

Unconditional Time and Space Complexity Lower Bounds for Intersection Non-Emptiness*

Michael Wehar 

Department of Computer Science, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, PA

Abstract

We reinvestigate known lower bounds for the Intersection Non-Emptiness Problem for Deterministic Finite Automata (DFA's). We first strengthen conditional time complexity lower bounds from T. Kasai and S. Iwata (1985) which showed that Intersection Non-Emptiness is not solvable more efficiently unless there exist more efficient algorithms for non-deterministic logarithmic space (NL). Next, we apply a recent breakthrough from R. Williams (2025) on the space efficient simulation of deterministic time to show an unconditional $\Omega(\frac{n^2}{\log^3(n) \log \log^2(n)})$ time complexity lower bound for Intersection Non-Emptiness. Finally, we consider implications that would follow if Intersection Non-Emptiness for a fixed number of DFA's is computationally hard for a fixed polynomial time complexity class. These implications include $\text{PTIME} \subseteq \text{DSPACE}(n^c)$ for some $c \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\text{PSPACE} = \text{EXPTIME}$.

2012 ACM Subject Classification Theory of computation \rightarrow Formal languages and automata theory; Theory of computation \rightarrow Problems, reductions and completeness

Keywords and phrases Decision Problems for Finite Automata, Unconditional Lower Bounds, Time Complexity, Space Complexity

Digital Object Identifier 10.4230/LIPIcs.CVIT.2016.23

Acknowledgements I would especially like to thank A. Salamon for years of productive collaboration. In addition, I am grateful to M. Oliveira for our prior works on intersection non-emptiness.

1 Background

1.1 Intersection Non-Emptiness

The Intersection Non-Emptiness Problem for Deterministic Finite Automata (DFA's) is defined as follows. Given a finite list of DFA's D_1, D_2, \dots, D_k over an alphabet Σ , does there exist a string $s \in \Sigma^*$ such that $s \in \bigcap_{i \in [k]} L(D_i)$? In other words, is the intersection of the regular languages (associated with the DFA's) non-empty? We denote this problem by DFA-INT. It became natural to consider DFA-INT following the work of M. Rabin and D. Scott (1959) [19] because it was shown that a product automaton could be constructed that recognizes the intersection of any finite set of regular languages. Using this product construction, one can solve DFA-INT in $O(n^{O(k)})$ time where n denotes the total input size and k denotes the number of DFA's. We will measure the total input size n in terms of the length of the bit string that encodes the entire input. The standard approach is to imagine a product directed graph and simply search to see if any product final state can be reached from the product initial state. Furthermore, we can solve DFA-INT in $O(k \log(n))$ non-deterministic space because a product state along with a counter can be represented using $O(k \log(n))$ bits of memory. Then, we simply non-deterministically guess a path from the product initial state to a product final state and reject if the counter surpasses the value n^k . We also consider the k -DFA-INT problem where k , the number of DFA's, is fixed.

* This is a draft for an upcoming paper that is currently under review. This was submitted to arXiv for archiving purposes. All proposed results and proofs are subject to changes.



The complexity of DFA-INT and k -DFA-INT have been investigated in prior works. It was shown that DFA-INT is a PSPACE-complete problem in D. Kozen (1977) [16]. Next, T. Kasai and S. Iwata (1985) [15] showed that k -DFA-INT is not solvable more efficiently unless all non-deterministic logspace (NL) problems are solvable in less time. In particular, it was shown that if k -DFA-INT is solvable in $O(n^{\frac{k-2-\varepsilon}{2}})$ time for some $\varepsilon > 0$, then $\text{NSPACE}_b(k \log(n)) \subseteq \text{DTIME}(n^{k-\varepsilon})$ for some $\varepsilon > 0$. Here, NSPACE_b is similar to the common NSPACE, but it essentially measures bits of memory instead of measuring length over larger than binary tape alphabets. In particular, it measures space complexity relative to two-tape Turing machines where one tape is read-only and the other tape is restricted to a binary alphabet except for a fixed number of special delimiter symbols $\#$. This is also known as an offline Turing machine. Later on, the author (2014) [25] showed that $\text{DFA-INT} \notin \text{NSPACE}(f(n))$ unconditionally for all $f(n)$ such that $f(n)$ is $o(\frac{n}{\log(n) \log \log(n)})$. This was proven by demonstrating that a space efficient algorithm for DFA-INT could be used to space efficiently simulate all space bounded computations in a way that violates the non-deterministic Space Hierarchy Theorem [21, 13, 8]. The reason for the $\log \log(n)$ factor in the denominator is because the proof constructs $O(n)$ DFA's with at most $O(\log(n))$ states each. Furthermore, it takes $\log(n) \log \log(n)$ bits to represent a $\log(n)$ state DFA as a binary string because we are essentially encoding a directed graph with $\log(n)$ vertices and $O(\log(n))$ edges (assuming a fixed finite alphabet). Additional conditional time complexity lower bounds for DFA-INT have been shown in [14, 26, 6, 5].

1.2 Structural Complexity

Structural complexity is concerned with complexity classes and their relationships. We recall the definitions for a selection of standard complexity classes that we consider within this work. The standard classes that we consider within this work are polynomial time denoted by $\text{PTIME} = \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \text{DTIME}(n^k)$, polynomial space denoted by $\text{PSPACE} = \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \text{DSpace}(n^k)$, exponential time denoted by $\text{EXPTIME} = \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \text{DTIME}(2^{n^k})$, and non-deterministic logarithmic space denoted by $\text{NL} = \text{NSPACE}(\log(n))$.

