

## 1. Sequence Numbers (20)

### Background

A variadic function  $f : \mathbb{N}^* \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  is called a **coding function** if there are “inverse” functions  $g : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  and  $h : \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} g(f(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n)) &= n, \\ h(f(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n), i) &= a_i, \quad 1 \leq i \leq n \end{aligned}$$

for all sequences  $a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n$ . Thus  $g$  determines the length of the sequence and  $h$  decodes it back into its elements. Moreover,  $h$  and  $g$  are supposed to be easily computable but let's ignore that for the time being. Now consider the pairing function  $\pi$  defined by

$$\pi(x, y) = \binom{x + y + 1}{2} + x + 1$$

and define  $f$  as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} f(\text{nil}) &= 0 \\ f(a) &= \pi(0, a) \\ f(a_1, \dots, a_n) &= \pi(f(a_2, \dots, a_n), a_1) \end{aligned}$$

### Task

- Show that  $\pi$  is injective.
- Show that  $f$  is a coding function. Make sure to explain what the appropriate decoding functions  $g$  and  $h$  are.
- What would happen if we replaced  $\pi(x, y)$  by  $\pi(x, y) - 1$ ? How could you fix the issue?

## 2. Write-First Turing Machines (40)

### Background

It is customary to define Turing machines via a transition function of the form

$$\delta : Q \times \Gamma \rightarrow \Gamma \times \Delta \times Q$$

Here  $Q$  is the set of states,  $\Gamma$  the tape alphabet including a blank symbol, and  $\Delta = \{-1, 0, +1\}$  indicates movement of the head. An instruction  $\delta(p, a) = (b, d, q)$  is interpreted as follows: if the machine is in state  $p$  and reads symbol  $a$  on the tape, it will write symbol  $b$ , move the head by  $d$  and go into state  $q$ . So the inner loop looks like this:

read — write — move — goto

Every action after the read depends on the symbol on the tape. This seems fairly natural, but there are other possibilities. For example, the machine could use a basic cycle

write — move — read — goto

The corresponding transition function has the format

$$\gamma : Q \rightarrow \Gamma \times \Delta \times (\Gamma \rightarrow Q)$$

Suppose the machine is in state  $p$  and  $\gamma(p) = (b, d, f)$ . Then the machine first writes  $b$  and moves the head according to  $d$ . Lastly, it reads the current tape symbol  $c$  (in a possibly new position) and transitions into state  $f(c)$ . For the sake of clarity we refer to these machines as write-first Turing machines (WFTM); their traditional counterparts will be called read-first Turing machines (RFTM).

#### Task

- A. Give a precise definition of what it means for a write-first Turing machine to compute a function.
- B. Show that every write-first Turing machine can be simulated by a read-first machine.
- C. Show that every read-first Turing machine can be simulated by a write-first machine.
- D. How do the machines compare in size?

#### Comment

For simplicity we assume here that  $\delta$  is total, so you will have to find a way to redefine halting.

---

### 3. Minimal Machines (40)

---

#### Background

All models of computation can be associated with a natural size function. This is particularly obvious for machine-based models: the machine is just a finite data structure, and has a canonical size. For example, we could define the size of a Turing machine  $M$  to be the product  $|Q||\Sigma|$ , or the number of bits needed to specify its transition function. Or we could think of the index  $\widehat{M}$  as a natural number, and use that number.

Fix one such measure, and call  $M$  **minimal** if no smaller machine is equivalent to  $M$ . Here equivalent means that  $\forall z (M(z) \simeq M'(z))$ : the computations may unfold in a different way, but the final result has to be the same for all inputs.

#### Task

- A. Explain intuitively why minimality of TMs should not be semidecidable. You might want to start with decidability.
- B. Assume that minimality of TMs is semidecidable. Show that there is an effective enumeration  $(N_e)$  of all minimal TMs.
- C. Show that minimality of TMs fails to be semidecidable using the recursion theorem and part (A).

#### Comment

This can be proven without the recursion theorem, but the argument is much easier using the theorem.