Week 9 at a glance

Textbook reading: Section 5.3, Section 5.1, Section 3.2

For Monday, Example 5.26 (page 237).

For Wednesday, Theorem 5.30 (page 238) and skim section 3.2.

Friday: no class in observance of Thanksgiving holiday.

For Monday of Week 10: Definition 7.1 (page 276)

We will be learning and practicing to:

- Clearly and unambiguously communicate computational ideas using appropriate formalism. Translate across levels of abstraction.
  - Give examples of sets that are regular, context-free, decidable, or recognizable (and prove that they are).
    - **Define and explain computational problems, including A_{**}, E_{**}, EQ_{**}, (for ** DFA or TM) and $HALT_{TM}$**
- Know, select and apply appropriate computing knowledge and problem-solving techniques. Reason about computation and systems.
  - Use mapping reduction to deduce the complexity of a language by comparing to the complexity of another.
    - **Explain what it means for one problem to reduce to another**
    - **Define computable functions, and use them to give mapping reductions between computational problems**
    - **Build and analyze mapping reductions between computational problems**
  - Classify the computational complexity of a set of strings by determining whether it is regular, context-free, decidable, or recognizable.
    - **State, prove, and use theorems relating decidability, recognizability, and co-recognizability.**
    - **Prove that a language is decidable or recognizable by defining and analyzing a Turing machines with appropriate properties.**
  - Describe several variants of Turing machines and informally explain why they are equally expressive.
    - **Define an enumerator**
    - **Define nondeterministic Turing machines**
    - **Use high-level descriptions to define and trace machines (Turing machines and enumerators)**
    - **Apply dovetailing in high-level definitions of machines**

TODO:

Review Quiz 9 on PrairieLearn (http://us.prairielearn.com), complete by Sunday 12/1/2024





Monday: Mapping reductions and recognizability

Recall definition: A is **mapping reducible to** B means there is a computable function $f : \Sigma^* \to \Sigma^*$ such that *for all* strings x in Σ^*,

$$x \in A \qquad \text{if and only if} \qquad f(x) \in B.$$ translation

Notation: when A is mapping reducible to B, we write $A \leq_m B$.

Theorem (Sipser 5.23): If $A \leq_m B$ and A is undecidable, then B is undecidable.

Last time we proved that $A_{TM} \leq_m HALT_{TM}$ where

$$HALT_{TM} = \{\langle M, w\rangle \mid M \text{ is a Turing machine, } w \text{ is a string, and } M \text{ halts on } w\}$$

Thm 5.23 $\qquad x = \langle M, w \rangle \rightsquigarrow \langle M'_x, w \rangle$

and since A_{TM} is undecidable, $HALT_{TM}$ is also undecidable. The function witnessing the mapping reduction mapped strings in A_{TM} to strings in $HALT_{TM}$ and strings not in A_{TM} to strings not in $HALT_{TM}$ by changing encoded Turing machines to ones that had identical computations except looped instead of rejecting.

True ~~or False~~: $\overline{A_{TM}} \leq_m \overline{HALT_{TM}}$ Why? Use same function as the one witnesses $A_{TM} \leq_m HALT_{TM}$

$PROP_1 \longleftrightarrow PROP_2 \;\equiv\; \neg PROP_1 \longleftrightarrow \neg PROP_2$

True ~~or False~~: $HALT_{TM} \leq_m A_{TM}$.

Observe: For any A, B $\;A \leq_m B$ guarantees $\overline{A} \leq_m \overline{B}$.

Proof: Need computable function $F : \Sigma^* \to \Sigma^*$ such that $x \in HALT_{TM}$ iff $F(x) \in A_{TM}$. Define

$F =$ " On input x,

1. Type-check whether $x = \langle M, w\rangle$ for some TM M and string w. If so, move to step 2; if not, output $\langle$ → big ◎ , ε $\rangle$ any constant string that's not in A_{TM} will do. OR output x.
2. Construct the following machine M'_x:

   M'_x = " On input y:
   1. Run M on y.
   2. If M accepts, accept.
   3. If M rejects, accept "

3. Output $\langle M'_x, w\rangle$."

want $x = \langle M, w \rangle$ $\qquad f(x) = \langle M'_x, \_ \rangle$

M halts on w then M'_x accepts _

M loops on w then M'_x doesn't accept _

Verifying correctness: (1) Is function well-defined (all inputs x considered) and computable (by F)? (2) Does it have the translation property $x \in HALT_{TM}$ iff its image is in A_{TM}?