Within structural complexity theory, it is standard to consider whether one class is included within another. We recall a selection of known relationships between complexity classes that we consider within this work. First, the deterministic Time Hierarchy Theorem states that $\text{DTIME}(t_1(n)) \subsetneq \text{DTIME}(t_2(n))$ when $t_2(n)$ is $\omega(t_1(n) \log(t_1(n)))$ and both $t_1(n)$ and $t_2(n)$ are time constructible [9, 10]. Next, the non-deterministic Space Hierarchy Theorem states that $\text{NSPACE}(s_1(n)) \subsetneq \text{NSPACE}(s_2(n))$ when $s_1(n)$ is $o(s_2(n))$ and $s_2(n)$ is space constructible [22, 2, 21, 13, 8]. Then, alternating time is included within deterministic space. In particular, we have $\text{ATIME}(t(n)) \subseteq \text{DSpace}(t(n))$ [3]. Finally, when space is sublinear, polynomial time is within alternating linear time. That is, we have $\text{NTISP}(n^k, n^{1-\varepsilon}) \subseteq \text{ATIME}(n)$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ [17, 7, 18, 28].

1.3 Space Efficient Simulation

Time bounded computations can be space efficiently simulated. In particular, it was shown in [11] that $\text{DTIME}(t(n)) \subseteq \text{DSpace}(\frac{t(n)}{\log(t(n))})$. Then, a more space efficient simulation was demonstrated in [12] when the time bounded machine has a read tape and only one read / write tape (also known as an offline Turing machine). We use DTIME_1 to measure time relative to these restricted machines with only one tape that can both read and write. In particular, the improved simulation from [12] demonstrated that $\text{DTIME}_1(t(n)) \subseteq \text{DSpace}(\sqrt{t(n) \log(t(n))})$. A more recent breakthrough was made demonstrating that for the more standard multitape Turing machine model, we also have $\text{DTIME}(t(n)) \subseteq \text{DSpace}(\sqrt{t(n) \log(t(n))})$ [27].

2 Introduction

2.1 Motivation

There are two primary motivations for this work. Firstly, we present modest improvements to the known lower bounds for the Intersection Non-Emptiness for DFA's Problem (DFA-INT) which is a core problem within the Reachability and Automata Theory research communities. Secondly, few natural problems in computer science theory have known unconditional time complexity lower bounds. In this work, we demonstrate that Intersection Non-Emptiness is such an example. The other known examples tend to be obtained from EXPTIME-hard problems which are therefore at least as hard as simulating time bounded Turing machines [23, 24]. In particular, combinatorial problems related to pebbling games were shown to have polynomial time lower bounds in [1]. Also, for some $c > 0$, intersection non-emptiness for k DFA's and one PDA was shown to have an $\Omega(n^{ck})$ time lower bound for all fixed $k \in \mathbb{N}$ [20].

We will see that the classic result on the space efficient simulation of time bounded computations (from [11]) implies that PSPACE-hard problems may also have time complexity lower bounds, especially with the recent improvement of this simulation from [27]. This is how we will demonstrate the time complexity lower bound for DFA-INT in Section 5. We hope that this work will further lead to unconditional time complexity lower bounds for other PSPACE-hard problems as well.

2.2 Our Contribution

First, in Theorem 3, we improve the conditional lower bounds of [15] showing that DFA-INT $\notin \text{DTIME}(n^{k-\varepsilon})$ for all $\varepsilon > 0$ unless $\text{NSPACE}_b(k \log(n)) \subseteq \text{DTIME}(n^{k-\varepsilon})$ for some $\varepsilon > 0$. Next, in Theorem 4, we restate the unconditional space complexity lower bounds of [25], showing that DFA-INT is not solvable non-deterministically in $o(\frac{n}{\log(n) \log \log(n)})$ space. Then, we show in Theorem 8, using the recent breakthrough from [27], that DFA-INT is not solvable in $o(\frac{n^2}{\log^3(n) \log \log^2(n)})$ deterministic time. Finally, in Theorem 13, we consider the implications of a hardness hypothesis for the k -DFA-INT problems. That is, we show that if DFA-INT for a fixed number of DFA's is $\text{DTIME}(n^{\beta+\varepsilon})$ -hard under $O(n^\beta)$ time reductions for some $\beta \geq 1$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, then $\text{PTIME} \subseteq \text{DSpace}(n^\beta)$. Furthermore, we show in Corollary 15 that this hardness hypothesis also implies that $\text{PSPACE} = \text{EXPTIME}$.

3 Conditional Time Lower Bound

Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ be given. We denote by k -DFA-INT the DFA-INT problem where the number of DFA's is restricted to be k . In [15], the following conjecture was made about the relationship between non-deterministic logarithmic binary space and deterministic polynomial time.

► **Binary Space Conjecture.** ([15]) For all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\text{NSPACE}_b(k \log(n)) \not\subseteq \text{DTIME}(n^{k-\varepsilon}).$$

Assuming that this conjecture is true, it was demonstrated that k -DFA-INT is not solvable in $O(n^{\frac{k-2-\varepsilon}{2}})$ deterministic time for all $k > 8$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ [15]. In this section, we first strengthen the preceding result by introducing a tighter reduction in Proposition 1. Then, we introduce an amplification technique in Lemma 2 to further tighten the result.¹

¹ A preliminary form of this result was intended by the author to be included in [5], but it did not make the final version.

