Run-time analysis

We've spent a lot of time in this class putting algorithms into specific run-time categories:
- \(O(\log n)\)
- \(O(n)\)
- \(O(n \log n)\)
- \(O(n^2)\)
- \(O(n \log \log n)\)
- \(O(n^{1.67})\)
- ...

When I say an algorithm is \(O(f(n))\), what does that mean?

Tractable vs. intractable problems

**tractable** adj.
1. Easily managed or controlled; governable.
2. Easily handled or worked; malleable.

What is a “tractable” problem?

Tractable problems can be solved in \(O(f(n))\) where \(f(n)\) is a polynomial
Tractable vs. intractable problems

What about... 

$O(n^{100})$? 

$O(n \log \log \log \log n)$?

Technically $O(n^{100})$ is tractable by our definition

Why don’t we worry about problems like this?

Solvable vs. unsolvable problems

What is a “solvable” problem?
Solvable vs. unsolvable problems

A problem is solvable if given enough (i.e. finite) time you could solve it.

Sorting

Given n integers, sort them from smallest to largest.

Solvable and tractable:
Mergesort: $\Theta(n \log n)$

Enumerating all subsets

Given a set of n items, enumerate all possible subsets.

Solvable/unsolvable?
Enumerating all subsets

Given a set of n items, enumerate all possible subsets.

- Solvable, but intractable: $\Theta(2^n)$ subsets
- For large n this will take a very, very long time

Halting problem

Given an arbitrary algorithm/program and a particular input, will the program terminate?

- Tractable/intractable?
- Solvable/unsolvable?

Integer solution?

Given a polynomial equation, are there integer values of the variables such that the equation is true?

$$x^3yz + 2y^4z^2 - 7xyz^5 = 6$$

- Tractable/intractable?
- Solvable/unsolvable?
Integer solution?

Given a polynomial equation, are there integer values of the variables such that the equation is true?

\[ x^3yz + 2y^4z^2 - 7xy^3z = 6 \]

Unsolvable 😞

---

Hamiltonian cycle

Given an undirected graph \( G = (V, E) \), a hamiltonian cycle is a cycle that visits every vertex \( V \) exactly once.

---
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Given an undirected graph $G=(V, E)$, a Hamiltonian cycle is a cycle that visits every vertex $V$ exactly once.

Tractable/intractable?
Solvable/unsolvable?

Hamiltonian cycle

Given an undirected graph, does it contain a Hamiltonian cycle?

Solvable: Enumerate all possible paths (i.e. include an edge or don’t) check if it’s a Hamiltonian cycle.

How would we do this check exactly, specifically given a graph and a path?

Checking Hamiltonian cycles

```python
def HAM-CYCLE-VERIFY(G, p):
    for i = 1 to |V|
        visited[i] ← false
    n ← length[|V| + 1]
    if p[1] ≠ p[n]
        return false
    if visited[p[n]]
        return false
    if (p[n], p[1]) ∉ E
        return false
    visited[p[n]] ← true
    for i = 1 to |V|
        if visited[p[i]]
            return false
        return true
```
Checking hamiltonian cycles

```
HAM-CYCLE-VERIFY(G, p)
1. for i = 1 to |V|
2. visited[i] ← false
3. n ← length(p)
4. if p_i ≠ p_{i+1} or n ≠ |V| + 1
5. return false
6. visited[p_i] ← true
7. for i = 1 to n - 1
8. if visited[p_i]
9. return false
10. if (p_i, p_{i+1}) ∉ E
11. return false
12. visited[p_i] ← true
13. for i = 1 to |V|
14. if visited[i]
15. return false
16. return true
```

Running time?
- $O(V)$ adjacency matrix
- $O(V+E)$ adjacency list

What does that say about the hamiltonian cycle problem?
- It belongs to NP

NP problems

NP is the set of problems that can be verified in polynomial time

A problem can be verified in polynomial time if you can check that a given solution is correct in polynomial time

(NP is an abbreviation for non-deterministic polynomial time)

Why might we care about NP problems?
- If we can't verify the solution in polynomial time then an algorithm cannot exist that determines the solution in this time (why not?)
- All algorithms with polynomial time solutions are in NP

The NP problems that are currently not solvable in polynomial time could in theory be solved in polynomial time
Big-O allowed us to group algorithms by run-time.

Today, we’re talking about sets of problems grouped by how easy they are to solve.

Where have we seen reductions before?
- Bipartite matching reduced to flow problem
- All pairs shortest path through a particular vertex reduced to single source shortest path

Why are they useful?

Given two problems P₁ and P₂ a reduction function, f(x), is a function that transforms a problem instance x of type P₁ to a problem instance of type P₂ such that: a solution to x exists for P₁ iff a solution for f(x) exists for P₂.

Reduction function

Reduction function

Reduction function
Reduction function

Most of the time we’ll worry about yes-no questions, however, if we have more complicated answers we often just have to do a little work to the solution to the problem of $P_2$ to get the answer.

Reduction function: Example

P1 = Bipartite matching
P2 = Network flow

Reduction function ($f$): Given any bipartite matching problem turn it into a network flow problem

What is $f$ and what is $f'$?

NP-Complete

A problem is NP-complete if:
1. it can be verified in polynomial time (i.e. in NP)
2. any NP-complete problem can be reduced to the problem in polynomial time (is NP-hard)

The Hamiltonian cycle problem is NP-complete

What are the implications of this?
What does this say about how hard the Hamiltonian cycle problem is compared to other NP-complete problems?
A problem is **NP-complete** if:
1. it can be verified in polynomial time (i.e. in NP)
2. any NP-complete problem can be reduced to the problem in polynomial time (is NP-hard)

The hamiltonian cycle problem is NP-complete

It’s at least as hard as any of the other NP-complete problems

If I found a polynomial-time solution to the hamiltonian cycle problem, what would this mean for the other NP-complete problems?

