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$$
\begin{aligned}
\text { SAT } & =\left\{\Phi=\left(x_{1} \vee x_{7} \vee \overline{x_{8}}\right) \wedge\left(\overline{x_{5}} \vee x_{8}\right) \wedge \cdots \mid \Phi \text { satisfiable }\right\} \\
k \text {-SAT } & =\text { all clauses have } \leq k \text { literals }
\end{aligned}
$$

## Parameters:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{n} & =\text { number of variables } \\
\mathrm{m} & =\text { number of clauses }
\end{aligned}
$$

Upper bounds:
SAT:

$$
2^{n\left(1-\frac{1}{o(\log (m / n))}\right)} \cdot \operatorname{poly}(m)=2^{n-o(n)}
$$

$k$-SAT:

$$
2^{n\left(1-O\left(\frac{1}{k}\right)\right)} \cdot \operatorname{poly}(m)=2^{s_{k} n}
$$

## ETH: 3-SAT cannot be solved in $2^{o(n)}$

## Assuming ETH, $s_{k}$ is increasing. [IP'01]

Hard SAT: SAT requires $2^{n-o(n)}$
If SAT takes $2^{\delta n}, s_{k} \leq \delta\left(1-\Omega\left(\frac{1}{k}\right)\right)$. [IP'01]
Strong ETH: $s_{k} \rightarrow 1$

Open problem. Say $s_{k} \rightarrow \frac{1}{2}$. Can SAT be solved in $2^{0.99 n}$ ?

## Applications: Lower Bounds

## d-SUM

Given $S=\{n$ numbers $\}$, are there $x_{1}, \ldots, x_{d} \in S$ with $x_{1}+\cdots+x_{d}=0 ?$
$\mathrm{ETH} \Rightarrow n^{\Omega(d)}$ time.

## k-Dominating Set

Given graph, find $S \subset V,|S|=k$ such that $N(S)=V$.
Hard SAT $\Rightarrow O\left(n^{k-\varepsilon}\right)$ impossible.

## 3-Party Set Disjointness

Alice, Bob, Carmen hold $A, B, C \subset[n]$.
Goal: determine whether $A \cap B \cap C=\emptyset$.
Number on forehead
Strong ETH $\Rightarrow$ no o(n) protocol.

## $k$-Dominating Set Requires $n^{k-o(1)}$

$n$ variables $\mapsto k$ blocks of $\frac{n}{k}$ variables
Block $\mapsto 2^{n / k}$ nodes (partial assignments)
... Plus one supernode connected to block's assignments $\Rightarrow$ much select exactly one assignment in each block
$m$ clauses $\mapsto m$ nodes
Edges from close $C_{i}$ to partial assignment satisfying it

## Harder Reductions: Sparsity Matters

When doing reductions, $m$ matters!
Is sparse SAT still hard? No: $2^{(1-\varepsilon) n}$.

How about sparse $k$-SAT?

## Lemma (Sparsification Lemma)

Complexity of $k$-SAT with $m=f(k, \varepsilon) \cdot n$ $\leq[$ Complexity of general $k-S A T] / 2^{\varepsilon n}$
$\mathrm{ETH} \Rightarrow$ may assume $m=O(n)$.

## Reduction to d-SUM

| Problem | Variables | Clauses | Why |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $k$-SAT |  |  |  |
| $k$-SAT | n | $\mathrm{m}=\mathrm{O}(\mathrm{n})$ | sparsification |
| 3-SAT | $O(n k)$ | $O(n k)$ | [Cook] |
| 1-in-3-SAT | $N=O(n k)$ | $M=O(N)$ | [GJ] |

Partition variables $\rightarrow d$ blocks of $\frac{N}{d}$ variables
Block $\rightarrow 2^{N / d}$ numbers of $M$ digits digit $[i]=1 \Longleftrightarrow$ clause $i$ satisfied

Must find numbers to sum to $11 \ldots 11$.

## Reduction to Set Disjointness

Partition variables $\rightarrow X \cup Y \cup Z,|X|=|Y|=|Z|=\frac{n}{3}$.
$x$ induces $S(x)=\{$ clauses not satisfied by x$\} \subseteq[m]$

$$
\Phi(x y z)=\operatorname{true} \Longleftrightarrow S(x) \cap S(y) \cap S(z)=\emptyset
$$

Run communication protocol for " $S(x) \cap S(y) \cap S(z)=\emptyset$ ?"

- $O(m)=O(n)$ bits of communication
[Sparsity!]
- so enumerate all transcripts $\pi$ ending in "Disjoint!"

Tripartite graph $G: V=X \cup Y \cup Z$
$(x, y) \in X \times Y \Longleftrightarrow$ Alice follows $\pi$ on $S(x), S(y)$
$(y, z) \in Y \times Z \Longleftrightarrow$ Bob follows $\pi$ on $S(y), S(z)$
$(x, z) \in X \times Z \Longleftrightarrow$ Carmen follows $\pi$ on $S(x), S(z)$
Find triangle in $O\left(N^{2.376}\right)=O\left(\left(2^{n / 3}\right)^{2.376}\right)=O\left(1.74^{n}\right)$.

## Thank you!
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