

Parameterized Compilability

Master of Logic Thesis Defense

NOEL ARTECHE · Supervised by RONALD DE HAAN and HUBIE CHEN

July 11, 2022

Institute for Logic, Language and Computation (ILLC) · University of Amsterdam

Table of contents

1. Introduction
2. A new framework for parameterized compilability
3. Selected compilability results
4. Conclusion

Introduction

Classical (polynomial-size) compilation

Assume the instances $x = (y, z)$ of a problem are made of two parts:

- y is the **offline part**;
- z is the **online part**.

We can (expensively) compile y into a representation y' that can be **polynomially bigger** to hopefully solve (y', z) in polynomial time.

Compilation of logic problems

TERM INFERENCE

Does $\varphi \models l_1 \wedge \dots \wedge l_k$?

CLAUSE INFERENCE

Does $\varphi \models l_1 \vee \dots \vee l_k$?

FORMULA INFERENCE

Does $\varphi \models \psi$?

Compile φ !

Theorem

All three inference problems are **coNP**-complete.

Theorem (Selman and Kautz, 1996; Cadoli et al., 2002)

- TERM INFERENCE is *efficiently compilable*.
- CLAUSE INFERENCE is *not efficiently compilable* unless $\text{PH} = \Sigma_2^{\text{P}}$.
- FORMULA INFERENCE is *not efficiently compilable* unless $\text{P} = \text{NP}$.

The parameter compilation framework

Chen's 2015 *parameter compilation framework* models **compilability** as a special case of **fixed-parameter tractability (FPT)**.

We study parameterized problems (Q, κ) such that κ points at the **compilable part of the input**.

Example (TERM INFERENCE)

On input $(\varphi, \ell_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \ell_k)$ we compile φ . Hence we are interested in the parameterized problem $(\text{TERM INFERENCE}, \varphi)$.

The framework consists of the (parameterized) classes **poly-comp-C**, where **C** is a classical complexity class.

The class **poly-comp-P** models **efficient compilation**.

A new framework for parameterized compilability

Doubly parameterized problems

We introduce doubly parameterized problems:

$$(Q, \kappa, \lambda)$$

where

- $Q \subseteq \Sigma^*$ is a *decision problem*;
- $\kappa : \Sigma^* \rightarrow \Sigma^*$, computable in polynomial time, points at the *compilable part of the input*;
- $\lambda : \Sigma^* \rightarrow \Sigma^*$ is a *parameterization* that *relaxes the size of the compilation from polynomial-size to λ -fpt-size*.

The new fpt-comp-C classes

Let \mathbf{C} be a parameterized complexity class like **FPT**, **W[1]**, **para-NP**...
We define **fpt-comp-C** as containing all the (Q, κ, λ) such that on input $x \in \Sigma^*$,

- we can **compile** $\kappa(x)$ into something of λ -fpt-size:

$$|c(\kappa(x), \lambda(x))| \leq h(\lambda(x)) \cdot p(|\kappa(x)|)$$

for some computable c , computable h and some polynomial p ;

- x together with $c(\kappa(x), \lambda(x))$ and parameter $\lambda(x)$ can be solved **within the resources of C**.

Efficient parameterized compilation is captured by

$$\mathbf{fpt-comp-FPT} = \mathbf{fpt-comp-P}.$$

The fpt-comp reductions and methodology theorems

Our **fpt-comp-C** classes are closed under a new notion of reduction: the **fpt-comp reductions** ($\leq_{\text{comp}}^{\text{fpt}}$).

Theorem (General methodology theorem, Thm. 2.19)

Let \mathbf{C} and \mathbf{C}' be parameterized complexity classes (like **FPT**, **W[1]**, **para-NP**...). If

- (A, λ) is \mathbf{C} -hard,
- $(A, \text{len}, \lambda) \leq_{\text{comp}}^{\text{fpt}} (B, \kappa, \mu)$,
- $(B, \kappa, \mu) \in \text{fpt-comp-}\mathbf{C}'$,

then $\mathbf{C} \subseteq \mathbf{C}' / \text{fpt}$.

Example

Take $\mathbf{C} = \mathbf{W}[1]$ and $\mathbf{C}' = \mathbf{FPT}$. If $(\text{CLIQUE}, \text{len}, k) \leq_{\text{comp}}^{\text{fpt}} (Q, \kappa, \lambda)$ and $(Q, \kappa, \lambda) \in \text{fpt-comp-FPT}$, then $\mathbf{W}[1] \subseteq \mathbf{FPT} / \text{fpt}$ (cf. $\mathbf{NP} \subseteq \mathbf{P} / \text{poly}$).

Selected compilability results

SAT COMPLETION

Instance A Boolean formula φ and a partial assignment α .

Question Is there an extension of α into a satisfying assignment for φ ?

Additional parameterization

The number u of undefined variables in α .

Proposition

$(\text{SAT COMPLETION}, \varphi) \notin \text{poly-comp-P}$ (unless **PH** collapses) but
 $(\text{SAT COMPLETION}, \varphi, u) \in \text{fpt-comp-FPT}$.

CSP COMPLETION

Instance An instance $I = \langle X, D, C \rangle$ of CSP and a partial assignment $\alpha : X \rightarrow D$.

Question Is there an extension of α into a satisfying assignment for I ?

Additional parameterization

The number u of undefined variables in α .

Theorem (Corollary 3.7)

(CSP COMPLETION, u) is $W[1]$ -complete.

Theorem (Thm. 3.9)

(CSP COMPLETION, I, u) \notin **fpt-comp-FPT** unless $W[1] \subseteq \text{FPT} / \text{fpt}$.

