

Section 2: Finite Computation and Universality

Prof. Madhu Sudan and Adam Hesterberg

Ife Omidiran

1 Practice Problems

- Show whether the following gate sets are universal:
 - AND and NOT (Hint: Use the definition of universality.)
 - AND and OR (Hint: Think about the properties of functions that can be computed using AND/OR. What happens if all of the inputs are 1?)

Solution:

- NAND(a, b) can be computed by applying the operations NOT(AND(a, b)). The definition of universality of a gate set is that it can compute NAND, thus AND and NOT are universal.
 - AND and OR are not universal because they can't compute the constant 0 function. This can be proven by induction on k , the size of the circuit. The base case $k = 1$ is simple: AND(x_0, x_1) = 1 and OR(x_0, x_1) = 1 when $x_0 = x_1 = 1$, but the constant 0 function must output 0 for all inputs. For $k > 1$, consider a circuit that outputs the AND or OR of a previous line or input. Once again, if both inputs are 1, then each of the previous lines must evaluate to 1, so the circuit can only output 1 in this case. However, a NAND circuit can compute the constant 0 function: NAND(a, a) = 0. Thus, AND and OR do not form a universal gate set.
- Let IF-CIRC be the programming language where we have the following operations: `foo = 0`, `foo = 1`, `foo = IF(cond, yes, no)`; that is, we can use the constants 0 and 1, and the $IF : \{0, 1\}^3 \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ function such that $IF(a, b, c)$ equals b if $a = 1$ and equals c if $a = 0$. Show that AON-CIRC is as powerful as IF-CIRC, and vice versa.¹

Solution:

We show that AON-CIRC is **as powerful** as IF-CIRC in two parts.

Claim: AON-CIRC is at least as powerful as IF-CIRC.

Proof: As IF-CIRC is a sequence of statements of the form $d_i = IF(a_i, b_i, c_i)$. To show that AON-CIRC is as powerful as IF-CIRC, we just need to show that we can compute replace every such IF statement with a sequence of AND, OR and NOT statements. Below we show a replacement for the statement $d = IF(a, b, c)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{temp_0} &= \text{NOT}(a) \\ \text{temp_1} &= \text{AND}(a, b) \\ \text{temp_2} &= \text{AND}(\text{temp_0}, c) \\ d &= \text{OR}(\text{temp_1}, \text{temp_2}) \end{aligned}$$

¹Hint: The $LOOKUP_1$ function is closely related to IF .

Once we have this, we can replace every line of an IF-CIRC with the sequence above (taking care to replace the variable names a, b, c, d with the ones in the IF statement).

Claim: IF-CIRC is at least as powerful as AON-CIRC.

Proof: As in the proof above we need to show that each of the lines $b = \text{NOT}(a)$, $c = \text{OR}(a, b)$ and $c = \text{AND}(a, b)$ can be replaced by a sequence of IF statements. The following sentence is equivalent to $b = \text{NOT}(a)$:

$$b = \text{IF}(a, 0, 1).$$

For $c = \text{OR}(a, b)$ we have:

$$c = \text{IF}(a, 1, b).$$

Finally for $c = \text{AND}(a, b)$ we can use:

$$c = \text{IF}(a, b, 0) \quad .$$

With the above “macros” we can replace every line of an AON-CIRC program with a line of IF-CIRC program.

3. In the proof presented for the universality of NAND, we mentioned, but didn't prove, that the lookup function is in $SIZE(4 \cdot 2^k)$. Prove that $LOOKUP_k$ can indeed be computed using a circuit of at most $4 \cdot 2^k - 1$ gates.

Solution:

We complete the proof using strong induction.

Base cases: We showed in section that $LOOKUP_1$ can be computed using a 4-line AON-CIRC program. An equivalent NAND-CIRC program can be described as follows:

```
def LOOKUP_1(X[0], X[1], X[2]):
    temp_0 = NAND(X[2], X[2])
    temp_1 = NAND(X[0], temp_0)
    temp_2 = NAND(X[1], X[2])
    Y[0] = NAND(temp_1, temp_2)
```

The program is 4 lines, so the base case holds for $l = 1$.

We have the following program for $LOOKUP_2$:

```
def LOOKUP_2(X[0], X[1], X[2], X[3], i[0], i[1]):
    temp_0 = LOOKUP_1(X[2], X[3], i[1])
    temp_1 = LOOKUP_1(X[0], X[1], i[1])
    Y[0] = LOOKUP_1(temp_0, temp_1, i[0])
```

The program uses 3 invocations of $LOOKUP_1$, each of which can be replaced by 4 NAND lines, resulting in a program that is fewer than $4 \cdot 2^2 - 1$ lines. The base case holds for $l = 2$.

Inductive step: Suppose that we have a program of length k that computes $LOOKUP_n$. We assume as our inductive hypothesis that the length of the program computing $LOOKUP_m$ for all $m < n$ is at most $4 \cdot 2^m - 1$ lines. We need to show that $k \leq 4 \cdot 2^n - 1$.

Generalizing the NAND-CIRC program computing $LOOKUP_2$ to the program computing $LOOKUP_n$, the program will require 2 invocations of the $LOOKUP_{(n-1)}$ procedure, and one invocation of the $LOOKUP_1$ procedure. By our inductive hypothesis, the $LOOKUP_{(n-1)}$ procedure is at most $4 \cdot 2^{n-1}$ lines, and we know that the $LOOKUP_1$ procedure is exactly 4 lines. Thus $k \leq 2 \cdot 4 (2^{n-1} - 1) + 4$, which simplifies to $k \leq 4(2^n - 1)$.