

## Question 1: Shorties

(a) Given an instance of 3COL,  $G = (V, E)$ . We construct an instance  $G' = (V', E')$  as follow:

Let  $V' = V \cup v$ ,  $E' = E \cup \{uv | u \in V\}$ . We could then run our black box for 4COL and return the same result it gives.

This construction adds 1 node and  $|V|$  edges to the original graph. So it can be done in  $O(|V|)$  time.

(b) The second part of step 2 in the construction is wrong. Because you don't know if and when  $M$  does not halt on  $y$ . So you could only decide what to do when  $M$  accepts/rejects  $y$ , but not when  $M$  loops on  $y$ .

(c) No. Because  $P \subset NP$ . Therefore,  $A$  could be a problem in  $P$ , which indeed can be solved by a poly-time algorithm.

Instead, what you want to do is first show that  $A$  is in NP-Complete and then find a polytime for  $A$ .

(d)  $a \cup b \cup (a\{a, b\}^*a) \cup (b\{a, b\}^*b)$

## Question 2: Mystery Grammar

Context free grammar  $G$  with production rule  $S \rightarrow aS|Sb|bSa|\epsilon$ .

The language generated by this grammar is  $A = \{a, b\}^*$

First, we will show that  $A \subset L(G)$ ,

We prove by induction that if  $x \in A$ , then  $S \xrightarrow{*} x$  base case:  $S \rightarrow \epsilon$ ,

$S \rightarrow aS \rightarrow a, S \rightarrow Sb \rightarrow b, S \rightarrow bSa \rightarrow ba, S \rightarrow aS \rightarrow aSb \rightarrow ab$

Induction hypothesis: For some  $k \geq 2$ , if  $x \in A$  and  $|x| \leq k$  then  $y \in L(G)$

Induction steps: Consider  $y \in A$  with  $|y| = k + 1$ , we must have  $y = ax$  or  $y = xb$  or  $y = bxa$  for some  $x$ , where  $x$  is itself in  $A$  and  $|x| \leq k$ , and thus our inductive hypothesis implies that  $S \xrightarrow{*} x$

If  $y = ax$  then we can use the derivation  $S \xrightarrow{1} aS \xrightarrow{*} ax = y$ . If  $y = xb$  then we can use the derivation  $S \xrightarrow{1} Sb \xrightarrow{*} xb = y$ . If  $y = bxa$  then we can use the derivation  $S \xrightarrow{1} bSa \xrightarrow{*} bxa = y$

Thus we have prove by induction that  $A \subset L(G)$

Then we show that  $L(G) \subset A$

We prove that for all  $i \geq 1$  if  $S \xrightarrow{i} x$  then  $x \in A$  by induction:

Base case:  $S \xrightarrow{1} \epsilon$  and  $\epsilon \in A$

Induction hypothesis: For all  $i \leq k$ , we have if  $S \xrightarrow{i} x$ , then  $x \in A$

Induction steps: We now consider  $y$  s.t.  $S \xrightarrow{k+1} y$

There will be 3 cases:

$y \xrightarrow{1} aS \xrightarrow{k} y$ . Then  $y = ax$  for some  $x \in \Sigma^*$ . By induction hypothesis,  $x \in A$ , therefore,  $y = ax \in A$

$y \xrightarrow{1} Sb \xrightarrow{k} y$ . Then  $y = xb$  for some  $x \in \Sigma^*$ . By induction hypothesis,  $x \in A$ , therefore,  $y = xb \in A$

$y \xrightarrow{1} bSa \xrightarrow{k} y$ . Then  $y = bxa$  for some  $x \in \Sigma^*$ . By induction hypothesis,  $x \in A$ , therefore,  $y = bxa \in A$

Thus, we have shown that  $L(G) \subset A$ .

In conclusion, we have shown that  $A \subset L(G)$  and  $L(G) \subset A$ . Therefore,  $A = L(G)$ .

### Question 3: Balanced Concat

$$A \heartsuit B = \{xy \mid x \in A, y \in B, |x| = |y|\}$$

(a)  $A = \{a\}^*, B = \{b\}^*$

(b) A and B are regular sets accepted by DFAs  $M_A = (Q_A, \Sigma, \delta_A, s_A, F_A)$  and  $M_B = (Q_B, \Sigma, \delta_B, s_B, F_B)$

We now construct a NPDA  $M = (Q, \Sigma, \delta, \Gamma, s, F)$  that accepts  $A \heartsuit B$

$$Q = Q_A \times Q_B \times \{0, 1, 2\}$$

$$\Gamma = \{C, \$\}$$

$$s = (s_A, s_B)$$

$$\delta((q_1, q_2, 0), \epsilon, \epsilon) = ((q_1, q_2, 0), \$)$$

$$\delta((q_1, q_2, 0), x, \epsilon) = ((\delta_A(q_1), q_2, 0), C)$$

$$\delta((q_1, q_2, 0), \epsilon, \epsilon) = ((q_1, q_2, 1), \epsilon)$$

$$\delta((q_1, q_2, 1), x, C) = ((q_1, \delta_B(q_2), 1), \epsilon)$$

$$\delta((q_1, q_2, 1), \epsilon, \$) = ((q_1, q_2, 2), \epsilon)$$

$$(q_1, q_2, 2) \in F \text{ if } q_1 \in F_A, q_2 \in F_B$$

The state of this machine will be in the form  $(q_1, q_2, n)$  where  $q_1$  is a state of  $M_A$  and  $q_2$  is a state of  $M_B$ .  $n$  is 0 when we are treating the input character as a character from A and  $n$  is 1 when we are treating the input character as a character from B.  $n$  is 2 when we the condition  $|x| = |y|$  is satisfied

The machine will write a \$ on the tape in the beginning.

