

Complexity Theory

Jörg Kreiker

Chair for Theoretical Computer Science
Prof. Esparza
TU München

Summer term 2010

Lecture 17

IP = PSPACE (2)

Goal and Plan

Goal

- $IP = PSPACE$

Plan

1. $PSPACE \subseteq IP$ by showing $QBF \in IP$ ✓
2. $IP \subseteq PSPACE$ by computing optimal prover strategies in polynomial space

Agenda

- optimal prover strategy to show $IP \subseteq PSPACE$
- a note on graph isomorphism
- Questionnaire 6
- summary: interactive proofs including further reading
- evaluation
- outlook: approximation and PCP theorem

Definition recap

L is in IP iff

1. there exists a polynomial p and
2. there exists a poly-time, randomized verifier V

such that for all words $x \in \{0, 1\}^*$ holds

- if $x \in L$ then there exists a prover P such that $Pr[out_V\langle P, V \rangle(x) = 1] \geq 2/3$
- if $x \notin L$ then for all provers P holds that $Pr[out_V\langle P, V \rangle(x) = 1] \leq 1/3$

Moreover, the following is bounded by $p(|x|)$

- the number of random bits chosen by V
- the number of rounds
- the length of each message

Optimal Prover

Let $L \in \text{IP}$ be arbitrary, we need to show that $L \in \text{PSPACE}$.

We know that there exist V and p according to definition on previous slide.

For $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$, we need to compute in polynomial space whether $x \in L$ or $x \notin L$.

$$z := \max_P \{ \Pr[\text{out}_V \langle P, V \rangle (x) = 1] \mid P \text{ is any prover for } L \}$$

z is error probability of optimal prover.

- if $z \leq 1/3$ then $x \notin L$
- if $z \geq 2/3$ then $x \in L$
- since $L \in \text{IP}$ other z cannot occur
- maximum taken over finitely many provers for a given x

Recursive computation of z

If we can compute z in polynomial space, we are done.

Recursive algorithm:

- **simulate** V branching on
 - each **random choice** of V
 - each **possible response** of P
- **count**
 - **accepting** branches produced by P 's **optimal response**
 - **total number** of branches
- **ratio is z**

Doable in polynomial space?

- recursion depth: $p(n)$
 - total number of branches: $p(n)^{p(n)}$
- ⇒ requires polynomially many bits only
- can manage both counters and current branch with a PSPACE machine

So $IP = PSPACE \dots$

- **PSPACE** has short **interactive** proofs (certificates)
 - proof of $IP \supseteq PSPACE$ also showed that we can have
 - **public coins**
 - **perfect completeness**
- for each $L \in IP$
- interaction **plus** randomization seem to add power, whereas each in isolation seemingly does not

Agenda

- optimal prover strategy to show $IP \subseteq PSPACE$ ✓
- a note on graph isomorphism
- Questionnaire 6
- summary: interactive proofs including further reading
- evaluation
- outlook: approximation and PCP theorem

GI not likely to be NP-complete

Theorem

If GI is NP-complete, then $\Sigma_2^P = \Pi_2^P$.

Proof: Show that $\Sigma_2^P \subseteq \Pi_2^P$

1.)

- GI is NP-complete

⇒ GNI is coNP-complete

⇒ there exists f such that for all Boolean formulas ϕ with n variables holds

- $\forall \mathbf{y}.\phi(\mathbf{y})$ is true iff $f(\phi) \in \text{GNI}$

2.) GNI has two-round AM protocol with perfect completeness and soundness error probability $< 2^{-n}$.

Agenda

- optimal prover strategy to show $IP \subseteq PSPACE$ ✓
- a note on graph isomorphism ✓
- Questionnaire 6
- summary: interactive proofs including further reading
- evaluation
- outlook: approximation and PCP theorem

Further Reading

- interactive proofs defined in 1985 by *Goldwasser, Micali, Rackoff*. [The knowledge complexity of interactive proof systems](#). SIAM Journal on Computing archive. Volume 18 (1)(1989).
- public coins: *L. Babai* [Trading group theory for randomness](#). STOC 1985.
- survey book: *Oded Goldreich* [Computational Complexity. A Conceptual Perspective](#). <http://www.wisdom.weizmann.ac.il/~oded/cc-drafts.html>
- *Adi Shamir*. [IP=PSPACE](#). Journal of the ACM v.39 n.4, p.878-880.
- outline here followed lecture notes from Brown university: [A detailed proof that IP=PSPACE](#). <http://www.cs.brown.edu/courses/gs019/papers/ip.pdf>
- also nice: Michael Sipser's book [Introduction to the Theory of Computation](#)
- essentially covered [8.1](#) and [8.2](#) from Arora-Barak book

Agenda

- optimal prover strategy to show $IP \subseteq PSPACE$ ✓
- a note on graph isomorphism ✓
- Questionnaire 6 ✓
- summary: interactive proofs including further reading ✓
- evaluation
- outlook: approximation and PCP theorem

Outlook

In the beginning of the 90s a lot of things happened quickly. . .

- Shamir proved that **IP** – **PSPACE**
- one can also allow **multiple provers** which leads to the complexity class **MIP**
- one accepts only if provers agree
- **MIP** = **NEXP**
- lead to the notion of **PCP** $[q, r]$, where one checks only r entries in a table of answer/query pairs of size 2^q
- it was then shown that **PCP** $[poly, poly]$ = **NEXP** and **PCP** $[\log n, O(1)]$ = **NP**
- which yields strong results about **approximation** of **NP**-complete problems
- for instance: consider a **7/8** approximation of **3SAT**

Block structure of lecture

- basic complexity classes
- probabilistic TMs and randomization
- interactive proofs
- approximations and PCP
- parallelization
 - NC
 - circuits
 - descriptive complexity