

Justin Li  
Dr. Krehbiel  
CSCI 161  
11/21/20

## HW 9

- 0) I collaborated with Carlo Bilbao on this assignment.
- 1) The language  $EQ_{DR} = \{ \langle D, R \rangle \mid D \text{ is a DFA and } R \text{ is a regex w/ } L(D) = L(R) \}$  is decidable. According to Lemma 1.6, the language of any DFA is described by some regex. Thus, we can convert the regex into a DFA and then apply Theorem 4.5, which states that  $EQ_{DFA}$  is decidable, thus proving  $EQ_{DR}$  is also decidable.
  - 2) The language  $SUBSET_{REX} = \{ \langle R, S \rangle \mid R, S \text{ are regular expressions and } L(R) \subseteq L(S) \}$  is decidable. We can convert both  $R$  and  $S$  into DFAs using Lemma 1.6. Because DFAs are closed under complement, we can then obtain the DFA  $S'$  from  $S$ . Then, we can compare the intersection of  $R$  and  $S'$  and create a DFA  $T$  from that. If any string lies within this intersection, then  $R$  is not a subset of  $S$ . Using Theorem 4.4, which states that  $E_{DFA}$  is decidable, we can plug in  $T$ , which will either be accepted or rejected for every input, thus proving  $SUBSET_{REX}$  is also decidable.
  - 3) The language  $IMB_{DFA} = \{ \langle D \rangle \mid D \text{ is a DFA and } w \in L(D) \text{ for some } w \text{ with more 1's than 0's} \}$  is decidable. Assume there is a CFG that accepts  $w$  if it has more 1's than 0's. Then, using the fact that any regular language intersected with a CFL is context-free, by intersecting  $D$  and this CFG,  $IMB_{DFA}$  must also be context free. By proving that  $IMB_{DFA}$  is context-free, we can then apply Theorem 4.7, which states that  $A_{CFG}$  is decidable. Hence,  $IMB_{DFA}$  is also decidable.
  - 4) The language  $A_{\epsilon CFG} = \{ \langle G \rangle \mid G \text{ is a CFG and } \epsilon \in L(G) \}$  is decidable. Convert  $G$  into CNF. Then, if any rule  $R$  where some variable  $V \rightarrow \epsilon$  exists, then accept the language. If not, then reject. Thus,  $A_{\epsilon CFG}$  is decidable.
  - 5) The language  $EQ_{CFG} = \{ \langle G, H \rangle \mid G, H \text{ are CFGs and } L(G) = L(H) \}$  is co-Turing-recognizable. Convert both  $G$  and  $H$  into CNF. Then, run CYK on both of them for any possible string, and for any if one of them accepts and the other rejects, then the languages are proven to be nonequivalent, proving  $EQ_{CFG}$  to be co-Turing-recognizable.

- 6) The language  $REV_{TM} = \{ \langle M \rangle \mid M \text{ is a TM and } L(M) = w^R \mid w \in L(M) \}$  is undecidable. Assume for contradiction that a TM exists that decides  $REV_{TM}$ . Thus, there is an acceptor for strings that are in this language, and a rejector for strings that are not in this language. This decides  $A_{TM}$ , but according to theorem 4.11,  $A_{TM}$  is undecidable, contradicting the decidability of  $REV_{TM}$ , proving it is not decidable by reduction.