

# CPTH 3

Saswata Mukherjee (BMC201945)  
Somnath Bhattacharjee (BMC201954)

April 23, 2021

## Question 1.

Let for a fixed TM  $M$ ,  $T_{M,x}$  be the r.v. for the time taken by  $M$  to conclude on the input  $x$

Let  $L \in ZPP$  with the TM  $M$

$\therefore E(T_{M,x}) \leq p(|x|)$  for some polynomial  $p$

Now we will design a PTM  $M'$  for  $L$ :

on input  $x$ ,  $M'$  will run  $x$  on  $M$  for  $3p(|x|)$  and answer accordingly. If the computation is not done yet, it will simply reject  $x$ .

So clearly if  $x \notin L$  then anyway  $M'$  will reject it

So  $P[M'(x) = 0] = 1$

if  $x \in L$  then if it halts within  $3p(|x|)$  steps then surely  $M'(x) = M(x) = 1$  or  $P[M'(x) = 1] = 1$

otherwise

$$\begin{aligned} P[M'(x) = 0] &= P[T_{M,x} > 3p(|x|)] \\ &\leq \frac{E(T_{M,x})}{3p(|x|)} && \text{(marcov's inequality)} \\ &\leq \frac{p(|x|)}{3p(|x|)} = \frac{1}{3} \end{aligned}$$

Hence  $L \in RP$

Hence  $ZPP \subseteq RP$

Hence  $\text{co-ZPP} \subseteq \text{co-RP}$

Now it is quite obvious that  $ZPP = \text{co-ZPP}$  as we can simply swap the accept and reject state

Hence  $ZPP \subseteq RP \cap \text{co-RP}$

Now let  $L \in RP \cap \text{co-RP}$

So we have  $M_1$  to recognise  $L$  for  $RP$  and  $M_2$  to recognise  $L$  for  $\text{co-RP}$

We will design a new TM  $M$  which on input  $x$  runs  $x$  on  $M_1$  and  $M_2$  both. If  $M_1(x) = 1$  then  $M(x) = 1$  and if  $M_2(x) = 0$  then  $M(x) = 0$

(Note  $M_1(x) = 1$  and  $M_2(x) = 0$  both cannot happen simultaneously)  
 if any of these does not happen then it will repeat this step again and again.

Clearly  $M$  will never err.

say,  $N_{M,x}$  is the random variable for number of iterations needed for  $M(x)$   
 and  $A_i$  is the event that,  $M(x)$  reaches  $i$ th iteration.

so,  $Pr(A_{i+1}|A_i) \leq \frac{1}{3}$  for all  $i \geq 1$  (from definition of RP, co-RP)

so,  $Pr(A_{i+1}) = Pr(A_{i+1} \cap A_i)$  (as,  $A_{i+1} \subset A_i$ )

$= Pr(A_{i+1}|A_i)Pr(A_i) \leq \frac{1}{3}Pr(A_i) = \dots \leq \frac{1}{3^{i-1}}$  (by induction)

say,  $B_i$  is the event that  $M(x)$  halts after  $i$ th iteration then,  $B_i \subset A_i$

$\implies Pr(B_i) \leq Pr(A_i)$

so,  $Pr(N_{M,x} = i) \leq \frac{1}{3^{i-1}}$  for all  $i \geq 1$

so,  $E[N_{M,x}] = \sum_{i \geq 1} iPr(N_{M,x} = i) \leq \sum_{i \geq 1} \frac{i}{3^{i-1}} < k$

(for some  $k > 0$ , as the series converges)

Now, each iteration takes  $p(|x|)$  time where  $p(n)$  is a polynomial.

$\implies E[T_{M,x}] \leq kp(|x|)$  ( $T_{M,x}$  is the random variable for time taken by  $M(x)$ )

so, expected time is polynomial in  $|x| \implies RP \cap coRP \subseteq ZPP$

$\implies ZPP = RP \cap coRP$ .

### Question 2.

We will prove it just like  $BPP \subseteq P/poly$

With the similar work like error reduction we will have a equivalent definition for randomisation reduction :  $A \leq_r B$  iff there exists a polytime PTM  $M$

$$(1) x \in A \implies P(B(M(x)) = 1) \geq 1 - \frac{1}{2^{|x|+1}}$$

$$(2) x \notin A \implies P(B(M(x)) = 1) \leq \frac{1}{2^{|x|+1}}$$

Hence from the calculation we done in the last assignment we can say there will be some random bits  $r \in \{0, 1\}^{p(n)}$  which is 'good' for any input  $x$

Now using that machine  $M$  and random bits  $r$  we can construct a circuit which will end up giving the corresponding circuit of 3-SAT which is in NP/poly

And clearly the size will be atmost quadratic of running time of  $M$  which is polynomial on  $|x|$