► **Proposition 1.** *The Binary Space Conjecture implies $(k+1)$ -DFA-INT \notin DTIME($n^{k-\varepsilon}$) for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$.*

Proof. We proceed with a variation on the standard reduction from [16, 14, 5] where it is shown how DFA's can be constructed to verify the correctness of a space bounded computation. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ be given. Let a language $L \in \text{NSPACE}_b(k \log(n))$ and a non-deterministic Turing machine M such that M decides L using at most $k \log(n)$ space be given. Let an input string s of length n be given. We construct $k+1$ DFA's as follows. The DFA's read in a sequence of 6-tuples $(q, r_0, r_1, m_0, m_1, w)$ encoded in binary such that q represents the current state. We use r_0 and r_1 to represent what is currently read on the input and work tapes of M on input s , respectively. Similarly, we use m_0 and m_1 to represent which direction the input and work tapes move, respectively. We use w to represent what will be written to the work tape. One DFA \mathcal{D}_0 will keep track of the current state, the input tape head position, and verify the correctness of each q, r_0, m_0, m_1 , and w . For each $i > 0$, the DFA \mathcal{D}_i will keep track of the worktape position and verify the correctness of each r_1 when the worktape position is between $(i-1) \log(n)$ and $i \log(n) - 1$. In other words, we broke the worktape into k blocks each of length $\log(n)$ where each \mathcal{D}_i stores the contents of the i th block. These blocks store binary strings representing the tape content with a fixed number of delimiter $\#$ symbols. Together, the DFA's will verify that the sequence corresponds with a valid and accepting computation of M on input s . The DFA \mathcal{D}_0 will have $\tilde{O}(|M|^2 n)$ states while each \mathcal{D}_i will have $\tilde{O}(n)$ states. Because $|M|$ is a constant, we have constructed $k+1$ DFA's each with $\tilde{O}(n)$ states. Now, we proceed with the contrapositive. If $(k+1)$ -DFA-INT \in DTIME($n^{k-\varepsilon}$) for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, then by the reduction, we have $\text{NSPACE}_b(k \log(n)) \subseteq \text{DTIME}(\tilde{O}(n^{k-\varepsilon}))$. Therefore, the Binary Space Hypothesis would not hold. ◀

The following amplification lemma works because DFA-INT has a self-reducibility property where for all d and $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $(d \cdot k)$ -DFA-INT on DFA's of size n is reducible to k -DFA-INT on DFA's of size n^d by applying the classic Cartesian product construction from [19].

► **Lemma 2.** *Let $c \in \mathbb{N}$ be given. If $(k+c)$ -DFA-INT \notin DTIME($n^{k-\varepsilon}$) for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, then k -DFA-INT \notin DTIME($n^{k-\varepsilon}$) for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$.*

Proof. Let $c \in \mathbb{N}$ be given. Suppose that $(k+c)$ -DFA-INT \notin DTIME($n^{k-\varepsilon}$) for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$. Suppose for sake of contradiction that k -DFA-INT \in DTIME($n^{k-\varepsilon}$) for some k and $\varepsilon > 0$. Consider $\alpha = \lceil \frac{c+1}{\varepsilon} \rceil$. By applying the Cartesian product construction [19], we have

$$(\alpha \cdot k)\text{-DFA-INT} \in \text{DTIME}(n^{\alpha \cdot (k-\varepsilon)}) \subseteq \text{DTIME}(n^{\alpha \cdot k - c - 1}).$$

Now, by assigning $r = \alpha \cdot k - c$, we get $(r+c)$ -DFA-INT \in DTIME(n^{r-1}). Therefore, we have contradicted the assumption and obtained the desired result. ◀

► **Theorem 3.** *The Binary Space Conjecture implies k -DFA-INT \notin DTIME($n^{k-\varepsilon}$) for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$.*

Proof. Combine the results of Proposition 1 and Lemma 2 (for $c = 1$). ◀

4 Unconditional Space Lower Bound

From [25], we know that DFA-INT \notin NSPACE($f(n)$) for all $f(n)$ such that $f(n)$ is $o(\frac{n}{\log(n) \log \log(n)})$. This result is demonstrated by reducing the simulation of an n space bounded Turing machine to solving DFA-INT for $O(n)$ DFA's each with at most $\log(n)$ states. When encoded in binary, the $\log(n)$ state DFA's will be represented by bit strings of length $\log(n) \log \log(n)$. The

original construction from [25] is missing a few important elements. In particular, the informative configurations should also include the write bit and the move directions of both tapes to ensure that all DFA's agree on which non-deterministic transition to take. Below we provide a refined presentation of this argument from [25].

► **Theorem 4.** ([25]) $DFA-INT \notin NSPACE(f(n))$ for all $f(n)$ such that $f(n)$ is $o(\frac{n}{\log(n) \log \log(n)})$.

Proof. Let a language $L \in NSPACE(n)$ and an input string s of length n be given. Therefore, there exists a non-deterministic Turing machine M that decides L using at most $O(n)$ space. We construct $O(n)$ DFA's each with at most $O(\log(n))$ states such that M accepts s if and only if the DFA's have a non-empty intersection. The DFA's read a sequence of 8-tuples $(q, h_0, h_1, r_0, r_1, m_0, m_1, w)$ encoded in binary such that q represents the current state. The values h_0 and h_1 were not included in Proposition 1. We use h_0 and h_1 to represent the current input and work tape positions, respectively. We use r_0 and r_1 to represent what is currently read on the input and work tapes of M on input s , respectively. We use m_0 and m_1 to represent which direction the input and work tapes move, respectively. We use w to represent what will be written to the work tape.

