

Average-case Computational Complexity

Algorithms and Complexity

Andreas Mantis

MPLA

July 10, 2014

- Conventional complexity theory deals with worst-case.

Motivation and Structure of the talk

- Conventional complexity theory deals with worst-case.
- However, we are only interested in instances that arise in practice.

Motivation and Structure of the talk

- Conventional complexity theory deals with worst-case.
- However, we are only interested in instances that arise in practice.
- First, we define what are distributional problems and the class of "easy" problems(distP).

Motivation and Structure of the talk

- Conventional complexity theory deals with worst-case.
- However, we are only interested in instances that arise in practice.
- First, we define what are distributional problems and the class of "easy" problems(distP).
- What are some realistic distributions?

Motivation and Structure of the talk

- Conventional complexity theory deals with worst-case.
- However, we are only interested in instances that arise in practice.
- First, we define what are distributional problems and the class of "easy" problems(distP).
- What are some realistic distributions?
- How can we define reductions on average case?

Motivation and Structure of the talk

- Conventional complexity theory deals with worst-case.
- However, we are only interested in instances that arise in practice.
- First, we define what are distributional problems and the class of "easy" problems (distP).
- What are some realistic distributions?
- How can we define reductions on average case?
- A class of "hard" problems (distNP) and a complete problem for that class.

Distributional Problem

A distributional problem is a pair $\langle L, D \rangle$ where $L \subseteq \{0, 1\}^$ is a language, and $D = \{D_n\}$ is a sequence of distributions, with D_n being a distribution over $\{0, 1\}^n$*

Distributional Problem

A distributional problem is a pair $\langle L, D \rangle$ where $L \subseteq \{0, 1\}^$ is a language, and $D = \{D_n\}$ is a sequence of distributions, with D_n being a distribution over $\{0, 1\}^n$*

For example: SAT only on inputs with more than $10n$ clauses u.a.r

- Defining a class of easy problems on average is tricky.

- Defining a class of easy problems on average is tricky.

distP first attempt

$\langle L, D \rangle$ is poly-time solvable on average if there is an algorithm A such that $A(x) = L(x)$ for every x and a polynomial p such that for every n ,

$$\mathbb{E}_{x \sim D_n}[\text{time}_A(x)] \leq p(n).$$

- The definition is not robust.

- The definition is not robust.
- If we change the model of computation to one with quadratic slow-down, we lose exponentially on time.

- The definition is not robust.
- If we change the model of computation to one with quadratic slow-down, we lose exponentially on time.
- Suppose that an algorithm A halts in n steps on every input except for the all-zeros input, on which it runs for 2^n steps.

- The definition is not robust.
- If we change the model of computation to one with quadratic slow-down, we lose exponentially on time.
- Suppose that an algorithm A halts in n steps on every input except for the all-zeros input, on which it runs for 2^n steps.
- $\mathbb{E}_{x \sim \{0,1\}^n} [time_A(x)] = (1 - 2^{-n})n + 2^{-n}2^n \leq n + 1.$

- The definition is not robust.
- If we change the model of computation to one with quadratic slow-down, we lose exponentially on time.
- Suppose that an algorithm A halts in n steps on every input except for the all-zeros input, on which it runs for 2^n steps.
- $\mathbb{E}_{x \sim \{0,1\}^n} [time_A(x)] = (1 - 2^{-n})n + 2^{-n}2^n \leq n + 1.$
- $\mathbb{E}_{x \sim \{0,1\}^n} [time_A^2(x)] = (1 - 2^{-n})n^2 + 2^{-n}2^{2n} \geq 2^n.$

distP

A distributional problem $\langle L, D \rangle$ is in distP if there is an algorithm A for L and constants C and $\epsilon > 0$ such that for every n ,

$$\mathbb{E}_{x \sim D_n} \left[\frac{\text{time}_A(x)^\epsilon}{n} \right] \leq C.$$

- $P \subseteq \text{dist}P$. Indeed, if L is decided by A in $O(|x|^c)$, then $\text{time}_A(x)^{1/c} = O(|x|)$ and the expectation would be bounded by a constant.

- $P \subseteq \text{distP}$. Indeed, if L is decided by A in $O(|x|^c)$, then $\text{time}_A(x)^{1/c} = O(|x|)$ and the expectation would be bounded by a constant.
- High probability to run in polytime. Indeed, by Markov's inequality, for every $K > 1$, $\text{Prob}\left[\frac{\text{time}_A(x)^\epsilon}{n} \geq KC\right] = \text{Prob}[\text{time}_A(x) \geq (KCn)^{1/\epsilon}]$ is at most $1/K$.

