## COMS 3003A HW 6

**DMITRY SHKATOV** 

Due 12 April, 2024

No new readings. This HW relies on understanding of Turing machines that you should have acquired from previous lectures and readings. Go back if you find these question hard—use the study break time for this.

We will now start describing TMs at a higher level, not wishing to be bogged down into the details of how to implement the machines we describe—this is what we expect you to do for this HW. Make sure, however, that, if pressed, you can translate your descriptions into detailed descriptions of TMs.

Mastering questions in this HW is essential to getting decent grades on subsequent tests and on the final exam.

- 1. Let M be a Turing machine.
  - (a) Design a Turing machine M' that accepts exactly those string that M rejects and rejects exactly those strings that M accepts.

Suppose that

$$M = (Q, \Delta, \Gamma, q_0, q_{accept}, q_{reject}, \delta).$$

Define

$$M' = (Q \cup \{q'_{accept}, q'_{reject}, \}, \Delta, \Gamma, q_0, q'_{accept}, q'_{reject}, \delta')$$

where  $\delta'$  is  $\delta$  plus the following instructions, for every  $s \in \Gamma$ :

$$\begin{array}{ccc} q_{accept}, s & \rightarrow & q'_{reject}, s, R; \\ q_{reject}, s & \rightarrow & q'_{accept}, s, R. \end{array}$$

It should be clear that M' works as intended.

(b) Under which conditions is M' going to be a decider?

M' is a decider if, and only if, M is a decider.

2. Let  $\Sigma$  be an alphabet and let  $L \subseteq \Sigma^*$ . The *compliment* of L is the language

$$\bar{L} := \Sigma^* \setminus L = \{ w \in \Sigma^* : w \notin L \}.$$

- (a) Prove that, if L is decidable, then L is decidable. Suppose that L is decided by a Turing machine M. Construct a Turing machine M' as in Question 1. Then, M' decides  $\bar{L}$ ; hence,  $\bar{L}$  is decidable.
- (b) What can you say about  $\bar{L}$  if L is undecidable? In that case,  $\bar{L}$  is undecidable. Indeed, if it were decidable, then there would exist a Turing machine M that would decide it. But then the Turing machine M', defined as in Question 1, would decide L. This is, however, impossible since L is, by assumption, undecidable.
- 3. Let  $\Sigma$  be an alphabet and let  $L_1, L_2 \subseteq \Sigma^*$ . Prove that, if  $L_1$  and  $L_2$  are decidable, then so are  $L_1 \cap L_2$  and  $L_1 \cup L_2$ .

We only consider  $L_1 \cap L_2$  (the solution for  $L_1 \cup L_2$  is similar). Suppose that  $L_1$  and  $L_2$  are decidable. Then, there exist Turing machines  $M_1$  and  $M_2$  deciding, respectively,  $L_1$  and  $L_2$ . Let M be a Turing machine that works as follows: on input w, M simulates  $M_1$  on w and then simulates  $M_2$  on w; if both  $M_1(w) = 1$  and  $M_2(w) = 1$ , then M accepts; if  $M_1(w) = 0$  or  $M_2(w) = 0$ , then M rejects. Then, M decides  $L_1 \cap L_2$ :

- If M(w) = 1, then  $M_1(w) = 1$  and  $M_2(w) = 1$ , which means that  $w \in L_1$  and  $w \in L_2$ , i.e.,  $w \in L_1 \cap L_2$ .
- If M(w) = 0, then  $M_1(w) = 0$  or  $M_2(w) = 0$ , which means that  $w \notin L_1$  or  $w \notin L_2$ , i.e.,  $w \notin L_1 \cap L_2$ .
- 4. We want to give as input to a Turing machine with the binary input alphabet a binary encoding  $\langle M \rangle$  of a Turing machine M and a binary word w. We, therefore, want to represent both as a single string  $\langle M, w \rangle$  so that the machine that is given input  $\langle M, w \rangle$  knows where  $\langle M \rangle$  ends and w begins. How could we do this?

There are multiple ways of doing this. Here is one: prefix the input with the number of 0s that equals the length of  $\langle M \rangle$  and then with a single 1 (after that, the encoding of M starts, immediately followed by w).

5. Assume that  $M_A$  is a Turing machine with the input alphabet  $\{0,1\}$  that solves the following decision problem: given a binary encoding  $\langle M \rangle$  of a Turing machine M and a binary word w, it decides if M accepts w, i.e.,

$$M_A(\langle M \rangle, w) = \left\{ egin{array}{ll} 1 & ext{if } M(w) = 1; \\ 0 & ext{otherwise (what does this mean?).} \end{array} 
ight.$$

Using  $M_A$  as a helper function, design a Turing machine  $M_{SA}$  that solves the following problem: given a binary encoding  $\langle M \rangle$  of a Turing machine M, decide if M accepts its own encoding  $\langle M \rangle$ .

The machine  $M_{SA}$  works as follows on input  $\langle M \rangle$ :

- (1)  $M_{SA}$  calls  $M_A$  with arguments  $\langle M \rangle$  and  $\langle M \rangle$ .
- (2) If  $M_A(\langle M \rangle, \langle M \rangle) = 1$ , then  $M_{SA}$  accepts; if  $M_A(\langle M \rangle, \langle M \rangle) = 0$ , then  $M_{SA}$  rejects.

