

## Weekly exercises on $NP$ -completeness

**Exercise 1** We have looked at several versions of Hamiltonicity. Here are three different problems related to the same topic:

$HP = \{\langle G \rangle \mid \text{The directed graph } G \text{ contains a Hamiltonian path}\}.$

$HC = \{\langle G \rangle \mid \text{The directed graph } G \text{ contains a Hamiltonian cycle}\}.$

$GH = \{\langle G, s, t \rangle \mid \text{The directed graph } G \text{ contains a Hamiltonian path from node } s \text{ to node } t\}.$

Show the following six reductions:

1.  $HP \leq_P HC$
2.  $HP \leq_P GH$
3.  $HC \leq_P HP$
4.  $HC \leq_P GH$
5.  $GH \leq_P HP$
6.  $GH \leq_P HC$

**Solution proposal** Solutions proposed in the group session.

**Exercise 2** Let

$DOUBLE-SAT = \{\langle \phi \rangle \mid \text{The Boolean formula } \phi \text{ has at least two satisfying assignments}\}.$

Show that  $DOUBLE-SAT$  is  $NP$ -complete.

**Solution proposal** A certificate for  $DOUBLE-SAT$  could be two distinct assignments, satisfying  $\phi$ .

We reduce  $SAT$  to  $DOUBLE-SAT$ . Our reduction  $f$  takes  $\phi$  and produces  $\phi \wedge (x \vee \bar{x})$ , where  $x$  is a fresh variable not found in  $\phi$ .

If an assignment satisfies  $\phi$ , then  $\phi \wedge (x \vee \bar{x})$  has two satisfying assignments: one where we extend the assignment for  $\phi$  with  $x$  assigned true, and another where  $x$  is assigned false.

If  $\phi$  has no satisfying assignment, then  $\phi \wedge (x \vee \bar{x})$  also has no satisfying assignment (and in particular not two).

The reduction runs in polynomial time.

**Exercise 3** In the lecture, we showed that *PARTITION* is *NP*-complete by reducing *SUBSET-SET* to *PARTITION*. We also saw that all *NP*-complete problems can be reduced to each other in polynomial time.

Show that  $PARTITION \leq_P SUBSET-SUM$ .

**Solution proposal** The reduction  $f$  takes an instance of *PARTITION*,  $\langle S \rangle$ . Let us assume that  $\Sigma S = k$ . If  $k$  is odd, we are dealing with a no-instance of *PARTITION*, so we must produce a no-instance of *SUBSET-SUM*.

$\langle S, k+1 \rangle$  will do. If  $k$  is even,  $f$  returns the instance  $\langle S, \frac{k}{2} \rangle$ .

If  $\langle S \rangle \in PARTITION$ , then it is possible to select a subset of  $S$  summing to  $\frac{k}{2}$ , so  $\langle S, \frac{k}{2} \rangle \in SUBSET-SUM$  and vice versa.

**Exercise 4** An *independent set* of nodes in a graph  $G$  is a subset of the nodes of  $G$ , such that no edge connects any nodes in the subset.

Let  $INDEPENDENT-SET = \{ \langle G, k \rangle \mid \text{The undirected graph } G \text{ contains an independent set of size } k \text{ or more} \}$ .

Show that *INDEPENDENT-SET* is *NP*-complete.

**Solution proposal** The main idea is to show that  $CLIQUE \leq_P INDEPENDENT-SET$ .

On input  $\langle G, k \rangle$  the reduction returns  $\langle \bar{G}, k \rangle$ , where  $\bar{G}$  is the *complement graph* of  $G$ , that is,  $G$  where all edges are "flipped".

A clique in  $G$  forms an independent set in  $\bar{G}$ .

Flipping the edges in  $G$  can be done in polynomial time.

**Exercise 5** A *vertex cover* in a graph  $G$  is a subset of the nodes of  $G$ , such that any edge is connected to at least one node in the vertex cover.

Let  $VERTEX-COVER = \{ \langle G, k \rangle \mid \text{The undirected graph } G \text{ contains vertex cover of size } k \text{ or less} \}$ .

Show that *VERTEX-COVER* is *NP*-complete.

**Solution proposal** One way to do this is by reducing *INDEPENDENT-SET* to *VERTEX-COVER*.

On input  $\langle G, k \rangle$ , the reduction produces  $\langle G, |G| - k \rangle$ , where  $|G|$  is the number of nodes in  $G$ .

If  $G$  has an independent set of size  $k$ , then the remaining  $|G| - k$  nodes form a vertex cover. This is because any edge in  $G$  must be connected to at least one node in the cover, since no edge connects two nodes in the independent set.