

Relationship between circuit complexity and symmetry

Satoshi Tazawa*

ABSTRACT

It is already shown that a Boolean function for a NP-complete problem can be computed by a polynomial-sized circuit if its variables have enough number of automorphisms. Looking at this previous study from the different perspective gives us the idea that the small number of automorphisms might be a barrier for a polynomial time solution for NP-complete problems.

Here I show that by interpreting a Boolean circuit as a graph, the small number of graph automorphisms and the large number of subgraph automorphisms in the circuit establishes the exponential circuit lower bound for NP-complete problems. As this strategy violates the largeness condition in Natural proof, this result shows that $P \neq NP$ without any contradictions to the existence of pseudorandom functions.

Categories and Subject Descriptors

F.2 [Theory of Computation]: Analysis of algorithms and problem complexity

General Terms

Theory

Keywords

Circuit complexity, graph automorphism, $P \neq NP$

1. PRELIMINARY AND OUTLINE OF THIS PAPER

In this paper, unbounded depth Boolean circuits with standard gates AND(\wedge), OR(\vee), NOT(\neg) are discussed. AND gates and OR gates have 2 fan-in and unbounded fan-out. In section 3, a NP-complete Boolean function f_k for the k -clique problem with n vertices is discussed. f_k can be written

*Email address is tazawa314[at mark]gmail.com

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. To copy otherwise, to republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee.

Copyright 20XX ACM X-XXXXX-XX-X/XX/XX ...\$15.00.

as two different ways,

$$f_k(e_{12}, e_{13}, \dots, e_{(n-1)n}) = f_k(x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots, x_{\binom{n}{2}}) \quad (1)$$

(The former emphasizes the variables in f_k as edges, the latter emphasizes the number of variables in f_k , and both expressions are used.)

Section 3.1 shows that the proof strategy in Section 3 is non-Naturalizable.

In section 4, the relationship to other open problems in computational complexity theory is discussed.

2. INTRODUCTION

Many approaches have been proposed to solve the famous $P \neq NP$ problem[11][17][20]. Among them, circuit complexity has been studied in order to separate the complexity classes. As the exponential circuit lower bound for some NP-complete problem means $P \neq NP$, much effort is devoted to show such lower bound. Although no exponential circuit lower bound for NP-complete problems is known for general circuit, the exponential circuit lower bound for problems in NP is obtained with restrictions on its depth, kinds of gates available, and so on [1][2][3][4][5][6][7][9][13][14][15][16][21][22][23][24][25][26][28][29][31]. However such attempts cannot be extended to general circuits, and the reason why these attempts fail in general circuits is discussed in Natural proof[8]. Natural proof showed that proof strategies which are natural or naturalizable can not succeed in establishing the exponential lower bound for NP-complete problems under the assumption that there exist the pseudorandom functions. As it is widely believed that pseudorandom functions exist, a promising approach needs to be non-naturalizable(In other words, it needs to violate one of the conditions(constructivity, largeness, usefulness) in Natural proof).

Apart from this, it is already shown that a Boolean function for a NP-complete problem can be computed by a polynomial-sized circuit if its variables have enough number of automorphisms[18] and many difficult SAT instances do not have symmetries[12]. Looking at this previous study from the different perspective gives us the idea that the small number of automorphisms might be a barrier for a polynomial time solution for NP-complete problems.

Here I show that by interpreting a Boolean circuit as a graph, the small number of graph automorphisms (global symmetry) and the large number of subgraph automorphisms (local symmetry) in the circuit establishes the exponential circuit lower bound for NP-complete problems. As this strategy violates the largeness condition in Natural proof,

this result shows that $P \neq NP$ without any contradictions to the existence of pseudorandom functions.

3. PROOF

Before going into the discussion of the Boolean circuit of a NP-complete problem, it is necessary to explain the detailed outline of the proof. In order to show the exponential circuit lower bound, it is necessary to derive an idea from the following well-known fact.

“A C^∞ function $f(x)$ can be written as an infinite series

$$f(x) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n x^n \quad (2)$$

If constraints on $f(x)$ are given, for example $f^{(n)}(0) = 1$, we can specify the form of (2) as $f^{(n)}(0) = n!a_n = 1 \Leftrightarrow a_n = \frac{1}{n!}$. As a result, (2) can be written as

$$f(x) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n!} x^n \quad (3)$$

This function $f(x)$ has a simpler form $f(x) = e^x$.”

Similarly, any Boolean function $f(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$ can be written in the disjunctive normal form.

$$f(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) = \bigvee_{j=1}^m C_j \quad (4)$$

If constraints on $f(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$ are given, we can specify the form of $f(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$. $f(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$ may have a simpler form than expressed in the disjunctive normal form. In order to establish the exponential circuit lower bound for a Boolean function of a NP-complete problem, it is reasonable to specify the form of $f(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$ before its size is measured. Of course, the size of the Boolean circuit should not be measured in the disjunctive normal form as conversion into the disjunctive normal form sometimes results in an exponential explosion in the formula. So it is necessary to determine the lower bound of the size of the circuits which are logically equivalent to $f(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$ in the specified form (4).

