Homework 3

Joe Baker, Brett Schreiber, Brian Knotten

January 18, 2018

4

a

Claim:

There is no Turing Machine that takes input TM M and determines whether the language L(M) accepted by M is the empty language.

Proof by reduction:

We will reduce the Halting Problem HP to the stated Empty Language Problem ELP. Let $\langle X, w \rangle$ be the input to HP, where X is a TM and w is the input to the TM. Then create a new TM N from $\langle X, w \rangle$ where N rejects in all cases where input to N is not w, and when the input is w, N runs X on w. Finally, pass N as input to the ELP and return the opposite of ELP's output.

If X halts on w, then:

- \bullet N will accept on w
- \bullet *ELP* will return 0 since *N* accepts a non-empty input
- HP returns the opposite, which is 1

so HP returns 1 if ELP returns 0. Next, if X loops forever on w, then:

- N will not accept on w
- N rejects any other input
- N always rejects
- ELP returns 1 since N has no strings in L(N) that accept
- HP returns the opposite, which is 0

so HP returns 0 if ELP returns 1.

Finally, $HP \leftrightarrow !ELP$, so $HP \leq ELP$, and thus ELP is undecidable.

b

Claim:

There is no Turing Machine that takes input TM M and determines whether the language L(M) accepted by M is the language of every string over the input alphabet.

Proof by reduction:

We will reduce the Halting Problem HP to the stated Complete Language Problem CLP. Let $\langle X, w \rangle$ be the input to HP, where X is a TM and w is the input to the TM. Then create a new TM N from $\langle X, w \rangle$ where N accepts in all cases where the input to N is not w, and when the input is w, N runs X on w. Finally, pass N as input to the CLP and return the same as CLP's output.

If X halts on w, then:

• N will accept on w

- N accepts all other inputs
- N always accepts
- \bullet *CLP* will return 1 since *N* accepts all strings
- *HP* returns the same output, 1

so HP returns 1 if CLP returns 1. Next, if X loops forever on w, then:

- \bullet N will not accept on w
- N did not accept all inputs
- CLP returns 0 since there are strings in L(N) that N does not accept
- *HP* returns the same, 0

so HP returns 0 if CLP returns 0.

Finally, $HP \leftrightarrow CLP$, so $HP \leq CLP$, and thus CLP is undecidable.

\mathbf{c}

Claim:

There is no Turing Machine that takes input TM M and determines whether the language L(M) accepted by M includes the string 11110.

Proof by reduction:

We will reduce the Halting Problem HP to the stated Specific Language Problem SLP. Let $\langle X, w \rangle$ be the input to HP, where X is a TM and w is the input to the TM. Then create a new TM N from $\langle X, w \rangle$ where N runs X on w, and then accepts if the input to N = 11110. Finally, pass N as input to the SLP and return the same as SLP's output.

If X halts on w, then:

- N will accept if the input to N = 11110
- SLP will return 1 since $L(N) = \{11110\}$
- \bullet HP returns the same output, 1

so HP returns 1 if SLP returns 1, that is, if $11110 \in L(N)$.

Next, if X loops forever on w, then:

- N will not accept on w
- N will not accept any strings.
- SLP returns 0 since $L(N) = \phi$ and thus 11110 $\notin L(N)$.
- *HP* returns the same, 0

so HP returns 0 if SLP returns 0.

Finally, $HP \leftrightarrow SLP$, so HP < SLP, and thus SLP is undecidable.

\mathbf{d}

Claim:

Given some property P of languages, there is no Turing Machine that takes input TM M and determines whether the language L(M) accepted by M satisfies P.

Proof by reduction:

We will reduce the Halting Problem HP to the stated Property Language Problem PLP. Let $\langle X, w \rangle$ be the input to HP, where X is a TM and w is the input to the TM. Next, let M_1 be a TM that accepts all inputs that satisfy property P. Then create a new TM N from $\langle X, w \rangle$ that, on input s, runs s0 on s1 and then runs s2 and accepts if and only if s3 accepts. Finally, run s4 with input s5 and return s6 result as the final result for the Halting Problem.

If X halts on w, then:

- \bullet N will run X on w and halt
- N will run M_1 on s and return 1 if M_1 accepts
- ullet PLP will return 1 since N returned 1

so PLP returns 1 if X halts on w. Next, if X loops forever on w, then:

- $\bullet \ N$ will run X on w but never halt
- \bullet N will never halt
- PLP returns 0 since N never halts

so PLP returns 0 if X does not halt on w. Finally, $X \leftrightarrow PLP$, so $HP \leq PLP$, and thus PLP is undecidable.

 \mathbf{e}

To show that 4.a, 4.b, 4.c are consequences of 4.d:

- 1. For problem 4.a, let P_a be the property that the language is empty
- 2. For problem 4.b, let P_b be the property that the language is every string over the input alphabet
- 3. For problem 4.c, let P_c be the property that the string 11110 is in the language

Each bullet's P is a valid property for a language, thus we can apply the result of 4.d to show 4.a,4.b,4.c are consequences of 4.d.