We break the DFA's into four groups. In the first group, we have one DFA to keep track of the current state and verify that m_0, m_1, w , and the next tuple's q all correspond with a valid transition from the current state. This DFA has $O(|M|^2)$ states. In the second group, we have $O(n)$ DFA's for verifying the correctness of the h_0 and r_0 values. Each DFA is assigned an input tape position. For this position, the DFA will verify that the read bit r_0 is correct. It will also check that the following tuple's h_0 value is one more or one less depending on m_0 's value. Each DFA has $O(\log(n))$ states because it essentially just needs to read and check that $O(1)$ many bit strings of length $O(\log(n))$ appropriately match. In the third group, we have $O(n)$ DFA's for verifying the correctness of the h_1 and r_1 values. Each DFA has $O(\log(n))$ states and is constructed similar to the second group. In the fourth group, we have $O(n)$ DFA's for keeping track of the worktape contents. Each DFA is assigned a worktape position. For this position, the DFA keeps track of the bit currently stored there, verifying that the r_1 bit matches when the DFA's position is h_1 , and updates the stored worktape content based on w when appropriate. Each DFA has $O(\log(n))$ states because it again just needs to read and check that $O(1)$ many bit strings of length $O(\log(n))$ appropriately match.

It remains to select the initial states appropriately with all of the tape heads moved to the left and with the worktape initially configured with 0's. In addition, transitions to dead states are made when the checks that the DFA's are assigned to fail. Also, for the first group DFA, final states are selected for when q is final in M and the other DFA's have all states as final that aren't dead states. By combining this reduction with the Non-Deterministic Space Hierarchy Theorem from [21, 13, 8], we obtain the desired result. ◀

► **Remark 5.** We suggest that there is an optimization for constructing the second and third group DFA's. In particular, we can break the tapes into contiguous blocks of size $O(\log \log(n))$. Then, we can accomplish their verification tasks using $O(\frac{n}{\log \log(n)})$ DFA's each with $O(\log(n))$ states.

► **Remark 6.** It was suggested by M. Oliveira (and shown in manuscript [4]) that the DFA's obtained from the construction of Theorem 4 can be represented in a succinct way that doesn't involve encoding the entire graph structure. In particular, each DFA can be succinctly represented using only $\log(n)$ bits instead of $\log(n) \log \log(n)$ bits. Furthermore, $DFA-INT$ over succinctly represented DFA's is not non-deterministically solvable in $o(\frac{n}{\log(n)})$ space.

5 Unconditional Time Lower Bounds

In this section, we combine Theorem 4 from the preceding section with the space efficient simulation of deterministic time bounded multitape Turing machines from [27] to show that $\text{DFA-INT} \notin \text{DTIME}(n^{2-\varepsilon})$ for all $\varepsilon > 0$. In other words, DFA-INT is not solvable deterministically in strongly subquadratic time. We proceed with the following lemma.

► **Lemma 7.** *If $\text{DFA-INT} \notin \text{DSpace}(f(n))$, then $\text{DFA-INT} \notin \text{DTIME}(\frac{f(n)^2}{\log(f(n))})$.*

Proof. We will prove the contrapositive. Suppose that $\text{DFA-INT} \in \text{DTIME}(\frac{f(n)^2}{\log(f(n))})$. By applying the space efficient simulation of time bounded computations from [27], we have that $\text{DTIME}(\frac{f(n)^2}{\log(f(n))}) \subseteq \text{DSpace}(f(n))$. Therefore, it follows that $\text{DFA-INT} \in \text{DSpace}(f(n))$. ◀

► **Theorem 8.** *$\text{DFA-INT} \notin \text{DTIME}(t(n))$ for all $t(n)$ such that $t(n)$ is $o(\frac{n^2}{\log^3(n) \log \log^2(n)})$.*

Proof. Combine Theorem 4 with Lemma 7 where $f(n)$ is $o(\frac{n}{\log(n) \log \log(n)})$. ◀

► **Corollary 9.** *$\text{DFA-INT} \notin \text{DTIME}(n^{2-\varepsilon})$ for all $\varepsilon > 0$.*

Proof. Follows directly from Theorem 8. ◀

► **Remark 10.** It is worth noting that a restricted variant of this result can still be obtained even without the recent breakthrough on space efficient simulation. In particular, we can apply the classic result of [12] on space efficient simulation of deterministic time bounded one-tape offline Turing machines to obtain that $\text{DFA-INT} \notin \text{DTIME}_1(n^{2-\varepsilon})$ for all $\varepsilon > 0$.

6 Hardness Hypothesis

In the preceding section, we proved an unconditional time complexity lower bound for the DFA-INT problem. We did so by first showing that every language in $\text{NSpace}(\frac{n}{\log(n) \log \log(n)})$ is efficiently reducible to DFA-INT . Then, we observed that $\text{DTIME}(n^{2-\varepsilon}) \subseteq \text{NSpace}(\frac{n}{\log(n) \log \log(n)})$ for all $\varepsilon > 0$ by applying [27]. Therefore, every language in $\text{DTIME}(n^{2-\varepsilon})$ is efficiently reducible to DFA-INT . The reductions run in nearly linear time because a Turing machine for a language in $\text{DTIME}(n^{2-\varepsilon})$ is fixed meaning that we basically just need to take the input string and hard code it into the DFA's from the construction. Furthermore, these DFA's are almost entirely determined by the Turing machine and the input size.

From the preceding, we observe that DFA-INT is $\text{DTIME}(n^{2-\varepsilon})$ -hard under nearly linear time reductions. In this section, we consider the possibility that $k\text{-DFA-INT}$ is hard for a superlinear fixed polynomial time complexity class for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$. If we consider hardness under logspace reductions, then this would clearly be difficult to prove because it would imply that $\text{NL} = \text{PTIME}$ since $k\text{-DFA-INT} \in \text{NL}$. However, what if we consider hardness under polynomial time bounded reductions? This leads us to the following hardness hypothesis.