- $P \subseteq \text{distP}$. Indeed, if L is decided by A in $O(|x|^c)$, then $\text{time}_A(x)^{1/c} = O(|x|)$ and the expectation would be bounded by a constant.
- High probability to run in polytime. Indeed, by Markov's inequality, for every $K > 1$, $\text{Prob}[\frac{\text{time}_A(x)^\epsilon}{n} \geq KC] = \text{Prob}[\text{time}_A(x) \geq (KCn)^{1/\epsilon}]$ is at most $1/K$.
- Robust in minor changes. Indeed, for every $d > 0$ our definition is equivalent with: there exist ϵ, C , such that

$$\mathbb{E}_{x \sim D_n} \left[\frac{\text{time}_A(x)^\epsilon}{n^d} \right] \leq C.$$

Realistic distributions

- The world is indifferent to our algorithm.

- The world is indifferent to our algorithm.

P-computable distributions

The P-computable distributions have an associated deterministic polynomial time machine that, given input $x \in \{0,1\}^n$, can compute the cumulative probability $\mu_{D_n}(x)$, where

$$\mu_{D_n}(x) = \sum_{y \in \{0,1\}^n: y \leq x} Pr[y].$$

P-samplable distributions

The P-samplable distributions have an associated probabilistic polynomial time machine that can produce samples from the distribution. Specifically, we say that $D = \{D_n\}$ is P-samplable if there is a polynomial p and a probabilistic $p(n)$ -time algorithm A such that for every n , the random variables $A(1^n)$ and D_n are identically distributed.

Theorem 2

Every P -computable distribution is also P -samplable

Theorem 2

Every P-computable distribution is also P-samplable

Proof.

- Generate a truncated $\rho \in [0, 1]$.

Theorem 2

Every P-computable distribution is also P-samplable

Proof.

- Generate a truncated $\rho \in [0, 1]$.
- Look via binary search for the unique x , such that $\mu_{D_n}(x - 1) < \rho \leq \mu_{D_n}(x)$.

Theorem 2

Every P-computable distribution is also P-samplable

Proof.

- Generate a truncated $\rho \in [0, 1]$.
- Look via binary search for the unique x , such that $\mu_{D_n}(x - 1) < \rho \leq \mu_{D_n}(x)$.
- Output x .



Theorem 2

Every P -computable distribution is also P -samplable

Proof.

- Generate a truncated $\rho \in [0, 1]$.
- Look via binary search for the unique x , such that $\mu_{D_n}(x-1) < \rho \leq \mu_{D_n}(x)$.
- Output x .



NOTE: The converse is not true unless $P = P^{\#P}$.

distNP

A distributional problem $\langle L, D \rangle$ is in distNP if $L \in NP$ and D is P -computable.

distNP

A distributional problem $\langle L, D \rangle$ is in distNP if $L \in NP$ and D is P-computable.

Average-case reduction

We say that a distributional problem $\langle L, D \rangle$ average-case reduces to a distributional problem $\langle L', D' \rangle$, if there is a polynomial-time computable f and polynomials $p, q: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ satisfying:

1. (Correctness) For every $x \in \{0, 1\}^*$, $x \in L \Leftrightarrow f(x) \in L'$.
2. (Length Regularity) For every $x \in \{0, 1\}^*$, $|f(x)| = p(|x|)$.
3. (Domination) For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $y \in \{0, 1\}^{p(n)}$,

$$\Pr[y = f(D_n)] \leq q(n)\Pr[y = D'_{p(n)}].$$

Notes on the definition:

- (Correctness) For every $x \in \{0, 1\}^*$, $x \in L \Leftrightarrow f(x) \in L'$.

Notes on the definition:

- (Correctness) For every $x \in \{0, 1\}^*$, $x \in L \Leftrightarrow f(x) \in L'$.
Like any other reduction!

Notes on the definition:

- (Correctness) For every $x \in \{0, 1\}^*$, $x \in L \Leftrightarrow f(x) \in L'$.
Like any other reduction!
- (Length Regularity) For every $x \in \{0, 1\}^*$, $|f(x)| = p(|x|)$.

