

COMP4141 Theory of Computation

Oracle machines & Turing Reducibility

Ron van der Meyden

CSE, UNSW

Revision: 2015/05/13

(Credits: K. Engelhardt, M Sipser, C Papadimitriou, R. van Glabbeek, P Hofner)

Definition

An *oracle* for a language B is an external device that is capable of deciding B .

An *oracle TM* is a modified TM $M^?$ that has the additional capability of querying an oracle.

If an oracle TM $M^?$ with an oracle for B decides A then we say that A is *decidable relative to B* .

Language A is *Turing reducible* to language B (or $A \leq_T B$) if A is decidable relative to B .

\leq_P VS \leq_m VS \leq_T

$$A \leq_L B \Rightarrow A \leq_P B \Rightarrow A \leq_m B \Rightarrow A \leq_T B$$

As for the other two notions of reduction we have

Theorem

If $A \leq_T B$ and B is decidable, then A is decidable.

Corollary

If $A \leq_T B$ and A is undecidable, then B is undecidable.

but whereas \leq_m also transferred r.e. this is not the case for \leq_T .

Example

Recall that A_{TM} is r.e. but $\overline{A_{TM}}$ isn't. But $A_{TM} \leq_T \overline{A_{TM}}$ and $\overline{A_{TM}} \leq_T A_{TM}$ by simply reversing the oracles' answers.

Definition

Let \mathbf{P}^O be the class of languages decided by a polynomial-time oracle TM using oracle O . (Similar for \mathbf{NP}^O .)

Example

$\mathbf{NP} \subseteq \mathbf{P}^{SAT}$ and $\mathbf{coNP} \subseteq \mathbf{P}^{SAT}$.

Example

A formula of propositional logic ϕ is *minimal* if there does not exist a shorter formula ψ such that $\phi \Leftrightarrow \psi$ is valid (true for all assignments).

It is not known whether $\overline{MIN-F} \in \mathbf{NP}$ where

$$MIN-F = \{ \langle \phi \rangle \mid \phi \text{ is a minimal Boolean formula} \}$$

but $\overline{MIN-F} \in \mathbf{NP}^{SAT}$ as witnessed by the oracle NTM

$M^? =$ “On input $\langle \phi \rangle$

- 1 Non-deterministically guess a smaller formula ψ .
- 2 Ask the oracle whether $\langle \phi \Leftrightarrow \neg\psi \rangle \in SAT$ and if it accepts, *reject*; otherwise *accept*.”

This problem is not known to be in NP, nor in co-NP.

$P \stackrel{?}{=} NP$ and Diagonalisation

Any theorem proved about TMs by using only methods based on

- I string representations of TMs
- II simulation of one TM by another without much overhead in time/space

lifts to oracle machines.

That the resolution of $P \stackrel{?}{=} NP$ can not be such a theorem follows from:

Theorem (Baker, Gill, Solovay 1975)

Oracles A and B exist whereby $P^A = NP^A$ and $P^B \neq NP^B$.

Proof of $\exists A (P^A = NP^A)$

A could be QBF :

$$NP^{QBF} \subseteq NPSPACE$$

$$= PSPACE$$

$$\subseteq P^{QBF}$$

$$\subseteq NP^{QBF}$$

by $QBF \in PSPACE$

by Savitch's theorem

QBF is $PSPACE$ -complete

by $P \subseteq NP$



Proof of $\exists B (\mathbf{P}^B \neq \mathbf{NP}^B)$

Iteratively construct a B (and its complement B') such that in the end $U_B \in \mathbf{NP}^B \setminus \mathbf{P}^B$ where

$$U_B = \{ 1^n \mid \Sigma^n \cap B \neq \emptyset \} .$$

That $U_B \in \mathbf{NP}^B$ is easy:

“On input 1^n guess $x \in \Sigma^n$ and *accept* iff the oracle confirms $x \in B$.”

Proof of $\exists B (\mathbf{P}^B \neq \mathbf{NP}^B)$ cont.

Initially, $B = B' = \emptyset$. For stage i of the construction, let $M_i^?$ be the i 'th polynomial-time oracle TM running in w.l.o.g. in time n^i .

Let m exceed the length of all strings in $B \cup B'$ so far, and also $m^i < 2^m$.

We'll ensure that U_B and M_i^B disagree on 1^m .

- 1 Simulate $M_i^?$ on 1^m by answering queries x to the oracle with “yes” if $x \in B$, “no” if $x \in B'$, otherwise we also answer “no” and add x to B' .
- 2 If $M_i^?$ accepts 1^m then we put all strings of length m into B' ; otherwise, we add the first string of length m neither in B nor in B' to B . Such a string exists because $M_i^?$ can have queried at most $m^i < 2^m$ strings of length m and none were queried ever before.

It follows that no M_i^B will decide U_B and thus $U_B \notin \mathbf{P}^B$. □