

Complexity Theory

Jan Křetínský

Chair for Foundations of Software Reliability
and Theoretical Computer Science
Technical University of Munich
Summer 2016

July 11, 2016

Lecture 25

Counting

Agenda

- examples of counting problems
- definition
- how hard are they?

Examples

Deciding is easy, counting is hard

Example (#CYCLE)

Number of simple cycles

- cycle detection in linear time
- if #CYCLE has a polynomial algorithm then $P = NP$

Examples

Deciding is easy, counting is hard

Example (#CYCLE)

Number of simple cycles

- cycle detection in linear time
- if #CYCLE has a polynomial algorithm then $P = NP$

Example (GraphReliability)

$\frac{1}{2^n}$ · number of subgraphs with a path from s to t

Example (Maximum likelihood in Bayes nets)

Visible variables are v 's of ≤ 3 hidden variables.

What is the fraction of satisfying assignments with $x_1 = 1$?

- equivalent to #SAT

Definition

Definition (#P)

A function $f : \{0, 1\}^* \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ is in **#P** if there is a polynomial-time TM M and a polynomial p such that $\forall x \in \{0, 1\}^*$

$$f(x) = \left| \{y \in \{0, 1\}^{p(|x|)} : M(x, y) = 1\} \right|$$

- counting certificates
- or accepting paths

Definition (FP)

A function $f : \{0, 1\}^* \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ is in **FP** if there is a **deterministic** polynomial-time TM computing f .

- efficiently solvable counting

Decision analog

Theorem

$$FP = \#P$$

Decision analog

Theorem

$$FP = \#P \iff$$

Decision analog

Theorem

$$FP = \#P \iff P = PP$$

Completeness

Definition

A function f is $\#P$ -complete if $f \in \#P$ and for every $g \in \#P$ we have $g \in FP^f$

- $\#SAT$ is $\#P$ -complete

Completeness

Definition

A function f is $\#P$ -complete if $f \in \#P$ and for every $g \in \#P$ we have $g \in FP^f$

- $\#SAT$ is $\#P$ -complete

Example (Determinant)

$$\det(A) = \sum_{\sigma \in S_n} \text{sgn}(\sigma) \prod_{i=1}^n A_{i,\sigma(i)}$$

- computable in polynomial time

Example (Permanent)

$$\text{perm}(A) = \sum_{\sigma \in S_n} \prod_{i=1}^n A_{i,\sigma(i)}$$

- $\#P$ -complete (for 0,1 matrices) [Valiant'79]
- hence $\text{perm} \in FP \implies P = NP$

Toda's theorem

Theorem (Toda'91)

$$\text{PH} \subseteq \text{P}^{\#\text{SAT}}$$

Proof idea

- randomized reduction from **PH** to $\oplus\text{SAT}$
(odd number of satisfying assignments; $\oplus\text{P}$ -complete problem)
- derandomization

What have we learnt?

- counting seems harder than deciding
- $\#P$ -complete problems arise from NP -complete problems as well as from those in P
- more powerful than alternating quantifiers
- classes PP and $\oplus P$: most and least significant bits of $\#P$ function