

## **Locally Checkable Proofs**

#### Mika Göös & Jukka Suomela

Helsinki Institute for Information Technology HIIT

# What global information can we infer from local structure?

- What global information can we infer from local structure?
- Specifically: Can we prove to a distributed local verifier that a graph has a certain global property?

i

## Local Algorithms



## Local Algorithms



Locality condition: constant running time  $t \in \mathbb{N}$ 

Göös, Suomela (HIIT)

Locally Checkable Proofs



## Local Algorithms



## Locally Checkable Properties



[Naor & Stockmeyer, 1995]

## Locally Checkable Properties



e.g. Eulerian graphs

## Locally Checkable Properties



Graph Eulerian  $\iff$  all vertices have even degree

1 Very few properties are locally checkable

- Very few properties are locally checkable
- 2 Extension: Add information to local neighbourhoods:

**Proof labels:**  $P: V(G) \rightarrow \{0,1\}^*$ 

- Very few properties are locally checkable
- <u>Extension</u>: Add information to local neighbourhoods:

## **Proof labels:** $P: V(G) \rightarrow \{0,1\}^*$

Proof Labelling Schemes"
[Korman, Kutten & Peleg, PODC 2005]
[Korman & Kutten, 2007]
[Fraigniaud, Korman & Peleg, 2010]

## Example: 3-Colourability



## Example: 3-Colourability



### Example: 3-Colourability



 $\exists c: V \rightarrow \{1, 2, 3\}$  s.t. all edges non-monochromatic

A graph property  $\mathcal{P}$  admits **locally checkable proofs of** size  $f : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$  if there exists a local algorithm  $\mathcal{A}$  so that  $G \in \mathcal{P}$ : There exists a proof

$$P: V(G) \to \{0,1\}^{f(n(G))}$$

so that  $\mathcal{A}(G, P, v)$  outputs yes on all nodes v.  $G \notin \mathcal{P}$ : For every proof P,  $\mathcal{A}(G, P, v)$  outputs no on some node v.

## **Complexity Theory Analogue**

#### Locally checkable properties

#### Locally checkable proofs



We study the Locally Checkable Proof (LCP) hierarchy

 $LCP(0) \subset LCP(O(1)) \subset LCP(O(\log n)) \subset LCP(O(n^2))$ 

- 2 Extending the results of [Korman et al., 2005]
  - Our model is strictly stronger
- Lower-bound constructions—using e.g.
  - Extremal graph theory
  - Gadgets (from NP-completeness theory)
  - Communication complexity









3 Equip C with node counters



- Equip C with node counters
- 4 Prove the existence of a unique L using spanning tree methods

Suppose *non-bipartiteness* admits proof of size  $o(\log n)$  with local algorithm A

- Suppose non-bipartiteness admits proof of size o(log n) with local algorithm A
- **2** Then  $\mathcal{A}$  accepts **odd cycles** with short proofs:



- Suppose non-bipartiteness admits proof of size o(log n) with local algorithm A
- **2** Then  $\mathcal{A}$  accepts **odd cycles** with short proofs:



- Suppose non-bipartiteness admits proof of size o(log n) with local algorithm A
- **2** Then  $\mathcal{A}$  accepts **odd cycles** with short proofs:



- Suppose non-bipartiteness admits proof of size o(log n) with local algorithm A
- **2** Then  $\mathcal{A}$  accepts **odd cycles** with short proofs:



- Suppose non-bipartiteness admits proof of size o(log n) with local algorithm A
- **2** Then  $\mathcal{A}$  accepts **odd cycles** with short proofs:



- Suppose non-bipartiteness admits proof of size o(log n) with local algorithm A
- **2** Then  $\mathcal{A}$  accepts **odd cycles** with short proofs:



- Suppose non-bipartiteness admits proof of size o(log n) with local algorithm A
- **2** Then  $\mathcal{A}$  accepts **odd cycles** with short proofs:



- Suppose *non-bipartiteness* admits proof of size o(log n) with local algorithm A
- **2** Then  $\mathcal{A}$  accepts **odd cycles** with short proofs:



- Suppose non-bipartiteness admits proof of size o(log n) with local algorithm A
- **2** Then  $\mathcal{A}$  accepts **odd cycles** with short proofs:



- Suppose non-bipartiteness admits proof of size o(log n) with local algorithm A
- **2** Then  $\mathcal{A}$  accepts **odd cycles** with short proofs:



Class	Proof size	Graph property	Graph family
<b>LCP</b> (0)	0 0	Eulerian graphs line graphs	connected general
<b>LCP</b> ( <i>O</i> (1))	$\begin{array}{c} \Theta(1) \\ \Theta(1) \\ \Theta(1) \\ \Theta(1) \\ \Theta(1) \\ \Theta(1) \\ \Theta(1) \end{array}$	s-t reachability s-t unreachability s-t unreachability s-t connectivity = k bipartite graphs even $n(G)$	undirected undirected directed planar general cycles
$LCP(O(\log k))$	$\begin{array}{c} O(\log k) \\ O(\log k) \end{array}$	s-t connectivity $= kchromatic number \leq k$	general general

## Local Proof Complexities 2

Class	Proof size	Graph property	Graph family
$LCP(O(\log n))$	$O(\log n)$ $O(\log n)$ $\Theta(\log n)$ $\Theta(\log n)$	any $coLCP(0)$ property any monadic $\Sigma_1^1$ property odd $n(G)$ chromatic number > 2	connected connected cycles connected
LCP(poly(n))	$ \begin{array}{c} \Theta(n) \\ \Theta(n^2) \\ \Omega(n^2/\log n) \\ O(n^2) \end{array} $	fixpoint-free symmetry symmetric graphs chromatic number > 3 any computable property	trees connected connected connected
—	_	connected	general

- The exact local proof complexity for many classical problems remains unknown
- **2** Is it the case that, when  $\Delta = O(1)$ ,

 $LCP(O(1)) \subseteq NP$  ?

Note: we already know that

 $\mathbf{LCP}(0) \subseteq \mathbf{P} \qquad \& \qquad \mathbf{LCP}(O(\log n)) \begin{cases} \not\subseteq \mathbf{NP} \\ \subseteq \mathbf{NP}_{/\mathsf{poly}} \end{cases}$ 



# Thank you!