

1. Consider the problem of determining whether a Turing machine ever writes a particular symbol $\gamma \in \Gamma - \Sigma$ on its tape when it is run on input w .

(a) (___ /1 pt) Formulate this problem as a language.

$$C = \{ \langle M, w \rangle \mid M \text{ is TM and writes } \gamma \in \Gamma - \Sigma \text{ on its tape when given } w. \}$$

(b) (___ /2 pts) How would the proof that the language above is undecidable differ from the proof, on homework, of the undecidability of

$$B = \{ \langle M, w \rangle \mid M \text{ 2-tape TM that writes } \gamma \neq \sqcup \text{ on 2nd tape given } w \}?$$

T = "On input x :

1. Simulate M' on x

2. If simulation shows that M' accepts, write γ anywhere on tape. "

Where M' is M , except if it uses γ , instead it uses γ' .

2. Let $R_{TM} = \{ \langle M \rangle \mid M \text{ is a TM and } L(M) \text{ is regular} \}$. Consider, from homework, the proof that R_{TM} is undecidable, and answer the following.

(a) (___ /2 pts) M_2 is constructed to first accept input x of the form $0^n 1^n$. If x does not have this form, run M on input w and accept if M accepts w .

(b) (___ /2 pts) Consider $C_{TM} = \{ \langle M \rangle \mid M \text{ is TM and } L(M) \text{ is CFL} \}$. How can you change this proof to instead show that C_{TM} is undecidable?

Change $0^n 1^n$ to an expression which describes a language which is not context-free.

E.g. $0^n 1^n 2^n$, as established in class via the pumping lemma.

3. Let $Z_{CFG} = \{ \langle G \rangle \mid G \text{ is CFG and } L(G) = \Sigma^* \}$. Consider, from homework, the proof of Theorem 5.13: Z_{CFG} is undecidable.

(a) (___ /1 pt) The CFG G is designed to generate all strings that are not accepting computational histories for M on input w .

(b) (___ /2 pts) Instead of constructing CFG G , we instead create PDA D . Since D uses the stack structure, we write every other configuration (C_i) in reverse order.