

Combinatorial Characterisations of accessible Graphical Computational Search Problems: $\mathcal{P} \neq \mathcal{NP}$.

Kayibi Koko-Kalambay

*School of Mathematics. Department of Sciences
University of Bristol*

Abstract

Let G be a connected graph with edge-set E and vertex-set V . Given an input X , where X is the edge-set or the vertex-set of the graph G , a graphical computational search problem associated with a predicate γ consists of finding a solution Y , where $Y \subseteq X$, and Y satisfies the condition γ . We denote such a problem as $\Pi(X, \gamma)$, and we let $\hat{\Pi}$ to denote the decision problem associated with $\Pi(X, \gamma)$.

A sub-solution of $\Pi(X, \gamma)$ is a subset Y' that is a solution of the problem $\Pi(X', \gamma)$, where $X' \subset X$, and X' is the edge-set or the vertex-set of the contraction-minor G/A , where $A \subseteq E$. To each search problem $\Pi(X, \gamma)$, we associate the set system (X, \mathcal{I}) , where \mathcal{I} denotes the set of all the solutions and sub-solutions of $\Pi(X, \gamma)$.

The predicate γ is an accessible predicate if, given $Y \neq \emptyset$, Y satisfies γ in X implies that there is an element $y \in Y$ such that $Y \setminus y$ satisfies γ in X' . If γ is an accessible property, we then show in Theorem 1 that a decision problem $\hat{\Pi}$ is in \mathcal{P} if and only if, for all input X , the set system (X, \mathcal{I}) satisfies Axioms M2', where M2', called the Augmentability Axiom, is an extension of both the Exchange Axiom and the Accessibility Axiom of a greedoid. We also show that a problem $\hat{\Pi}$ is in \mathcal{P} -complete if and only if, for all input X , the set system (X, \mathcal{I}) satisfies Axioms M2' and M1, where M1 is the Heredity Axiom of a matroid. A problem $\hat{\Pi}$ is in \mathcal{NP} if and only if, for all input X , the set system (X, \mathcal{I}) satisfies Axioms M2'', where M2'' is an extension of the Augmentability Axiom. Finally, the problem $\hat{\Pi}$ is in \mathcal{NP} -complete if and only if, for all input X , the set system (X, \mathcal{I}) satisfies Axiom M1.

Using the fact that Hamiltonicity is an accessible property that satisfies M2'', but does not satisfies Axiom M2', in Corollary 1 we get that $\mathcal{P} \neq \mathcal{NP}$.

Keywords: Algorithms, Greedoids, Matroid, Polynomial time, P versus NP

2000 MSC: 05C99, 11K99

1. Introduction

Prior to Hassler Whitney [22] defining matroids axiomatically as generalisations of linear independence, Boruvka Otakar [21] used implicitly axioms of matroids to justify the optimality of the greedy algorithm he proposed for finding a Minimum Spanning Tree of a graph. Later Korte and Lovasz [4] observed that the optimality of some other greedy algorithms requires to extend axioms of matroids to what they aptly called greedoids. Thus, we have that whenever the combinatorial structure of a problem is a greedoid, there is an algorithm that solves the problem in linear time. The present paper attempts to reverse the implication. That is, the existence of a polynomial time algorithm implies the existence of a combinatorial structure that is a natural extension of a greedoid.

The key intuition stems from an unpublished Conjecture by Dominic Welsh: *"whenever there is a good algorithm, there is a matroid lurking behind"*. After Edmonds [11, 12], we understood 'good algorithms' as 'efficient algorithms'. That is, algorithms that run in time bounded above by a polynomial on the size of the input. We set ourselves the goal of characterising axiomatically this class of problems that may be solved easily. While working on Canonical Paths for proving that the mixing times of some Markov chains are polynomial [16, 17, 18], it occurred to us that an algorithm solves a problem in polynomial time only if the structure of the problem is such that, (1), it is possible to move towards the solution in easy (polynomial time), steady (every step brings the goal closer, no backtracking) and incremental steps (each step adds as few elements as possible), and, (2), at least one solution is accessible (reachable) through these easy, steady and incremental steps. In what follows in this paper, Condition (1) is formally defined as *Augmentability*, while Condition (2) is formally defined as *Accessibility*. It happened that Augmentability is an extension of the axioms of Greedoids (Exchange and Accessibility). This important breakthrough allowed us to express characterisations of Computational Search Problems in using a terminology proper to Matroid and Greedoid Theory. We thus confirm Dominic Welsh's intuition, and we got many interesting results on the hierarchy of Computational Complexity Classes as consequences.

The enfoldings of this article is organised in three sections. In Section Two, we define the feasible sets of a computational problem Π , and we give some examples to help understanding. Next we present the axioms of Greedoids and their extensions. That serves to show that the definition of feasible sets for computational problems extends naturally the definition of feasible sets of Greedoids. We then present the main Theorem. In Section Three, we present the Theoretical Computer Sciences folklore results about P and NP completeness that are used in our proofs. In Section Four, we present the proof of the main Theorem, which is divided in many Lemmas and Propositions.

2. Main Definitions and Main Result

2.1. Feasible sets of $\Pi(X, \gamma)$: solutions and sub-solutions

A *Graphical Computational Search Problem* associated with the predicate γ , denoted $\Pi(X, \gamma)$, consists of finding a subset $Y \subseteq X$, where X is the edge-set or the vertex-set of a connected graph G , and Y satisfies the condition γ . We say that X is the *instance* or the *input* of the search problem, or the search problem is instanced on X , or the search problem is restricted to X , and we say that Y is a *solution* or a *basis* of $\Pi(X, \gamma)$. The *decision problem* associated with $\Pi(X, \gamma)$, denoted $\hat{\Pi}$, consists of finding whether or not there is a solution Y , where $Y \subseteq X$ and Y satisfies γ .

Let $G(V, E)$ be a connected (labelled) graph with vertex-set V and edge-set E . Abusing of language, we may say that G is the instance or the input of $\Pi(X, \gamma)$ if $X = E$ or $X = V$, and we write $\Pi(G, \gamma)$ instead of $\Pi(X, \gamma)$. We write $G[X]$ to denote the graph whose vertex-set or edge-set is X .

Let $e \in E$, where $e = \{v_1, v_2\}$ (e not a loop). The *contraction* by e consists of merging the end-vertices v_1 and v_2 into a single vertex and deleting the loop thus formed (The new vertex formed by merging v_1 and v_2 takes one of the merged labels). We denote the new graph obtained from G as G/e . If G consists of a single vertex and loops, contracting by a loop e consists of deleting the single vertex and loops to obtain the empty graph (graph with $E = \emptyset$ and $V = \emptyset$).

Let $A \subseteq E$. The graph H is a *contraction-minor* of G if $H = G/A$. That is, H is obtained from G by contracting the edges in A . Note that the order

of contractions is irrelevant. See Figure 1 for illustrations.

Given a graph G/A , a *de-contraction* by an edge $e \in A$ consists of reversing the contraction by $e = \{v_1, v_2\}$. We write the decontraction by e as $G/(A \setminus e)$. (We caution that if A is a set, not a graph, $A \setminus e$ is the set A with the element e removed from it). Obviously, if K is obtained from G/A by de-contracting some elements of A , then K is a contraction-minor of G . And, if G is a connected graph then G/A is also a connected graph




Figure 1: A: graph G ; B: $G/\{c\}$; C: $G/\{e\}$; D: $G/\{c, d, e\}$; E: $G/\{e, c\}$; Going from A to B is a contraction by the edge c , while going from B to A is a de-contraction by the edge c .

Definitions 1. Given the problem $\Pi(X, \gamma)$ where X is the edge-set or the vertex-set of a connected graph G , we say that Y' is a *sub-solution* of $\Pi(X, \gamma)$ if Y' is not a solution of $\Pi(X, \gamma)$, and there is a graph G/A , whose

edge-set or the vertex-set is $X' \subset X$, and Y' is a solution of $\Pi(X', \gamma)$. The set X' is said to be a *sub-instance*. A *feasible set* of $\Pi(X)$ is either a sub-solution or a solution (basis) of $\Pi(X, \gamma)$. We may refer to a sub-solution as a non-basic feasible set.

Using graphical terminology, we say Y' is a sub-solution of $\Pi(G, \gamma)$ if Y' is not a solution of $\Pi(G, \gamma)$, and there is a sub-instance $H = G/A$ such that Y' is the solution of the problem $\Pi(H, \gamma)$.

Definitions 2. Let G be a graph with vertex-set V and edge-set E . A subset $Y \subseteq V$ is *independent* if there are no edges connecting elements of Y . A subset $Y \subseteq E$ is *independent* if Y does not contain a cycle. Notice that if Y is independent in G , then there is an element $y \in Y$ such that $Y \setminus y$ is independent in G/e for some edge e . Hence, Independence is an accessible property. (It satisfies the Accessibility Axiom of Gredoids). More generally, a property γ is an *accessible property* if, given $Y \neq \emptyset$, Y satisfies γ in X of G implies that there is a subset X' of G/A and there is an element $y \in Y$ such that $Y \setminus y$ satisfies γ in X' . Apart from Independence, this article makes much use of the fact that if a cycle C is a hamiltonian cycle for a graph G , then there is an edge $e \in C$ such that C/e is a Hamiltonian cycle of the graph G/e . That is, Hamiltonicity is also an accessible property.

Remark on Notations. In what follows, for the sake of convenience and if the context is clear, we may write Π , or $\Pi(X)$, instead of $\Pi(X, \gamma)$. We also write $\Pi(X) = Y$ to mean that Y is a solution of the problem Π instanced on X (Since there may be other solutions, Π is not a function).

Acid-Test: Example 1.

Consider the graph G given in Figure 2. Let Π be the problem, denoted STP, that consists of finding a spanning tree of G . That is, finding a set Y of edges that does not contain a cycle. Thus $X = E$, the set of edges of G . Let \mathcal{I} denote the set of all feasible sets of Π . We have

$$\mathcal{I} = \{\text{all the spanning trees of } G, \text{ all the sub-trees of } G, \text{ the empty set.}\}$$

Indeed, we have that solutions or bases of Π are spanning trees of G . And sub-solutions of Π are the sub-trees of G . For, let Y' be a subtree of G . Then there is a set of edges A such that $Y' \cup A$ is a spanning tree of G . Thus, G/A is a contraction-minor of G such that Y' is a solution of Π




Figure 2: A graph G .

restricted to G/A . For example, \emptyset is a sub-solution since \emptyset is the solution of Π restricted to $G/\{a, b, c\}$. The singletons $\{a\}$ and $\{b\}$ are sub-solutions since they are solutions of Π restricted to $G/\{c, d\}$. The singletons $\{c\}$, $\{d\}$ and $\{e\}$ are sub-solutions since they are solutions (spanning trees) of Π restricted to $G/\{a, b\}$. All the two-set subsets are also sub-solutions. For example, the sets $\{a, e\}$, $\{a, d\}$, $\{a, b\}$, $\{d, b\}$, $\{d, e\}$ are sub-solutions since they are solutions (spanning trees) of Π restricted to $G/\{c\}$. All the three-set subsets except for $\{a, d, e\}$ and $\{b, c, e\}$ are bases. That is, they are solutions of $\Pi(G)$. Thus, a feasible set is any subset of $\{a, b, c, d, e\}$ that does not contain a cycle. Hence, for the STP problem, \mathcal{I} is the set of feasible sets of the cycle matroid of G . As an acid-test, this example shows how our definition of feasible sets is a natural extension of the definition of feasible sets of greedoids. More generally, the present paper aims at showing that, if a problem can be solved in polynomial time, or a solution can be checked in polynomial time, then a solution of every such a search problem is a ‘basis’ of some ‘greedoid-like’ combinatorial structure.

