

Complexité avancée

TD 3

Cristina Sirangelo - LSV, ENS-Cachan

October 8, 2014

Exercise 1. Geography game Principle :

- The game starts with a given name of a city, for instance *Cachan* ;
- the first player gives the name of a city whose first letter coincides with the last letter of the previous city, for instance *Nanterre* ;
- the second player gives then another city name, always starting with the last letter of the previous city, for instance *Evian* ;
- the first player plays again, and so on – with the restriction that no player is allowed to give the name of a city already used in the game ;
- the loser is the first player who does not find a new city name to continue.

This game can be described using a graph whose vertices represent cities and where an edge (X, Y) means that the last letter of the city X is the same as the first letter of the city Y . This graph has also a vertex marked as the initial vertex of the game (the initial city). Each player choses a vertex of the graph, the first player choses first, and the two players alternate their moves. At each move, the sequence of vertices chosen by the two players must form a simple path in the graph, starting from the distinguished initial vertex.

Player 1 wins the game if, after some number of moves, Player 2 has no valid move (that is no move that forms a simple path with the sequence of previous moves).

1. The geography game problem (JG) is the problem of checking, given an input arbitrary graph and initial vertex, whether the first player has a winning strategy for the above mentioned set of rules (i.e. a strategy that allows Player 1 to win, no matter the moves of Player 2).

Show that JG is in **PSPACE** by describing a polynomial space Turing machine for it.

2. Show that JG is **PSPACE**-complete.

Exercise 2. NFA universality Show that the problem of deciding – given a non-deterministic finite state automaton A over alphabet Σ – whether the language accepted by A is Σ^* , is **PSPACE**-complete.

Exercise 3. NFA equivalence Show that the problem of deciding – given two non-deterministic finite state automata A_1 and A_2 over alphabet Σ – whether $L(A_1) = L(A_2)$, is **PSPACE**-complete.

Exercise 4. Intersection of deterministic finite state automata Show that the problem of deciding $\bigcap_{i=1}^m L(A_i) = \emptyset$ for a given set of deterministic finite state automata, $A_i, i = 1..m$, is **PSPACE**-complete.

Exercise 5. Non-trivial FO theories Recall that the FO-theory of an FO-structure $\mathbf{A}$ of vocabulary σ is the set of all FO σ -sentences which are satisfied by $\mathbf{A}$. The *decision problem* for an FO theory is to determine whether a given sentence φ belongs to the theory (i.e to determine whether $\mathbf{A} \models \varphi$).

Come up with a definition of *trivial* for FO theories, in terms of constraints on the structure $\mathbf{A}$. Prove that for your definition of trivial :

1. The decision problem of every non-trivial theory is **PSPACE**-hard.
2. The decision problem of every non-trivial theory of a finite structure is **PSPACE**-complete.
3. The decision problem of every trivial theory is in **P**.

Exercise 6. First-order theory of natural numbers with linear order Determine the complexity of the decision problem for the FO-theory of the structure $(\omega, \leq)$, where ω is the set of natural numbers and $\leq$ is the usual linear order on ω .

For the upper bound proceed as follows. For k -tuples $a_1, \dots, a_k$ and $b_1, \dots, b_k$ of natural numbers, let $a_0 = b_0 = 0$ and define

$$a_1, \dots, a_k \equiv_k^m b_1, \dots, b_k$$

if there exists a permutation $\pi : \{0, \dots, k\} \rightarrow \{0, \dots, k\}$ such that

- $a_{\pi(0)} \leq \dots \leq a_{\pi(k)}$ and $b_{\pi(0)} \leq \dots \leq b_{\pi(k)}$ and
- $\min(2^m, a_{\pi(i+1)} - a_{\pi(i)}) = \min(2^m, b_{\pi(i+1)} - b_{\pi(i)})$ for all $i = 0..k-1$

1. Prove the following lemma :

Lemma 0.1 *If $a_1, \dots, a_k \equiv_k^m b_1, \dots, b_k$ then for all a_{k+1} there exists b_{k+1} such that $a_1, \dots, a_k, a_{k+1} \equiv_{k+1}^{m-1} b_1, \dots, b_k, b_{k+1}$.*

2. Use the lemma above to show that if $a_1, \dots, a_k \equiv_k^m b_1, \dots, b_k$ and $\varphi(x_1, \dots, x_k)$ is a formula with k free variables of quantifier rank m , then $\varphi(a_1, \dots, a_k)$ holds in $(\omega, \leq)$ iff $\varphi(b_1, \dots, b_k)$ does. (The quantifier rank of a formula is the depth of nesting of quantifiers; a quantifier-free formula is of rank 0.)
3. Using 2. determine the complexity of checking whether a given FO sentence holds in $(\omega, \leq)$.