In order to separate the $P/poly$ and NP , a Boolean function f_k for the k -clique problem with n vertices (NP-complete problem) is discussed[17]. A graph with n vertices can be encoded in binary using $\binom{n}{2}$ bits (Each bit represents one of possible edges). In order to specify the form of f_k , the symmetry of variables in the Boolean circuit needs to be examined by interpreting the Boolean circuit as a graph. Formally an automorphism of $f_k = f_k(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{\binom{n}{2}})$ is defined as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{For a permutation } \sigma \in S_{\binom{n}{2}}, \sigma \in \text{Aut}(f_k) \\ & \text{if } f_k(x_{\sigma(1)}, x_{\sigma(2)}, \dots, x_{\sigma(\binom{n}{2})}) = f_k(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{\binom{n}{2}}) \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

A Boolean function f_k has no automorphism except trivial automorphisms caused by permutations of labels on vertices. That is, for any permutation $\sigma \in S_n$, it follows that

$$f_k(e_{12}, e_{13}, \dots, e_{(n-1)n}) = f_k(e_{\sigma(1)\sigma(2)}, e_{\sigma(1)\sigma(3)}, \dots, e_{\sigma(n-1)\sigma(n)}) \quad (6)$$

f_k is relatively asymmetrical based on the fact

$$\frac{\text{The number of automorphisms of } f_k}{\text{The number of all possible permutations}} = \frac{n!}{\binom{n}{2}!} \quad (7)$$

However this information is not enough to specify the form of f_k as there exist many kinds of asymmetrical circuits. So it is necessary to examine not only the global symmetry but also the local symmetry of the circuit as a graph. Unlike ordinary graphs, exchangeability of gates should be taken into considerations. Gates AND(\wedge) and OR(\vee) should be regarded as exchangeable gates when used in the forms

$$a \wedge b (\Leftrightarrow b \wedge a), a \vee b (\Leftrightarrow b \vee a), \neg a \wedge \neg b (\Leftrightarrow \neg b \wedge \neg a), \neg a \vee \neg b (\Leftrightarrow \neg b \vee \neg a). \quad (8)$$

A NOT gate(\neg) works as an inexchangeable gate when used in the forms

$$\neg a \wedge b (\not\Leftrightarrow \neg b \wedge a), \neg a \vee b (\not\Leftrightarrow \neg b \vee a) \quad (9)$$

In this paper, in order to measure the local symmetry of variables X in a Boolean circuit f , we express the Boolean function f in the disjunctive normal form and examine the automorphisms of X after applying false values 0 to the remaining variables.

For example, let f denote a Boolean function

$$f = (x_1 \wedge x_2 \wedge x_3) \vee (x_2 \wedge x_4 \wedge \neg x_5) \quad (10)$$

By restricting variables,

- (A) For $X = \{x_1, x_2, x_3\}$,
 $f^{\text{restricted}}(X) = f^{\text{restricted}}(x_1, x_2, x_3)$
 $= f^{\text{restricted}}(x_1, x_2, x_3, 0, 0)$
 $= (x_1 \wedge x_2 \wedge x_3) \vee (x_2 \wedge 0 \wedge 1) = (x_1 \wedge x_2 \wedge x_3).$
 $\text{Aut}(f^{\text{restricted}}(x_1, x_2, x_3)) \cong S_3.$
- (B) For $X = \{x_1, x_2\}$,
 $f^{\text{restricted}}(X) = f^{\text{restricted}}(x_1, x_2)$
 $= f^{\text{restricted}}(x_1, x_2, 0, 0, 0)$
 $= (x_1 \wedge x_2 \wedge 0) \vee (x_2 \wedge 0 \wedge 1) = 0.$
 $\text{Aut}(f^{\text{restricted}}(x_1, x_2)) \cong S_2$
- (C) For $X = \{x_2, x_4, x_5\}$,
 $f^{\text{restricted}}(X) = f^{\text{restricted}}(x_2, x_4, x_5)$
 $= f^{\text{restricted}}(0, x_2, 0, x_4, x_5)$
 $= (0 \wedge x_2 \wedge 0) \vee (x_2 \wedge x_4 \wedge \neg x_5) = (x_2 \wedge x_4 \wedge \neg x_5).$
 $\text{Aut}(f^{\text{restricted}}(x_2, x_4, x_5)) \cong S_2(x_2 \text{ and } x_4 \text{ are exchangeable}).$
- (D) For $X = \{x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4\}$,
 $f^{\text{restricted}}(X) = f^{\text{restricted}}(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4)$
 $= f^{\text{restricted}}(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, 0)$
 $= (x_1 \wedge x_2 \wedge x_3) \vee (x_2 \wedge x_4 \wedge 1)$
 $= (x_1 \wedge x_2 \wedge x_3) \vee (x_2 \wedge x_4)$
 $\text{Aut}(f^{\text{restricted}}(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4)) \cong S_2(x_1 \text{ and } x_3 \text{ are exchangeable})$

