Solutions to Problems on Decidability

Traehan Arnold

4/18/2025

Exercise 1

Classify each language as:

- Decidable
- Recursively Enumerable (r.e.)
- co-Recursively Enumerable (co-r.e.)
- 1. $L_1 := \{M \mid M \text{ halts on itself}\}$ This is a version of the **diagonal halting problem**, which is known to be:
 - Not decidable (by reduction from the halting problem),
 - Not r.e. (there's no TM that semi-decides it),
 - Not co-r.e. (its complement is not r.e. either).
- 2. $L_2 := \{(M, w) \mid M \text{ halts on } w\}$ This is the classic **Halting Problem**, which is:
 - Not decidable,
 - Recursively enumerable (r.e.) (can simulate M on w and accept if it halts),
 - Not co-r.e..
- 3. $L_3 := \{(M, w, k) \mid M \text{ halts on } w \text{ in at most } k \text{ steps}\}$ This is **decidable**, because:
 - You can simulate M on w for at most k steps.
 - \bullet Halt and accept if M halts within k steps; otherwise, reject.

Exercise 2

- 1. **True.** The union of two decidable languages is also decidable. Run both deciders and accept if either accepts.
- 2. True. The class of decidable languages is closed under complement. If L is decidable, we can construct a TM that rejects when L accepts and vice versa.
- 3. True. If L is decidable, then L^* is also decidable. You can nondeterministically split the input string and test each part with the decider for L.
- 4. **True.** The union of two r.e. languages is also r.e. You can dovetail both TMs and accept if either one accepts.
- 5. **False.** The complement of an r.e. language is not necessarily r.e. Counterexample: the Halting Problem is r.e., but its complement is not.
- 6. False. L^* may not be r.e. even if L is. For example, let $L=\{w\mid M_w \text{ halts}\}$. Then L^* is not r.e. in general.