Notice that, in the STP example, a subset may be a solution for many

sub-instances. For example, $\{a, b\}$ is a solution for G/c , G/d or G/e . And a sub-instance may have many possible solutions. However, in Definition 1, we only require the existence of one sub-instance X' such that $\Pi(X') = Y'$ for Y' to be a feasible set of Π .

Example 2. Let Π consist of finding a Hamiltonian cycle of the graph in Figure 2. The set of edges $C = \{a, b, c, d\}$ is a solution (basis), since it is a Hamiltonian cycle of the graph G . The set of edges $C_1 = \{a, b, d\}$ is a sub-solution of Π , since it is a Hamiltonian cycle for the sub-instance $G/\{c\}$. Notice also that the set of edges $C_2 = \{a, d, e\}$ is another Hamiltonian cycle of the graph $G/\{c\}$. We have,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I} = & \{\emptyset, \text{all the singletons, all the 2-subsets, } \{a, d, e\}, \{b, c, e\}, \\ & \{a, b, c\}, \{a, b, d\}, \{b, c, d\}, \{a, c, d\}, \{a, b, c, d\}\} \end{aligned}$$

Indeed, the feasible set $B = \{a, b, c, d\}$ is the unique basis. Moreover, consider any subset $C \subseteq B$. Then $B \setminus C$ is a Hamiltonian cycle of the graph G/C . Hence, all the subsets of B are feasible sets. Now, consider the feasible sets that are not subsets of B . The singleton $\{e\}$ is a Hamiltonian cycle of the graph $G/\{b, c, d\}$. The 2-subsets $\{a, e\}$, $\{c, e\}$, $\{b, e\}$ and $\{d, e\}$ are Hamiltonian cycles of the graph $G/\{b, d\}$, $G/\{b, c\}$, $G/\{a, c\}$ and $G/\{a, b\}$, respectively. The 3-subsets $\{a, d, e\}$ and $\{a, d, c\}$ are Hamiltonian cycles of the graphs $G/\{b\}$, while $\{b, c, e\}$ and $\{b, c, d\}$ are Hamiltonian cycles of the graph $G/\{a\}$. As, we shall show later, the set system (X, \mathcal{I}) of the Hamiltonian Cycle Problem does not define a greedoid.

□

2.2. Simplicial Complexes, Matroids, Greedoids and Main Theorem.

Let X be a set and let \mathcal{I} be a family of subsets of X . We refer to elements of \mathcal{I} as feasible sets. A *simplicial complex* is a pair (X, \mathcal{I}) , where \mathcal{I} satisfies the following axiom.

M1. *Heredity Axiom:* If $I \in \mathcal{I}$, then for all $e \in I$, $I \setminus e \in \mathcal{I}$.

A *matroid* is a pair (X, \mathcal{I}) , where \mathcal{I} satisfies the following axioms.

M1. *Heredity Axiom:* If $I \in \mathcal{I}$, then for all $e \in I$, $I \setminus e \in \mathcal{I}$.

M2. *Exchange Axiom*: If I_1 and I_2 are elements of \mathcal{I} , and $|I_1| > |I_2|$, then there is an element $e \in I_1 \setminus I_2$ such that $I_2 \cup e \in \mathcal{I}$.

A *greedoid* is a pair (X, \mathcal{I}) , where \mathcal{I} satisfies the following axioms.

G1. *Accessibility Axiom*: If $I \in \mathcal{I}$, then there is an element $e \in I$ such that $I \setminus e \in \mathcal{I}$.

M2. *Exchange Axiom*: If I_1 and I_2 are elements of \mathcal{I} , and $|I_1| > |I_2|$, then there is an element $e \in I_1 \setminus I_2$ such that $I_2 \cup e \in \mathcal{I}$.

We extend the axioms of greedoids as follows.

M2'. *Augmentability*: If $I \in \mathcal{I}$, and I is not a solution (basis), then there is an element $x \in X \setminus I$ such that $I \cup x \in \mathcal{I}$.

M2''. *Within-Augmentability*: If $I \in \mathcal{I}$, $Y \in \mathcal{I}$ and $I \subset Y$, then there is an element $y \in Y \setminus I$ such that $I \cup y \in \mathcal{I}$.

Remarks about the axioms. We notice that M2 implies M2', which implies M2'', and M1 implies G1. Finally, M1 implies M2''.

In the axioms of Greedoids, G1 and M2 are independent. Indeed, since \emptyset is not assumed to be a feasible set in a greedoid, Axiom G1 is necessary to show that \emptyset is a feasible set. However, in Definition 1, we already have that the solution of $\Pi(\emptyset)$ is the empty set. Hence \emptyset is always a sub-solution. Using this, we get that M2'' implies G1. Indeed, suppose that M2'' holds and $Y \in \mathcal{I}$. Since $\emptyset \subset Y$ and \emptyset is a feasible set, there is an element $y_1 \in Y$ such that $I^{(1)} = \emptyset \cup y_1$ and $I^{(1)} \in \mathcal{I}$. Using M2'' recursively, we get that there is a chain $\emptyset \subset I^{(1)} \subset I^{(2)} \subset \dots \subset Y$, such that $I^{(i+1)} = I^{(i)} \cup y_i$. Thus, G1 holds.

□

Terminology. Suppose that I' and I'' are two feasible sets. We write $I'' \trianglelefteq I'$ if $I'' \subset I'$, and $|I''| = |I'| - 1$. A feasible set I is *accessible* if there is a chain $\emptyset \trianglelefteq I^{(1)} \trianglelefteq I^{(2)} \trianglelefteq \dots \trianglelefteq I$, where every $I^{(i)}$ is a feasible set. Such a chain is called a *chain of accessibility*, which entails that there is a steady path from I to the empty set. A problem Π is accessible if it satisfies G1. That is, a problem Π is accessible if all its feasible sets are accessible. A feasible set I' is *augmentable* if there is an element $x \in X$ such that $I' \cup x$ is a feasible set. A problem is augmentable if it satisfies Axiom M2'. That

is, a problem is augmentable if every sub-solution (feasible sets that are not bases) is augmentable.

A feasible set I' is *augmentable within* the feasible I if $I' \subset I$ and there is an element $x \in I \setminus I'$ such that $I' \cup x$ is a feasible set. A problem is *within-augmentable* if it satisfies Axiom M2". That is, a problem is within-augmentable if every sub-solution (feasible sets that are not bases) is within-augmentable.

Naturally, we say that a predicate γ is augmentable, or within-augmentable, or accessible, if and only if, for every input X on the search problem associated with γ , $\Pi(X, \gamma)$ is augmentable, or within-augmentable, or accessible. As mentioned in the abstract, this article only deals with problems (equivalently, predicates) that satisfy Axiom G1.

Intuitively, Augmentability entails that, in the quest for a solution Y , if one starts from the empty set and moves from one sub-solution to another sub-solution by augmentation, then, every move is a right move towards a solution Y . Thus, there would be no backtracking, and a solution can be found in polynomial time if each augmentation can be made in polynomial time. Conversely, suppose that there is a sub-solution Y' such that, for all $e \notin Y'$, $Y' \cup e$ is not a sub-solution. Then, an algorithm searching for a solution by building it from the empty set has to avoid getting stuck into Y' . To avoid doing so, for every e added iteratively the algorithm has to check exhaustively all the supersets of the sub-solution reached so far to see which one is augmentable. Hence the algorithm would be exponential, and in the worst cases, it has to backtrack. Much of the present paper is about turning this intuition in a sound mathematical proof.

Theorem 1. *Let G be a connected graph with vertex-set V and edge-set E , and let X be either V or E (not both). Let (X, \mathcal{I}) be the set of all feasible sets (the solutions and sub-solutions) of the search problem $\Pi(X, \gamma)$, where γ is an accessible property. If $\hat{\Pi}$ denotes the decision problem associated with $\Pi(X, \gamma)$, then,*

1. $\hat{\Pi}$ is in the computational class \mathcal{P} if and only if, for every input X , the set (X, \mathcal{I}) satisfy Axiom M2'.
2. $\hat{\Pi}$ is in the computational class \mathcal{P} -complete if and only if, for every input X , the set (X, \mathcal{I}) satisfy Axioms M1 and M2'.
3. $\hat{\Pi}$ is in the computational class \mathcal{NP} if and only if, for every input X , the set (X, \mathcal{I}) satisfy Axiom M2".

4. $\hat{\Pi}$ is in the computational class \mathcal{NP} -complete if and only if, for every input X , the set (X, \mathcal{I}) satisfy Axioms M1.

Theorem 1 and the set inclusion that it implies are illustrated in Figure 3.




Figure 3: Strict set inclusion of computational classes of accessible search problems. STP stands for Spanning Tree Problem, HCP stands for Hamiltonian Cycle Problem, MIS stands for Maximal Independent Set (problem), and MaxIS stands for Maximum Independent Set (problem).

The proof of Theorem 1 requires the following background, definitions and lemmas. We follow closely the notations of [1, 6, 9] for Theoretical Computational Complexity, the notations of [22, 27] for Matroid Theory and the notations of [4] for Greedoid Theory.

2.3. Closures and Important Examples.

A notion much used in the following article is that of ‘closure’. The set $B \subseteq X$ is *maximal* for a property if one can not add an element $x \in X \setminus B$ into B without violating that property. The set $B \subseteq X$ is *minimal* for a property if one can not remove an element $x \in B$ from B without violating that property. For all feasible sets Y' , let a closure of Y' , denoted $cl(Y')$, be defined as

$$cl(Y') = Y' \cup A,$$

where A is a maximal set of the elements $x \in X \setminus Y'$ such that $\Pi(Y' \cup A) = Y'$. That is, Y' is a solution of Π instanced on $Y' \cup A$, and $Y' \cup A$ is maximal for that property. In graphical terminology, $cl(Y') = H$, where H is a contraction minor of G such that Y' is a solution of $\Pi(H)$, and H is maximal for the property $\Pi(H) = Y'$.

Notice that our closure is not defined for all the subsets of X . Moreover, $cl(Y')$ may not be unique neither as a set (of vertices or edges, not both), nor as a contraction-minor of G . But we have the following fact.