In order to measure the local symmetry of f_k , let $X_k = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{\binom{n}{2}}\} = \{\text{edges among a } k\text{-clique}\}$. As a graph with n vertices has $\binom{n}{k}$ candidate k -cliques, X_k is used as a representative of $\binom{n}{k}$ candidate k -cliques $X_k^1, X_k^2, \dots, X_k^{\binom{n}{k}}$. For a Boolean function f_k for the k -clique problem with n vertices, the local symmetry of f_k can be expressed as follows.

$$\text{THEOREM 1. } \text{Aut}(f_k^{\text{restricted}}(X_k)) \cong S_{\binom{n}{k}}.$$

A proof of theorem1 is shown later. In order to prove theorem 1, it is necessary to understand the relationship between the symmetry (or asymmetry) of variables and the structure of Boolean function. To reduce the the number of possibilities of structures of Boolean functions, the following theorem is useful.

$$\text{THEOREM 2. For } f_k^{\text{restricted}}(X_k) = C_1 \vee C_2 \vee \dots \vee C_m,$$

each one of the clauses, $C_i(1 \leq i \leq m)$, has to contain all of the variables in X_k .

PROOF. A method of proof by contradiction is used. If $C_i(1 \leq i \leq m)$ contains only $l(< \binom{k}{2})$ variables, then two cases are conceivable.

- (1) C_i is satisfiable if the truth values of l variables are appropriately chosen.
- (2) C_i is not satisfiable for any of the truth values.

In case (1), $C_i = 1$ for l variables with appropriately chosen truth values. So

$$f_k^{\text{restricted}}(X_k) = C_1 \vee C_2 \vee \dots \vee C_i \vee \dots \vee C_m = 1 \quad (11)$$

But if the variable not used in C_i takes 0, $f_k^{\text{restricted}}(X_k)$ should return 0 as X_k does not form a k -clique. This contradicts with (11).

In case (2), as $C_i = 0$
 $f_k^{\text{restricted}}(X_k) = C_1 \vee C_2 \vee \dots \vee C_{i-1} \vee C_i \vee C_{i+1} \vee \dots \vee C_m$
 $= C_1 \vee C_2 \vee \dots \vee C_{i-1} \vee 0 \vee C_{i+1} \vee \dots \vee C_m$
 $= C_1 \vee C_2 \vee \dots \vee C_{i-1} \vee C_{i+1} \vee \dots \vee C_m$

C_i does not influence the return value and should be erased. Therefore each one of C_i has to contain all of the variables in X_k . \square

By theorem 2, we just need to consider clauses, each one of which contains all of the variables in X_k . Regarding the symmetry of variables in a clause, the following theorem follows.

THEOREM 3. For a clause $C(X_k)$ in which all of the variables are connected by \wedge , it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Aut}(C(X_k)) &\cong S_{\binom{k}{2}} \\ \Leftrightarrow C(X_k) &= (x_1 \wedge x_2 \wedge \dots \wedge x_{\binom{k}{2}}) \text{ or } (\neg x_1 \wedge \neg x_2 \wedge \dots \wedge \neg x_{\binom{k}{2}}) \end{aligned}$$

PROOF. To show \Leftarrow is trivial. So it is necessary to show \Rightarrow . If $\text{Aut}(C(X_k)) \cong S_{\binom{k}{2}}$, then all of the variables in X_k are exchangeable. Based on the simply observation, x_i and x_j ($x_i, x_j \in X_k, i \neq j$) are exchangeable in $C(X_k)$ if and only if x_i and x_j take the forms $(x_i \wedge x_j)$ or $(\neg x_i \wedge \neg x_j)$. Therefore in order for all of the variables in $C(X_k)$ to be exchangeable, $C(X_k) = (x_1 \wedge x_2 \wedge \dots \wedge x_{\binom{k}{2}})$ or $(\neg x_1 \wedge \neg x_2 \wedge \dots \wedge \neg x_{\binom{k}{2}})$ \square

Regarding the asymmetry, many possibilities can be considered. So I discuss the case where one transposition does not follow.

THEOREM 4. For a clause $C(X_k)$ in which all of the variables are connected by \wedge , one transposition, say $(x_1 x_2)(x_1, x_2 \in X_k)$, does not follow $\Leftrightarrow C(X_k) = (x_1 \wedge \neg x_2 \wedge \text{remaining variables})$ or $(\neg x_1 \wedge x_2 \wedge \text{remaining variables})$

PROOF. To show \Leftarrow is trivial. So it is necessary to show \Rightarrow . Based on the simply observation, x_1 and x_2 are inexchangeable if and only if one of them is connected to a NOT gate. As all of the variables in a clause are connected by \wedge , $C(X_k) = (x_1 \wedge \neg x_2 \wedge \text{remaining variables})$ or $(\neg x_1 \wedge x_2 \wedge \text{remaining variables})$

\square

Using these results, theorem 1 is shown here.

$$\text{Theorem 1. } \text{Aut}(f_k^{\text{restricted}}(X_k)) \cong S_{\binom{k}{2}}.$$

PROOF. A method of proof by contradiction is used.

