

End-semester exam: conceptual part

-
- The points for each problem is indicated on the side. The total for this set is **50 points**.
 - You are allowed 90 minutes for this exam.
 - Collaboration with other students is **not allowed!**
 - You can refer to the summary scribe notes and any handwritten notes that you may have. All other sources are disallowed.
 - Be clear in your writing. Try to fit your answer within the space provided. If you *really* feel like you need more space (although you shouldn't have to), you can use blank sheets.
 - Even if you do not manage to solve some questions, explain your attempts and partial thoughts.
 - If you don't write the word 'pineapple' on the last page, it will cost you 5 points.
-

Your name: _____

1. (5 points)

Which of the following statements imply $P \neq NP$? And are any of them already known to be true?

Give brief but sufficient justifications for your answers.

(a) There is a constant $c > 1$ such that $SAT \notin DTIME(n^c)$.

(b) For all constants $c > 1$, $SAT \notin DTIME(n^c)$.

(c) There is a constant $c > 1$ such that $NP \not\subseteq DTIME(n^c)$.

(d) For all constants $c > 1$, $NP \not\subseteq DTIME(n^c)$.

2. (5 points)

In class, when we did the proof of Razborov-Smolensky, we saw two different notions of approximating polynomials:

Let $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ be a Boolean function.

A polynomial $P(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ *weakly-approximates* f with error ε if

$$\Pr_{x \in \{0,1\}^n} [P(x) \neq f(x)] \leq \varepsilon.$$

A polynomial $Q_{r_1, \dots, r_t}(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ *strongly-approximates* f with error ε if

$$\text{for every } x \in \{0, 1\}^n, \quad \Pr_{r \in \mathbb{F}^t} [Q_r(x) \neq f(x)] \leq \varepsilon.$$

We showed that OR and AND have very simple weakly-approximating polynomials. We also showed that any $f \in \text{AC}^0$ can actually be strongly-approximated using $O((\log s)^d)$ degree polynomials.

Recall that we showed that Parity cannot even be weakly-approximated unless the degree is $\Omega(\sqrt{n})$. Hence, it should have been sufficient to show that AC^0 can be weakly-approximated by $O((\log s)^d)$ degree polynomials.

Why did we work with strong-approximation? Couldn't we have just used the weakly-approximating polynomials for OR and AND to construct weakly-approximating polynomials for AC^0 ?

3. (10 points)

Consider the following function.

```
1 def  $f(n)$ :  
2   if  $n = 0$  then return 24  
3   if  $n = 1$  then return 42  
4   curr_sum = 0  
5   for  $i = 1, \dots, n - 1$  do  
6      $a = f(i)$   
7     curr_sum = (curr_sum +  $a$ ) mod 1000  
8   return curr_sum
```

What is the time and space complexity of the above code (think of the input n being provided in unary as 1^n)? (Just provide ball-park answers such as $O(\log n)$, $O(n)$, $2^{O(n)}$ etc. but with sufficient justification)

4. (10 points)

- (a) For any space-constructible function $s : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, and any constant $\varepsilon > 0$, prove that

$$\text{DSPACE}(s(n)) \not\subseteq \text{DTIME}(s(n)^{2-\varepsilon}).$$

[Hint: This is the first time I'm asking this question in an exam / problem set.]

- (b) Suppose $P = \text{LOGSPACE}$, does this imply that $\text{EXP} = \text{PSPACE}$? Give brief but sufficient justification.

5. (10 points)

Suppose you are told that Circuit-SAT can be solved in $T_1(n)$ time. What is the time complexity $T_2(n)$ to solve Σ_2 -SAT? (As usual, n is the length of the input.)

Which of the following values of $T_1(n)$ results in $T_2(n) = 2^{o(n)}$?

- $T_1(n) = \text{poly}(n)$
- $T_1(n) = n^{O((\log n)^{10})}$
- $T_1(n) = 2^{n^{1/100}}$

6. True or false (with brief but sufficient justification):

(a) **(5 points)** $\text{NP}^{\text{NP} \cap \text{coNP}} = \text{NP}$.

(b) **(5 points)** $\text{LOGSPACE}^{\text{LOGSPACE}} = \text{LOGSPACE}$.

(For space-bounded machines, assume that the oracle tape is a write-once tape, and the space on the oracle tape does not count towards workspace tape (just like the output tape).)