Notes on the definition:

- (Correctness) For every $x \in \{0, 1\}^*$, $x \in L \Leftrightarrow f(x) \in L'$.
Like any other reduction!
- (Length Regularity) For every $x \in \{0, 1\}^*$, $|f(x)| = p(|x|)$.
Technical. Useful for proving transitivity.

Notes on the definition:

- (Correctness) For every $x \in \{0, 1\}^*$, $x \in L \Leftrightarrow f(x) \in L'$.
Like any other reduction!
- (Length Regularity) For every $x \in \{0, 1\}^*$, $|f(x)| = p(|x|)$.
Technical. Useful for proving transitivity.
- (Domination) For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $y \in \{0, 1\}^{p(n)}$,

$$\Pr[y = f(D_n)] \leq q(n)\Pr[y = D'_{p(n)}].$$

Notes on the definition:

- (Correctness) For every $x \in \{0, 1\}^*$, $x \in L \Leftrightarrow f(x) \in L'$.
Like any other reduction!
- (Length Regularity) For every $x \in \{0, 1\}^*$, $|f(x)| = p(|x|)$.
Technical. Useful for proving transitivity.
- (Domination) For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $y \in \{0, 1\}^{p(n)}$,

$$\Pr[y = f(D_n)] \leq q(n)\Pr[y = D'_{p(n)}].$$

If A' is for $\langle L', D' \rangle$, we want the obvious algorithm A for $\langle L, D \rangle$ to work: on $x \sim D$, we compute $f(x) = y$ and run algorithm A' on y .

Theorem 1

distP is closed under the average-case reduction.

Theorem 1

distP is closed under the average-case reduction.

Proof:

- A' solves polynomially $\langle L', D' \rangle$. Therefore, there are constants C , $\epsilon > 0$, such that for every m ,

$$\mathbb{E}_{x \sim D'_m} \left[\frac{\text{time}_{A'}(x)^\epsilon}{m} \right] \leq C.$$

Theorem 1

distP is closed under the average-case reduction.

Proof:

- A' solves polynomially $\langle L', D' \rangle$. Therefore, there are constants C , $\epsilon > 0$, such that for every m ,

$$\mathbb{E}_{x \sim D'_m} \left[\frac{\text{time}_{A'}(x)^\epsilon}{m} \right] \leq C.$$

- We need to prove that $\langle L, D \rangle$ is in distP.

- Assume that for every x , $|f(x)| = |x|^d$.

- Assume that for every x , $|f(x)| = |x|^d$.
- Computing f on input length n is faster than A' on input length n^d .
Therefore $time_A(x) \leq 2time_{A'}(f(x))$.

- Assume that for every x , $|f(x)| = |x|^d$.
- Computing f on input length n is faster than A' on input length n^d .
Therefore $time_A(x) \leq 2time_{A'}(f(x))$.
- It suffices to show that

$$\mathbb{E}_{x \sim D_n} \left[\frac{(\frac{1}{2} time_A(x))^\epsilon}{q(n)n^d} \right] \leq C.$$

where $q(n)$ is the polynomial in the dominating condition.

$$\mathbb{E}_{x \sim D_n} \left[\frac{(\frac{1}{2} \text{time}_A(x))^\epsilon}{q(n)n^d} \right] \leq \sum_{y \in \{0,1\}^{nd}} \Pr[y = f(D_n)] \frac{\text{time}_{A'}(y)^\epsilon}{q(n)n^d}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_{x \sim D_n} \left[\frac{\left(\frac{1}{2} \text{time}_A(x)\right)^\epsilon}{q(n)n^d} \right] &\leq \sum_{y \in \{0,1\}^{n^d}} \Pr[y = f(D_n)] \frac{\text{time}_{A'}(y)^\epsilon}{q(n)n^d} \\ &\leq \sum_{y \in \{0,1\}^{n^d}} \Pr[y = D'_{n^d}] \frac{\text{time}_{A'}(y)^\epsilon}{n^d}\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_{x \sim D_n} \left[\frac{\left(\frac{1}{2} \text{time}_A(x)\right)^\epsilon}{q(n)n^d} \right] &\leq \sum_{y \in \{0,1\}^{n^d}} \Pr[y = f(D_n)] \frac{\text{time}_{A'}(y)^\epsilon}{q(n)n^d} \\ &\leq \sum_{y \in \{0,1\}^{n^d}} \Pr[y = D'_{n^d}] \frac{\text{time}_{A'}(y)^\epsilon}{n^d} \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\text{time}_{A'}(D'_{n^d})^\epsilon}{n^d} \right] \leq C.\end{aligned}$$

And now a complete problem... albeit artificial

And now a complete problem... albeit artificial

Theorem 2

(Existence of a distNP-complete problem) Let U contain all tuples $\langle M, x, 1^t \rangle$ where there exists a string $y \in \{0, 1\}^l$ such that a nondeterministic TM M outputs 1 on input x on t steps.

