

Review of: "NP on Logarithmic Space"

Szabolcs Iván¹

¹ University of Szeged

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The submission claims to prove, among other things, $L = NL$, with its key points being Hypothesis 1 (more on this below), Theorem 2 which states “if hypothesis 1 is true, then $L = NL$ ” (and NP is a subseteq of $L^{<L>}$) and Theorems 7 & 8 which are together said to imply Hypothesis 1. Hypothesis 1 is a conjunction of two statements, the first being proved in Theorem 7, the second being proved in Theorem 8.

Unfortunately, the proof of Theorem 7 is flawed irreparably, the proposed reduction does not preserve membership. For a counterexample, consider the graph $1 \rightarrow 3, 2 \rightarrow 3, 2 \rightarrow 4$ with topological sorted representation 1,2,3,4, source $s = 1$, target $t = 4$. In this graph t is *not* reachable from s . However, the generated formula is unsatisfiable, as setting x_1 to true would force x_3 being true due to $(\neg x_1 \vee x_3)$, that would force x_2 being true due to $(\neg x_2 \vee x_3)$ which would force x_4 being true due to $(\neg x_2 \vee x_4)$ which would contradict to $\neg x_4$. As Theorem 7 would be the key component of showing the existence of an 1NL-complete language being in L , this ruins the whole chain. (Of course if s is the only source in the directed acyclic graph, then all the other nodes are reachable from s , making that version of the problem trivial instead of 1NL-complete so that possibility cannot be excluded.) This construction works for *undirected* graphs actually, but for those, reachability is known to be in L .

I did not check the other parts of the paper (in particular, whether hypothesis 1 would imply $L = NL$ or the other statement, and Thm 8 with Hypothesis 1's second part) but the proof of Thm 7 is certainly wrong.

(Another note: it is well-known that $NL = coNL$ so I believe literally no-one in the scientific community says things as “a language belongs to $coNL$ ” but “to NL ” instead, apart from some early parts of textbooks where the Immerman-Szelepcsényi theorem is not yet shown at that point.)