

Homework 10

Out: 16 Apr. Due: 23 Apr.

Instructions: Submit your solutions in pdf format on Gradescope by **5pm on Friday, April 23**. Solutions may be written either in \LaTeX (with either machine-drawn or hand-drawn diagrams) or **legibly** by hand. (The \LaTeX source for this homework is provided in case you want to use it as a template.) Please be sure to begin the solution for each problem on a new page, and to tag each of your solutions to the correct problem! Per course policy, no late solutions will be accepted. Take time to write **clear** and **concise** answers; confused and long-winded solutions may be penalized. You are encouraged to form small groups (two to four people) to work through the homework, but you **must** write up all your solutions on your own. Depending on grading resources, we reserve the right to grade a random subset of the problems and check off the rest; so you are advised to attempt all the problems.

1. Consider the problem of deciding whether a Boolean formula in 2-CNF (i.e., conjunctive normal form with two literals per clause) is unsatisfiable. This problem corresponds to the language

$$2\text{-UNSAT} = \{\langle\phi\rangle : \phi \text{ is in 2-CNF and is not satisfiable}\}.$$

We know from CS170 that there exists a polynomial time algorithm for deciding whether such a ϕ is satisfiable, so we know that $2\text{-UNSAT} \in \text{P}$.

- (a) Show that 2-UNSAT belongs to NL.

[NOTE: Be careful here! You do not have enough space to write down a complete assignment!]

- (b) By giving a reduction from PATH, show that 2-UNSAT is NL-complete (w.r.t. log-space reduction).
(c) Deduce that 2-SAT is also NL-complete.

2. Consider the problem STRONG-CON, defined as follows:

$$\text{STRONG-CON} := \{\langle G \rangle : G \text{ is a strongly connected directed graph}\}.$$

(Recall that a directed graph G is strongly connected if, for every pair of vertices u, v , there is a path from u to v and from v to u in G .) Show that STRONG-CON is NL-complete.

3. This problem concerns the following two languages:

$$\text{ALL}_{\text{DFA}} = \{\langle D \rangle : D \text{ is a DFA that accepts all input strings}\}$$

$$\text{ALL}_{\text{NFA}} = \{\langle N \rangle : N \text{ is an NFA that accepts all input strings}\}$$

- (a) Show that ALL_{DFA} is NL-complete.
(b) Show that ALL_{NFA} is $\overline{\text{PSPACE}}$ -complete. [HINT: For hardness, try a direct reduction from any language in PSPACE to $\overline{\text{ALL}_{\text{NFA}}}$. Consider a computation sequence of a PSPACE TM M on input w , and construct an NFA that “guesses” a place where the sequence goes wrong. (This is somewhat reminiscent of the proof we saw earlier in the class that ALL_{CFG} is undecidable.)]
(c) Parts (a) and (b) indicate that there is a huge difference in computational complexity between ALL_{DFA} and ALL_{NFA} . Why does this not contradict the fact that DFAs and NFAs are equivalent, in the sense that both recognize the regular languages?