► **Hardness Hypothesis.** *$k\text{-DFA-INT}$ is $\text{DTIME}(n^{\beta+\varepsilon})$ -hard under $O(n^\beta)$ time reductions for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\beta \geq 1$, and $\varepsilon > 0$.*

In the following, we demonstrate how the hardness hypothesis has significant implications within structural complexity theory. In particular, assuming the hypothesis, we can repeatedly apply it to obtain that $\text{PTIME} \subseteq \text{DSpace}(n^\beta)$ and $\text{PSPACE} = \text{EXPTIME}$. In other words, showing unconditional time complexity lower bounds in this way for the $k\text{-DFA-INT}$ problems would be at least as difficult as resolving major open problems in structural complexity theory such as PTIME vs PSPACE and PSPACE vs EXPTIME . We proceed by making the following initial observation about the hardness hypothesis.

► **Proposition 11.** *The Hardness Hypothesis implies that $NL \not\subseteq DTIME(n^\alpha)$ for some $\alpha > 1$.*

Proof. Suppose that the Hardness Hypothesis holds. Hence, $k\text{-DFA-INT}$ is $DTIME(n^{\beta+\varepsilon})$ -hard under $O(n^\beta)$ time reductions for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\beta \geq 1$, and $\varepsilon > 0$. We cannot have α such that $1 < \alpha < \frac{\beta+\varepsilon}{\beta}$ and $k\text{-DFA-INT} \in DTIME(n^\alpha)$. Otherwise, we would get that $DTIME(n^{\beta+\varepsilon}) \subseteq DTIME(n^{\alpha\beta})$, but this violates the Time Hierarchy Theorem [9, 10] because $\alpha \cdot \beta < \beta + \varepsilon$. Since we also have that $k\text{-DFA-INT} \in NL$, it follows that $NL \not\subseteq DTIME(n^\alpha)$ for all α such that $1 < \alpha < \frac{\beta+\varepsilon}{\beta}$. ◀

In the following, we carefully consider alternating time bounded computations with a restricted amount of alternations and total witness length. We denote by $ATIME_{w(n)}^{a(n)}(t(n))$ the class of languages that can be decided by an alternating Turing machine in $O(t(n))$ time with at most $a(n)$ alternations and at most $w(n)$ combined binary witness length across all quantifiers. Furthermore, we write SP as an abbreviation for subpolynomial. That is, $ATIME_{sp}^{O(1)}(t(n)) = \bigcap_{\varepsilon > 0} ATIME_{n^\varepsilon}^{O(1)}(t(n))$. We obtain the following proposition by carefully analyzing the alternations and combined witness length from the known proof of $NTISP(n^k, n^{1-\varepsilon}) \subseteq ATIME(n)$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ [17, 7, 18, 28].

► **Proposition 12.** *Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ be given. We have $NTISP(n^k, n^{1-\varepsilon}) \subseteq ATIME_{o(n)}^{O(1)}(n)$. Furthermore, for any subpolynomial function $g(n)$, we have $NTISP(n^k, g(n)) \subseteq ATIME_{sp}^{O(1)}(n)$.*

Proof. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ be given. Let a language $L \in NTISP(n^k, n^{1-\varepsilon})$ be given. Consider a non-deterministic Turing machine M that decides L in at most $O(n^k)$ time using at most $O(n^{1-\varepsilon})$ space. We proceed similar to [17, 7, 18, 28] where we use existential quantifiers (\exists) to guess tape configurations of size $O(n^{1-\varepsilon})$ and then universal quantifiers (\forall) to check that for every adjacent pair of configurations, there exists a valid computation leading from the earlier configuration to the later configuration within the pair. Now, consider making the existential quantifiers guess n^α many configurations for $\alpha > 0$. Consider repeatedly alternating between quantifiers in this way until configurations are only one computational step apart. This results in $\frac{2k}{\alpha}$ alternations and $O(\frac{k}{\alpha} \cdot n^\alpha \cdot n^{1-\varepsilon})$ combined binary witness length. Since k and α are constants that do not depend on n , we have $O(1)$ alternations and $O(n^{1-\varepsilon+\alpha})$ witness length. If we pick $\alpha = \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$, then we have $O(n^{1-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}) = o(n)$ witness length. Therefore, $NTISP(n^k, n^{1-\varepsilon}) \subseteq ATIME_{o(n)}^{O(1)}(n)$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$. If the Turing machine instead uses $g(n)$ spaces where $g(n)$ is subpolynomial, then this same construction yields an alternating simulation with $O(1)$ alternations and $O(g(n) \cdot n^\alpha)$ witness length. Since this works for all $\alpha > 0$, we obtain $NTISP(n^k, g(n)) \subseteq ATIME_{sp}^{O(1)}(n)$. ◀

Next, assuming the Hardness Hypothesis, we repeatedly apply it similar to a speed-up argument to obtain implications about the relationships between time and space complexity. To do so, we define a complexity measure that we denote by $DTIRE$ (Time-Reducible). In particular, we define $DTIRE(t(n), s(n))$ to be the set of languages that can be reduced in $O(t(n))$ time to a language in $NSPACE(s(n))$.

