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## Lecture 17 <br> $I P=P S P A C E(2)$

## Goal and Plan

Goal

- IP = PSPACE

Plan

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

## Agenda

- optimal prover strategy to show IP $\subseteq$ PSPACE
- summary and further reading
- outlook: approximation and PCP theorem
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1. there exists a polynomial $p$ and
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such that for all words $x \in\{0,1\}^{*}$ holds

- if $x \in L$ then there exists a prover $P$ such that

$$
\operatorname{Pr}\left[\text { outv }_{V}\langle P, V\rangle(x)=1\right] \geq 2 / 3
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- if $x \notin L$ then for all provers $P$ holds that

$$
\operatorname{Pr}\left[\text { out }_{V}\langle P, V\rangle(x)=1\right] \leq 1 / 3
$$

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
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## Optimal Prover

Let $L \in \mathbb{I P}$ be arbitrary, we need to show that $L \in$ 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 $x \notin L$.

$$
z:=\max _{P}\left\{\operatorname{Pr}\left[\text { out }_{V}\langle P, V\rangle(x)=1\right] \mid P \text { is any prover for } L\right\}
$$

$z$ is acceptance probability of optimal prover, inducing the error probability.

- if $z \leq 1 / 3$ then $x \notin L$
- if $z \geq 2 / 3$ then $x \in L$
- since $L \in \mathbb{I P}$ other $z$ cannot occur
- maximum taken over finitely many provers for a given $x$
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## 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: $p(n)^{p(n)}$
$\Rightarrow$ requires polynomially many bits only
- can manage both counters and current branch with a PSPACE machine


## Agenda

- optimal prover strategy to show IP $\subseteq$ PSPACE $\checkmark$
- summary and further reading
- outlook: approximation and PCP theorem


## Summary

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


## 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


## Further Reading

- 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
- an entertaining survey about the development in the beginning of the 90s by L. Babai. Transparent proofs and limits to approximations. First European Congress of Mathematicians. 1994.


## 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 $\mathrm{PCP}[\log n, O(1)]=\mathrm{NP}$
- 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