**Claim.** 3-SAT is in NP/poly

For CNF  $\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ , we will basically construct a circuit which has branches of  $\varphi$  all possible assignment for  $(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ . Now if  $\varphi \in 3\text{-SAT}$  then we have a certified assignment for  $\varphi$ , hence we will consider that specific branch corresponds to that

satisfying assignment and vice versa

Hence our claim is true

**Question 3.**

**Claim.**  $\exists$   $AM[O(1)]$  protocol for proving set lower bound so that error probability is exponentially small.

we have a  $AM[O(1)]$  protocol for  $S$  so that,

$$\text{if } |S| \geq K \implies \Pr_r[\exists y : V(S, y, r) = 1] \geq \frac{2}{3}$$

$$\text{and, } |S| \leq \frac{K}{2} \implies \Pr_r[\forall y, V(S, y, r) = 1] \leq \frac{1}{3}$$

( $S \subseteq \{0, 1\}^m$  and for any  $X \in S$  in  $S$  has a short membership proof)

Now, in our new protocol:

$V \rightarrow$  randomly picks  $n$  pairs  $(h_i, y_i)$  independently, where  $h_i \in \mathcal{H}_{m,k}$ ,  $y_i \in \{0, 1\}^k$  and sends to  $P$ .

$P \rightarrow$  finds (if possible)  $x_i \in S$  so that  $h_i(x_i) = y_i$  and sends to  $V$ .

$V \rightarrow$  accepts iff  $\exists$  more than  $\frac{n}{2}$  functions in  $\{h_i\}_{i=1}^n$  so that  $h_i(x_i) = y_i$  for some  $x_i \in S$ .

**Analysis:** define  $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^n$  be a random variables and

$$X_i = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } h_i(x_i) = y_i \text{ for some } x_i \in S \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

$$\text{and, } X = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$$

$$\text{if } |S| \geq K \implies \mu = E[X] \geq \frac{2}{3}$$

$$\text{so, } \Pr[X \leq \frac{1}{2}] = \Pr[X - \frac{2}{3} \leq -\frac{1}{6}] \leq \Pr[|X - \mu| \geq \frac{1}{6}] \leq e^{-\frac{n}{c}}$$

(for some constant  $c$ )

$$\implies \Pr[X > \frac{1}{2}] \geq 1 - e^{-\frac{n}{c}}$$

$$\text{again, if } |S| \leq \frac{K}{2} \implies \mu = E[X] \leq \frac{1}{3}$$

$$\text{so, } \Pr[X > \frac{1}{2}] \leq \Pr[X > \frac{1}{3} + \frac{1}{12}] \leq \Pr[|X - \mu| > \frac{1}{12}] \leq e^{-\frac{n}{k}}$$

for some constant  $k$ .

Hence, the error probability of our protocol becomes exponentially small.

here we define a perfectly complete  $AM[O(1)]$  protocol for proving set lower bound:-

On input a set  $S$ ,

I.  $V$  and  $P$  act as the protocol defined for exponentially small error.

II.  $V$  sends the description of  $S_x$  to  $P$ ,  $P$  computes  $S_x$  and sends to  $V$ .

where  $r \in S_x$  iff  $\exists y$  so that  $V(S, r, y) = 1$

and sends to  $V$

and clearly for any  $r \in S_x$ ,  $P$  can convince  $V$  with a small membership proof.

(say  $n_1 = \frac{l}{n} + 1$ ,  $|S_x| \geq (1 - \frac{1}{n_1 2^n}) 2^l$  if  $x \in L$ , and  $|S_x| \leq \frac{1}{n_1 2^n} 2^l$  if  $x \notin L$ )

III.  $P$  produces  $u_1, \dots, u_{n_1} \in \{0, 1\}^l$  and sends to  $V$

IV.  $V$  picks randomly  $r_0 \in \{0, 1\}^l$  and sends to  $P$

V.  $P$  proves if  $r_0 \in \bigcup_{i=1}^{n_1} (S_x + u_i)$

if it can prove to  $V$  that, for some  $i$ ,  $r_0 + u_i \in S_x$  then,  $V$  accepts otherwise reject.

we know that, if  $x \in L \implies |S_x| \geq (1 - \frac{1}{n_1 2^n}) 2^l$

$\implies \exists u_1, \dots, u_{n_1}$  so that  $\bigcup_{i=1}^{n_1} (S_x + u_i) = \{0, 1\}^l \implies V$  accepts with probability 1.

$x \notin L \implies |S_x| \leq \frac{2^l}{n_1 2^n} \implies \Pr[V \text{ accepts}] = \Pr_{r_0 \in \{0, 1\}^l} [r_0 \in \bigcup_{i=1}^{n_1} (S_x + u_i)] \leq \frac{1}{2^n}$

#### Question 4.

We know there is a bijection  $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_{2^n}$

Hence we can extend the bijection to an isomorphism and hence extend the set  $\{0, 1\}^n$  to a field of cardinality  $2^n$  by defining the addition and the multiplication in this way:

$$a + b = f^{-1}(f(a) + f(b))$$

$$a \cdot b = f^{-1}(f(a) \cdot f(b))$$

Now we will define  $\mathcal{H}_{n,n}$  first

To define  $\mathcal{H}_{n,k}$  for  $k < n$  we can use the collection  $\mathcal{H}_{n,n}$  and truncate the last  $n - k$  bits of the output. It will be obvious from our procedure that removing last  $n - k$  digits will not change the probability