Fact 1. *Let Y' be a feasible set, and let x_1 and x_2 be in $X \setminus Y'$ such that $x_1 \in cl(Y')$ if and only if $x_2 \in cl(Y')$. Thus there is an equivalence relation, \sim , defined on the set $X \setminus Y'$, where $x_1 \sim x_2$ if they belong to the same closure of Y' . The equivalence relation \sim induces a partition $\{P_1, P_2, \dots, P_k\}$, where $Y' \cup P_i$ is a closure of Y' .*

Moreover, if $cl(Y') = Y' \cup P_i = G/A$ then $Y' \cup P_i \cup P_j = G/(A \setminus P_j)$, where P_j is the set of edges added to $Y' \cup P_i$ by de-contraction if X is the set of edges of G , or P_j is the set of edges incident to vertices added by de-contraction if X is the set of vertices of G .

However, for the problems relevant in the present paper, such as Hamiltonian Cycle Problem (HC) or Maximal Independent Set Problem (MIS), $cl(Y')$ is unique (as a set) for all feasible sets Y' . Moreover, one may check that our definition of the closure operation extends naturally the definition of closure of a greedoid.

Example 3.

Consider again the graph G given in Figure 2, and where Π be the problem consisting of finding a spanning tree of G , denoted STP. We have

$$\mathcal{I} = \{\text{all the spanning trees of } G, \text{ and all the sub-trees of } G, \text{ the empty set.}\}$$

Indeed, sub-solutions of Π are the solutions of Π instanced on minors G/B , where $B \subset E$. For example, \emptyset is a sub-solution since \emptyset is the solution of Π restricted to $G/\{a, b, c\}$. And, $cl(\emptyset) = G/\{a, b, c\}$. The set $\{a, b\}$ is also a sub-solution since $\{a, b\}$ is the solution of Π restricted to $G/\{c\}$. And, $cl(\{a, b\}) = G/\{c\}$.

Notice that, for this example, our notion of closure corresponds with the notion of closure in Matroids, defined as follows. For all subsets $X' \subseteq X$, let the rank of X' be a function $r : 2^X \rightarrow \mathbb{N}^+$ (positive integers), defined as

$$r(X') = |Y'|,$$

where Y' is the largest element of \mathcal{I} contained in X' . For all subsets X' , let the closure of X' , denoted $cl(X')$, be defined as

$$cl(X') = \{e \in X : r(X' \cup e) = r(X')\}.$$

Now, each sub-solution Y' is a sub-tree of the graph G , and $cl(Y')$ is just the contraction-minor spanned by Y' . That is, $cl(Y')$ is the set of edges that do not increase the rank of the sub-tree Y' .

It is part of the folklore of Matroid Theory that the family of all the feasible sets of the STP is the family of all the spanning trees and sub-trees of the graph G . And this is the family of the feasible sets of a matroid, the cycle matroid of G . Hence, the set system (X, \mathcal{I}) of STP defines a matroid, as shown in Figure 3.

□

Now we give some important examples and series of Lemmas (Lemma 1 to Lemma 7) that will be much used in the proof of Theorem 1. All these lemmas concern the Maximal Independent Set Problem and the Hamiltonian Cycle Problem, whose associated decision problems are prototypes of \mathcal{P} -complete and \mathcal{NP} -complete problems, respectively.

Example 4.

Consider the graph given in Figure 4. Let $\Pi(G)$, denoted MIS, be the problem consisting of finding a maximal independent set of G . That is, finding a set Y of vertices that are not adjacent to each other and no other vertex can be added without violating independence. Thus $X = V$, the set of vertices of G . A solution (basis) would be the set

$$Y = \{1, 4\}.$$

We have




Figure 4: A graph G .

$$\mathcal{I} = \{\emptyset, \{1\}, \{2\}, \{3\}, \{4\}, \{5\}, \{1, 4\}, \{2, 3\}, \{2, 5\}, \{3, 5\}, \{2, 3, 5\}\}$$

Another maximal independent set (basis) is the set $\{2, 3, 5\}$. It is worth noticing that, although, by Definition 1, $\{1, 4\}$ and $\{2, 3, 5\}$ are both bases, they have not the same cardinality. Hence, the set system (X, \mathcal{I}) associated with MIS can not be that of a greedoid. However, one may check that every feasible set that is not a basis is augmentable. For example, \emptyset can be augmented to become any singleton. The sets $\{1\}$ or $\{4\}$ can be augmented into $\{1, 4\}$. This is an illustration of the result given in Lemma 1, which, along with Lemma 2 and Lemma 3, is much used in the present paper. First, we would like to mention that, for MIS problem, $cl(Y') = Y' \cup A$, where A is the set of all vertices in $X \setminus Y'$ that are connected to some vertex in Y' . Hence, $cl(Y')$ is unique (as a set of vertices) for all feasible sets Y' . As a contraction-minor, $cl(Y')$ can be defined as the graph G/A where A is the set of edges $e = \{v, w\}$ of G such that either v or w is not adjacent to vertices in Y' (this definition also makes it unique as a contraction-minor).

Example 5.

Consider the graph given in Figure 5. Notice that, for the MIS problem, the bases (solutions) are the sets of vertices B_1, B_2, B_3 , where

$$B_1 = \{1, 4\}, B_2 = \{2\}, B_3 = \{3\}$$

On the other end, the *Maximum Independent Set* problem, denoted *MaxIS*, consists of finding an independent set of the greatest cardinality. The bases (solutions) for this problem is B_1 only. The sets $B_2 = \{2\}$ and $B_3 = \{3\}$ are not bases for the *MaxIS*, but there are sub-solutions. Indeed,




Figure 5: A graph G .

they are solutions when the instance is the contraction-minor G/c . It is worth noticing that in *MaxIs*, the sub-solutions B_2 and B_3 are not augmentable.

Lemma 1. *Every sub-solution (feasible sets that are not bases) of the Maximal Independent Set Problem is augmentable. That is, MIS problem satisfies $M2'$.*

Proof. Let Y' be a sub-solution. That is, there is a sub-instance (contraction-minor) of the connected graph G , denoted $cl(Y')$, such that Y' is the solution of the problem Π restricted to $cl(Y')$. Since, by definition, $cl(Y') \neq G$, we have that there is a vertex v that is not adjacent to any vertex of Y' in G . Thus v can be added to Y' such that $Y' \cup v$ is also a maximal independent set. That is, $Y' \cup v$ is feasible set. \square

Lemma 2. *Every feasible set of the Maximal Independent Set Problem is accessible. That is, MIS problem satisfies $G1$.*

Proof. Let $Y' = \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_k\}$ be a feasible set. There is a contraction-minor G/A , with $A \supseteq \emptyset$, such that Y' is a solution of $\Pi(G/A)$, where A is the set of all the edges $e = \{v, w\}$ of G such that either v or w is not adjacent to vertices in Y' . Consider now $Y' \setminus v_i$, with $1 \leq i \leq k$. We have that G/B , where B is the set of all the edges $e = \{v, w\}$ of G such that either v or w is not adjacent to vertices in $Y' \setminus v_i$, is a contraction-minor such that $Y' \setminus v_i$ is a solution of $\Pi(G/B)$. Notice that $A \subset B$. Moreover, $Y' \setminus v_i$ is maximal since any other vertex in G/B but not in $Y' \setminus v_i$ is adjacent to some vertex in $Y' \setminus v_i$. By induction, we get that there is a chain of accessibility from \emptyset to Y' .

□

The proof of Lemma 2 shows more than we need to prove. It actually proves the following.

Lemma 3. *Every subset of a feasible set of the Maximal Independent Set Problem is a feasible set. That is, MIS problem satisfies M1.*

□

Example 6. Consider the graph G of Figure 6. Let $X = E$, the set of edges of G . Let $\Pi(G)$, denoted HC, be the problem that consists of finding a Hamiltonian cycle of G . First, we would like to recall that, for the HC problem on a graph G , Y' is a feasible set means that Y' is a Hamiltonian cycle of a contraction-minor H of the graph G . And, $cl(Y') = Y' \cup A$, where A is the set of all edges in $X \setminus Y'$ that are loops in H , or form a cycle with some (not all) edges of Y' in H . Hence, $cl(Y')$ is unique. As said earlier, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I} = & \{\emptyset, \text{all the singletons, all the 2-subsets, } \{a, d, e\}, \{b, c, e\}, \\ & \{a, b, c\}, \{a, b, d\}, \{b, c, d\}, \{a, c, d\}, \{a, b, c, d\}\} \end{aligned}$$

Most importantly for what follows in Corollary 1, notice that all the sub-solutions are augmentable, except for $\{a, d, e\}$ and $\{b, c, e\}$. Indeed, we have the following important observation.




Figure 6: A graph where a Hamiltonian circuit exists.

Lemma 4. *The subset $Y' = \{a, d, e\}$ is a feasible set that is not augmentable.*

Proof. The subset $Y' = \{a, d, e\}$ is a feasible set (sub-solution), since it is a Hamiltonian cycle of the sub-instance $G/\{b\}$. But there is no edge x such that $x \in X \setminus Y'$ and $Y' \cup x \in \mathcal{I}$. That is, there is no minors of G whose Hamiltonian cycle would be $Y' \cup x$, for all $x \in X \setminus Y'$. Hence Y' is not augmentable. \square

Lemma 4 is true for any cycle of G that does not contain all the vertices all G . In contrast, we have that $\{a, c, d\}$ is also a hamiltonian cycle of the sub-instance $G/\{b\}$. But $\{a, c, d\}$ is augmentable into $\{a, b, c, d\}$. Thus, HC does not satisfy M2'. However, it satisfies a weaker form of Augmentability. Indeed, consider the feasible set $C = \{a, b, c, d\}$, and consider the set \mathcal{I}' , the set of feasible sets that are subsets of C . Notice that all the elements of \mathcal{I}' are augmentable within C . Indeed, we have the following.

Lemma 5. *Let C be a hamiltonian cycle of the graph $G(V, E)$. Then all the sub-solutions that are subsets of C are augmentable within C . That is HC*

satisfies $M2''$.

Proof. Let C' be a sub-solution that is a subset of C . Suppose that $C' = C \setminus A$, where $A \subseteq E$. Since C' is a sub-solution, we have that C' is a Hamiltonian cycle of the sub-instance G/A . Consider an edge $e \in A$. We then have that $C' \cup e$ is a Hamiltonian cycle of the sub-instance $G/(A \setminus e)$. Hence C' is augmentable within C .

□

While some sub-solution of HC may not be augmentable, we also notice that every feasible set is accessible. For example, we have

$$\emptyset \trianglelefteq \{a\} \trianglelefteq \{a, d\} \trianglelefteq \{a, c, d\} \trianglelefteq \{a, b, c, d\}$$

See Figure 7 for an illustration.




Figure 7: A chain of Accessibility for the Hamiltonian Cycle Problem on the graph G .

This is an example of the following fact, given in Lemma 6, which is used later in the present paper.