For every n , we let \mathcal{U}_n be the following distribution on length n tuples $\langle M, x, 1^t \rangle$: the string representing M is chosen at random from all strings of length at most $\log n$, t is chosen at random in the set $\{0, \dots, n - |M|\}$ and x is chosen at random from $\{0, 1\}^{n-t-|M|}$.

This distribution is polynomial-time computable.

Then $\langle U, \mathcal{U} \rangle$ is distNP-complete.

- L decidable by a $p(n)$ -time NDTM M.

- L decidable by a $p(n)$ -time NDTM M.
- f: $x \mapsto \langle M, x, 1^{p(n)} \rangle$.

- L decidable by a $p(n)$ -time NDTM M .
- $f: x \mapsto \langle M, x, 1^{p(n)} \rangle$.
- Correctness?

- L decidable by a $p(n)$ -time NDTM M.
- $f: x \mapsto \langle M, x, 1^{p(n)} \rangle$.
- Correctness? **YES**. The problem is NP-complete!

- L decidable by a $p(n)$ -time NDTM M.
- $f: x \mapsto \langle M, x, 1^{p(n)} \rangle$.
- Correctness? **YES**. The problem is NP-complete!
- Length regularity?

- L decidable by a $p(n)$ -time NDTM M .
- $f: x \mapsto \langle M, x, 1^{p(n)} \rangle$.
- Correctness? **YES**. The problem is NP-complete!
- Length regularity? **YES**

- L decidable by a $p(n)$ -time NDTM M.
- $f: x \mapsto \langle M, x, 1^{p(n)} \rangle$.
- Correctness? **YES**. The problem is NP-complete!
- Length regularity? **YES**
- Domination?

- L decidable by a $p(n)$ -time NDTM M .
- $f: x \mapsto \langle M, x, 1^{p(n)} \rangle$.
- Correctness? **YES**. The problem is NP-complete!
- Length regularity? **YES**
- Domination? Not necessarily. We have a problem with peaks. What if D has an input of probability much higher than 2^{-n} , whereas \mathcal{U} 's probability is at most 2^{-n} .

- L decidable by a $p(n)$ -time NDTM M .
- $f: x \mapsto \langle M, x, 1^{p(n)} \rangle$.
- Correctness? **YES**. The problem is NP-complete!
- Length regularity? **YES**
- Domination? Not necessarily. We have a problem with peaks. What if D has an input of probability much higher than 2^{-n} , whereas \mathcal{U} 's probability is at most 2^{-n} .
- We deal with that with our next lemma

Lemma (Peak elimination)

Let $D = \{D_n\}$ be a P -computable distribution. Then there is a polynomial-time computable function $g : \{0, 1\}^* \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^*$ such that:

1. g is one-to-one: $g(x) = g(z)$ iff $x = z$.
2. For every $x \in \{0, 1\}^*$, $|g(x)| \leq |x| + 1$.
3. For every string $y \in \{0, 1\}^m$, $\Pr[y = g(D_m)] \leq 2^{-m+1}$.

Proof:

- For any x of length n , $h(x)$ is the largest common prefix of the binary numbers $\mu_{D_n}(x)$ and $\mu_{D_n}(x - 1)$.

Proof:

- For any x of length n , $h(x)$ is the largest common prefix of the binary numbers $\mu_{D_n}(x)$ and $\mu_{D_n}(x - 1)$.
- We know that $Pr_{D_n}[x] = \mu_{D_n}(x) - \mu_{D_n}(x - 1)$ and let's assume that $Pr_{D_n}[x] \geq 2^{-k}$. Then the difference must be in the first k digits, namely $|h(x)| \leq k$.