For $f_k^{\text{restricted}}(X_k) = C_1(X_k) \vee C_2(X_k) \vee \dots \vee C_m(X_k)$, suppose if $\text{Aut}(C_i(X_k)) \not\cong S_{\binom{k}{2}}$, then one of the transpositions, say $(x_1 x_2)(x_1, x_2 \in X_k)$, does not follow in $C_i(X_k)$. To satisfy this inexchangeability of x_1 and x_2 ,

$$C_i(X_k) = (\neg x_1 \wedge x_2 \bigwedge_{3 \leq z \leq \binom{k}{2}} (\neg x_z) \bigwedge_{3 \leq w \leq \binom{k}{2}} x_w)(z \neq w) \quad (12)$$

$$\text{or } C_i(X_k) = (x_1 \wedge \neg x_2 \bigwedge_{3 \leq z \leq \binom{k}{2}} (\neg x_z) \bigwedge_{3 \leq w \leq \binom{k}{2}} x_w)(z \neq w) \quad (13)$$

However by assigning values $x_1 = 0, x_2 = 1, x_z = 0, x_w = 1$ to (12), (12) returns 1 though $f_k^{\text{restricted}}(X_k)$ should return 0. By assigning values $x_1 = 1, x_2 = 0, x_z = 0, x_w = 1$ to (13), (13) returns 1 though $f_k^{\text{restricted}}(X_k)$ should return 0. Therefore $\text{Aut}(C_i(X_k)) \cong S_{\binom{k}{2}}$ and $\text{Aut}(f_k^{\text{restricted}}(X_k)) \cong \text{Aut}(C_1(X_k) \vee C_2(X_k) \vee \dots \vee C_m(X_k)) \cong S_{\binom{k}{2}}$. \square

THEOREM 5. $f_k^{\text{restricted}}(X_k) = (x_1 \wedge x_2 \wedge \dots \wedge x_{\binom{k}{2}})$

PROOF. By theorem1, $f_k^{\text{restricted}}(X_k) = C_1(X_k) \vee C_2(X_k) \vee \dots \vee C_m(X_k)$ and $\text{Aut}(C_i(X_k)) \cong S_{\binom{k}{2}}(i = 1, 2, \dots, m)$. By theorem3, a clause $C_i(X_k)$ in which all of the variables are connected by \wedge , satisfies this condition on the automorphism if and only if $C_i(X_k) = (x_1 \wedge x_2 \wedge \dots \wedge x_{\binom{k}{2}})$ or $(\neg x_1 \wedge \neg x_2 \wedge \dots \wedge \neg x_{\binom{k}{2}})$ Among them, a Boolean function which correctly recognizes a k -clique is only $(x_1 \wedge x_2 \wedge \dots \wedge x_{\binom{k}{2}})$.

Therefore $f_k^{\text{restricted}}(X_k) = (x_1 \wedge x_2 \wedge \dots \wedge x_{\binom{k}{2}})$. \square

THEOREM 6. For a variable $y(\notin X_k)$ representing an edge, $\text{Aut}(f_k^{\text{restricted}}(X_k, y)) \not\cong S_{\binom{k}{2}+1}$.

PROOF. A method of proof by contradiction is used. Suppose if $\text{Aut}(f_k^{\text{restricted}}(X_k, y)) \cong S_{\binom{k}{2}+1}$, then for any input (X_k, y) the return value of $f_k^{\text{restricted}}(X_k, y)$ does not change after the permutation on variables. However for two inputs $(X_k, y) = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{\binom{k}{2}}, y) = (1, 1, \dots, 1, 1, 0)$ and $(y, x_2, \dots, x_{\binom{k}{2}}, x_1) = (0, 1, \dots, 1, 1, 1)$ (x_1 and y are exchanged), the return values of each of these inputs need to be different.

$$\begin{aligned} f_k^{\text{restricted}}(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{\binom{k}{2}}, y) &= f_k^{\text{restricted}}(1, 1, \dots, 1, 0) = 1 \\ \neq f_k^{\text{restricted}}(y, x_2, \dots, x_{\binom{k}{2}}, x_1) &= f_k^{\text{restricted}}(0, 1, \dots, 1, 1) = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

Therefore $\text{Aut}(f_k^{\text{restricted}}(X_k, y)) \not\cong S_{\binom{k}{2}+1}$. \square

Based on these results, the local structure of Boolean function f_k can be specified. So next, it is necessary to specify its global structure based on its local structure. For $f_k(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{\binom{n}{2}}) = C_1 \vee C_2 \vee \dots \vee C_m$ ($C_j(1 \leq j \leq m)$ is not the same as C_j used in the discussion above), the following theorem follows.

THEOREM 7. (A) $C_j(1 \leq j \leq m)$ has to contain at least $\binom{k}{2}$ variables.

(B) $\binom{k}{2}$ variables in $X_k^i(1 \leq i \leq \binom{n}{k})$ have to be contained in one of $C_j(1 \leq j \leq m)$.