Define

$$\mathcal{H}_{n,n} = \{h_{a,b} \mid h_{a,b}(x) = ax + b, \forall a, b \in \{0, 1\}^n\}$$

Now let for some  $x_1 \neq x_2, y_1, y_2 \in \{0, 1\}^n$  and  $h_{a,b} \in \mathcal{H}_{n,n}$

$$\begin{aligned} & \begin{cases} h_{a,b}(x_1) = y_1 \\ h_{a,b}(x_2) = y_2 \end{cases} \\ \implies & \begin{cases} ax_1 + b = y_1 \\ ax_2 + b = y_2 \end{cases} \\ \implies & \begin{bmatrix} x_1 & 1 \\ x_2 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} a \\ b \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} y_1 \\ y_2 \end{bmatrix} \\ \implies & \begin{bmatrix} a \\ b \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} x_1 & 1 \\ x_2 & 1 \end{bmatrix}^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} y_1 \\ y_2 \end{bmatrix} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{the matrix is invertible as } x_1 \neq x_2)$$

So,  $\Pr_{h \in \mathcal{H}_{n,n}} [h(x_1) = y_1 \wedge h(x_2) = y_2]$   
 $= \Pr_{a,b \in \mathbb{F}_{2^n}} [ax_1 + b = y_1 \wedge ax_2 + b = y_2]$

$$= Pr_{a,b \in \mathbb{F}_2^n} \left[ \begin{bmatrix} a \\ b \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} x_1 & 1 \\ x_2 & 1 \end{bmatrix}^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} y_1 \\ y_2 \end{bmatrix} \right] = 2^{-2n}$$

if  $k < n$  then, by our construction,

$$\begin{cases} h_{a,b}(x_1) = y_1 \\ h_{a,b}(x_2) = y_2 \end{cases} \implies \begin{cases} ax_1 + b = y'_1 \\ ax_2 + b = y'_2 \end{cases}$$

where  $y'_1 = y_1 y''_1$  and  $y'_2 = y_2 y''_2$   
 $y''_1$  and  $y''_2$  are  $n - k$  length bit string and such  $y''_1, y''_2$  will exist.

$$\text{Hence, } Pr_{h \in \mathcal{H}_{n,k}} [h(x_1) = y_1 \wedge h(x_2) = y_2] = \frac{1}{2^{2n}}$$

### Question 5.

Let  $\varphi = c_1 \wedge c_2 \wedge \dots \wedge c_m$  be a 3-CNF formula on  $x_1, \dots, x_n$  variables

Now let  $c_i = l_1 \vee l_2 \vee l_3$

Define  $l'_j = x_k$  if  $l_j = x_k$  for some  $x_k$

if  $l_j = \neg x_k$  for some  $x_k$  then  $l'_j = 1 - x_k \forall j = 1, 2, 3$

Note  $l'_j \equiv l_j$  i.e. if  $l_j = 1$  then  $l'_j = 1$  and if  $l_j = 0$  then  $l'_j = 0$

Define a new variable  $y_i$  which takes values from  $\mathbb{F}_2$

$$\begin{aligned} y_i &= l_1 \vee l_2 \\ \implies (1 - l'_1)(1 - l'_2) &= 1 - y_i \\ \implies y_i + l'_1 + l'_2 + l'_1 l'_2 &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

Now say  $p_{i1}(x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_m) = y_i + l'_1 + l'_2 + l'_1 l'_2$

Clearly  $p_{i1} \equiv y_i \equiv l_1 \vee l_2$

Now  $p_{i2}(x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_m) = y_i + l'_3 + y_i l'_3 - 1$

Clearly  $p_{i2} + 1 \equiv y_i \vee l_3$

clearly  $p_{i1}, p_{i2} \in \mathbb{F}_2[x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_m]$  and degree of each monomial in it is at most 2

also  $p_{i1} = 0 \iff y_i = l_1 \wedge l_2$  and  $p_{i2} = 0 \iff y_i \wedge l_3$

Hence  $p_{i1} = 0$  and  $p_{i2} = 0 \iff$  for some assignment  $c_i = 1$

(we can put the same values for  $x_i$  for both cases)

Hence  $\{p_{i1}, p_{i2} \mid \forall i = 1(1)n\}$  has a solution iff  $\varphi$  has a satisfiable assignment.

(we can put the same values for  $x_i$  for both cases)

Clearly the reduction is in polynomial time. Hence  $3\text{-SAT} \leq_p \text{QUADEQ}$

Hence QUADEQ is NP-Hard

Now  $\{p_i(x_1, \dots, x_n)\} \in \text{QUADEQ}$

$\iff \exists$  some assignment for  $(x_1, \dots, x_n)$  s.t.  $p_i(x_1, \dots, x_n) = 0$

$\implies$  it is in NP

Hence QUADEQ is NP-complete