It is not hard to see that  $M_{SA}$  works as required:

- If  $M_{SA}(\langle M \rangle) = 1$ , then  $M_A(\langle M \rangle, \langle M \rangle) = 1$ , which means, by specification of  $M_A$ , that  $M(\langle M \rangle) = 1$ .
- If, on the other hand,  $M_{SA}(\langle M \rangle) = 0$ , then  $M_A(\langle M \rangle, \langle M \rangle) = 0$ , which means, by specification of  $M_A$ , that  $M(\langle M \rangle) = 0$ .
- 6. Assume that  $M_{\epsilon}$  is a Turing machine with the input alphabet  $\{0,1\}$  that solves the following decision problem: given a binary encoding  $\langle M \rangle$  of a Turing machine M, it decides if M halts on the empty string  $\epsilon$ , i.e.,

$$M_{\epsilon}(\langle M \rangle) = \begin{cases} 1 & M(\epsilon) \neq \infty; \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Using  $M_{\epsilon}$  as a helper function, design a Turing machine  $M_H$  that solves the following problem: given a binary encoding  $\langle M \rangle$  of a Turing machine M and a word w in its input alphabet, decide if M halts on w.

The machine  $M_H$  works as follows on input  $\langle M, w \rangle$ :

- (1)  $M_H$  writes down (the program of) a Turing machine  $M_{M,w}$  that accepts as input (an encoding of) a Turing machine and a binary string and works as follows on inputs  $\langle M \rangle$  and x:
  - (a)  $M_{M,w}$  simulates M on xw.
  - (b) If M(xw) = 1, then  $M_{M,w}$  accepts; if M(xw) = 0, then  $M_{M,w}$  rejects.
- (2)  $M_H$  calls  $M_{\epsilon}$  with the argument  $\langle M_{M,w} \rangle$ .
- (3) If  $M_{\epsilon}(\langle M_{M,w} \rangle) = 1$ , then  $M_H$  accepts; if  $M_{\epsilon}(\langle M_{M,w} \rangle) = 0$ , then  $M_H$  rejects.

It is not hard to see that  $M_H$  works as required:

- If  $M_H(\langle M \rangle, w) = 1$ , then  $M_{\epsilon}(\langle M_{M,w} \rangle) = 1$ , which means, by specification of  $M_{\epsilon}$ , that  $M_{M,w}(\epsilon) \neq \infty$ ; looking at the definition of  $M_{M,w}$ , we see that this happens only if  $M(w) \neq \infty$  (notice that  $M_{M,w}$  would go into an infinite loop only if M went into an infinite loop on input  $\epsilon w (= w)$ ).
- If  $M_H(\langle M \rangle, w) = 0$ , then  $M_{\epsilon}(\langle M_{M,w} \rangle) = 0$ , which means, by specification of  $M_{\epsilon}$ , that  $M_{M,w}(\epsilon) = \infty$ ; looking at the definition of  $M_{M,w}$ , we see that this happens only if  $M(\epsilon w) = M(w) = \infty$ .
- 7. Assume that  $M_H$  is a Turing machine with the input alphabet  $\{0,1\}$  that solves the following decision problem: given a binary encoding  $\langle M \rangle$  of a Turing machine M and a word w in its input alphabet (which we may assume to be binary), it decides if M halts on w, i.e.,

$$M_H(\langle M, w \rangle) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } M(w) \neq \infty; \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Using  $M_H$  as a helper function, design a Turing machine  $M_A$  that solves the following problem: given a binary encoding  $\langle M \rangle$  of a Turing machine M and a word w in its input alphabet, decide if M accepts w.

The machine  $M_A$  works as follows, given an input  $\langle M, w \rangle$ :

- (1)  $M_A$  writes down (the program of) a Turing machine  $M_M$  that accepts as input a binary string and works as follows on input x:
  - (a)  $M_M$  simulates M on x.
  - (b) If M(x) = 1, then  $M_M$  accepts; if M(x) = 0, then  $M_M$  goes into an infinite loop.
- (2)  $M_A$  calls  $M_H$  with arguments  $\langle M_M \rangle$  and w.
- (3) If  $M_H(\langle M_M, w \rangle) = 1$ , then  $M_A$  accepts;  $M_H(\langle M_M, w \rangle) = 0$ , then  $M_A$  rejects.