(C) After reordering clauses, we can take $C_i(X_k^i) = f_k^{\text{restricted}}(X_k^i) = (x_1^i \wedge x_2^i \wedge \dots \wedge x_{\binom{k}{2}}^i)(1 \leq i \leq \binom{n}{k})$.

PROOF. (A) Like the discussion in theorem2, a method of proof by contradiction is used. If $C_j (1 \leq j \leq m)$ contains only $l (< \binom{k}{2})$ variables, then two cases are conceivable.

(1) C_j is satisfiable if the truth values of l variables are appropriately chosen.

(2) C_j is not satisfiable for any of the truth values.

In case (1), $C_j = 1$ for l variables with appropriately chosen truth values. So

$$f_k(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{\binom{n}{2}}) = C_1 \vee C_2 \vee \dots \vee C_j \vee \dots \vee C_m = 1 \quad (15)$$

But if the variable not used in C_j and the remaining variables take 0, $f_k(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{\binom{n}{2}})$ should return 0 as X_k does not form a k -clique. This contradicts with (15).

In case (2), as $C_j = 0$

$$\begin{aligned} f_k(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{\binom{n}{2}}) &= C_1 \vee C_2 \vee \dots \vee C_{j-1} \vee C_j \vee C_{j+1} \vee \dots \vee C_m \\ &= C_1 \vee C_2 \vee \dots \vee C_{j-1} \vee 0 \vee C_{j+1} \vee \dots \vee C_m \\ &= C_1 \vee C_2 \vee \dots \vee C_{j-1} \vee C_{j+1} \vee \dots \vee C_m \end{aligned}$$

C_j does not influence the return value and should be erased. Therefore each one of C_j has to contain at least $\binom{k}{2}$ variables.

(B) If $\binom{k}{2}$ variables in $X_k^i (1 \leq i \leq \binom{n}{k})$ are not contained in any of C_j , then $f_k^{restricted}(X_k^i)$ does not contain $\binom{k}{2}$ variables in X_k^i , which contradicts with theorem 5. Therefore $\binom{k}{2}$ variables in $X_k^i (1 \leq i \leq \binom{n}{k})$ have to be contained in one of $C_j (1 \leq j \leq m)$.

(C) For clauses which contain $\binom{k}{2}$ variables in X_k^i , suppose if all of them have more than $\binom{k}{2}$ variables. Then a clause C_j which satisfies the above condition takes the forms

$$C_j = (x_1^i \wedge x_2^i \wedge \dots \wedge x_{\binom{k}{2}}^i \wedge y_1 \wedge Y) \quad (16)$$

(Y is a clause in which variables are connected by \wedge).

$$\text{or } C_j = (x_1^i \wedge x_2^i \wedge \dots \wedge x_{\binom{k}{2}}^i \wedge \bigwedge_{l=1}^{\binom{k}{2}} (\neg y_l)) \quad (17)$$

In (16), assigning false values to variables other than $x_1^i, x_2^i, \dots, x_{\binom{k}{2}}^i$ does not produce a clause

$$f_k^{restricted}(X_k^i) = (x_1^i \wedge x_2^i \wedge \dots \wedge x_{\binom{k}{2}}^i)$$

In (17), assigning false values to variables other than $x_1^i, x_2^i, \dots, x_{\binom{k}{2}}^i$ produces a clause

$$f_k^{restricted}(X_k^i) = (x_1^i \wedge x_2^i \wedge \dots \wedge x_{\binom{k}{2}}^i)$$

but assigning $(x_1^i = x_2^i = \dots = x_{\binom{k}{2}}^i = 1, y_l = 1 (1 \leq l))$ to C_j returns 0, though C_j and f_k should return 1.

Therefore neither (16) nor (17) follow. So C_j has exactly $\binom{k}{2}$ variables in X_k^i , and $C_j = (x_1^i \wedge x_2^i \wedge \dots \wedge x_{\binom{k}{2}}^i)$. \square

By theorem7, f_k can be expressed in the following form.

$$f_k(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{\binom{n}{2}}) = \left(\bigvee_{i=1}^{\binom{n}{k}} f_k^{restricted}(X_k^i) \right) \bigvee_{j=1} C_j' \quad (18)$$

It is necessary to specify the form of C_j' .

THEOREM 8. C_j' has to contain $\binom{k}{2}$ variables representing edges among k vertices: $C_j' = C_j'(X_k^i, \dots)$ for some i

PROOF. If C_j' returns 0 for all of the inputs, C_j' should be erased in f_k . So it is necessary to consider the case where C_j' returns 1 for some input. If no $\binom{k}{2}$ variables in C_j' represent edges among k vertices and C_j' returns 1 for some input,

that contradicts with the fact

$$f_k(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{\binom{n}{2}}) = \left(\bigvee_{i=1}^{\binom{n}{k}} f_k^{restricted}(X_k^i) \right) \bigvee_j C_j'$$

detects k cliques. Therefore C_j' has to contain $\binom{k}{2}$ variables representing edges among k vertices. \square