Similarly, if we found a polynomial time solution to any NP-complete problem we’d have a solution to all NP-complete problems
NP-complete problems

Longest path
Given a graph \( G \) with nonnegative edge weights does a simple path exist from \( s \) to \( t \) with weight at least \( g \)?

3D matching
Bipartite matching: given two sets of things and pair constraints, find a matching between the sets.
3D matching: given three sets of things and triplet constraints, find a matching between the sets.

Figure from Dasgupta et al. 2008

P vs. NP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Polynomial time solutions exist</th>
<th>NP-complete (and no polynomial time solution currently exists)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shortest path</td>
<td>Longest path</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bipartite matching</td>
<td>3D matching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear programming</td>
<td>Integer linear programming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum cut</td>
<td>Balanced cut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proving NP-completeness

A problem is NP-complete if:
1. it can be verified in polynomial time (i.e. in NP)
2. any NP-complete problem can be reduced to the problem in polynomial time (is NP-hard)

Ideas?
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Proving NP-completeness

Given a problem NEW to show it is NP-Complete

1. Show that NEW is in NP
   a. Provide a verifier
   b. Show that the verifier runs in polynomial time

2. Show that all NP-complete problems are reducible to NEW in polynomial time
   a. Describe a reduction function \( f \) from a known NP-Complete problem to NEW
   b. Show that \( f \) runs in polynomial time
   c. Show that a solution exists to the NP-Complete problem IFF a solution exists to the NEW problem generated by \( f \)

Why is it sufficient to show that one NP-complete problem reduces to the NEW problem?

Proving NP-completeness

Show that a solution exists to the NP-Complete problem IFF a solution exists to the NEW problem generated by \( f \)

- Assume we have an NP-Complete problem instance that has a solution, show that the NEW problem instance generated by \( f \) has a solution

- Assume we have a problem instance of NEW generated by \( f \) that has a solution, show that we can derive a solution to the NP-Complete problem instance

Other ways of proving the IFF, but this is often the easiest

All others can be reduced to NEW by first reducing to the one problem, then reducing to NEW. Two polynomial time reductions is still polynomial time!
Proving NP-completeness

Show that all NP-complete problems are reducible to NEW in polynomial time.

Show that any NP-complete problem is reducible to NEW in polynomial time.

BE CAREFUL!
- Show that NEW is reducible to any NP-complete problem in polynomial time.

NP-complete: 3-SAT

A boolean formula is in n-conjunctive normal form (n-CNF) if:
- it is expressed as an AND of clauses
- where each clause is an OR of no more than n variables

\[(a \lor \neg a \lor \neg b) \land (c \lor b \lor d) \land (\neg a \lor c \lor \neg d)\]

3-SAT: Given a 3-CNF boolean formula, is it satisfiable?

3-SAT is an NP-complete problem.

NP-complete: SAT

Given a boolean formula of n boolean variables joined by m connectives (AND, OR or NOT) is there a setting of the variables such that the boolean formula evaluate to true?

\[(a \land b) \lor (\neg a \land \neg b)\]

\[\left((\neg (b \lor \neg c) \land a) \lor (a \land b \land c)\right) \land c \land \neg b\]

Is SAT an NP-complete problem?
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### NP-Complete: SAT

1. Show that SAT is in NP
   a. Provide a verifier
   b. Show that the verifier runs in polynomial time

Verifier: A solution consists of an assignment of the variables
- If clause is a single variable:
  - return the value of the variable
- otherwise
  - for each clause:
    - call the verifier recursively
    - compute a running solution

polynomial run-time?

2. Show that all NP-complete problems are reducible to SAT in polynomial time
   - Describe a reduction function \( f \) from a known NP-Complete problem to SAT
   - Show that \( f \) runs in polynomial time
   - Show that a solution exists to the NP-Complete problem IFF a solution exists to the SAT problem generated by \( f \)

Reduce 3-SAT to SAT:
- Given an instance of 3-SAT, turn it into an instance of SAT

Reduction function:
- DONE
- Runs in constant time! (or linear if you have to copy the problem)
NP-Complete problems

Why do we care about showing that a problem is NP-Complete?
- We know that the problem is hard (and we probably won’t find a polynomial time exact solver)
- We may need to compromise:
  - reformulate the problem
  - settle for an approximate solution
- Down the road, if a solution is found for an NP-complete problem, then we’d have one too…

CLIQUE

A clique in an undirected graph $G = (V, E)$ is a subset $V'$ of vertices that are fully connected, i.e. every vertex in $V'$ is connected to every other vertex in $V'$

CLIQUE problem: Does $G$ contain a clique of size $k$?

HALF-CLIQUE

Given a graph $G$, does the graph contain a clique containing exactly half the vertices?

Is HALF-CLIQUE an NP-complete problem?
Is Half-Clique NP-Complete?

1. Show that NEW is in NP
   a. Provide a verifier
   b. Show that the verifier runs in polynomial time
2. Show that all NP-complete problems are reducible to NEW in polynomial time
   a. Describe a reduction function $f$ from a known NP-Complete problem to NEW
   b. Show that $f$ runs in polynomial time
   c. Show that a solution exists to the NP-Complete problem IFF a solution exists to the NEW problem generate by $f$

Given a graph $G$, does the graph contain a clique containing exactly half the vertices?