{poly}(d))$  (for any constant  $\epsilon > 0$ ). Prove that **HSH** implies **OVH**.

*Hint: Be careful about the direction this reduction has to go. In the lecture, we gave a reduction from **All-Pairs Negative Triangle** to **Negative Triangle**. The same type of reduction will work here.*

## Exercise 4 (10 points)

Recall the following formal definition of *subcubic reductions*: Let **P** and **Q** be computational problems with a common size measure  $n$  on the inputs. We say that there is a subcubic reduction from **P** to **Q** if there is an algorithm  $\mathcal{A}$  with oracle access to **Q** satisfying three properties:

- For every instance  $x$  of  $\mathbf{P}$ ,  $\mathcal{A}(x)$  solves the problem  $\mathbf{P}$  on  $x$ .
- Excluding oracle calls,  $\mathcal{A}$  runs in time  $O(n^{3-\gamma})$  (for some constant  $\gamma > 0$ ) on instances of size  $n$ .
- For every constant  $\varepsilon > 0$  there is a constant  $\delta > 0$  such that for every instance  $x$  of  $\mathbf{P}$  of size  $n$  we have  $\sum_i n_i^{3-\varepsilon} \leq n^{3-\delta}$ , where  $n_i$  is the size of the  $i$ th oracle call to  $\mathbf{Q}$  in  $\mathcal{A}(x)$ .

We use the notation  $\mathbf{P} \leq \mathbf{Q}$  to denote the existence of a subcubic reduction from  $\mathbf{P}$  to  $\mathbf{Q}$ . Prove that subcubic reductions are transitive. In other words, prove that if  $\mathbf{P} \leq \mathbf{Q}$  and  $\mathbf{Q} \leq \mathbf{R}$  then  $\mathbf{P} \leq \mathbf{R}$ .