Lemma 6. *Every feasible set of the Hamiltonian Cycle Problem is accessible.*

Proof. Let $C' = \{e_1, e_2, \dots, e_k\}$ be a hamiltonian cycle of the graph G/A , with $A \supseteq \emptyset$. Consider the recursive contractions by the edges of C' . Every recursive contraction $G/(A \cup e_i)$, with $i \leq k$, is a contraction-minor of G and contains the Hamiltonian cycle $C' \setminus e_i$. Thus, there is a chain of accessibility from \emptyset to C' . \square

Actually, HC satisfies a stronger axiom than Axiom G1. Indeed, consider again the feasible set $C = \{a, b, c, d\}$ of the graph in Figure 6, and consider 2^C , the set of all the subsets of C . Notice that all the elements of 2^C are feasible sets.

Lemma 7. *Let C be a hamiltonian cycle of the graph $G(V, E)$. Then all the subsets of C are sub-solutions. That is, HC satisfies Axiom M1.*

Proof. let C' be a subset of C , where $C' = C \setminus A$, and $A \subseteq E$. Then C' is a Hamiltonian cycle of the sub-instance G/A . \square

3. Computational Complexity Requisites

This section concerns the key notions of Computational Complexity Theory needed in the proof of Theorem 1. An *algorithm* \mathcal{A} is a sequence of instructions that transforms an input X into an output Y . The *run time* of \mathcal{A} with input X , denoted $t_{\mathcal{A}}(X)$, is the number of steps in the computation of \mathcal{A} on input X . The time $t_{\mathcal{A}}(X) = \infty$ if this computation never halts. Let $T_{\mathcal{A}}(n)$ be the worst case run time of \mathcal{A} on all input of size n . That is,

$$T_{\mathcal{A}}(n) = \max\{t_{\mathcal{A}}(X) : |X| = n\}.$$

An algorithm \mathcal{A} runs in *polynomial time* if there exists a real number k such that for all n ,

$$T_{\mathcal{A}}(n) \leq n^k.$$

That is, the number of steps taken by the computation is bounded above by a polynomial on the size of the input. An algorithm \mathcal{A} runs in *exponential time* if there exists a real number k such that for all n ,

$$T_{\mathcal{A}}(n) \geq k^n.$$

A *decision problem* is a problem that takes some input X , and outputs "yes" or "no". Roughly speaking, the class \mathcal{P} consists of all those decision problems that can be solved by an algorithm that runs in an amount of time that is polynomial in the size of the input.

The class \mathcal{NP} consists of all those decision problems whose positive solutions can be verified in polynomial time given the right information, called a certificate Y . To each \mathcal{NP} decision problem is associated a *search problem*, which is, given a string X , find a string Y such that Y is a certificate of membership of X in some class L (or determine that no such certificate exists).

Definitions 3. A decision problem $\hat{\Pi}$ is *reducible* to another problem $\hat{\Pi}'$ if there is an algorithm ϕ that transforms an instance of $\hat{\Pi}$ into an instance of $\hat{\Pi}'$ and an algorithm ψ that transforms each solution of $\hat{\Pi}'$ into a solution of $\hat{\Pi}$, such that Y is a solution of $\hat{\Pi}'$ if and only if $\psi(Y)$ is a solution of $\hat{\Pi}$. This means that a solution to the $\hat{\Pi}'$ problem provides a solution for the problem $\hat{\Pi}$.

A decision problem $\hat{\Pi}$ is *complete* for the class \mathcal{C} if it is in \mathcal{C} , and all the problems in \mathcal{C} can be reduced to it in an appropriate manner. Or, given an algorithm \mathcal{A} for a problem complete for \mathcal{C} , any problem in \mathcal{C} can be solved by an algorithm \mathcal{B} that uses \mathcal{A} as sub-routine. A decision problem $\hat{\Pi}$ is *hard* for the class \mathcal{C} if all problems in \mathcal{C} can be reduced to it in an appropriate manner.

The notions of \mathcal{NP} -complete and \mathcal{P} -complete problems are essential in what follows in the present paper. \mathcal{NP} -complete problems are the set of problems to each of which any other \mathcal{NP} problem can be reduced in polynomial time, and whose solution may still be verified in polynomial time. Similarly, \mathcal{P} -complete problems are the set of problems to each of which any other \mathcal{P} problem can be reduced in logarithmic space. A *logspace reduction* of problem $\hat{\Pi}$ to problem $\hat{\Pi}'$ is a transformation which converts an instance of $\hat{\Pi}$ into an equivalent instance of $\hat{\Pi}'$ and uses only logarithmic space for the computation.

The *Boolean Satisfiability Problem*, denoted $S\hat{A}T$, is the problem of determining whether there exists an interpretation that satisfies a given Boolean

formula. That is, given Boolean formula, can the variables be consistently replaced by the values ‘true’ or ‘false’ in such a way that the formula evaluates to ‘true’. The following folklore results of Computer Sciences will be used throughout the present paper.

Theorem 2. [7] \hat{SAT} is \mathcal{NP} -complete.

Theorem 3. [3] The decision problem \hat{SAT} is in \mathcal{P} if and only if the search problem SAT is solvable in polynomial time.

Consider the graph $G(V, E)$, where V is the vertex-set and E is the edge-set. A *Hamiltonian cycle* of G is a cycle that contains all the vertices of G , while a *Hamiltonian path* is a path that passes through all the vertices of G exactly once. The *Hamiltonian Cycle Problem*, denoted HC , consists of finding such a Hamiltonian cycle. We denote by \hat{HC} the decision problem associated with HCP .

Theorem 4. [7]. \hat{HC} is \mathcal{NP} -complete.

The proof consists of reducing the Sat Problem to Hamiltonian Cycle Problem and using the transitivity property of reduction.

Theorem 5. The decision problem \hat{HC} is in \mathcal{P} if and only if the search problem HC is solvable in polynomial time.

The proof uses Theorem 3 and the fact that both \hat{HC} and \hat{SAT} are \mathcal{NP} -complete.

An *Acyclic Boolean Circuit* is a collection of gates (and, or, not) and wires that performs a mapping from Boolean inputs (0,1) to Boolean outputs (0,1), and contains no loops (always feeds forward). Given an Acyclic Boolean Circuit with several inputs and one output and a truth assignment to the inputs, the *Circuit Value Problem* (CV) consists of finding the value of the output.

Theorem 6. [19] \hat{CV} is \mathcal{P} -complete.

Consider the graph $G(V, E)$, where V is the vertex-set and E is the edge-set. Let $X = V$. An *independent set* is a subset of vertices $U \subseteq V$ such that no two vertices in U are adjacent. An independent set is *maximal* if no vertex can be added without violating independence. An independent set is *maximum* if it has the largest cardinality (Make no confusion between maximal and maximum). The *Maximal Independent Set* problem, denoted MIS , is the problem that consists of finding a maximal independent set of the graph G , while the *Maximum Independent Set* problem, denoted $MaxIS$, consists of finding an independent set of the greatest cardinality. We denote by \hat{MIS} the decision problem associated with MIS .

Theorem 7. [5] \hat{MIS} is \mathcal{P} -complete.

The proof consists of reducing the Circuit Value Problem to Maximal Independent Set Problem and using the transitivity property of reduction.

Theorem 8. [5] $MaxIS$ is \mathcal{NP} -hard.

By Theorems 4, 6, 7, 8, there are decision problems on graphs that are \mathcal{P} -complete or \mathcal{NP} -complete. That is, there are ‘prototypical’ problems in \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{NP} that can be expressed in terms of graphs. In other words, every decision problem in \mathcal{P} is the Maximal Independent Set Problem (\hat{MIS}) in disguise, while every decision problem in \mathcal{NP} is the Hamiltonian Cycle Problem (\hat{HC}) in disguise. Thus, we only have to concern ourselves in finding the inherent combinatorial properties that make the \hat{MIS} problem to be \mathcal{P} -complete, and a solution of \hat{HC} problem to be easy to check but hard to find. Hence, without loss of generality, we may restrict ourselves on cases where X is the set of edges or vertices of a connected graph to characterise completely the computational classes \mathcal{P} , \mathcal{NP} , \mathcal{P} -complete and \mathcal{NP} -complete.

4. Proof of Theorem 1.

For the sake of clarity, the proof of theorem 1 is split into many lemmas and propositions.

4.1. \mathcal{P} class characterisation

Theorem 9. *Let γ be an accessible predicate. The search problem Π associated with γ is solvable in polynomial time if and only if, for every input X , the set system (X, \mathcal{I}) satisfies Axiom M2'. That is, if and only if all its non-basic feasible sets (sub-solutions) are augmentable.*

The proof consists of a necessity and a sufficiency parts. Before delving deep into these parts of the proof, we need the following.

By Theorem 7, we have that \hat{MIS} Problem is in \mathcal{P} -complete. And, by Lemma 1, we have that the search problem associated with \hat{MIS} satisfies Axiom M2'.

Now, let $\Pi(X, \gamma)$ be solvable in polynomial time. Then $\hat{\Pi}$ is in \mathcal{P} , and, by Definition 3 and Theorem 7, there is an algorithm ϕ that transforms in (logspace) the instance $G[X]$ of $\hat{\Pi}$ into an instance $\phi(G[X])$ of \hat{MIS} , and there is a (logspace) algorithm ψ that transforms a solution S of \hat{MIS} into the solution Y of $\hat{\Pi}$ such that S is a solution of \hat{MIS} if and only if $\psi(S) = Y$ is a solution of $\hat{\Pi}$.

Let Y' be a sub-solution of $\Pi(X, \gamma)$ whenever the instance of the search problem is X' . Consider the feasible set S' of MIS which is a solution of $\phi(X')$. That is, $\psi(S') = Y'$.

First, we have that S' is a sub-solution (not a basis). Indeed, if it is a basis, then S' is a solution of $\phi(X)$. Hence, ψ maps S' to both Y' and Y . Hence ψ is not well defined. This is a contradiction.

Now, since S' is a sub-solution, by Lemma 1, S' is augmentable. That is, there is a vertex v such that $S' \cup v$ is a sub-solution. Consider the accessibility chain $\emptyset \sqsubseteq \dots \sqsubseteq S' \sqsubseteq S' \cup v \sqsubseteq \dots \sqsubseteq S$, where S is a solution of $\phi(X)$. This chain exists, since MIS satisfies M1. We aim at showing that there is an accessibility chain $\emptyset \sqsubseteq \dots \sqsubseteq Y' \sqsubseteq Y' \cup x \sqsubseteq \dots \sqsubseteq Y$, such that Y is a solution of X and $\psi(S') = Y'$, as illustrated in Figure 8. The existence of such a chain would show that Y' is augmentable. (We know, by assumption, that there is an accessibility chain from \emptyset to Y . We aim at showing that there is one such chain passing through Y' .)

The proof that there is an accessibility chain $\emptyset \sqsubseteq \dots \sqsubseteq Y' \sqsubseteq Y' \cup x \sqsubseteq \dots \sqsubseteq Y$, such that Y is a solution of X and $\psi(S') = Y'$ requires the following Lemma 8.




Figure 8: ‘Parallel’ accessibility chains of a solution S of MIS and the solution Y of $\Pi(X)$ such that $\psi(S) = Y$.