It is not hard to see that  $M_A$  works as required:

- If  $M_A(\langle M \rangle, w) = 1$ , then  $M_H(\langle M_M \rangle, w) = 1$ , which means, by specification of  $M_H$ , that  $M_M(w) \neq \infty$ ; looking at the definition of  $M_M$ , we see that this happens only if M(w) = 1.
- If  $M_A(\langle M \rangle, w) = 0$ , then  $M_H(\langle M_M \rangle, w) = 0$ , which means, by specification of  $M_H$ , that  $M_M(w) = \infty$ ; looking at the definition of  $M_M$ , we see that this can happen for two reasons: either  $M(w) = \infty$  or M(w) = 0; in either case,  $M(w) \neq 1$ .
- 8. Assume that  $M_{\perp}$  is a Turing machine with the input alphabet  $\{0,1\}$  that solves the following decision problem: given a binary encoding  $\langle M \rangle$  of a Turing machine M, it decides if M writes a blank during the course of at least one of its computations, i.e.,

$$M_{\sqcup}(\langle M \rangle) = \left\{ egin{array}{ll} 1 & \mbox{if $M$ writes $\sqcup$ during at least one of its computations;} \\ 0 & \mbox{otherwise.} \end{array} \right.$$

Using  $M_{\sqcup}$  as a helper function, design a Turing machine  $M_A$  that solves the following problem: given a binary encoding  $\langle M \rangle$  of a Turing machine M and a word w in its input alphabet, decide if M accepts w.

The machine  $M_A$  works as follows, given an input  $\langle M, w \rangle$ :

- (1)  $M_A$  writes down (the program of) a Turing machine  $M_{M,w}$  that accepts no input and works as follows:
  - (a)  $M_{M,w}$  simulates M on w in such a way that it never writes a  $\sqcup$  (notice that M's blank is encoded as a string of non-blanks from  $M_M$ 's alphabet; also notice that  $M_M$  can always avoid writing a  $\sqcup$ : if it needs to delete the contents of a cell, it can simply write a special tape symbol, say #, in that cell);
  - (b) If M(w) = 1, then  $M_{M,w}$  writes a  $\sqcup$  and accepts; if M(w) = 0, then  $M_{M,w}$  immediately rejects.
- (2)  $M_A$  calls  $M_{\sqcup}$  with the argument  $\langle M_{M,w} \rangle$ .
- (3) If  $M_{\sqcup}(\langle M_{M,w}\rangle)=1$ , then  $M_A$  accepts;  $M_{\sqcup}(\langle M_{M,w}\rangle)=0$ , then  $M_A$  rejects.

It is not hard to see that  $M_A$  works as required:

• If  $M_A(\langle M \rangle, w) = 1$ , then  $M_{\sqcup}(\langle M_{M,w} \rangle) = 1$ , which means, by specification of  $M_{\sqcup}$ , that  $M_{M,w}$  writes a blank (since  $M_{M,w}$  accepts no inputs, it always performs the same computation when it runs). This only happens if M(w) = 1.

- If  $M_A(\langle M \rangle, w) = 0$ , then  $M_{\sqcup}(\langle M_{M,w} \rangle) = 0$ , which means, by specification of  $M_{\sqcup}$ , that  $M_{M,w}$  never writes a blank. This happen if  $M(w) = \infty$  or if M(w) = 0, i.e., if  $M(w) \neq 1$ .
- 9. Assume that  $M_2$  is a Turing machine with the input alphabet  $\{0,1\}$  that solves the following decision problem: given a binary encoding  $\langle M \rangle$  of a Turing machine M, it decides if M ever is in the same state in two consecutive configurations, i.e.,

$$M_{\sqcup}(\langle M \rangle) = \left\{ egin{array}{ll} 1 & M \ {
m ever} \ {
m is \ in \ the \ same \ state \ in \ two \ successive \ configurations;} \\ 0 & {
m otherwise.} \end{array} 
ight.$$

Using  $M_2$  as a helper function, design a Turing machine  $M_H$  that solves the following problem: given a binary encoding  $\langle M \rangle$  of a Turing machine M and a word w in its input alphabet, decide if M halts on w.

The machine  $M_H$  works as follows, given an input  $\langle M, w \rangle$ :

- (1)  $M_H$  writes down (the program of) a Turing machine  $M_{M,w}$  that accepts no input and works as follows:
  - (a)  $M_{M,w}$  simulates M on w in such a way that it never stays in the same state in two successive configurations (notice that this can always be achieved:  $M_{M,w}$  can always go to a dummy state and then on to the next state while keeping its head in the same cell just for the sake of fulfilling this requirement);
  - (b) Upon the completion of the simulation (if it completes),  $M_{M,w}$  moves write and writes  $\square$  while remaining in the same state; then, it accepts.
- (2)  $M_H$  calls  $M_2$  with the argument  $\langle M_{M,w} \rangle$ .
- (3) If  $M_2(\langle M_{M,w} \rangle) = 1$ , then  $M_H$  accepts;  $M_2(\langle M_{M,w} \rangle) = 0$ , then  $M_H$  rejects.

It is not hard to see that  $M_H$  works as required:

- If  $M_H(\langle M \rangle, w) = 1$ , then  $M_2(\langle M_{M,w} \rangle) = 1$ , which means, by specification of  $M_2$ , that  $M_{M,w}$  stays in the same state in two successive configurations. This can only happen if  $M(w) \neq \infty$ .
- If  $M_H(\langle M \rangle, w) = 0$ , then  $M_2(\langle M_{M,w} \rangle) = 0$ , which means, by specification of  $M_2$ , that  $M_{M,w}$  never stays in the same state in two successive configurations. This can only happen if  $M(w) = \infty$ .