Reduction of IND to Subset_Sum

We define an instance of IND, the independent set problem, to be a string of the form \( \langle G \rangle \langle k \rangle \) where \( G \) is a graph and \( k \) a positive integer. That string is a member of the language IND if there is some set \( I \) vertices of \( G \) such that \( |I| = k \) and no two members of \( I \) form an edge of \( G \), a \( k \)-independent set of \( G \).

We define an instance of Subset_Sum, the subset sum problem to be a string \( \langle X \rangle \langle K \rangle \) where \( X \) is a list of positive numbers and \( K \) is a number. We say \( \langle X \rangle \langle K \rangle \in \text{Subset}_\text{Sum} \) if there is some sublist of \( X \) whose sum is \( K \). We prove that Subset_Sum is \( \mathcal{NP} \), using the certificate method. The sublist whose total equals \( K \) is the certificate, which can be (trivially) verified in polynomial time.

We now define a \( \mathcal{P} \)-time reduction \( R \) of IND to Subset_Sum, where IND is the independent set problem. We assume that all of our languages (problems) are over an alphabet \( \Sigma \). Without loss of generality, \( \Sigma \) is the binary alphabet. Each reduction must be a function

\[
R : \Sigma^* \rightarrow \Sigma^*
\]

When we define \( R(w) \) below, we will assume that \( w \) is an instance of the independent set problem. If \( w \) is any other string, we define \( R(w) = \lambda \), the empty string. No further discussion of this case is necessary.

Let \( \langle G \rangle \langle k \rangle \) be an instance of IND, where \( G = (V,E) \). Write \( V = \{v_1, v_2, \ldots v_n\} \), the vertices of \( G \), and and \( E = \{e_1, e_2, \ldots e_m\} \), the edges of \( G \). We say \( e_j \) meets \( v_i \), and write \( e_j \perp v_i \), if \( v_i \) is one of the two end points of \( e_j \).

We now define \( R(\langle G \rangle \langle k \rangle) = \langle X \rangle \langle K \rangle \), an instance of the subset sum problem. Define \( \text{weight}(v_i) = 10^{m+1} + \sum_{j : e_j \perp v_i} 10^j \) and \( \text{weight}(e_j) = 10^j \). Let \( X = \text{weight}(v_1) \ldots \text{weight}(v_n), \text{weight}(e_1) \ldots \text{weight}(e_m) \), and let \( K = k \cdot 10^{m+1} + \sum_{j=1}^m 10^j \).

By the following two lemmas, \( R \) is a reduction of IND to Subset_Sum.

**Lemma 1** If \( G \) has an independent set of size \( k \), then \( \langle X \rangle \langle K \rangle \in \text{Subset}_\text{Sum} \).

**Proof:**

Let \( I \) be a set of \( k \) independent vertices of \( G \). Let \( J \) be the set of edges which do not meet any of the vertices in \( I \). Let \( S \) be the sum of the weights of vertices in \( I \) and the edges in \( J \), that is, \( S \) is the sum of a subsequence of \( X \). Write \( S = \sum_{i} \ell = 1^{m+1} \alpha \ell 10^\ell \).

Claim: \( S = K \).

Proof of Claim: Since \( I \) has cardinality \( k \), we have \( \ell_{m+1} = k \) since \( I \) has cardinality \( k \). For any \( 1 \leq \ell \leq m \), If \( e_\ell \) does not meet any member of \( I \), \( y_{\ell} \) contributes \( 10^\ell \) to \( S \), while if \( e_\ell \) meets \( v_i \), then \( x_i \) contributes \( 10^\ell \) to \( S \). Since \( I \) is independent, \( e_\ell \) does not meet any other vertex, there is no additional contribution of \( 10^\ell \) to \( S \). That is, \( \alpha_\ell = 1 \) in either case. Thus, \( S = K \). \( \square \)

**Lemma 2** If \( \langle X \rangle \langle K \rangle \in \text{Subset}_\text{Sum} \), then \( G \) has an independent set of size \( k \).

\(^1\text{Note that the size of an instance } \langle X \rangle \langle K \rangle \text{ is the number of bits in that string, not the number of numbers encoded. Similarly, the size of an instance of IND is the number of bits in the string } \langle G \rangle \langle k \rangle.\)
Proof: Suppose $K$ is the sum of a sublist of $X$. Then there are sets $I \subseteq V$ and $J \subseteq E$ such that $K$ is the sum of the weights of a $I \subseteq V$ and $J \subseteq E$. Write $K = \sum |\ell = 1^{m+1} \alpha_{\ell}10^{\ell}$. Since $\alpha_{m+1} = k$, the cardinality of $I$ is $k$. No two members of $J$ span an edge, since otherwise $\alpha_{\ell} = 2$ for some $\ell$. Thus, $I$ is a $k$-independent set of $G$.

Immediately from Lemmas 1 and 2:

**Theorem 1** If IND is $\mathcal{NP}$-complete then Subset Sum is $\mathcal{NP}$-complete.

**Example**

Let $G$ be the graph illustrated below, where $n = 6$ and $m = 8$. Let $k = 3$. The set $I = \{v_1, v_3, v_6\}$ is an independent set of vertices of $G$ of size $k$. In our reduction, $J = \{e_4, e_7\}$. We write $k$ and all the weights in base 10. The first array shows the weights of all items, while the second array shows that the weights of the selected items sum to $k$.

\[
\begin{align*}
K &= 3 \ 1 \ 1 \ 1 \ 1 \ 1 \ 1 \ 1 \ 1 \ 0 \\
y_1 &= 1 \ 0 \ 0 \ 1 \ 0 \ 0 \ 1 \ 0 \ 1 \ 0 \\
y_2 &= 1 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 1 \ 0 \ 1 \ 1 \ 0 \\
y_3 &= 1 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 1 \ 0 \ 0 \ 1 \ 0 \ 0 \\
y_4 &= 1 \ 0 \ 1 \ 0 \ 1 \ 1 \ 1 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \\
y_5 &= 1 \ 1 \ 1 \ 1 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \\
y_6 &= 1 \ 1 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \\
z_1 &= 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 1 \ 0 \\
z_2 &= 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 1 \ 0 \ 0 \\
z_3 &= 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 1 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \\
z_4 &= 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 1 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \\
z_5 &= 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \\
z_6 &= 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 1 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \\
z_7 &= 0 \ 0 \ 1 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \\
z_8 &= 0 \ 1 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \\
x_1 &= 1 \ 0 \ 0 \ 1 \ 0 \ 0 \ 1 \ 0 \ 1 \ 0 \\
x_3 &= 1 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 1 \ 0 \ 0 \ 1 \ 0 \ 0 \\
x_6 &= 1 \ 1 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \\
y_4 &= 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 1 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \\
y_7 &= 0 \ 0 \ 1 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \ 0 \\
K &= 3 \ 1 \ 1 \ 1 \ 1 \ 1 \ 1 \ 1 \ 1 \ 0
\end{align*}
\]