	Input string	Output string	
x in $HALT_{TM}$	$\langle M, w\rangle$ where M halts on w — M accepts w	$\langle M'_x, w \rangle$ $\;w \in L(M'_x)$ trace M'_x step 2	$F(x) \in A_{TM}$
	— M rejects w	$\langle M'_x, w \rangle$ $\;w \in L(M'_x)$ trace M'_x step 3	$F(x) \in A_{TM}$
x is not in $HALT_{TM}$	$\langle M, w\rangle$ where M does not halt on w	$\langle M'_x, w \rangle$ $\;w$ $L(M'_x)$ trace M'_x step 1-loop	$F(x) \notin A_{TM}$
	x not encoding any pair of TM and string	$\langle$ → big ◎ , ε $\rangle$	$F(x) \notin A_{TM}$

Why doesn't the function that witnesses

$A_{TM} \leq_m HALT_{TM}$

also witness

$HALT_{TM} \leq_m A_{TM}$?

Have function with property $x \in A_{TM}$ iff $f(x) \in HALT_{TM}$

arbitrary x
- $x \neq \langle M, w \rangle$
- $x = \langle M, w \rangle$ M accepts w
- $x = \langle M, w \rangle$ M rejects w
- $x = \langle M, w \rangle$ M loops on w.

Want $x \in HALT_{TM}$ iff $f(x) \in A_{TM}$

arbitrary string x
- $x \neq \langle M, w \rangle$
- $x = \langle M, w \rangle$ M accepts w
- $x = \langle M, w \rangle$ M rejects w — $x \in HALT_{TM}$ but $f(x) \notin HALT_{TM}$ and so $f(x) \notin A_{TM}$.
- $x = \langle M, w \rangle$ M loops on w.



Function that witnessed $A_{TM} \leq_m HALT_{TM}$ can't be used to witness $HALT_{TM} \leq_m A_{TM}$

Look for another function that might!

- well defined
- computable
- for each string x in Σ^* $x \in HALT_{TM}$ iff $\tilde{f}(x) \in A_{TM}$

---

① $A_{TM} \leq_m HALT_{TM}$

② $HALT_{TM} \leq_m A_{TM}$.

$A_{TM} \neq HALT_{TM}$

$A_{TM} \subsetneq HALT_{TM}$

Theorem (Sipser 5.28): If $A \leq_m B$ and B is recognizable, then A is recognizable.

Proof:

COPY ARGUMENT FOR 5.23

Pf: Let A and B be languages
Assume $A \leq_m B$.
By def, there is f computable function
so that for each string $x \in \Sigma^*$, $x \in A$ iff $f(x) \in B$.

WTS if B is recognizable so is A.

Assume B is recognizable
By definition, there is a TM M_B — Turing machine, $L(M_B) = B$
WTS A is recognizable.

Define M_A = " On input x.
1. Compute $f(x)$ — finitely many steps b/c f is computable
2. Run M_B on $f(x)$
3. If accepts, accept; if rejects, reject "

To show M_A recognizes A, consider arbitrary string x
Case 1: Assume $x \in A$. By def of $f(x)$, $f(x) \in B$. Running M_A on x, step 1 takes finitely long to compute $f(x)$ and M_B on $f(x)$ halts and accepts so M_A accepts x in step 3 ✓

Case 2: Assume $x \notin A$. By def of $f(x)$, $f(x) \notin B$. Running M_A on x, step 1 takes finitely long to compute $f(x)$ and M_B on $f(x)$ halts and rejects so M_A rejects x in step 3 or doesn't halt so M_A doesn't halt on x. Either way, $x \notin L(A)$, as required ✓

Corollary: If $A \leq_m B$ and A is unrecognizable, then B is unrecognizable.

To calibrate "difficulty" of language.

A_{TM} undecidable, recognizable
$HALT_{TM}$ undecidable, recognizable
$\overline{A_{TM}}$ undecidable, unrecognizable
$\overline{HALT_{TM}}$ undecidable, unrecognizable

$A_{TM} \leq_m X$ gives X undecidable
and that $\overline{A_{TM}} \leq_m \overline{X}$

$HALT_{TM} \leq_m X$ gives X undecidable
and that $\overline{HALT_{TM}} \leq_m \overline{X}$.