Proof:

- For any x of length n , $h(x)$ is the largest common prefix of the binary numbers $\mu_{D_n}(x)$ and $\mu_{D_n}(x - 1)$.
- We know that $Pr_{D_n}[x] = \mu_{D_n}(x) - \mu_{D_n}(x - 1)$ and let's assume that $Pr_{D_n}[x] \geq 2^{-k}$. Then the difference must be in the first k digits, namely $|h(x)| \leq k$.
- D is P-computable, thus h is computable in polynomial time.

Proof:

- For any x of length n , $h(x)$ is the largest common prefix of the binary numbers $\mu_{D_n}(x)$ and $\mu_{D_n}(x - 1)$.
- We know that $Pr_{D_n}[x] = \mu_{D_n}(x) - \mu_{D_n}(x - 1)$ and let's assume that $Pr_{D_n}[x] \geq 2^{-k}$. Then the difference must be in the first k digits, namely $|h(x)| \leq k$.
- D is P-computable, thus h is computable in polynomial time.
- h is one-to-one because only two strings can have a specific longest prefix.

$$g(x) = \begin{cases} 0x & , \text{Prob}_{D_n}[x] \leq 2^{-n} \\ 1h(x) & , \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Example:

$$\text{Prob}_{D_n}[1010] = 0.10000$$

$$\text{Prob}_{D_n}[1011] = 0.10101111$$

$$\Rightarrow g(1011) = 1h(1011) = 110.$$

$$g(x) = \begin{cases} 0x & , \text{Prob}_{D_n}[x] \leq 2^{-n} \\ 1h(x) & , \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

- g in one-to-one.

$$g(x) = \begin{cases} 0x & , \text{Prob}_{D_n}[x] \leq 2^{-n} \\ 1h(x) & , \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

- g is one-to-one.
- $|g(x)| \leq |x| + 1$.

$$g(x) = \begin{cases} 0x & , \text{Prob}_{D_n}[x] \leq 2^{-n} \\ 1h(x) & , \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

- g is one-to-one.
- $|g(x)| \leq |x| + 1$.
- If y is not $g(x)$, then $\Pr[y = g(D_m)] = 0 \leq 2^{-m+1}$.

$$g(x) = \begin{cases} 0x & , \text{Prob}_{D_n}[x] \leq 2^{-n} \\ 1h(x) & , \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

- g is one-to-one.
- $|g(x)| \leq |x| + 1$.
- If y is not $g(x)$, then $\Pr[y = g(D_m)] = 0 \leq 2^{-m+1}$.
- If $y = 0x$ when $\Pr_{D_n}[x] \leq 2^{-|x|}$, then $\Pr[y = g(D_m)] \leq 2^{-|y|+1}$.

$$g(x) = \begin{cases} 0x & , \text{Pr}_{D_n}[x] \leq 2^{-n} \\ 1h(x) & , \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

- g is one-to-one.
- $|g(x)| \leq |x| + 1$.
- If y is not $g(x)$, then $\Pr[y = g(D_m)] = 0 \leq 2^{-m+1}$.
- If $y = 0x$ when $\Pr_{D_n}[x] \leq 2^{-|x|}$, then $\Pr[y = g(D_m)] \leq 2^{-|y|+1}$.
- Let $y = 1h(x)$. $\Pr_{D_n}[x] > 2^{-|x|}$ and therefore $|h(x)| \leq |x|$. So $\Pr[y = g(D_m)] \leq 2^{-|y|+1}$.

And now we can prove the following theorem

And now we can prove the following theorem

Theorem 3

(Existence of a distNP-complete problem) Let U contain all tuples $\langle M, x, 1^t \rangle$ where there exists a string $y \in \{0, 1\}^l$ such that a nondeterministic TM M outputs 1 on input x on t steps.

For every n , we let \mathcal{U}_n be the following distribution on length n tuples $\langle M, x, 1^t \rangle$: the string representing M is chosen at random from all strings of length at most $\log n$, t is chosen at random in the set $\{0, \dots, n - |M|\}$ and x is chosen at random from $\{0, 1\}^{n-t-|M|}$.

This distribution is polynomial-time computable.

Then $\langle U, \mathcal{U} \rangle$ is distNP-complete.

Theorem Proof:

- Let $\langle L, D \rangle$ be in distNP and let M be a nondeterministic TM M accepting L .

Theorem Proof:

- Let $\langle L, D \rangle$ be in distNP and let M be a nondeterministic TM M accepting L .
- NDTM M' : On input y , guess x such that $g(x) = y$ and execute $M(x)$. Let p the polynomial running time of M' .