► **Theorem 13.** *Let $\beta \geq 1$ be given. If $k\text{-DFA-INT}$ is $DTIME(n^{\beta+\varepsilon})$ -hard under $O(n^\beta)$ time reductions for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, then $PTime \subseteq ATIME_{sp}^{O(1)}(n^\beta) \subseteq DSPACE(n^\beta)$. Moreover, the Hardness Hypothesis implies that $PTime \subseteq DSPACE(n^c)$ for some $c > 0$.*

Proof. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\beta \geq 1$, and $\varepsilon > 0$ be given. Suppose that $k\text{-DFA-INT}$ is $DTIME(n^{\beta+\varepsilon})$ -hard under $O(n^\beta)$ time reductions. Therefore, every language in $DTIME(n^{\beta+\varepsilon})$ can be reduced in $O(n^\beta)$ time to $k\text{-DFA-INT}$. Since $k\text{-DFA-INT} \in NL$, we have that every language in

$\text{DTIME}(n^{\beta+\varepsilon})$ can be reduced in $O(n^\beta)$ time to a language in $\text{NL} = \text{NSPACE}(\log(n))$. Hence, $\text{DTIME}(n^{\beta+\varepsilon}) \subseteq \text{DTIRE}(n^\beta, \log(n))$. Therefore, we have that

$$\text{DTIME}(p(n)^{\beta+\varepsilon}) \subseteq \text{DTIRE}(p(n)^\beta, \log(n))$$

by a straightforward padding argument. We can now apply

$$\text{NL} \subseteq \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \text{NTISP}(n^k, \log(n)) \subseteq \text{ATIME}_{\text{sp}}^{O(1)}(n)$$

by Proposition 12 to get that

$$\text{DTIME}(p(n)^{\beta+\varepsilon}) \subseteq \text{DTIRE}(p(n)^\beta, \log(n)) \subseteq \text{ATIME}_{\text{sp}}^{O(1)}(p(n)^\beta).$$

Let $c \in \mathbb{N}$ be given. Let $h(d) = (\frac{\beta}{\beta+\varepsilon})^d$. We proceed by showing that $\text{DTIME}(n^c) \subseteq \text{ATIME}_{\text{sp}}^{O(1)}(n^\beta + n^{c \cdot h(d)})$ for every $d \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$. The base case ($d = 0$) trivially holds since $\text{DTIME}(n^c) \subseteq \text{ATIME}_{\text{sp}}^{O(1)}(n^c)$. For the inductive step, suppose that

$$\text{DTIME}(n^c) \subseteq \text{ATIME}_{\text{sp}}^{O(1)}(n^{c \cdot h(d)})$$

for a given $d \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$. Let $L \in \text{DTIME}(n^c)$ be given. By the hypothesis, $L \in \text{ATIME}_{\text{sp}}^{O(1)}(n^{c \cdot h(d)})$. Consider an alternating Turing machine M that decides L within this time bound. Consider a new machine M' that decides L where all of M 's exist and for all quantifiers are moved out front. Therefore, the verification part of M' is a deterministic $O(n^{c \cdot h(d)})$ time computation.

Now, we can take $p(n) = n^{c \cdot \frac{h(d+1)}{\beta}}$ to get

$$\text{DTIME}(n^{c \cdot h(d)}) \subseteq \text{DTIRE}(n^{c \cdot h(d+1)}, \log(n)) \subseteq \text{ATIME}_{\text{sp}}^{O(1)}(n^{c \cdot h(d+1)}).$$

If we combine the alternating quantifiers with those from M' , then we get

$$L \in \text{ATIME}_{\text{sp}}^{O(1)}(n^\beta + n^{c \cdot h(d+1)}).$$

Since this works for any language $L \in \text{DTIME}(n^c)$, we have

$$\text{DTIME}(n^c) \subseteq \text{ATIME}_{\text{sp}}^{O(1)}(n^\beta + n^{c \cdot h(d+1)}).$$

Notice that an important reason why this works is because the combined witness length across all quantifiers is subpolynomial. The base case and inductive step together imply that $\text{DTIME}(n^c) \subseteq \text{ATIME}_{\text{sp}}^{O(1)}(n^\beta + n^{c \cdot h(d)})$ for all $d \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$.

By taking d sufficiently large, we obtain $\text{DTIME}(n^c) \subseteq \text{ATIME}_{\text{sp}}^{O(1)}(n^\beta)$. Since we also know that $\text{ATIME}_{\text{sp}}^{O(1)}(n^\beta) \subseteq \text{DSPACE}(n^\beta)$ [3], we have obtained

$$\text{DTIME}(n^c) \subseteq \text{ATIME}_{\text{sp}}^{O(1)}(n^\beta) \subseteq \text{DSPACE}(n^\beta)$$

for all $c \in \mathbb{N}$. Therefore, $\text{PTIME} \subseteq \text{ATIME}_{\text{sp}}^{O(1)}(n^\beta) \subseteq \text{DSPACE}(n^\beta)$. ◀

If in Proposition 12, we instead make all of our existential quantifier blocks guess a single tape configuration, then we have the following variation to the result from [17, 7, 18, 28].

► **Proposition 14.** *Let functions $t(n)$ and $s(n)$ be given. We have*

$$\text{NTISP}(t(n), s(n)) \subseteq \text{ATIME}_{w(n)}^{a(n)}(s(n) \log(t(n)))$$

for some $a(n)$ and $w(n)$ such that $a(n)$ is $O(\log(t(n)))$ and $w(n)$ is $O(s(n) \log(t(n)))$.