Strategy:

(i) To prove that a recognizable language R is undecidable, prove that $A_{TM} \leq_m R$.

(ii) To prove that a co-recognizable language U is undecidable, prove that $\overline{A_{TM}} \leq_m U$, i.e. that $A_{TM} \leq_m \overline{U}$.

$$E_{TM} = \{\langle M \rangle \mid M \text{ is a Turing machine and } L(M) = \emptyset\}$$

Can we find algorithms to recognize

E_{TM} ? Not recognizable (needs proof)

$\overline{E_{TM}}$? Recognizable Dovetail the computations of M on each string. if any accept, $\langle M \rangle \notin E_{TM}$.

Claim: $A_{TM} \leq_m \overline{E_{TM}}$. *And hence also* $\overline{A_{TM}} \leq_m E_{TM}$

This will guarantee that $\overline{E_{TM}}$ is undecidable, hence E_{TM} is undecidable and unrecognizable.

Proof: Need computable function $F : \Sigma^* \to \Sigma^*$ such that $x \in A_{TM}$ iff $F(x) \notin E_{TM}$. Define

$F =$ " On input x,

1. Type-check whether $x = \langle M, w \rangle$ for some TM M and string w. If so, move to step 2; if not, output $\langle$  $\rangle$
2. Construct the following machine M'_x:

   M'_x = "On input y
   1. Run M on w
   2. If M accepts w, accept y.
   3. If M rejects w, reject y"

3. Output $\langle M'_x \rangle$."

Verifying correctness: (1) Is function well-defined and computable? (2) Does it have the translation property $x \in A_{TM}$ iff its image is **not** in E_{TM} ?

Goal: $x \in A_{TM}$ iff $F(x) \notin E_{TM}$

Input string	Output string
$x = \langle M, w \rangle$ where $w \in L(M)$ $x \in A_{TM}$	$F(x) = \langle M'_x \rangle$ with $L(M'_x) = \Sigma^*$ $F(x) \notin E_{TM}$
$x = \langle M, w \rangle$ where $w \notin L(M)$ $x \notin A_{TM}$	$F(x) = \langle M'_x$ with $L(M'_x) = \emptyset$ $F(x) \in E_{TM}$
x not encoding any pair of TM and string $x \notin A_{TM}$	$\langle$  $\rangle$ $F(x) \in E_{TM}$

Wednesday: More mapping reductions and other models of computation

Recall: A is **mapping reducible to** B, written $A \leq_m B$, means there is a computable function $f : \Sigma^* \to \Sigma^*$ such that *for all* strings x in Σ^*,

$$x \in A \qquad \text{if and only if} \qquad f(x) \in B.$$

So far:

- A_{TM} is recognizable, undecidable, and not-co-recognizable.
- $\overline{A_{TM}}$ is unrecognizable, undecidable, and co-recognizable.
- $HALT_{TM}$ is recognizable, undecidable, and not-co-recognizable.
- $\overline{HALT_{TM}}$ is unrecognizable, undecidable, and co-recognizable.
- E_{TM} is unrecognizable, undecidable, and co-recognizable.
- $\overline{E_{TM}}$ is recognizable, undecidable, and not-co-recognizable.

$$EQ_{TM} = \{\langle M_1, M_2 \rangle \mid M_1 \text{ and } M_2 \text{ are both Turing machines and } L(M_1) = L(M_2)\}$$

$\forall x$ (M_1 accepts x iff M_2 accepts x)

Can we find algorithms to recognize

EQ_{TM} ? hmm...

$\overline{EQ_{TM}}$? hmm...

Goal: Show that EQ_{TM} is not recognizable and that $\overline{EQ_{TM}}$ is not recognizable.

