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## Lecture 1

## Introduction

## Agenda

- computational complexity and two problems
- your background and expectations
- organization
- basic concepts
- teaser
- summary


## Computational Complexity

- quantifying the efficiency of computations
- not: computability, descriptive complexity, ...
- computation: computing a function $f:\{0,1\}^{*} \rightarrow\{0,1\}^{*}$
- everything else matter of encoding
- model of computation?
- efficiency: how many resources used by computation
- time: number of basic operations with respect to input size
- space: memory usage
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## Example (Dinner Party)

You want to throw a dinner party. You have a list of pairs of friends who do not get along. What is the largest party you can throw such that you do not invite any two who don't get along?
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| person | does not get along with |
| :--- | :--- |
| Jack | James, John, Kate |
| James | Jack, Hugo, Sayid |
| John | Jack, Juliet, Sun |
| Kate | Jack, Claire, Jin |
| Hugo | James, Claire, Sun |
| Claire | Hugo, Kate, Juliet |
| Juliet | John, Sayid, Claire |
| Sun | John, Hugo, Jin |
| Sayid | James, Juliet, Jin |
| Jin | Sayid, Sun, Kate |
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- largest party?
- naive computation
- check all sets of people for compatibility
- number of subsets of $n$ element set is $2^{n}$
- intractable
- can we do better?
- observation: for a given set compatibilty checking is easy
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## Example (Map Coloring)
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- naive algorithm: try all colorings and check
- number of 3-colorings for $n$ countries: $3^{n}$
- can we do better?
- observation: for a given coloring compatibilty checking is easy


## What about you?

- What do you expect?
- What do you already know about complexity?
- behavior in class?
- code of conduct?
- immediate feedback


## Organization

- lecture in English
- course website: http://www7.in.tum.de/um/courses/complexity/SS10/
- two lectures per week
- Tuesdays, 8.30-10.00, 00.08.038
- Wednesdays, 8.30-10.00, 00.08.038
- tutorial: Wednesdays, 16.00-17.30, 03.09.014 starting next week
- tutor: Michael Luttenberger
- weekly exercise sheets, not mandatory


## Literature

- lecture based on Computational Complexity: A Modern Approach by Sanjeev Arora and Boaz Barak
- book website: http://www.cs.princeton.edu/theory/complexity/
- useful links plus freely available draft
- lecture is self-contained
- more recommended reading on course website


## Assessment

- written or oral exam, depending on number of students
- 10x10-tests
- app. 10 times, we will have a 10 minute mini test
- happens during lectures, un-announced, covers 2-4 lectures
- self-assessment and feedback to us
- if $C$ is ratio of correct answers, exam bonus computed by

$$
\frac{\lceil 5 C-1\rceil}{2}
$$

- in case of a written exam, grading is according to the table below

| $\sum$ Points | Grade | $\sum$ Points | Grade |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $[0,5)$ | 5,0 | $(26,28]$ | 2,7 |
| $[5,11)$ | 4,7 | $(28,30]$ | 2,3 |
| $[11,17)$ | 4,3 | $(30,32]$ | 2,0 |
| $[17,19]$ | 4,0 | $(32,34]$ | 1,7 |
| $(19,22]$ | 3,7 | $(34,36]$ | 1,3 |
| $(22,24]$ | 3,3 | $(36,40]$ | 1,0 |
| $(24,26]$ | 3,0 |  |  |

## Agenda

- computational complexity and two problems $\checkmark$
- your background and expectations $\checkmark$
- organization $\checkmark$
- basic concepts
- teaser
- summary


## Prerequisites

- sets, relations, functions
- formal languages
- Turing machines
- graphs and algorithms on graphs
- little probability theory
- Landau symbols


## Landau symbols

- characterize asymptotic behavior of functions (on integers, reals)
- ignore constant factors
- useful to talk about resource usage


## Landau symbols

- characterize asymptotic behavior of functions (on integers, reals)
- ignore constant factors
- useful to talk about resource usage
- upper bound: $f \in O(g)$ defined by $\exists c>0 . \exists n_{0}>0 . \forall n>n_{0} . f(n) \leq c \cdot g(n)$
- dominated by: $f \in O(g)$ defined by $\forall \varepsilon>0$. $\exists n_{0}>0$. $\forall n>n_{0} \cdot \frac{f(n)}{g(n)}<\varepsilon$
- lower bound: $f \in \Omega(g)$ iff $g \in O(f)$
- tight bound: $f \in \Theta(g)$ iff $f \in O(g)$ and $f \in \Omega(g)$
- dominating: $f \in \omega(g)$ iff $g \in o(f)$