Lemma 8. *Let $G[X]$ denote the connected graph whose edge-set or vertex-set is X , let $\Pi(X, \gamma)$ be a problem solvable in polynomial time, let Y' be a sub-solution of Π , and consider the sub-solution S' of MIS, such that $\psi(S') = Y'$. Let v_1 be an element of $\phi(G[X])$ such that $S' \cup v_1$ is a feasible set. If $S' \subset S' \cup v_1 \subset S$, where S is a solution of $\phi(G[X])$, then, there is an instance Z of Π , with $cl(Y') \subset Z \subset X$, such that $\psi(S' \cup v_1)$ is a solution of the instance Z .*

Proof.

Obviously, if we have the chain $S' \subset S' \cup v_1 \subset S' \cup v_1 \cup v_2 = S$, then there must be a set Z whose solution is $\psi(S' \cup v_1)$, lest ϕ maps X to both $cl(S)$ and $cl(S' \cup v_1)$ or ϕ maps $cl(Y')$ to both $cl(S')$ and $cl(S' \cup v_1)$. This would be a contradiction. The only problem is to show that $cl(Y') \subset Z \subset X$ and $G[Z]$ is a contraction-minor of $G[X]$.

Suppose that $\psi(S') = Y'$, and let $S' \cup v$ be a solution of MIS. We aim to construct a set $Z \subset X$ such that the solution of Z is $\psi(S' \cup v)$. So, let v_1 and v_2 be vertices of $\phi(G[X])$ such that $S' \cup v_1 \cup v_2$ is a feasible set. Without loss of generality, suppose that $S' \cup v_1 \cup v_2$ is a solution of $\phi(G[X])$. Now, let Algorithm \mathcal{A} construct the sets X_1 and X_2 , where X_i ($i = 1, 2$) is the edge-set or vertex-set of a contraction-minor G_i of $G[X]$, and where X_1 is a minimal superset of Y' such that $S' \cup v_1 \subseteq \phi(G_1)$ but $S' \cup v_2 \not\subseteq \phi(G_1)$, and X_2 is a minimal superset of Y' such that $S' \cup v_2 \subseteq \phi(G_2)$ but $S' \cup v_1 \not\subseteq \phi(G_2)$, as follows. (Algorithm \mathcal{A} consists of adding recursively elements of $X \setminus Y'$ into the set Y' until either v_1 or v_2 gets into the closure of the image under ϕ of $Y' \cup \{x_1, x_2, \dots\}$ in the chain of accessibility of S .)

Algorithm \mathcal{A}

Consider the feasible set $Y' = \psi(S')$, and the elements v_1 and v_2 such that $S' \cup v_1$, $S' \cup v_2$ and $S' \cup v_1 \cup v_2$ are feasible sets of MIS. Consider elements

$x_i \in X \setminus cl(Y')$.

- Step 1. Let $i = 0$ and let $T^{(0)} = cl(Y')$. ($cl(Y')$ exists by assumption.)
- Step 2. Increment i . Take any $x \in X \setminus T^{(i-1)}$, label it as x_i , and set $T^{(i)} = T^{(i-1)} \cup x_i$ (add the element x_i by de-contraction).
- Step 3. Let $S^{(i)}$ be the set of vertices that are independent in $\phi(T^{(i)})$. If $cl(S^{(i)})$ contains v_1 , set $X_1 = T^{(i)}$. If $cl(S^{(i)})$ contains v_2 , set $X_2 = T^{(i)}$. Stop. Else, go back to Step 2.




Figure 9:

First, we have $cl(S^{(i)})$ exists and is unique, since it is the set of all the vertices in $S^{(i)}$, and all the vertices in $\phi(G[X])$ that are connected to some vertex in $S^{(i)}$, where $S^{(i)}$ is the set of vertices that are independent in $\phi(T^{(i)})$. (We recall that $\phi(T^{(i)})$ is an instance of MIS). Moreover, Algorithm \mathcal{A} would terminate and output either X_1 or X_2 (not both). For, suppose that X_1 does not exist, then whenever v_1 is added to $cl(S^{(i)})$, v_2 is automatically added too. Thus, $v_2 \in cl(S' \cup v_1)$. Therefore $S' \cup v_1 \cup v_2$ is not a feasible set. This is a contradiction.

If $X_1 = X_2$, then $v_2 \in cl(S' \cup v_1)$. Thus $S' \cup v_1 \cup v_2$ is not a feasible set. This is a contradiction as well. Thus $X_1 \neq X_2$. Moreover, since $\phi(X_i) \supseteq S' \cup v_i$ for $i = 1$ or $i = 2$ (but not both) and is minimal, then a solution of X_i is $\psi(S' \cup v_i)$. Thus, set $Z = X_1$ or X_2 , dependent on which one algorithm \mathcal{A} gets first. Now, let $cl(Y') = G[X]/A$. Then the set Z is the edge-set or the vertex-set of the graph $G[X]/(A \setminus B)$, where, if X is a set of edges, B is the set of edges $\{x_1, x_2, \dots\}$ added by de-contraction by Algorithm \mathcal{A} . If X is a set of vertices, B is the set of edges $\{e_1, e_2, \dots\}$ that are incident to vertices $\{x_1, x_2, \dots\}$ added by de-contraction by Algorithm \mathcal{A} .

□

Now, we may proceed to give the proof of Theorem 9.

Proof of Theorem 9.

1. **Necessity.** Let $\Pi(X, \gamma)$ be a problem solvable in polynomial time. Then, $\hat{\Pi}(X)$ is in \mathcal{P} . Let Y' be a sub-solution of Π , and consider the sub-solution S' of MIS, such that $\psi(S') = Y'$. By Lemma 1, S' is augmentable. That is, there is a vertex v such that $S' \cup v$ is a feasible set.

Now, for a contradiction, suppose that Y' is not augmentable. That is, suppose that, for all $x \in X \setminus Y'$, $Y' \cup x$ is not a sub-solution. We aim to prove that this contradicts Lemma 8.

Take any $x \in X \setminus Y'$. Since $Y' \cup x$ is not a feasible set, then $x \in cl(Y')$. That is, for all $x \in X \setminus Y'$, x belongs to some $cl(Y')$ (If some x does not belong to some $cl(Y')$, then $Y' \cup x$ is a feasible set, a contradiction.).

If $cl(Y')$ is unique, then $X \setminus Y' \subseteq cl(Y')$. Thus $cl(Y') = X$. Therefore, $\phi(X) = cl(S')$. But, we also have that $\phi(X) = cl(S)$, and since $cl(S') \subset cl(S' \cup v) \subseteq cl(S)$, we have that ϕ maps X to two different instances of \hat{MIS} . Thus ϕ is not a well-defined function. This is a contradiction.

Hence, $cl(Y')$ is not unique. Now, suppose there are s different $cl(Y')$, each being of the form $Y' \cup P_j$, where P_j are the partitions of the equivalence relation of Fact 1.

Now, for a fixed element $x_1 \in P_1$ consider taking the element x_k such that $x_k \in P_k$, and construct the set $P_k \cup P_1 \cup Y'$. If $Y' \cup x_k$ or $Y' \cup x_1$ is a solution of the instance $P_k \cup P_1 \cup Y'$ (which is a contraction-minor of G by Fact 1), then Y' is augmentable. This is a contradiction.

Therefore, for all k in $2 \cdots s$, we have that a solution of $P_k \cup P_1 \cup Y'$ must be $Y' \cup x_k \cup x_i \cup \cdots \cup x_j$, where $x_i, \dots, x_j \in P_1$ or P_k and $j > 1$. That is, a solution of $P_k \cup P_1 \cup Y'$ must contain more than one element of $X \setminus Y'$. Without loss of generality, suppose that it contains two elements, x_j and x_k , where $x_k \in P_k$ and $x_j \in P_1$. Thus, suppose that $Y' \cup x_j \cup x_k$ is a feasible set, but neither $Y' \cup x_j$ nor $Y' \cup x_k$ is a feasible

set, and suppose that this holds for all the parts P_k .

Without loss of generality, let $X = P_k \cup P_1 \cup Y'$, with $P_k \neq P_1$.

(1) Suppose we have $S' \subset S' \cup v = S$, where S is a solution of $\phi(X)$. We have that $Y' \cup x_1 \cup x_j$ is a feasible set. But since $Y' \cup x_1 \cup x_j$ is accessible, there is an element x in $Y' \cup x_1 \cup x_j$ such that $A = (Y' \cup x_1 \cup x_j) \setminus x$ is a feasible set. If x is x_1 or x_j then either $Y' \cup x_j$ or $Y' \cup x_1$ must be a feasible set. This is a contradiction. Thus $x \in Y'$, and we have that $Y' \subset A \subset Y' \cup x_1 \cup x_j$. Thus ψ maps S' to both Y' and A , or ψ maps S to both A and $Y' \cup x_1 \cup x_j$. Hence ψ is not well defined. This is a contradiction. So, if $Y' \cup x_1 \cup x_j$ is a feasible set but neither $Y' \cup x_j$ nor $Y' \cup x_1$ are feasible sets, we must have $S' \subset S' \cup v \subset S$.

(2) If we have $S' \subset S' \cup v \subset S$, where S is a solution of $\phi(X)$, but there is no feasible set F such that $Y' \leq F \leq Y' \cup x_j \cup x_k$, where $Y = Y' \cup x_j \cup x_k$ is a solution of X , then, there is no instance Z such that $cl(Y') \subset Z \subset cl(Y' \cup x_j \cup x_k) = X$. This contradicts Lemma 8.

□

2. **Sufficiency.** Suppose now that Augmentability holds. Define an algorithm that solves the problem $\Pi(X, \gamma)$ in polynomial time as follows. The algorithm consists of building a solution by moving from a feasible set to another by augmentation.

Algorithm \mathcal{B}

Consider a problem Π , where the input X , the vertex-set or edge-set of a connected graph G , contains n elements.

- Step 1. Let $i = 0$ and let $Y^{(0)} = \emptyset$. (We can do that since \emptyset is a feasible set.)
- Step 2. Amongst all elements of $X \setminus Y^{(i)}$, choose an element x such that $Y^{(i)} \cup x$ is a sub-solution of the problem. By Axiom M2', such an element x exists if $Y^{(i)}$ is a sub-solution (not basis) of $\Pi(X)$. If no such an element x exists, stop, output $Y = Y^{(i)}$.
- Step 3. Let $Y^{(i+1)} = Y^{(i)} \cup x$. Go to Step 2.

Algorithm \mathcal{B} must eventually terminate and outputs a solution of the problem Π . Indeed, since X contains a finite number of elements, Step 2 would eventually exhaust all the elements x such that $Y^{(i)} \cup x$ is a sub-solution. Moreover, since by Accessibility there are paths from \emptyset to the solutions, a solution would eventually be reached.

Finally Algorithm \mathcal{B} runs in polynomial time. Indeed, since $Y^{(i)}$ is an augmentable feasible set, there is a contraction-minor $G^{(i)}$ of G , such that $Y^{(i)}$ is a solution of Π instanced on $G^{(i)}$. And, since there is an element x such that $Y^{(i)} \cup x$ is a feasible set, there is a graph, $G^{(i+1)}$, such that $G^{(i)}$ is a contraction-minor of $G^{(i+1)}$, and $Y^{(i)} \cup x$ is a solution of Π instanced on $G^{(i+1)}$.