THEOREM 9. C_j' has to contain $\binom{k}{2}$ variables representing edges among k vertices "without NOT gates": $C_j' = (x_1^i \wedge x_2^i \wedge \dots \wedge x_{\binom{k}{2}}^i \wedge \dots)$

PROOF. By theorem8, $C_j' = C_j'(X_k^i, \dots)$. As C_j' might contain variables representing more than one clique, variables in C_j' can be written as

$$X_k^{i_1} \cup X_k^{i_2} \cup \dots \cup X_k^{i_{m_1}} \cup y_1 \cup y_2 \cup \dots \cup y_{m_2} \quad (m_1 \geq 1) \quad (19)$$

y_1, y_2, \dots, y_{m_2} do not contain variables representing a k -clique. Suppose if at least one variable in each $X_k^i (i = i_1, i_2, \dots, i_{m_1})$ is connected to a NOT gate, then C_j' can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} C_j' &= C_j'(X_k^{i_1} \cup X_k^{i_2} \cup \dots \cup X_k^{i_{m_1}} \cup y_1 \cup y_2 \cup \dots \cup y_{m_2}) \\ &= (\bigwedge (\neg x_{z_1}) \bigwedge x_{z_2} \bigwedge (\neg y_{w_1}) \bigwedge y_{w_2}) \\ &(x_{z_1}, x_{z_2} \in X_k^i, i = i_1, i_2, \dots, i_{m_1}, 1 \leq w_1, w_2 \leq m_2) \quad (20) \end{aligned}$$

As each $X_k^i (i = i_1, i_2, \dots, i_{m_1})$ has to contain at least one x_{z_1} , an input $x_{z_1} = 0, x_{z_2} = 1, y_{w_1} = 0, y_{w_2} = 1$ does not contain a k -clique though

$$C_j'(x_{z_1} = 0, x_{z_2} = 1, y_{w_1} = 0, y_{w_2} = 1) = 1 \quad (21)$$

Therefore C_j' has to contain $\binom{k}{2}$ variables in X_k^i without NOT gates. So $C_j' = (x_1^i \wedge x_2^i \wedge \dots \wedge x_{\binom{k}{2}}^i \wedge \dots)$. \square

By theorem9, f_k can be specified as follows.

$$f_k(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{\binom{n}{2}}) = \left(\bigvee_{i=1}^{\binom{n}{k}} f_k^{restricted}(X_k^i) \right) \bigvee_j C_j' \quad (22)$$

$$C_j' = (x_1^i \wedge x_2^i \wedge \dots \wedge x_{\binom{k}{2}}^i \wedge Y) \quad (Y \text{ is a clause}) \quad (23)$$

As indicated above, conversion into the disjunctive normal form sometime results in an explosion in the formula. So it is necessary to determine the minimum size of f_k among its logical equivalences.

THEOREM 10. For $f_k(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{\binom{n}{2}})$ for the k -clique problem, the circuit size of f_k is larger than $\left(\frac{n}{k}\right)^k - 1$.

PROOF. Using the absorption law,

$$A \vee (A \wedge B) = A \wedge (1 \vee B) = A \quad (24)$$

(22) can be expressed in a smaller circuit by compressing

$$\begin{aligned} &f_k^{restricted}(X_k^i) \vee C_j' \\ &= f_k^{restricted}(X_k^i) \vee (f_k^{restricted}(X_k^i) \wedge Y) = f_k^{restricted}(X_k^i) \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

$$f_k(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{\binom{n}{2}}) = \bigvee_{i=1}^{\binom{n}{k}} (f_k^{restricted}(X_k^i)) \quad (26)$$

(Of course, the compressed form (26) satisfies theorem1 and theorem6.)

For $i, j (i \neq j, 1 \leq i, j \leq \binom{k}{2})$, edge sets X_k^i and X_k^j have at most $l (< \binom{k}{2})$ elements in common. The only way to express (26) in a smaller circuit is to apply the distributive law

$$(A \wedge B) \vee (A \wedge C) = A \wedge (B \vee C) \quad (27)$$

As the number of OR gates in (26) cannot be reduced by converting it into its logical equivalences using (27), the size of the Boolean circuit is larger than the number of OR gates expressed as a Boolean circuit of (26), not as a disjunctive normal form. Therefore the size of f_k as a Boolean circuit is larger than $\binom{n}{k} - 1 > (\frac{n}{k})^k - 1$. \square

By theorem10, for k in $3 < k < n^{\frac{1}{4}}$, this proves $P/poly \neq NP$ and $P \neq NP$.

3.1 Proof that this strategy is non-Naturalizable

In the paper [8], the proof is natural or naturalizable if it satisfies the following three conditions, constructivity, largeness, and usefulness.

