#1

Answer True or False for each of the following claims. (Please refer to the definitions, theorems, and corollaries in Sipser §5.3).

- 1. Let A be the set of (binary representations of) natural numbers and B be the set of (binary representations of) signed integers. Then $A \leq_m B$ under the function $f(n) = 1 \circ n$. (f(n) is implemented by adding a leading one to the binary string n. You may presume f leaves malformed inputs as is.)
- 2. $A_{\text{TM}} \leq_m \mathsf{HALT}_{\text{TM}}$.
- 3. $\mathsf{HALT}_{\mathsf{TM}} \leq_m A_{\mathsf{TM}}$. (Proof not necessary, but what is your hunch?)
- 4. If $A \leq_m B$ and A is decidable then B is decidable.
- 5. If $A \leq_m B$ and B is decidable then A is decidable.
- 6. If $A \leq_m B$ and B is undecidable then A is undecidable.
- 7. If $A \leq_m B$ and A is undecidable then B is undecidable.

#2

Reduce each of the following languages from known, undecidable languages. N.b. Please refer to Prof. Osera's writeup on reductions for a great guide. See course schedule for link.

You do not need to give a proof of correctness.

- 1. $L_1 = \{ M \mid M \text{ is a TM that accepts } w^R \text{ whenever it accepts } w \}$. (Recall that w^R is the reversal of w.)
- 2. $L_2 = \{ (M, w) \mid M \text{ is a TM that, on input } w, \text{ writes a '$'} \text{ on the tape } \}.$

#3

Find a match in the following instance of the Post Correspondence Problem:

$$\left\{ \left[\frac{ab}{abab}\right], \left[\frac{b}{a}\right], \left[\frac{aba}{b}\right], \left[\frac{aa}{a}\right] \right\}.$$