It will then assume the input character is a character of A and add a C on the tape

It have an  $\epsilon$  transition from state  $(q_1, q_2, 0)$  to  $(q_1, q_2, 1)$ . This utilise the fact that it is nondeterministic to try all the possible division of the input string. It then treat the input character as a character of B and pop a C from the tape. When it see a \$ on the tape, this means that we have satisfied the condition that  $|x| = |y|$ . If there is no more input it will then check if we accept the state.

## Question 4: Self-Acceptance

$C = \{\langle M \rangle \mid M \text{ is a Turing machine that accepts } \langle M \rangle\}$

(a) Rice's Theorem does not apply here. Because this is a property of the machine not the language.

(b) First, show that  $C$  is recognisable.

We could just simulate  $M$  on  $\langle M \rangle$ . if this accepts then accepts. We have built a machine that recognise  $C$ .

Now, to prove it is not decidable by showing  $A_{TM} \leq_M C$   
 $f =$  "on input  $\langle M, x \rangle$ :

1. compute/construct a TM  $M_1$  such that  $\langle M, x \rangle \in A_{TM} \iff \langle M_1 \rangle \in C$ :  
 $M_1 =$  "on input  $\langle M_1 \rangle$ 
  1. Ignore  $\langle M_1 \rangle$ .
  2. Run  $M$  on  $x$ , accept  $y$  if and only if  $M$  accepts  $x$ . "
2. Return  $\langle M_1 \rangle$ . "

We claim that  $M$  halts on  $x$  if and only if  $\langle M_1, M_2 \rangle$  is in  $F$ .

$$\begin{aligned}\langle M, x \rangle \in A_{TM} &\Rightarrow M \text{ halts on } x \\ &\Rightarrow M_1 \text{ accepts } \langle M_1 \rangle \\ &\Rightarrow f(\langle M \rangle) \in C\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\langle M, x \rangle \notin A_{TM} &\Rightarrow M \text{ does not halt on } x \\ &\Rightarrow M_1 \text{ does not accept } M_1 \\ &\Rightarrow f(\langle M \rangle) \notin C\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have shown that  $A_{TM} \leq_M C$ . Since  $A_{TM}$  is not Turing decidable, we know that  $C$  is also not decidable

## Question 5: Box Packing

First, We will show that Box Packing is NP.

Our certificate will be satisfying arrangement  $A$  for boxes. Given  $A$ , our verifier will check the there is no overlap, and there should be no remaining empty space. Doing this is in time proportional to the size of  $\phi$  ( $O(WH)$  time). Conversely if  $A$  is a certificate accepted by our verifier, then we know that  $A$  is an assignment for  $\phi$ .

Thus we have shown that Box Packing is NP.

We now show that  $\text{SUBSET SUM} \leq_p \text{BOX PACKING}$ .

For an instance of SUBSET SUM, set  $X = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$  and target value is  $M$ . Construct a BOX PACKING problem as follow. For every  $x \in X$ , construct a box of width  $x$  and height 1. Then construct a van with width  $M$  and height 1.

We now run our black box for Independent Set on BOX PACKING problem and return the same result it gives.

Runtime: we construct as many boxes as the number of element in  $X$  and we also construct a van, so it takes  $O(n)$  time.

To finish the proof, we simply need to show that there is an arrangement for BOX PACKING if and only of there is a solution for SUBSET SUM.

Claim. If there is a subset of  $X$  sums to  $M$  then there is a satisfying assignment for BOX PACKING.

Suppose SUBSET SUM problem has a solution  $\{y_1, y_2, \dots, y_k\}$ , then we know  $y_1 + \dots + y_k = M$ . The corresponding boxes will have size  $y_1, \dots, y_k$  and the van have size  $M$ . Since all boxes and van have height 1, we can just put the boxes in a line and avoid overlapping. Thus the BOX with width  $y_1, y_1, \dots, y_k$  will be a solution for BOX PACKING.

Claim. If there is a satisfying assignment for BOX PACKING then there is a subset of  $X$  sums to  $M$ .

Suppose BOX PACKING problem has a satisfying arrangement with boxes of width  $y_1, \dots, y_k$ . Since height of boxes are 1, they will have area  $y_1, y_2, \dots, y_k$ . Since there's no overlap and no remaining empty space, we have  $y_1 + \dots + y_k = M$ . So  $y_1, \dots, y_k$  is a solution for SUBSET SUM problem

In conclusion, BOX PACKING is NP complete