Theorem Proof:

- Let $\langle L, D \rangle$ be in distNP and let M be a nondeterministic TM M accepting L .
- NDTM M' : On input y , guess x such that $g(x) = y$ and execute $M(x)$. Let p the polynomial running time of M' .
- Reduction: $x \mapsto \langle M', g(x), 1^k \rangle$, where $k = p(n) + \log n + n - |M'| - |g(x)|$.

Theorem Proof:

- Let $\langle L, D \rangle$ be in distNP and let M be a nondeterministic TM M accepting L .
- NDTM M' : On input y , guess x such that $g(x) = y$ and execute $M(x)$. Let p the polynomial running time of M' .
- Reduction: $x \mapsto \langle M', g(x), 1^k \rangle$, where $k = p(n) + \log n + n - |M'| - |g(x)|$.
- Correctness?

Theorem Proof:

- Let $\langle L, D \rangle$ be in distNP and let M be a nondeterministic TM M accepting L .
- NDTM M' : On input y , guess x such that $g(x) = y$ and execute $M(x)$. Let p the polynomial running time of M' .
- Reduction: $x \mapsto \langle M', g(x), 1^k \rangle$, where $k = p(n) + \log n + n - |M'| - |g(x)|$.
- Correctness? Yes! g is one-to-one.

Theorem Proof:

- Let $\langle L, D \rangle$ be in distNP and let M be a nondeterministic TM M accepting L .
- NDTM M' : On input y , guess x such that $g(x) = y$ and execute $M(x)$. Let p the polynomial running time of M' .
- Reduction: $x \mapsto \langle M', g(x), 1^k \rangle$, where $k = p(n) + \log n + n - |M'| - |g(x)|$.
- Correctness? Yes! g is one-to-one.
- Length regularity?

Theorem Proof:

- Let $\langle L, D \rangle$ be in distNP and let M be a nondeterministic TM M accepting L .
- NDTM M' : On input y , guess x such that $g(x) = y$ and execute $M(x)$. Let p the polynomial running time of M' .
- Reduction: $x \mapsto \langle M', g(x), 1^k \rangle$, where $k = p(n) + \log n + n - |M'| - |g(x)|$.
- Correctness? Yes! g is one-to-one.
- Length regularity? Yes!

Theorem Proof:

- Let $\langle L, D \rangle$ be in distNP and let M be a nondeterministic TM M accepting L .
- NDTM M' : On input y , guess x such that $g(x) = y$ and execute $M(x)$. Let p the polynomial running time of M' .
- Reduction: $x \mapsto \langle M', g(x), 1^k \rangle$, where $k = p(n) + \log n + n - |M'| - |g(x)|$.
- Correctness? Yes! g is one-to-one.
- Length regularity? Yes!
- Domination?

Theorem Proof:

- Let $\langle L, D \rangle$ be in distNP and let M be a nondeterministic TM M accepting L .
- NDTM M' : On input y , guess x such that $g(x) = y$ and execute $M(x)$. Let p the polynomial running time of M' .
- Reduction: $x \mapsto \langle M', g(x), 1^k \rangle$, where $k = p(n) + \log n + n - |M'| - |g(x)|$.
- Correctness? Yes! g is one-to-one.
- Length regularity? Yes!
- Domination? Yes! A length m tuple $\langle M', y, 1^t \rangle$ is obtained by the reduction with probability at most $2^{-|y|+1}$. This tuple is however obtained by U_m with probability at least $2^{-\log m} 2^{-|y|} \frac{1}{m}$.

Question:

Question: Why not use the polynomially samplable distribution since it is stronger?

Question: Why not use the polynomially samplable distribution since it is stronger?

sampNP

A distributional problem $\langle L, D \rangle$ is in sampNP if $L \in NP$ and D is P -samplable.

Question: Why not use the polynomially samplable distribution since it is stronger?

sampNP

A distributional problem $\langle L, D \rangle$ is in sampNP if $L \in NP$ and D is P -samplable.

Theorem 4

if $\langle L, D \rangle$ is distNP-complete, then it is also sampNP-complete.

Question: Why not use the polynomially samplable distribution since it is stronger?

sampNP

A distributional problem $\langle L, D \rangle$ is in sampNP if $L \in NP$ and D is P-samplable.

Theorem 4

if $\langle L, D \rangle$ is distNP-complete, then it is also sampNP-complete.