Using Corollary to **Theorem 5.28**: If $A \leq_m B$ and A is unrecognizable, then B is unrecognizable, it's enough to prove that

$\overline{HALT_{TM}} \leq_m EQ_{TM}$ hence since $\overline{HALT_{TM}}$ is not recognizable neither is EQ_{TM} aka $HALT_{TM} \leq_m \overline{EQ_{TM}}$

$\overline{HALT_{TM}} \leq_m \overline{EQ_{TM}}$ hence since $\overline{HALT_{TM}}$ is not recognizable neither is $\overline{EQ_{TM}}$ aka $HALT_{TM} \leq_m EQ_{TM}$

Goal ① $\overline{HALT_{TM}} \le_m EQ_{TM}$ i.e. $HALT_{TM} \le_m \overline{EQ_{TM}}$

Need computable function $F_1 : \Sigma^* \to \Sigma^*$ such that $x \in HALT_{TM}$ iff $F_1(x) \notin EQ_{TM}$.

Strategy:

Map strings $\langle M, w \rangle$ to strings $\langle M'_x$,  $\rangle$. This image string is not in EQ_{TM} when $L(M'_x) \neq \emptyset$.

We will build M'_x so that $L(M'_x) = \Sigma^*$ when M halts on w and $L(M'_x) = \emptyset$ when M loops on w.

Thus: when $\langle M, w \rangle \in HALT_{TM}$ it gets mapped to a string not in EQ_{TM} and when $\langle M, w \rangle \notin HALT_{TM}$ it gets mapped to a string that is in EQ_{TM}.

Define

$F_1 =$ " On input x,

1. Type-check whether $x = \langle M, w \rangle$ for some TM M and string w. If so, move to step 2; if not, output $\langle$  ,  $\rangle$
2. Construct the following machine M'_x:

   $M'_x =$ " On input y
   1. Run M on w
   2. If M accepts w, accept y
   3. If M rejects w, accept y. "
3. Output $\langle M'_x$,  $\rangle$ "

Verifying correctness: (1) Is function well-defined and computable? (2) Does it have the translation property $x \in HALT_{TM}$ iff its image is **not** in EQ_{TM} ?

Goal: $x \in HALT_{TM}$ iff $F_1(x) \notin EQ_{TM}$

Input string	Output string
$x =$ $\langle M, w \rangle$ where M halts on w	$F_1(x) = < M'_x$,  $>$ recognizes Σ^* recognizes $\emptyset$ $F_1(x) \notin EQ_{TM}$
$x =$ $\langle M, w \rangle$ where M loops on w	$F_1(x) = < M'_x$,  $>$ recognizes $\emptyset$ $F_1(x) \in EQ_{TM}$
x not encoding any pair of TM and string	$F_1(x) = <$  ,  $>$ $F_1(x) \in EQ_{TM}$

Conclude: $HALT_{TM} \le_m \overline{EQ_{TM}}$

Goal ② $\overline{HALT_{TM}} \leq_m \overline{EQ_{TM}}$ i.e. $HALT_{TM} \leq_m EQ_{TM}$

Need computable function $F_2 : \Sigma^* \to \Sigma^*$ such that $x \in HALT_{TM}$ iff $F_2(x) \in EQ_{TM}$.

Strategy:
Map strings $\langle M, w \rangle$ to strings $\langle M'_x,$ start $\to$ q_0 $\rangle$. This image string is in EQ_{TM} when $L(M'_x) = \Sigma^*$.

We will build M'_x so that $L(M'_x) = \Sigma^*$ when M halts on w and $L(M'_x) = \emptyset$ when M loops on w.

Thus: when $\langle M, w \rangle \in HALT_{TM}$ it gets mapped to a string in EQ_{TM} and when $\langle M, w \rangle \notin HALT_{TM}$ it gets mapped to a string that is not in EQ_{TM}.

Define

$F_2 =$ " On input x,

1. Type-check whether $x = \langle M, w \rangle$ for some TM M and string w. If so, move to step 2; if not, output $\langle$ $0, 1, \sqcup \to R$ start $\to$ q_0 q_{acc} , start $\to$ q_0 $\rangle$
2. Construct the following machine M'_x:

   M'_x = " On input y
   1. Run M on w
   2. If M accepts w, accept y
   3. If M rejects w, accept y."

3. Output $\langle M'_x,$ start $\to$ q_0 $\rangle$ "

Verifying correctness: (1) Is function well-defined and computable? (2) Does it have the translation property $x \in HALT_{TM}$ iff its image is in EQ_{TM} ?

