SAT: Given Boolean formula 4, dres it have a satisfying assignment?

 $((x_1 \lor x_2) \rightarrow (x_1 \land x_3)) \land \land x_1 \land \land x_3$ that makes $(x_1 \lor x_2) \rightarrow (x_1 \land x_3) \land \land x_1 \land \land x_3$ that makes $(x_1 \lor x_2) \rightarrow (x_1 \land x_3) \land \land x_1 \land \land x_2 \rightarrow (x_1 \lor x_2) \rightarrow (x_1 \land x_3) \land \land x_1 \land \land x_2 \rightarrow (x_1 \lor x_2) \rightarrow (x_1 \land x_3) \land \land x_1 \land \land x_2 \rightarrow (x_1 \lor x_2) \rightarrow (x_1 \land x_3) \land \land x_1 \land \land x_2 \rightarrow (x_1 \lor x_2) \rightarrow (x_1 \land x_3) \land \land x_1 \land \land x_2 \rightarrow (x_1 \lor x_2) \rightarrow (x_1 \land x_2) \rightarrow (x_1 \land x_3) \land \land x_1 \land \land x_2 \rightarrow (x_1 \lor x_2) \rightarrow (x_1 \land x_2) \rightarrow (x_1 \land x_3) \rightarrow (x_1 \land x_4) \rightarrow$

3-SAT: Given Boolean formula 4 in 3-CNF form, is it satisfiable?

4 is the control of the contro

(~x, v ~x, v ~x,) ~ (~x, v ~x, v x,) ~ (x, v x, v x,) ~ (X, v ~x, v ~x,) ~ (x, v x, v ~x,) ~ (x, v ~x, v ~x, v ~x,) ~ (x, v ~x, v ~x, v ~x,) ~ (x, v ~x, v ~x, v ~x, v ~x, v ~x,) ~ (x, v ~x,) ~ (x, v ~x, v ~x,

(X, VX, VX,)

in Joly-home

3-SAT & IND-SET Goal: given 4 in 3-CNF, construct G and pickak sit.

1) construct G, pick k
2) reduct TS (G, K)

T T T (x, vx2 v~x3) x (~x, vx3 vx4) x (~x2 v~x3 v~x4)

X, = T KZ=F Xz = T



HAM-PATH! evidence is the Hamiltonian path MIN-FEEDBALL-ARL-SET; evidence is sot of odges

given directed 6, int k is there a got of & k edges that when removed makes 6 acyclic k=2 0 30 30 30

NP-complete: hardest problems in NP

DEF: A is NP-complete means 1) AENP 2) for all BENP, B=PA

THM: If XENP and Y is NP-complete and YEPX then X 15 also NP-complete Proof: 1) XE NP Z) Let BENP [need B =P A] Then B = Y Y is NP-complete; part 2 def NP-complete

So B = p X trans. dv. ly ... HP ---> HC ->> TSP CIRCUIT-SAT ->3-SAT -> IS -> VC -> CLIQUE poly-home of for X THM: P = NP Let XEP. X-VERIFY (x,y): if X(x) = YES redun OK
ely vehin NOT-OK X. P Or P=NP =NP-WM To show P = NP, it is sufficient to find super-poly lb for some XENP To show P=NP, it is sufficient to find pay-how for some NP-complex X