

Simulating nondeterminism.

$$\text{def } P = \bigcup_c \text{DTIME}(n^c) \quad NP = \bigcup_c \text{NTIME}(n^c)$$

$$\text{EXP} = \bigcup_c \text{DTIME}(2^{n^c}) \quad \text{NEXP} = \bigcup_c \text{NTIME}(2^{n^c}).$$

th $NP \subseteq \text{EXP}$

proof: try all possible witnesses.

Formally: Let $L \in NP$, V verifier for L running in time n^c .

Let d st $x \in L$ iff $\exists y, |y| \leq |x|^d, V(x, y)$ accepts.

M : for each string y of size $\leq |x|^d$:
 $\quad \downarrow$ if $V(x, y)$ accepts: accept
 reject.

M accepts x iff $\exists y \dots \Rightarrow M$ is correct.

M runs in time $O(2^{n^d} \cdot n^c)$, i.e. exponential.

\forall we can prove $\text{NTIME}(f) \subseteq \text{DTIME}(2^{O(f)})$ similarly, as long as f is efficiently computable.

Q: is there a way to simulate nondeterminism other than brute-force?

We think of TMs running in poly-time as efficient, and exp time as inefficient.

We have $P \subseteq NP \subseteq \text{EXP} \subseteq \text{NEXP}$.

Also, $P \neq \text{EXP}$. But is $P = NP$?

Poly-time reductions

def. $A \leq_p B$ if $\exists f: A \rightarrow B$ poly-time computable
 st $x \in A$ iff $f(x) \in B$.

prop. $A \leq_p B$ and $B \in P \Rightarrow A \in P$
 $NP \Rightarrow NP$.

e.g. $\text{SAT} \leq_p 3\text{SAT}$

Given CNF over $x_1 \dots x_n$ and clauses $C_1 \dots C_m$, we build CNF where

$$C_i = (l_1 \vee \dots \vee l_k) \mapsto (l_1 \vee y_{i1}) \wedge (\bar{y}_{i1} \vee l_2 \vee y_{i2}) \wedge \dots \wedge (y_{ik-1} \vee l_k).$$

Easy to check poly-size and sat iff orig is sat.