Now, to construct $G^{(i+1)}$ from $G^{(i)}$, it suffices to check amongst $|X| - |Y^{(i)}|$ elements which one, if added to $G^{(i)}$, yields a graph whose one solution is $Y^{(i)} \cup x$. And checking whether $Y^{(i)} \cup x$ satisfies property γ in $G^{(i+1)}$ consists of checking the incidence properties of vertices and edges of $Y^{(i)} \cup x$ and $G^{(i+1)}$. But, since we already know the incidence properties of vertices and edges of $Y^{(i)}$ and $G^{(i)}$, checking the incidence properties of vertices and edges of $Y^{(i)} \cup x$ and $G^{(i+1)}$ consists only of checking how the extra element x (which may be an edge or a vertex) modifies the incidence properties of vertices and edges of $Y^{(i)}$ and $G^{(i)}$. Suppose that $G^{(i)}$ contains m elements, with $m \leq n$. The worst case would occur if the checking takes a time exponential in m and 1 (the new element added). Thus the worst case would be $\mathcal{O}(m^1)$ or $\mathcal{O}(1^m)$. Hence this can be done in polynomial time. That is, each iteration adding an element x can be performed in time polynomial in n . Finally, suppose that a solution contains at most k elements. Then the algorithm \mathcal{B} would run in at most k iterations, where every iteration takes a time that is polynomial in n .

□

Corollary 1.

$$\mathcal{P} \neq \mathcal{NP}$$

Proof

By Lemma 6, the Hamiltonian Cycle Problem is accessible, but by Lemma 4, the Hamiltonian Cycle Problem is not augmentable. Hence, it is not solvable in polynomial time. Therefore, by Theorem 5, the decision problem $\hat{H}C$ is not in \mathcal{P} . \square

4.2. \mathcal{P} -complete class characterisation

By Lemma 3, we have that MIS problem satisfies Axiom M1. More generally, we have the following.

Proposition 1. *An accessible decision Problem $\hat{\Pi}$ is \mathcal{P} -complete if and only if, for every input X , the set system (X, \mathcal{I}) satisfy Axioms M1 and M2'.*

Proof. Let $\hat{\Pi}$ be \mathcal{P} -complete. Since the necessity and sufficiency of Axiom M2' is already proved in Theorem 9, we only to prove the necessity and sufficiency of M1. That is, given a solution Y of a \mathcal{P} -complete problem, every subset of Y is a sub-solution. And, conversely, if every subset of Y is a sub-solution, then there is a logspace reduction from \hat{MIS} to $\hat{\Pi}$ (hence, by transitivity, one can reduce any problem in \mathcal{P} to $\hat{\Pi}$). We proceed by showing that ϕ is a bijection between the set of subsets of the solution Y and the set of subsets of the independent set S (of MIS) such that $\phi(S) = Y$.

Indeed, if $\hat{\Pi}$ is \mathcal{P} -complete, there is an algorithm ϕ that transforms in (logspace) an instance $S_i \subseteq S$ of \hat{MIS} into an instance Y_i of $\hat{\Pi}$ and a logspace algorithm ψ that transforms a solution Y_i of $\hat{\Pi}$ into a solution S_i of \hat{MIS} such that Y_i is a solution of $\hat{\Pi}$ if and only if $\psi(Y_i) = S_i$ is a solution of \hat{MIS} .

Now, let S be a solution of \hat{MIS} . Since \hat{MIS} is also \mathcal{P} -complete, there is an algorithm ϕ' that transforms in (logspace) a subset $Y_i \subseteq Y$ of $\hat{\Pi}$ into an instance S_i of \hat{MIS} and a logspace algorithm ψ' that transforms a solution S_i of \hat{MIS} into a solution Y_i of $\hat{\Pi}$ such that S_i is a solution of \hat{MIS} if and only if $\psi'(S_i) = Y_i$ is a solution of $\hat{\Pi}$. Hence, for a given pair of sub-solutions (Y_i, S_i) , we have that Y_i is a solution of $\hat{\Pi}$ if and only if $\psi(Y_i) = S_i$ is a solution of \hat{MIS} , and we have that S_i is a solution of \hat{MIS} if and only if $\psi'(S_i) = Y_i$. Thus $\psi' = \psi^{-1}$ and, therefore, ϕ' is also the inverse of ϕ . Thus, we have that all the subsets of S are paired bijectively to subsets of Y . Now, since, by Lemma 3, all the subsets of S are sub-solutions, we have that all the subsets of Y are also sub-solutions.

Conversely, suppose that Y is a solution of Π and all the subsets of Y are sub-solutions of Π . We aim to prove that there is a logspace reduction from

\hat{MIS} to $\hat{\Pi}$. That is, there is a function ϕ that transforms in (logspace) an instance G of \hat{MIS} into an instance X of $\hat{\Pi}$ and a logspace algorithm ψ that transforms every solution Y_i of $\hat{\Pi}$ into a solution S_i of \hat{MIS} such that Y_i is a solution of $\hat{\Pi}$ if and only if $\psi(Y_i) = S_i$ is a solution of \hat{MIS} .

Now, let S be a solution of \hat{MIS} such that $\psi'(S) = Y$. Indeed, since \hat{MIS} is \mathcal{P} -complete, there is an algorithm ϕ' that transforms in logspace every subset $Y_i \subseteq Y$ of $\hat{\Pi}$ into an instance $S_i \subseteq S$ of \hat{MIS} , and there is a logspace algorithm ψ' that transforms every solution S_i of \hat{MIS} into a solution $Y_i \subseteq Y$ of $\hat{\Pi}$ such that S_i is a solution of \hat{MIS} if and only if $\psi'(S_i) = Y_i$ is a solution of $\hat{\Pi}$. Since every subset of S is a sub-solution, we have that $\phi' = \psi'^{-1}$ (it is a bijection). So we define the reduction from \hat{MIS} to $\hat{\Pi}$ as $\phi = \phi'^{-1} = \psi'$, extended to any instance G of \hat{MIS} as

$$\phi(G) = X,$$

where a solution of G is S , and X is the instance of Π such that a solution of $\Pi(X)$ is Y if and only if $\psi'(S) = Y$. We only have to show that ϕ is well-defined function on the set of all the instances G of \hat{MIS} . Now, suppose that $\phi(G) = X_1$ and $\phi(G) = X_2$. Then, we have that Y is a solution of X_1 if and only if it is a solution of X_2 . Since, by Axiom M1, every subset of a sub-solution is a sub-solution, we have that, by Definition 1, every subset of X_1 is also a subset of X_2 . Hence $X_1 = X_2$.

□

4.3. \mathcal{NP} class characterisation

We say that a search problem $\Pi(X, \gamma)$ is *checkable* in polynomial time if, given a subset $Y \subseteq X$, there is an algorithm that runs in polynomial time and outputs either NO if Y does not satisfy γ , or outputs YES if Y satisfies γ . By Theorem 4, we have that \hat{HC} Problem is in \mathcal{NP} -complete. And, by Lemma 5, we have that the search problem associated with \hat{HC} satisfies Axiom M2'' (Within-augmentability). More generally, we have the following theorem.

Theorem 10. *Let γ be an accessible predicate. A Search Problem Π associated with γ is checkable in polynomial time if and only if, for every input X , the set system (X, \mathcal{I}) satisfy Axiom M2''. (that is, if and only if all its sub-solutions are within-augmentable.)*

As for Theorem 9 the proof consists of a necessity and a sufficiency parts. Before delving deep into these parts of the proof, we need the following.

Let $\Pi(X, \gamma)$ be checkable in polynomial time. Then $\hat{\Pi}(X)$ is in \mathcal{NP} , and, by Definition 3 and Theorem 4, there is an algorithm ϕ that transforms in polynomial time the instance X of $\hat{\Pi}$ into an instance $\phi(X)$ of \hat{HC} , and there is a polynomial time algorithm ψ that transforms a solution C of \hat{HC} into the solution Y of $\hat{\Pi}$ such that C is a solution of \hat{HC} if and only if $\psi(C) = Y$ is a solution of $\hat{\Pi}$.

Let $Y' \subset Y$ be a sub-solution of $\Pi(X, \gamma)$ when the instance of the search problem is X' . Consider the feasible set C' of HC which is the solution of $\phi(X')$. That is, $\psi(C') = Y'$.

First, we have that C' is a sub-solution (not a basis). Indeed, if it is a basis, then C' is a solution of $\phi(X)$. Hence, ψ maps C' to both Y' and Y . Hence ψ is not well defined. This is a contradiction.

Now, by Lemma 5, C' is within-augmentable. That is, there is an edge $e \in C \setminus C'$ such that $C' \cup e$ is a sub-solution. Consider the accessibility chain $\emptyset \sqsubseteq \dots \sqsubseteq C' \sqsubseteq C' \cup e \sqsubseteq \dots \sqsubseteq C$. Such a chain exists, since HC satisfies M1. We aim at showing that there is an accessibility chain $\emptyset \sqsubseteq \dots \sqsubseteq Y' \sqsubseteq Y' \cup y \sqsubseteq \dots \sqsubseteq Y$, such that $y \in Y \setminus Y'$, as illustrated in in Figure 10. Hence Y' is within-augmentable. (We know that there is an accessibility chain from \emptyset to Y . We aim at showing that there is one such chain passing through Y' .)




Figure 10: 'Parallel' accessibility chains of a solution C of HC and the solution Y of $\Pi(X)$ such that $\psi(C) = Y$.

The proof requires the following Lemma 9, which mimics Lemma 8.

Lemma 9. *Let $\Pi(X, \gamma)$ be an accessible problem that is checkable in polynomial time, and let $Y = \psi(C)$, where C is a solution of Hamiltonian Cycle Problem $\phi(X)$. Let $Y' \subset Y$ be a sub-solution of Π , and consider the sub-solution $C' \subset C$ of HC , such that $\psi(C') = Y'$. Let e_1 be an element of $\phi(X)$*

such that $C' \cup e_1$ is a feasible set. If $C' \subset C' \cup e_1 \subset C$, then, there is an instance Z of Π , with $cl(Y') \subset Z \subset Y$, such that $\psi(C' \cup e_1)$ is a solution of the instance Z . (We illustrate this in Figure 11.)




Figure 11:

Proof.

Obviously, if we have the chain $C' \subset C' \cup e_1 \subset C' \cup e_1 \cup e_2 = C$, then there must be a set Z such that $\Pi(Z) = \psi(C' \cup e_1)$, lest ϕ maps X to both $cl(C)$ and $cl(C' \cup e_1)$ or ϕ maps $cl(Y')$ to both $cl(C')$ and $cl(C' \cup e_1)$. This would be a contradiction. The only issue is to show that $cl(Y') \subset Z \subset Y$ and Z is a contraction-minor of $G[X]$. We show this by construction.