Conclusion

Overview of results in the thesis

- We developed an extension of the parameter compilation framework that models **parameterized compilability** (Chapter 2).
- We showed **parameterized uncompleability results** for *completion variants* of problems around the classes $W[1]$ and $W[2]$ (Chapters 3 and 4):

WEIGHTED q -SAT COMPLETION (**chopped- $W[1]$ -complete**)

HITTING SET COMPLETION (**chopped- $W[2]$ -complete**)

DOMINATING SET COMPLETION (**chopped- $W[1]$ -hard**)




...

- We studied the issue of **treewidth in compiling CSP instances**, both for CSP COMPLETION and inference problems related to CSP (Chapter 5).

- Classify more problems under the framework.
- Show tighter classifications, e.g.
 - for DOMINATING SET COMPLETION, currently **chopped-W[1]**-hard but not **chopped-W[2]**-complete;
 - for (CSP COMPLETION, l , **ptw**), currently **chopped-W[1]**-hard but not known to be complete for any class.
- Focus on positive results.

Thanks for listening!

References

-  M. Cadoli, F. M. Donini, P. Liberatore, and M. Schaerf.
Preprocessing of intractable problems.
Information and computation, 176(2):89–120, 2002.
-  H. Chen.
Parameter compilation.
In *10th International Symposium on Parameterized and Exact Computation*, page 127, 2015.
-  B. Selman and H. Kautz.
Knowledge compilation and theory approximation.
Journal of the ACM (JACM), 43(2):193–224, 1996.

Reductions for poly-comp-C

Definition ($\leq_{\text{comp}}^{\text{poly}}$ reductions)

We say that (A, κ) *poly-comp-reduces* to (B, λ) if there is

- a **polynomial-size function** $c : \Sigma^* \rightarrow \Sigma^*$,
- a **polynomial-time function** $f : \Sigma^* \times \Sigma^* \rightarrow \Sigma^*$

such that for all $x \in \Sigma^*$,

$$x \in A \Leftrightarrow f(x, c(\kappa(x))) \in B$$

and there is a **polynomial-size function** $s : \Sigma^* \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_{\text{fin}}(\Sigma^*)$ such that

$$\lambda(f(x, c(\kappa(x)))) \in s(\kappa(x)).$$

A system for negative results

Hardness of problems is established via reductions from languages where the compilation has access to the **length of the input** (len).

Theorem (Chen, 2015)

Let A be a \mathbf{C} -complete language. If $(A, \text{len}) \leq_{\text{comp}}^{\text{poly}} (B, \kappa)$ and $(B, \kappa) \in \text{poly-comp-}\mathbf{C}'$, then $\mathbf{C}' \subseteq \mathbf{C}/_{\text{poly}}$.

Example

If $(\text{SAT}, \text{len}) \leq_{\text{comp}}^{\text{poly}} (A, \kappa)$ and $(A, \kappa) \in \text{poly-comp-P}$, then $\mathbf{NP} \subseteq \mathbf{P}/_{\text{poly}}$.
By the Karp-Lipton theorem, \mathbf{PH} collapses.

The case of SAT COMPLETION

SAT COMPLETION

Given a Boolean formula φ and a partial assignment α , decide whether α can be extended into a satisfying assignment for φ .

Theorem

$(3\text{SAT}, \text{len}) \leq_{\text{comp}}^{\text{poly}} (\text{SAT COMPLETION}, \pi_1)$.

Proof. Reduction via the “superinstance technique”. Over n variables, there are $\binom{2^n}{3} \in O(n^3)$ possible clauses. Enumerate them: $\mathcal{C} = \{C_1, C_2, C_3 \dots\}$ and build the formula $\bigwedge_{C_i \in \mathcal{C}} (c_i \rightarrow C_i)$. With a partial assignment to the c_i variables we can “configure” this superinstance to represent our specific formula. □

Corollary

$(\text{SAT COMPLETION}, \pi_1) \notin \text{poly-comp-P}$ unless PH collapses.

HITTING SET and DOMINATING SET COMPLETION

HITTING SET COMPLETION (HS-C)

Instance An instance $\langle U, S, k \rangle$ of HITTING SET together with sets $I, O \subseteq U$ and a set $A \subseteq S \times U$.

Question Is there a hitting set $H \subseteq U$ of size $k + |I|$ such that $I \subseteq H$, $H \cap O = \emptyset$ and for every $S_i \in S$, $H \cap (S_i \setminus \{u \in U \mid (u, S_i) \in A\}) \neq \emptyset$?

DOMINATING SET COMPLETION (DS-C)

Instance An instance of DOMINATING SET consisting of a graph $G = (V, E)$ and a number k , together with sets $I, O, S \subseteq V$.

Question Is there a dominating set D for the induced subgraph $G[V \setminus S]$ such that D is of size $k + |I|$, $I \subseteq D$ and $D \cap O = \emptyset$?

Complexity results

Proposition (Prop. 4.2 and 4.5)

$(\text{HS-C}, k)$ and $(\text{DS-C}, k)$ are $\text{W}[2]$ -complete.

Theorem (Corollary 4.8)

$(\text{HS-C}, \langle U, S, k \rangle)$ and $(\text{DS-C}, \langle G, k \rangle)$ are both **chopped-NP**-complete.

Theorem (Corollary 4.9)

$(\text{HS-C}, \langle U, S, k \rangle, k)$ is **chopped-W[2]**-complete.

$(\text{DS-C}, \langle G, k \rangle, k)$ is **chopped-W[1]**-hard and in **chopped-W[2]**.