"Formally, by a combinatorial property of Boolean functions we will mean a set of Boolean functions $\{C_n \subseteq F_n | n \in \omega\}$. Thus, a Boolean function f_n will possess property C_n if and only if $f_n \in C_n$. (Alternatively, we will sometimes find it convenient to use function notation: $C_n(f_n) = 1$ if $f_n \in C_n$; $C_n(f_n) = 0$ if $f_n \notin C_n$.) The combinatorial property C_n is natural if it contains a subset C_n^* with the following two conditions:

Constructivity. The predicate $f_n \in C_n^*$ is computable in P . Thus C_n^* is computable in time which is polynomial in the truth table of f_n ;

Largeness. $|C_n^*| \geq 2^{-O(n)} |F_n|$
A combinatorial property C_n is useful against $P/poly$ if it satisfies:

Usefulness. The circuit size of any sequence of functions $f_1, f_2, \dots, f_n, \dots$, where $f_n \in C_n$, is super-polynomial; i.e., for any constant k , for sufficiently large n , the circuit size of f_n is greater than n^k . "

The proof strategy used in this paper is to specify the Boolean function f_k as (26). Of course, a Boolean function

$$(26) \vee (x_1^1 \wedge \neg x_1^1) = \bigvee_{i=1}^{\binom{n}{k}} f_k^{restricted}(X_k^i) \vee (x_1^1 \wedge \neg x_1^1) \quad (28)$$

can also recognize k -cliques correctly, but the essential part of the function is (26) because not a clause in (26) cannot be erased. As the aim of this paper is to determine the circuit lower bound, not only logical equivalence but also impossibility to erase a clause should be the combinatorial property (If erasable clauses are added, the size gets larger than its strict lower bound). So it is reasonable to define the combinatorial property C_n as

" $f \in C_n$ if and only if f is logically equivalent to f_k (26) and not a clause in f cannot be erased when expressed in the disjunctive normal form."

Boolean functions satisfying this property can be given by adding double NOT gates such as

$$\begin{aligned} f_k(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{\binom{n}{2}}) &= \bigvee_{i=1}^{\binom{n}{k}} f_k^{restricted}(X_k^i) \\ &= (x_1^1 \wedge x_2^1 \wedge \dots \wedge x_{\binom{n}{2}}^1) \bigvee_{i=2}^{\binom{n}{k}} f_k^{restricted}(X_k^i) \\ &= \neg((\neg x_1^1) \vee (\neg x_2^1) \vee \dots \vee (\neg x_{\binom{n}{2}}^1)) \bigvee_{i=2}^{\binom{n}{k}} f_k^{restricted}(X_k^i) \end{aligned}$$

Therefore the total number of Boolean function satisfying this property is at most $2^{\binom{n}{k}}$. As the total number of Boolean functions with n variables is 2^{2^n} ,

$$\frac{|C_n^*|}{|F_n|} = \frac{2^{\binom{n}{k}}}{2^{2^n}} \ll 2^{-O(n)} \quad (29)$$

This violates the largeness condition in Natural proof. Therefore this strategy does not conflict with the widely believed conjecture on the existence of pseudorandom functions.

4. RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER OPEN PROBLEMS IN COMPUTATIONAL COMPLEXITY THEORY

As $P \neq NP$ and $NP \subseteq PH \subseteq PSPACE$, $P \neq PH$ and $P \neq PSPACE$. Among problems in NP , complexity classes of the integer factorization problem, the discrete logarithm problem and the graph isomorphism problem [10][19][27][30] remain open for many years. It is already known that

(1)if the decision version of the integer factorization problem is in NP-complete, then NP=co-NP and the polynomial hierarchy will collapse to its first level.

(2)if the graph isomorphism problem is in NP-complete, then the polynomial hierarchy will collapse to its second level.

As a collapse of polynomial hierarchy seems unlikely to happen under $P \neq NP$, they seem unlikely to be in NP-complete. Furthermore the circuit lower bounds of the integer factorization problem, the discrete logarithm problem and the graph isomorphism problem cannot be obtained by the proof strategy used in this paper, because

(1)the integer factorization problem and the discrete logarithm problem have neither global symmetry nor local symmetry to specify their structure.

(2)the global symmetry and local symmetry of graph isomorphism problem are hard to determine in general.

Whether or not NP-complete problems can be solved by quantum computers in polynomial time remains open.

5. CONCLUSIONS

By interpreting a Boolean circuit as a graph, the global symmetry and the local symmetry of variables in the circuit is discussed in this paper. The small number of global symmetry and the large number of local symmetry in the circuit which computes f_k can establish the exponential circuit lower bound for a NP-complete problem, which means $P/poly \neq NP$ and $P \neq NP$.

Even if the same strategy is used, the computational complexity classes of the integer factorization problem, the discrete logarithm problem and the graph isomorphism problem remain open. Furthermore whether or not NP-complete

problems can be solved by quantum computers in polynomial time remain open.

As NP-complete problems turn out to be impossible to solve in polynomial time by a classical computer, heuristic approaches or algorithms for restricted types of inputs need to be developed for NP-complete problems.