Suppose that $\psi(C') = Y'$, and let $C' \cup e$ be a solution of HC. We aim to construct a set $Z \subset Y$ such that the solution of the problem Π on Z is $\psi(C' \cup e)$. So, let e_1 and e_2 be edges of $\phi(G[X])$ such that $C' \cup e_1 \cup e_2$ is a feasible set. Without loss of generality, suppose that $C' \cup e_1 \cup e_2$ is a solution of $\phi(G[X])$. Now, let Algorithm \mathcal{A}' construct the sets X_1 and X_2 , where X_i ($i = 1, 2$) is the edge-set or vertex-set of a contraction-minor G_i of $G[X]$, and where X_1 is a minimal superset of Y' such that $C' \cup e_1 \subseteq \phi(G_1)$ but $C' \cup e_2 \not\subseteq \phi(G_1)$, and X_2 is a minimal superset of Y' such that $C' \cup e_2 \subseteq \phi(G_2)$ but $C' \cup e_1 \not\subseteq \phi(G_2)$, as follows. (Algorithm \mathcal{A} consists of adding recursively elements of $Y \setminus Y'$ into the set Y' until either e_1 or e_2 gets into the closure of the image of $Y' \cup \{x_1, x_2, \dots\}$ in the chain of accessibility of C .) In what follows, $cl(Y')$ means the closure of Y' within Y . That is, $cl(Y') = Y' \cup A$, where A is a maximal set of the elements $x \in Y \setminus Y'$ such that $\Pi(Y' \cup A) = Y'$.

Algorithm \mathcal{A}'

Consider the feasible set $Y' = \psi(C')$, and the elements e_1 and e_2 such that $C' \cup e_1 \cup e_2$ is a feasible set of HC. Consider elements $x_i \in Y \setminus cl(Y')$.

- Step 1. Let $i = 0$ and let $T^{(0)} = cl(Y')$ (closure within Y).

- Step 2. Increment i . Take any $x \in Y \setminus T^{(i-1)}$, label it as x_i , and set $T^{(i)} = T^{(i-1)} \cup x_i$ (add the element x_i by de-contraction).
- Step 3. Let $C^{(i)}$ be a hamiltonian cycle of $\phi(T^{(i)})$. If $cl(C^{(i)})$ contains e_1 , set $X_1 = T^{(i)}$. If $cl(C^{(i)})$ contains e_2 , set $X_2 = T^{(i)}$. Stop. Else, go back to Step 2.

First, we have that $C^{(i)}$ always exists. Indeed, since $T^{(i)}$ is a subset of Y , then $\phi(T^{(i)})$ is a subset of C . Thus, by Lemma 7, $\phi(T^{(i)})$ is a sub-solution (it is a hamiltonian circuit of some contraction-minor G/A). Also, we have $cl(C^{(i)})$ exists and is unique, since it is the set of all the edges in $C^{(i)}$ and all the edges in $\phi(X)$ that form a cycle with some (not all) edges in $C^{(i)}$, where $C^{(i)}$ is an Hamiltonian cycle of $\phi(T^{(i)})$ (We recall that $\phi(T^{(i)})$ is an instance of HC). Moreover, Algorithm \mathcal{A}' would terminate and output either X_1 or X_2 (not both). For, suppose that for all $x_i \in Y \setminus Y'$, neither e_1 nor e_2 is in $\phi(T^{(i)})$. Now adding all the $x \in Y \setminus Y'$ to Y' yields Y , since $Y' \subset Y$. But, since a solution of $\phi(Y) = C$, we have that $C' \cup e_1 \cup e_2 \not\subset C$. This contradicts Lemma 7.

Suppose that X_1 does not exist, then whenever e_1 is added to $cl(\phi(T^{(i)}))$, e_2 is automatically added too. Thus, $e_2 \in cl(C' \cup e_1)$. Therefore $C' \cup e_1 \cup e_2$ is not a feasible set. This is a contradiction.

If $X_1 = X_2$, then $e_2 \in cl(C' \cup e_1)$. Thus $C' \cup e_1 \cup e_2$ is not a feasible set. This is a contradiction as well. Thus $X_1 \neq X_2$.

Moreover, since $\phi(X_i) \supseteq C' \cup e_i$ ($i = 1, 2$) and is minimal, then a solution of X_i is $\psi(C' \cup e_i)$, and let $Z = X_1$ or X_2 (depending of which one is added first). Now, let $cl(Y') = G[X]/A$. Then the set Z is the edge-set or the vertex-set of the graph $G[X]/(A \setminus B)$, where, if X is a set of edges, B is the set of edges $\{x_1, x_2, \dots\}$ added by de-contraction by Algorithm \mathcal{A}' . If X is a set of vertices, B is the set of edges $\{e_1, e_2, \dots\}$ that are incident to vertices $\{x_1, x_2, \dots\}$ added by de-contraction by Algorithm \mathcal{A}' .

□

Now, we may proceed to give the proof of Theorem 10.

Proof of Theorem 10.

1. Necessity.

The proof mimics that of Theorem 9, with the difference that we write $cl(Y')$ to mean ‘closure within Y ’. That is, $cl(Y') = Y' \cup A$, where A is a maximal set of the elements $y \in Y \setminus Y'$ such that $\Pi(Y' \cup A) = Y'$. Let $\Pi(X, \gamma)$ be a problem that is checkable in polynomial time. Then, $\hat{\Pi}(X)$ in \mathcal{NP} . Let $Y' \subset Y$ be a sub-solution of Π , and consider the sub-solution $C' \subset C$ of HC such that $\psi(C') = Y'$. By Lemma 5, C' is augmentable within C . That is, there is an edge $e \in C \setminus C'$ such that $C' \cup e$ is a sub-solution. By Lemma 9, there is an instance $Z \subset X$ such that $\psi(C' \cup e)$ is a solution of the instance Z .

Now, for a contradiction, suppose that Y' is not augmentable within Y . That is, suppose that, for all $y \in Y \setminus Y'$, $Y' \cup y$ is not a sub-solution. Then, for all $y \in Y \setminus Y'$, y belongs to some $cl(Y')$ within Y .

If $cl(Y')$ is unique, then $cl(Y') = Y$. Thus, $\phi(Y) = cl(C')$. But, we also have that $\phi(Y) = C$, and since $cl(C') \subset cl(C' \cup e) \subseteq C$, we have that ϕ maps Y to two different instances of HC. Thus ϕ is not a well-defined function. This is a contradiction.

Hence, $cl(Y')$ is not unique. Now, suppose there are s different $cl(Y')$, each being of the form $Y' \cup P_j$, where P_j are the partitions of the equivalence relation of Fact 1.

Now, for a fixed element $y_1 \in P_1$ consider taking the element y_k such that $y_k \in P_k$, and construct the set $P_k \cup P_1 \cup Y'$. If $Y' \cup y_k$ is a solution of the instance $P_k \cup P_1 \cup Y'$ (which is a contraction-minor of G , by Fact 1), then Y' is within-augmentable. This is a contradiction.

Therefore, for all k in $2 \cdots s$, we have that a solution of $P_k \cup P_1 \cup Y'$ must be $Y' \cup y_k \cup y_i \cup \cdots \cup y_j$, where $y_i, \dots, y_j \in P_1$ or P_k and $j > 1$. That is, a solution of $P_k \cup P_1 \cup Y'$ must contain more than one element of $Y \setminus Y'$. Without loss of generality, suppose that it contains two elements, y_j and y_k , where $y_k \in P_k$ and $y_j \in P_1$. Thus, suppose that $Y' \cup y_j \cup y_k$ is a feasible set, but neither $Y' \cup y_j$ nor $Y' \cup y_k$ is a feasible set, and suppose that this holds for all the partitions P_k .

Without loss of generality, let $X = P_k \cup P_1 \cup Y'$, with $P_k \neq P_1$.

(1) Suppose we have $C' \subset C' \cup e = C$, where C is a solution of $\phi(X)$. We have that $Y' \cup y_1 \cup y_j$ is a feasible set. But since $Y' \cup y_1 \cup y_j$ is acces-

sible, there is an element y in $Y' \cup y_1 \cup y_j$ such that $A = (Y' \cup y_1 \cup y_j) \setminus y$ is a feasible set. If y is y_1 or y_j then either $Y' \cup y_j$ or $Y' \cup y_1$ must be a feasible set. This is a contradiction. Thus $y \in Y'$, and we have that $Y' \subset A \subset Y' \cup y_1 \cup y_j$. Thus ψ maps C' to both Y' and A , or ψ maps C to both A and $Y' \cup y_1 \cup y_j$. Hence ψ is not well defined. This is a contradiction. So, if $Y' \cup y_1 \cup y_j$ is a feasible set but neither $Y' \cup y_j$ nor $Y' \cup y_1$ are feasible sets, we must have $C' \subset C' \cup e \subset C$.

(2) If we have $C' \subset C' \cup e \subset C$, where C is a solution of $\phi(X)$, but there is no feasible set F such that $Y' \trianglelefteq F \trianglelefteq Y' \cup y_1 \cup y_j$, where $Y = Y' \cup y_1 \cup y_j$ is a solution of X , then, there is no instance Z such that $cl(Y') \subset Z \subset cl(Y' \cup y_1 \cup y_j) = Y$. This contradicts Lemma 9.

□

Notice that Axiom M2'' entails that if we are given a subset Y of X , one may check whether Y is a solution or not by just re-constructing using Algorithm \mathcal{B} . The only requirement would be that the augmentation is done by taking elements from Y solely. And, this is what we do in Algorithm \mathcal{C} that comes next.

2. Sufficiency.

Suppose that a Search Problem Π is such that (X, \mathcal{I}) satisfies Axiom M2'', and let $Y \subseteq X$ be a certificate. We give a polynomial time algorithm that is a slight modification of Algorithm \mathcal{B} , and which outputs NO if Y is not a solution, or outputs YES, if Y is a solution.

Algorithm \mathcal{C}

Consider a problem Π , where the input X contains n elements and Y is a subset of X that contains k elements.

- Step 1. Let $i = 0$ and let $Y^{(0)} = \emptyset$. (We can do that since \emptyset is a feasible set.)
- Step 2. If $cl(Y^{(i)}) = X$ (closure within X), Stop. Output YES.
- Step 3. Amongst all elements of $Y \setminus Y^{(i)}$, choose an element y such that $Y^{(i)} \cup y$ is a sub-solution of the problem. (by Axiom M2'', such an element y exists if Y is a solution).

- Step 4. If no such y exists, stop. Output NO.
- Step 5. Let $Y^{(i+1)} = Y^{(i)} \cup y$, then go to Step 2.

Algorithm \mathcal{C} must eventually terminate and outputs 'YES' or 'NO'. Indeed, since Y contains a finite number of elements, Step 3 would eventually exhaust all the elements $y \in Y \setminus Y^{(i)}$ such that $Y^{(i)} \cup y$ is a sub-solution. Moreover, since by Axiom G1, which is implied in M2'', there are paths from \emptyset to Y whenever Y is a solution, a final 'YES' would eventually be output if Y is a solution of Π .