## Intractability

## Polynomial

versus

## Exponential

- computations using exponential time or space intractable for all but the smallest inputs
- for a map with 200 countries: app. $2.66 \cdot 10^{95} 3$-colorings
- atoms in the universe (wikipedia): $8 \cdot 10^{80}$
- computational complexity: tractable vs. intractable
- tractable: problems with runtimes $\cup_{p>0} O\left(n^{p}\right)$
- intractable: problems with runtimes $O\left(2^{n}\right)$
- independent of hardware


## What about our examples?

- dinner party problem tractable?
- map coloring problem tractable?
- lower bounds on time/space consumption
- upper bounds on time/space consumption
- which is harder?
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- really a graph problem
- each person a node, each relation an edge
- find a maximal set of nodes, such that no two nodes are adjacent
- the independent set problem: Indset
- probably not tractable, no algorithm better than naive one known
- here: maximal independent set of size 4
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## Map Coloring



- really a graph problem
- each country a node, each border an edge
- color each node such that no two adjacent nodes have same color
- the three coloring problem: 3-Coloring
- probably not tractable, no algorithm better than naive one known
- here: answer is yes


## Bounds

- upper bounds
- time (naive algorithm): $O\left(2^{n}\right)$ for $n$ persons/countries
- space (naive algorith): $O\left(n^{p}\right)$ for $n$ persons/countries and a small $p$


## Bounds

- upper bounds
- time (naive algorithm): $O\left(2^{n}\right)$ for $n$ persons/countries
- space (naive algorith): $O\left(n^{p}\right)$ for $n$ persons/countries and a small $p$
- lower bounds
- very little known
- difficult because of infinitely many algorithms
- both problems could have a linear time and a logarithmic space algorithm
- but not simultaneously


## Which is harder?

- instead of tight bounds say which problem is harder
- $\Rightarrow$ reductions


## Which is harder?

- instead of tight bounds say which problem is harder
- $\Rightarrow$ reductions

IF - there is an efficient procedure for problem $A$ and

- and an efficient procedure for $B$ using the procedure for $A$

THEN $B$ cannot be radically harder than $A$
notation: $B \leq A$
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## 3-Coloring $\leq$ Indset

How can we solve 3 -Coloring using an algorithm to solve Indset?

- for same map (graph) find a maximal independent set


## 3-Coloring $\leq$ Indset

How can we solve 3 -Coloring using an algorithm to solve Indset?

- for same map (graph) find a maximal independent set
- remove independent set
efficient
efficient


## 3-Coloring $\leq$ Indset

How can we solve 3 -Coloring using an algorithm to solve Indset?

- for same map (graph) find a maximal independent set
- remove independent set
efficient
efficient
- remaining graph: check whether it is bipartite


## 3-Coloring $\leq$ Indset

How can we solve 3 -Coloring using an algorithm to solve Indset?

- for same map (graph) find a maximal independent set
- remove independent set
efficient
efficient
linear

Need to ensure: procedure returns yes if and only if the graph is 3 -colorable.

## Polynomial certificates: NP

- whole class of problems can be reduced to Indset
- all of them have polynomially checkable certificates
- characterizes (in)famous class NP
- all problems in NP reducible to Indset makes Indset NP-hard.
- 3-Coloring also NP-hard
- no polynomial-time algorithms known for NP-hard problems
- not all problems have polynomial certificates, e.g. winning strategy in chess


## Agenda

- computational complexity and two problems $\checkmark$
- your background and expectations $\checkmark$
- organization $\checkmark$
- basic concepts $\checkmark$
- teaser
- summary


## Lots of things to explore

- precise definition of computational model and resources
- problems with polynomial time checkable certificates
- space classes
- approximations
- hierarchies (polynomial, time/space tradeoffs)
- randomization
- parallelism
- average case complexities
- probabilistically checkable proofs
- (quantum computing)
- (logical characterizations of complexity classes)
- a bag of proof techniques


## What have we learnt?

- polynomial ~ tractable; exponential ~ intractable
- lower bounds hard to come by
- reductions key to establish relations among (classes of problems)
- NP: polynomially checkable certificates
- Indset $\in$ NP, 3 -Coloring $\in$ NP