Proof. We proceed with a similar alternating simulation as in Proposition 12, but we only guess one tape configuration for each block of existential quantifiers. The original computation is a sequence of $t(n)$ many tape configurations. For this alternating simulation, each block of existential quantifiers will split a sequence of configurations in half. A universal quantifier is then used to check both cases. That is, the earlier configuration leads to the middle configuration and the middle configuration leads to the later configuration. Also, each block of existential quantifiers will guess only $O(s(n))$ bits because the space bound is $O(s(n))$. In total, this leads to $O(\log(t(n)))$ alternations and witness length $O(s(n) \log(t(n)))$. Furthermore, the time bound is $O(s(n) \log(t(n)))$ because we only need to write down a sequence of middle configuration guesses and then finally check that one pair of configurations satisfies that the earlier configuration leads to the later configuration in one step. ◀

By applying a repeated speed-up argument similar to Theorem 13 for a number of times that depends on the input size, we obtain the following corollary.

▶ **Corollary 15.** *The Hardness Hypothesis implies that $PSPACE = EXPTIME$.*

Proof. Suppose that the Hardness Hypothesis holds for $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\beta \geq 1$, and $\varepsilon > 0$. Let $r = \frac{\beta}{\beta + \varepsilon}$. Following the approach of Theorem 13 with the efficient alternating simulation from Proposition 14, we obtain

$$DTIME(2^n) \subseteq DTIRE(2^{r \cdot n}, \log(n)) \subseteq \mathbf{ATIME}_{O(n^2)}^{O(n)}(2^{r \cdot n}).$$

Note that the second inclusion (\subseteq) follows by applying Proposition 14 with $t(n) = 2^{r \cdot n}$ and $s(n) = r \cdot n$. By repeated application of these inclusions, we obtain

$$DTIME(2^n) \subseteq \mathbf{ATIME}_{O(d \cdot n^2)}^{O(d \cdot n)}(2^{r^d \cdot n})$$

for all $d \in \mathbb{N}$. Furthermore, we proceed by carrying out this construction where d depends on the input length n . In particular, taking $d = \log_{1/r}(n)$ we obtain

$$DTIME(2^n) \subseteq \mathbf{ATIME}_{O(n^2 \log(n))}^{O(n \log(n))}(n^\beta + n^2 \log(n)) \subseteq \mathbf{DSpace}(n^\beta + n^2 \log(n)).$$

It follows that $EXPTIME \subseteq PSPACE$.

It remains to explain how we carry out the construction where d depends on n . First, we observe that by the hardness hypothesis along with Proposition 14 we have

$$DTIME(n^{\beta + \varepsilon} \log(n)) \subseteq DTIRE(n^\beta \log(n), \log(n)) \subseteq \mathbf{ATIME}_{O(\log^2(n))}^{O(\log(n))}(n^\beta \log(n)).$$

Next, consider the language $U = \{\mathbf{enc}(M)\#s \mid M \text{ accepts } s \text{ in at most } |s|^{\beta + \varepsilon} \text{ steps}\}$. In other words, U consists of encoded Turing machine and input string pairs where the machine accepts the string within n^β steps. By [10], we know that $U \in DTIME(n^{\beta + \varepsilon} \log(n))$. Therefore,

$$U \in \mathbf{ATIME}_{O(\log^2(n))}^{O(\log(n))}(n^\beta \log(n)).$$

Consider an alternating machine \mathcal{M} that decides U within these time, alternation, and witness length bounds. Finally, let a language $L \in DTIME(2^n)$ be given. We recursively define a sequence $\{M_d\}_{d \in \mathbb{N}}$ of alternating Turing machines that decide L . We define M_1 by taking the Turing machine that decides L deterministically in $O(2^n)$ time, applying a padding phase, and plugging an encoded machine with an input string into \mathcal{M} . Given M_d , we define M_{d+1} as follows. We pull out the quantifiers for M_d to get the inner verifier. We next apply a padding phase and use the inner verifier to plug an encoded machine with an input string into \mathcal{M} . We combine the pulled out quantifiers with the quantifiers from \mathcal{M} to obtain M_{d+1} .

Now, given d as input, we can compute M_d efficiently and the size of M_d only grows polynomially with d . Therefore, we can carry out the construction as described obtaining $\text{EXPTIME} \subseteq \text{PSPACE}$. It is worth noting that the logarithmic factor added from using U and \mathcal{M} does not have a significant effect on the resource bounds in the construction because it gets reduced with each iteration of the speed-up argument. ◀

7 Conclusion

In Theorem 3, we introduced an improved conditional time complexity lower bound for the k -DFA-INT problems. Next, in Corollary 9, we demonstrated that DFA-INT is not solvable in $O(n^{2-\varepsilon})$ time unconditionally for all $\varepsilon > 0$. Finally, in Corollary 15, we showed that if any of the k -DFA-INT problems are hard for polynomial time classes under sufficiently fast reductions, then $\text{PSPACE} = \text{EXPTIME}$. In particular, we have that the Hardness Hypothesis (from Section 6) implies that $\text{PSPACE} = \text{EXPTIME}$.

From these result, we conclude that the DFA-INT problem is not only computationally hard for space bounded computations, but also for strongly subquadratic time. This offers us hope to show a definitive time complexity lower bound for one of the k -DFA-INT problems for which we currently only have conditional time lower bounds. It also provides a general strategy for showing unconditional time complexity lower bounds for other PSPACE-complete problems such as those from [16].² Lastly, the results of Section 6 suggest that if the k -DFA-INT problems are really as hard as they appear to be, then it would be possible to improve the recent breakthrough on the space efficient simulation of time bounded computations from [27]. In particular, the hardness of k -DFA-INT for fixed polynomial time complexity classes (as considered in Proposition 11, Theorem 13, and Corollary 15) would imply that all polynomial time problems are solvable in fixed polynomial deterministic space.