The choice of P-computable distributions was suitable for average-case completeness results.

Impagliazzo has considered the following possible scenarios for the world of Complexity:

Impagliazzo has considered the following possible scenarios for the world of Complexity:

Algorithmica

Impagliazzo has considered the following possible scenarios for the world of Complexity:

Algorithmica

- $P = NP$ or something equivalent like $NP \subseteq BPP$

Impagliazzo has considered the following possible scenarios for the world of Complexity:

Algorithmica

- $P = NP$ or something equivalent like $NP \subseteq BPP$
- Computational utopia.

Impagliazzo has considered the following possible scenarios for the world of Complexity:

Algorithmica

- $P = NP$ or something equivalent like $NP \subseteq BPP$
- Computational utopia.
- Quite an array of tasks could be automated.

Impagliazzo has considered the following possible scenarios for the world of Complexity:

Algorithmica

- $P = NP$ or something equivalent like $NP \subseteq BPP$
- Computational utopia.
- Quite an array of tasks could be automated.
- All the current cryptographic applications will break down.

Heuristica

Heuristica

- We have $P \neq NP$ and yet $distNP \subseteq distP$.

Heuristica

- We have $P \neq NP$ and yet $distNP \subseteq distP$.
- We have efficient algorithms that "almost" solves every NP problem.

Heuristica

- We have $P \neq NP$ and yet $distNP \subseteq distP$.
- We have efficient algorithms that "almost" solves every NP problem.
- The kinds of inputs that fail are very rare to find in practice.

Heuristica

- We have $P \neq NP$ and yet $distNP \subseteq distP$.
- We have efficient algorithms that "almost" solves every NP problem.
- The kinds of inputs that fail are very rare to find in practice.
- Very similar to Algorithmica. Many NP optimization problems solved in practice.

Heuristica

- We have $P \neq NP$ and yet $distNP \subseteq distP$.
- We have efficient algorithms that "almost" solves every NP problem.
- The kinds of inputs that fail are very rare to find in practice.
- Very similar to Algorithmica. Many NP optimization problems solved in practice.
- Many cryptographic applications break down.

Pessiland

Pessimism

- distNP is not in distP and there do not exist any one-way functions.

Pessiland

- distNP is not in distP and there do not exist any one-way functions.
- Worst possible world!

Pessiland

- distNP is not in distP and there do not exist any one-way functions.
- Worst possible world!
- No wondrous results and no cryptography.

Pessiland

- distNP is not in distP and there do not exist any one-way functions.
- Worst possible world!
- No wonderous results and no cryptography.

Minicrypt

Pessimism

- distNP is not in distP and there do not exist any one-way functions.
- Worst possible world!
- No wonderful results and no cryptography.

Minicrypt

- One-way functions exist (and therefore distNP not in distP) but all the highly structured problems in NP such as integer factorization are solvable in polynomial time.

Pessimland

- distNP is not in distP and there do not exist any one-way functions.
- Worst possible world!
- No wonderous results and no cryptography.

Minicrypt

- One-way functions exist (and therefore distNP not in distP) but all the highly structured problems in NP such as integer factorization are solvable in polynomial time.
- Although one-way functions exist, there are no public key encryption schemes or key exchange protocols.

Pessiland

- distNP is not in distP and there do not exist any one-way functions.
- Worst possible world!
- No wonderous results and no cryptography.

Minicrypt

- One-way functions exist (and therefore distNP not in distP) but all the highly structured problems in NP such as integer factorization are solvable in polynomial time.
- Although one-way functions exist, there are no public key encryption schemes or key exchange protocols.
- Those cryptographic applications achievable only by one-way functions such as private key encryption and pseudorandom generators still work.

Cryptomania

Cryptomania

- The problem on factoring large integers is exponentially hard on average.

Cryptomania

- The problem on factoring large integers is exponentially hard on average.
- Most believe that this is the world we live in!

Cryptomania

- The problem on factoring large integers is exponentially hard on average.
- Most believe that this is the world we live in!
- We don't have general-purpose algorithms and we have to resort to heuristics, approximation, creativity and hard work.

Cryptomania

- The problem on factoring large integers is exponentially hard on average.
- Most believe that this is the world we live in!
- We don't have general-purpose algorithms and we have to resort to heuristics, approximation, creativity and hard work.
- We have a host of exciting cryptographic applications.