6. REFERENCES

- [1] A.A.Razborov. Lower bounds for the monotone complexity of some Boolean functions. *Soviet Math.Dokl.* 31 (1985), 354-357; *Dokl.Akad.Nauk SSSR* 281, No.4(1985), 798-801.
- [2] A.A.Razborov. Lower bounds of monotone complexity of the logical permanent function. *Math. Notes Acad. Sci. USSR* 37 (1985), 485-493; *Mat. Zametki* 37, No. 6(1985), 887-900.
- [3] A.A.Razborov. Lower bounds on the size of bounded-depth networks over a complete basis with logical addition. *Math. Notes Acad. Sci. USSR*, 41 (1987), 333-338; *Mat. Zametki* 41, No. 4 (1987), 598-607.
- [4] A.E.Andreev. On a method for obtaining lower bounds for the complexity of individual monotone functions. *Soviet Math. Dokl.* 31, No.3(1985), 530-534; *Dokl.Akad. Nauk SSSR* 282, No.5(1985), 1033-1037.
- [5] A.E.Andreev. On a method for obtaining more than quadratic effective lower bounds for the complexity of π -schemes. *Moscow Univ. Math. Bull*, 42(1):63-66, 1987.
- [6] A.Hajnal, W.Maass, P.Pudlak, M.Szegedy, and G.Turan. Threshold circuits of bounded depth. *In Proceedings, 28th Symposium on Foundations on Computer Science*, pages 99-110, 1987.
- [7] A. E. Andreev. On one method of obtaining effective lower bounds of monotone complexity. *Algebra i Logika*, 26(No.1):3-21, 1987.
- [8] A.Razborov and S.Rudich. Natural proofs. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 55(1):24-35, 1997.
- [9] A.Yao. Separating the polynomial-time hierarchy by oracles. *In Proceedings, 26th IEEE FOCS*, pages 1-10, 1985.
- [10] L. Babai, W. Kantor, and E. Luks. Computational complexity and the classification of finite simple groups. *Proceedings of 24th FOCS, IEEE Computer Society*, 25(1):162-171, November 1983.
- [11] S. A. Cook. The complexity of theorem-proving procedures. *Proceedings of the third annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 151-158, May 1971.
- [12] S. A. Cook and D. G. Mitchell. Finding hard instances of the satisfiability problem: A survey. *DIMACS Ser. Discr. Math. and Theor. Comp. Sci*, 1997.
- [13] D.A.Barrington. A Note on a Theorem of Razborov. *Technical report, University of Massachusetts*, 1986.
- [14] J.Aspnes, R.Beigel, M.Furst, and S.Rudich. The expressive power of voting polynomials. *Combinatorica*, 14(2):135-148, 1994.
- [15] J.Håstad. The shrinkage exponent is 2. *in Proceedings of 34th IEEE FOCS 1993, 114-123, SIAM J.Comput.*
- [16] J.Håstad. Computational Limitations on Small Depth Circuits. *Ph.D.thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology*, 1986.
- [17] R. M. Karp. Reducibility among combinatorial problems. In *Complexity of Computer Computations*, pages 85-103, 1972.
- [18] E. Kranakis. Symmetry and Computational Complexity of Boolean Functions: Problems and Results, Graph Coloring and Symmetry. 2002.
- [19] R. E. Ladner. On the structure of polynomial time reducibility. *Journal of ACM (JACM)*, 22(1):155-171, January 1975.
- [20] L. A. Levin. Universal sequential search problems. *Problemy Peredachi Informatsii*, 9(3):115-116, 1973.
- [21] M.Ajtai. Σ_1^1 -formulae on finite structures. *Ann. Pure Appl.Logic*, 24:1-48, 1983.
- [22] M.Furst, J.B.Saxe, and M.Sipser. Parity, circuits and the polynomial time hierarchy. *Math.Syst.Theory*, 17:13-27, 1984.
- [23] M.Karchmer and A.Wigderson. Monotone circuits for connectivity require super-logarithmic depth. *SIAM J.Disc. Math.*, 3(2):255-265, (May 1990).
- [24] M.S.Paterson and U.Zwick. Shrinkage of de Morgan formulae under restriction. *Random Structure and Algorothm*, 4(2):135-150, 1993.
- [25] N.Alon and R.Boppana. The monotone circuit complexity of Boolean functions. *Combinatorica* 7, No.1, pages 1-22, 1987.
- [26] N.Nisan and R.Impagliazzo. The effect of random restrictions on formulae size. *Ramdom Structures and Algorithms*, 4(2):121-134, 1993.
- [27] R. C. Read and D. G. Corneil. The graph isomorphism disease. *Journal of Graph Theory*, 1(4):339-363, 1977.
- [28] R.Raz and A.Wigderson. Monotone circuits for matching require linear depth. *J.Assoc. Comput. Mach.*, 39:736-744, 1992.
- [29] R.Smolensky. Algebraic methods in the theory of lower bounds for Boolean circuit complexity. *In Proceedings, 19th ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 77-82, 1987.
- [30] U. Schöning. Graph isomorphism is in the low hierarchy. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 37(3):312-323, December 1988.
- [31] É. Tardos. The gap between monotone and nonmonotone circuit complexity is exponential. *Combinatorica*, 8:141-142, 1988.