References

- 1 Akeo Adachi, Shigeki Iwata, and Takumi Kasai. Some combinatorial game problems require $\Omega(n^k)$ time. *J. ACM*, 31(2):361–376, March 1984. doi:10.1145/62.322433.
- 2 A. Borodin. Computational complexity and the existence of complexity gaps. *J. ACM*, 19(1):158–174, January 1972. doi:10.1145/321679.321691.
- 3 Ashok K. Chandra, Dexter C. Kozen, and Larry J. Stockmeyer. Alternation. *J. ACM*, 28(1):114–133, January 1981. doi:10.1145/322234.322243.
- 4 Mateus de Oliveira Oliveira and Michael Wehar. Emptiness of intersection of automata of bounded cutwidth, 2020. Manuscript.
- 5 Mateus de Oliveira Oliveira and Michael Wehar. On the fine grained complexity of finite automata non-emptiness of intersection. In Nataša Jonoska and Dmytro Savchuk, editors, *Developments in Language Theory*, pages 69–82, Cham, 2020. Springer International Publishing.
- 6 Henning Fernau and Andreas Krebs. Problems on finite automata and the exponential time hypothesis. *Algorithms*, 10(1):24, 2017.
- 7 L. Fortnow. Nondeterministic polynomial time versus nondeterministic logarithmic space: time-space tradeoffs for satisfiability. In *Proceedings of Computational Complexity. Twelfth Annual IEEE Conference*, pages 52–60, 1997. doi:10.1109/CCC.1997.612300.
- 8 Viliam Geffert. Space hierarchy theorem revised. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 295(1):171–187, 2003. Mathematical Foundations of Computer Science. doi:10.1016/S0304-3975(02)00402-4.

² Time complexity lower bounds follow straightforwardly for the emptiness of two-way finite automata.

- 9 Juris Hartmanis and Richard E Stearns. On the computational complexity of algorithms. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 117:285–306, 1965.
- 10 F. C. Hennie and R. E. Stearns. Two-tape simulation of multitape turing machines. *J. ACM*, 13(4):533–546, October 1966. doi:10.1145/321356.321362.
- 11 John Hopcroft, Wolfgang Paul, and Leslie Valiant. On time versus space. *J. ACM*, 24(2):332–337, April 1977. doi:10.1145/322003.322015.
- 12 John E. Hopcroft and Jeffrey D. Ullman. Relations between time and tape complexities. *J. ACM*, 15(3):414–427, July 1968. doi:10.1145/321466.321474.
- 13 Neil Immerman. Nondeterministic space is closed under complementation. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 17(5):935–938, 1988. doi:10.1137/0217058.
- 14 George Karakostas, Richard J Lipton, and Anastasios Viglas. On the complexity of intersecting finite state automata and nl versus np . *Theoretical Computer Science*, 302(1-3):257–274, 2003.
- 15 Takumi Kasai and Shigeki Iwata. Gradually intractable problems and nondeterministic log-space lower bounds. *Mathematical systems theory*, 18(1):153–170, 1985.
- 16 Dexter Kozen. Lower bounds for natural proof systems. In *Proceedings of the 18th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, SFCS '77, page 254–266, USA, 1977. IEEE Computer Society. doi:10.1109/SFCS.1977.16.
- 17 V. A. Nepomnyashchii. Rudimentary predicates and turing computations. *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR*, 195(2):282–284, 1970. URL: <http://mi.mathnet.ru/dan35780>.
- 18 Chris Pollett and Eric Miles. Alternating hierarchies for time-space tradeoffs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:0801.1307*, 2008.
- 19 M. O. Rabin and D. Scott. Finite automata and their decision problems. *IBM Journal of Research and Development*, 3(2):114–125, 1959. doi:10.1147/rd.32.0114.
- 20 Joseph Swernofsky and Michael Wehar. On the complexity of intersecting regular, context-free, and tree languages. In Magnús M. Halldórsson, Kazuo Iwama, Naoki Kobayashi, and Bettina Speckmann, editors, *Automata, Languages, and Programming*, pages 414–426, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2015. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- 21 Róbert Szelepcsényi. The method of forced enumeration for nondeterministic automata. *Acta informatica*, 26(3):279–284, 1988.
- 22 Boris Avraamovich Trakhtenbrot. Turing computers with logarithmic delay. *Algebra i logika*, 3(4):33–48, 1964.
- 23 ULechine. Problem in deterministic time n^p and not lower. Theoretical Computer Science Stack Exchange. URL: <https://csttheory.stackexchange.com/q/46284>.
- 24 Michael Wehar. Are there more polynomial time problems with complexity lower bounds? Theoretical Computer Science Stack Exchange. URL: <https://csttheory.stackexchange.com/q/33063>.
- 25 Michael Wehar. Hardness results for intersection non-emptiness. In Javier Esparza, Pierre Fraigniaud, Thore Husfeldt, and Elias Koutsoupias, editors, *Automata, Languages, and Programming*, pages 354–362, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2014. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- 26 Michael Wehar. *On the complexity of intersection non-emptiness problems*. PhD thesis, University at Buffalo, 2016.
- 27 R. Ryan Williams. Simulating time with square-root space. In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, STOC '25, page 13–23, New York, NY, USA, 2025. Association for Computing Machinery. doi:10.1145/3717823.3718225.
- 28 Ryan Williams. Alternation-trading proofs, linear programming, and lower bounds. *ACM Transactions on Computation Theory (TOCT)*, 5(2):1–49, 2013.