Finally Algorithm \mathcal{C} runs in polynomial time. Indeed, to check that $cl(Y^{(i)}) = X$ consists of comparing whether two graphs are equal. This can be done in polynomial time. As in Algorithm \mathcal{B} , to check that $Y' \cup y$ is a sub-solution in Step 3 takes a time polynomial in n . Moreover, suppose that the certificate Y contains at most k elements. Then the algorithm would run in at most k iterations, where, as in Algorithm \mathcal{B} , every iteration takes a time that is polynomial in n .

□

4.4. \mathcal{NP} -complete class characterisation

By Lemma 7, HC satisfies M1. More generally, we have the following.

Proposition 2. *An accessible decision problem $\hat{\Pi}$ is \mathcal{NP} -complete if and only if, for every input X , the set system (X, \mathcal{I}) satisfy Axioms M1 and M2''.*

Proof. Since any \mathcal{NP} -complete satisfies already the conditions to be in \mathcal{NP} , we only have to show the necessity and sufficiency of M1: every subset of a solution Y of the problem Π is a sub-solution. And, conversely, if every subset of Y is a sub-solution, then there is a polynomial time reduction from \hat{HC} to $\hat{\Pi}$ (hence, by transitivity, one can reduce any problem in \mathcal{NP} to $\hat{\Pi}$). The proof is similar to that of Proposition 1.

We proceed by showing that ϕ is a bijection between the set of subsets of Y and the set of subsets of the Hamiltonian cycle C such that $\phi(C) = Y$.

Indeed, since $\hat{\Pi}$ is \mathcal{NP} -complete, there is an algorithm ϕ that transforms in (polynomial time) an instance C_i of \hat{HC} into an instance Y_i of $\hat{\Pi}$ and a polynomial time algorithm ψ that transforms a solution Y_i of $\hat{\Pi}$ into a

solution C_i of $\hat{H}C$ such that Y_i is a solution of $\hat{\Pi}$ if and only if $\psi(Y_i) = C_i$ is a solution of $\hat{H}C$.

Now, let C be a solution of $\hat{H}C$. Since $\hat{H}C$ is also \mathcal{NP} -complete, there is an algorithm ϕ' that transforms in (polynomial time) a subset $Y_i \subseteq Y$ of $\hat{\Pi}$ into an instance C_i of $\hat{H}C$ and a polynomial time algorithm ψ' that transforms a solution C_i of $\hat{H}C$ into a solution Y_i of $\hat{\Pi}$ such that C_i is a solution of $\hat{H}C$ if and only if $\psi'(C_i) = Y_i$ is a solution of $\hat{\Pi}$. Hence, for a given pair of sub-solutions (Y_i, C_i) , we have that Y_i is a solution of $\hat{\Pi}$ if and only if $\psi(Y_i) = C_i$ is a solution of $\hat{H}C$, and we have that C_i is a solution of $\hat{H}C$ if and only if $\psi'(C_i) = Y_i$. Thus $\psi' = \psi^{-1}$ and, therefore, ϕ' is also the inverse of ϕ . Thus, we have that all the subsets of C are paired bijectively to subsets of Y . Now, since, by Lemma 7, all the subsets of C are sub-solutions, we have that all the subsets of Y are also sub-solutions.

Conversely, suppose that all the subsets of Y are sub-solutions of Π . We aim to prove that there is a polynomial time reduction from $\hat{H}C$ to $\hat{\Pi}$. That is, there is a function ϕ that transforms in (polynomial time) an instance C_i of $\hat{H}C$ into an instance Y_i of $\hat{\Pi}$, and a polynomial time algorithm ψ that transforms any solution Y_i of $\hat{\Pi}$ into a solution C_i of $\hat{H}C$ such that Y_i is a solution of $\hat{\Pi}$ if and only if $\psi(Y_i) = C_i$ is a solution of $\hat{H}C$.

Now, let C be a solution of $\hat{H}C$. Since $\hat{H}C$ is \mathcal{NP} -complete, there is an algorithm ϕ' that transforms in (polynomial time) a subset $Y_i \subseteq Y$ of $\hat{\Pi}$ into an instance $C_i \subseteq C$ of $\hat{H}C$ and a polynomial time algorithm ψ' that transforms any solution C_i of $\hat{H}C$ into a solution $Y_i \subseteq Y$ of $\hat{\Pi}$ such that C_i is a solution of $\hat{H}C$ if and only if $\psi'(C_i) = Y_i$ is a solution of $\hat{\Pi}$. Hence $\phi' = \psi'^{-1}$ (it is a bijection). So we define the reduction from $\hat{H}C$ to $\hat{\Pi}$ as $\phi = \phi'^{-1} = \psi'$, extended to any instance G of $\hat{H}C$ as

$$\phi(G) = X,$$

where a solution of G is C , and X is the instance of $\hat{\Pi}$ such that a solution of $\Pi(X)$ is Y if and only if $\psi'(C) = Y$. We now have to show that ϕ is well-defined function on the set of all the instances G of $\hat{H}C$. Indeed, suppose that $\phi(G) = X_1$ and $\phi(G) = X_2$. Then, we have that all the solutions of X_1 are also solutions of X_2 . Since every subset of a sub-solution is a sub-solution, we have that every subset of X_1 is also a subset of X_2 . Hence $X_1 = X_2$.

□

Proof of Theorem 1. Let γ be an accessible predicate.

1. $(\hat{\Pi}, \gamma)$ is in the computational class \mathcal{P} if and only if, for every input X , (X, \mathcal{I}) satisfy Axiom M2'. Proved in Theorem 9.
2. $(\hat{\Pi}, \gamma)$ is in the computational class \mathcal{P} -complete if and only if, for every input X , (X, \mathcal{I}) satisfy Axioms M1 and M2'. Proved in Proposition 1.
3. $(\hat{\Pi}, \gamma)$ is in the computational class \mathcal{NP} if and only if, for every input X , (X, \mathcal{I}) satisfy Axiom M2". Proved in Theorem 10.
4. $(\hat{\Pi}, \gamma)$ is in the computational class \mathcal{NP} -complete if and only if, for every input X , (X, \mathcal{I}) satisfy Axioms M1 and M2". Proved in Proposition 2.

□.

Lemma 10. *The Maximum Independent Set Problem is not accessible.*

Proof Consider G , the complete tripartite graph having six vertices $\{1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6\}$, such that vertices 1 and 2 are independent, 3 and 4 are independent, and 5 and 6 are independent. The sets $\{1, 2\}$, $\{3, 4\}$, and $\{5, 6\}$ are maximum independent sets. Soit e the edge connecting the vertex 2 to vertex 4 or 3 or 5 or 6. Then $\{1\}$ is not a maximum independent set in G/e , since either $\{3, 4\}$ is maximum (if e connects vertex 2 to vertex 5 or 6) or $\{5, 6\}$ is maximum (if e connects vertex 2 to vertex 3 or 4).

□

Acknowledgments The author is grateful to the various universities where he spent his academic life. He is especially grateful to University of Oxford where he was introduced to Matroid Theory by Prof. Dominic Welsh. He is very grateful to the University of Qatar where he did most of the work for this paper. He is finally very grateful to the University of London, Queen Mary College, where he was introduced to Graph Theory by Prof. David Arrowsmith and Prof. Peter Cameron.

References

- [1] R. Anderson and E. Mayr, *Parallelism and Greedy Algorithms*, Technical Report No. STAN-G-84-1003, Department of Computer Sciences, Stanford University, April 1984.
- [2] T. Baker, J. Gill, and R. Solovay, *Relativizations of the $P = NP$ question*, SIAM Journal on Computing, 4(4):431-442, 1975.
- [3] M. Bellare and S. Goldwasser, *The complexity of decision versus search*, SIAM J. on Computing, Vol. 23, No. 1, February 1994.
- [4] A. Björner and G. M. Ziegler, *Introduction to Greedoids*, Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications, Matroid Applications, N. White (ed), Vol.40.
- [5] S. A. Cook, *The Classification of Problems which have Fast Parallel Algorithms*, Technical Report No. 164/83, Department of Computer Science, University of Toronto 1983.
- [6] S. Cook, *The P versus NP Problem*, Unpublished manuscript.
- [7] S. Cook, *The complexity of theorem-proving procedures*, in Conference Record of Third Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, ACM, New York, 1971, 151-158.
- [8] S. Cook, *Computational complexity of higher type functions*, in Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians, Kyoto, Japan, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1991, 55-69.
- [9] S. Dasgupta, C.H. Papadimitriou, and U.V. Vazirani, *Algorithms*, unpublished manuscript.
- [10] R. Downey and M. Fellows, *Parameterized Complexity*, Springer, 1999.
- [11] J. Edmonds, *Paths, trees and flowers*, Canadian Journal of Mathematics, 17:449-467, 1965.
- [12] J. Edmonds, *Minimum partition of a matroid into independent subsets*, J. Res. Nat. Bur. Standards Sect. B 69 (1965), 67-72.

- [13] M. Furst, J. Saxe, and M. Sipser, *Parity, circuits and the polynomial-time hierarchy*, Mathematical Systems Theory, 17:13-27, 1984.
- [14] L. Fortnow, *The Status of the P versus NP Problem*, unpublished manuscript.
- [15] A. Haken, *The intractability of resolution*. Theoretical Computer Science, 39:297-305, 1985.
- [16] K. K. Kayibi, S. Pirzada, *T-tetromino tiling Markov chain is fast mixing*, Theor. Comp. Sci., 714:1–14, Mars 2018
- [17] K. K. Kayibi, S. Pirzada, *Sampling Contingency Tables*, AKCE Journal of Graphs and Combinatorics, Vol 15, Issue 3, 298–306, 2018.
- [18] K. K. Kayibi, M. A. Khan, S. Pirzada, *Uniform sampling of k-hypertournaments*, Linear and Multilinear Alg., (2012), 1–16.
- [19] R. E. Ladner, *The circuit value problem is log space complete for P*, JACM SIGACT News 7(1):18–20, January 1975.
- [20] L. Levin, *Average case complete problems*. SIAM Journal on Computing, 15:285-286, 1986.
- [21] J. Nešetřil and H. Nešetřilová, *The Origins of Minimal Spanning Tree Algorithms Boruvka and Jarník*, Documenta Mathematica, Extra Volume ISMP (2012) 127-141.
- [22] J. G. Oxley, *Matroid Theory*, Oxford University Press, New-York, 1992.
- [23] A. Razborov, *Lower bounds on the monotone complexity of some boolean functions*. Soviet MathematicsDoklady, 31:485-493, 1985.
- [24] A. Razborov, *On the method of approximations*. In Proceedings of the 21st ACM Symposium on the Theory of Computing, pages 167-176. ACM, New York, 1989.
- [25] A. Razborov and S. Rudich, *Natural proofs*. Journal of Computer and System Sciences, 55(1):24-35, Aug. 1997.
- [26] A. Turing, *On computable numbers with an application to the entscheidungsproblem*, Proc. London Math. Soc. 42 (1936), 230-265.
- [27] D. J. A. Welsh, *Matroid Theory*, Academic Press, New-York, 1976.