

L versus P

Run run-7b5f4a45 · solved · Started 2026-06-04 15:59 · Ended 2026-06-04 16:06

Introduction

The relationship between the complexity classes **L** (deterministic logarithmic space) and **P** (deterministic polynomial time) is a fundamental open question in theoretical computer science. Specifically, the root goal addresses whether every problem solvable in polynomial time is also solvable using only logarithmic memory ($L = P$? $L \subset P$?). This question parallels the famous P vs. NP problem; resolving whether L is a proper subset of P ($L \subsetneq P$) would significantly refine our understanding of memory-efficient computation, distinguishing problems that are tractable in time but require more than logarithmic space. Current consensus strongly suggests that L is strictly contained within P , though this remains unproven.

Method

The assessment of the L vs. P relationship was conducted through a review of established complexity theory literature and current mathematical consensus. The methodology involved:

1. **Consensus Analysis:** Examining standard references and expert statements (such as those from the Clay Mathematics Institute and Scott Aaronson) to determine the prevailing belief regarding the separation of L and P .
2. **Theoretical Framework Evaluation:** Analyzing the implications of the Space Hierarchy Theorem and the simulation overhead of logarithmic-space machines within polynomial time bounds.
3. **Hypothesis Testing:** Evaluating the specific hypothesis that a proof of $L \subset P$ might emerge if the simulation of L -machines by P -machines incurred only polylogarithmic overhead, rather than the standard polynomial overhead.

The evidence was synthesized from search results focusing on the hierarchical relationships between L , P , and $PSPACE$, and the current state of proofs regarding proper subset containment.

Findings

Current Consensus: $L \subsetneq P$

The prevailing view among complexity theorists is that **L is a proper subset of P** ($L \subsetneq P$). This means that there are problems solvable in polynomial time that cannot be solved with only logarithmic space. However, unlike the P vs. NP problem, this separation is not yet formally proven, though it is considered highly likely¹ (#fn:1).

Hierarchical Context: The Space Hierarchy Theorem

The Space Hierarchy Theorem provides a proven strict separation between space-bounded classes. It establishes that: $L \subsetneq \text{PSPACE}$. Since $P \subseteq \text{PSPACE}$, this theorem confirms that L is strictly smaller than PSPACE. However, because P itself is a subset of PSPACE, the theorem alone does not directly prove $L \subsetneq P$. It only proves that L is weaker than the class of problems solvable in polynomial space. To bridge the gap to P , one must account for the time-space trade-offs in machine simulation.

Simulation Overhead and the Hypothesis

A critical factor in the L vs. P question is the overhead incurred when simulating a logarithmic-space Turing machine. A standard simulation of an L -machine by a polynomial-time machine typically incurs polynomial overhead. The hypothesis posits that if this overhead could be shown to be merely polylogarithmic, it might facilitate a stronger proof of separation or inclusion. Currently, while we know $L \subseteq P$ (because a logarithmic-space machine uses a polynomial number of configurations and thus runs in polynomial time), the lack of a proof for $L \neq P$ stems from the difficulty in constructing problems that are inherently time-polynomial but space-super-logarithmic.

Comparative Complexity Relationships

The following table summarizes the known and conjectured relationships between these complexity classes:

Class	Definition	Relationship to L	Relationship to P	Status of Proof
L	Deterministic Logarithmic Space	—	$L \subseteq P$ (Proven)	$L \subsetneq P$ (Conjectured)
P		$L \subseteq P$	—	

Class	Definition	Relationship to L	Relationship to P	Status of Proof
	Deterministic Polynomial Time			$P \subseteq \text{PSPACE}$ (Proven)
PSPACE	Deterministic Polynomial Space	$L \not\subseteq \text{PSPACE}$ (Proven)	$P \subseteq \text{PSPACE}$ (Proven)	$P \not\subseteq \text{PSPACE}$ (Conjectured)

Note: The strict inclusion $L \not\subseteq \text{PSPACE}$ is a direct consequence of the Space Hierarchy Theorem. The inclusion $L \subseteq P$ is trivial because a machine using $O(\log n)$ space has at most $n^{O(1)}$ distinct configurations, limiting its runtime to polynomial bounds.

Implications of $P \subseteq L$

If $P \subseteq L$ were proven true (i.e., $L = P$), it would imply that any problem solvable in polynomial time can be solved with extremely limited memory. This would have profound implications for algorithm design, suggesting that time and logarithmic space are essentially equivalent in power for deterministic computation. However, most researchers believe this is false, supporting the hypothesis that L is strictly smaller than P ² (#fn:2).

Limitations

- Unproven Conjecture:** The primary limitation is that $L \not\subseteq P$ is a conjecture, not a proven theorem. The evidence reflects the consensus of the field rather than a mathematical proof.
- Scope of Simulation Overhead:** The hypothesis regarding polylogarithmic overhead is a theoretical mechanism. The evidence does not provide a concrete proof that such a simulation exists, only that its existence would impact the relationship between the classes.
- Missing Intermediate Classes:** The analysis focuses on L and P . It does not extensively detail intermediate classes (such as NC or SL) that might provide additional insight into the separation, though these are often discussed in the context of L vs P in broader literature.
- Source Specificity:** The evidence relies on general complexity theory sources (Clay Mathematics Institute, lecture notes, and expert blogs). Specific recent papers attempting to prove $L \neq P$ via specific circuit lower bounds are not detailed in the provided snippets.

Sources

1. tp-75abeaaf (tool:web_search) — {'query': 'current mathematical consensus L is a proper subset of P complexity theory', 'results': [{'url': 'https://www.claymath.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/06/pvsnp.pdf', 'title': 'PDF Statement of the Problem - Clay Mathematics Institute', 'snippet': '1. Statement of the Problem The P versus NP ...'}] ↩ (#fnref:1)
2. tp-46dabee5 (tool:web_search) — {'query': 'theoretical relationships hierarchy theorems L P PSPACE complexity classes', 'results': [{'url': 'https://iccl.inf.tu-dresden.de/w/images/d/d8/CT2019-Lecture-12-overlay.pdf', 'title': 'Complexity Theory - Lecture 12: Hierarchy Theorems - TU Dresden', 'snippet': 'Complexity Theory slide 4...'}] ↩ (#fnref:2)
3. tp-1c540d7e (tool:web_search) — {'query': 'space hierarchy theorem prove L subset P polylogarithmic overhead', 'results': [{'url': 'https://www.scottaaronson.com/papers/pnp.pdf', 'title': 'P = NP - Scott Aaronson', 'snippet': 'Space Hierarchy Theorem shows that there are languages ... If we compare it against the ultimate goal of...'}] ↩ (#fnref:3)}