Goal: $x \in HALT_{TM}$ iff $F(x) \in EQ_{TM}$

Input string	Output string
$x =$ $\langle M, w \rangle$ where M halts on w	$F_1(x) = \langle M'_x ,$ start $\to$ q_0 $\rangle$ recognizes Σ^* recognizes Σ^* $F_1(x) \in EQ_{TM}$
$x =$ $\langle M, w \rangle$ where M loops on w	$F_1(x) = \langle M'_x ,$ start $\to$ q_0 $\rangle$ recognizes $\emptyset$ $F_1(x) \notin EQ_{TM}$
x not encoding any pair of TM and string	$F_1(x) = \langle$ $0, 1, \sqcup \to R$ start $\to$ q_0 q_{acc} , start $\to$ q_0 $\rangle$ $F_1(x) \notin EQ_{TM}$

Conclude: $HALT_{TM} \leq_m EQ_{TM}$

Two models of computation are called **equally expressive** when every language recognizable with the first model is recognizable with the second, and vice versa.

Church-Turing Thesis (Sipser p. 183): The informal notion of algorithm is formalized completely and correctly by the formal definition of a Turing machine. In other words: all reasonably expressive models of computation are equally expressive with the standard Turing machine.



Some examples of models that are **equally expressive** *with deterministic Turing machines:*

$\boxed{\textbf{May-stay}\text{ machines}}$ The May-stay machine model is the same as the usual Turing machine model, except that on each transition, the tape head may move L, move R, or Stay.

Formally: $(Q, \Sigma, \Gamma, \delta, q_0, q_{accept}, q_{reject})$ where

$$\delta : Q \times \Gamma \to Q \times \Gamma \times \{L, R, S\}$$

Claim: Turing machines and May-stay machines are equally expressive. *To prove ...*

To translate a standard TM to a may-stay machine: never use the direction S!

To translate one of the may-stay machines to standard TM: any time TM would Stay, move right then left.

$\boxed{\textbf{Multitape Turing machine}}$ A multitape Turing macihne with k tapes can be formally representated as $(Q, \Sigma, \Gamma, \delta, q_0, q_{acc}, q_{rej})$ where Q is the finite set of states, Σ is the input alphabet with $\llcorner\!\lrcorner \notin \Sigma$, Γ is the tape alphabet with $\Sigma \subsetneq \Gamma$, $\delta : Q \times \Gamma^k \to Q \times \Gamma^k \times \{L, R\}^k$ (where k is the number of states)

If M is a standard TM, it is a 1-tape machine.

To translate a k-tape machine to a standard TM: Use a new symbol to separate the contents of each tape and keep track of location of head with special version of each tape symbol. Sipser Theorem 3.13



FIGURE 3.14
Representing three tapes with one

structured memory!

Enumerators Enumerators give a different model of computation where a language is **produced, one string at a time**, rather than recognized by accepting (or not) individual strings.

Each enumerator machine has finite state control, unlimited work tape, and a printer. The computation proceeds according to transition function; at any point machine may "send" a string to the printer.

$$E = (Q, \Sigma, \Gamma, \delta, q_0, q_{print})$$

Q is the finite set of states, Σ is the output alphabet, Γ is the tape alphabet ($\Sigma \subsetneq \Gamma, \llcorner\!\lrcorner \in \Gamma \setminus \Sigma$),

$$\delta : Q \times \Gamma \times \Gamma \to Q \times \Gamma \times \Gamma \times \{L, R\} \times \{L, R\}$$

where in state q, when the working tape is scanning character x and the printer tape is scanning character y, $\delta((q, x, y)) = (q', x', y', d_w, d_p)$ means transition to control state q', write x' on the working tape, write y' on the printer tape, move in direction d_w on the working tape, and move in direction d_p on the printer tape. The computation starts in q_0 and each time the computation enters q_{print} the string from the leftmost edge of the printer tape to the first blank cell is considered to be printed.

The language **enumerated** by E, $L(E)$, is $\{w \in \Sigma^* \mid E \text{ eventually, at finite time, prints } w\}$.

Theorem 3.21 A language is Turing-recognizable iff some enumerator enumerates it.

Proof, part 1: Assume L is enumerated by some enumerator, E, so $L = L(E)$. We'll use E in a subroutine within a high-level description of a new Turing machine that we will build to recognize L.

Goal: build Turing machine M_E with $L(M_E) = L(E)$.

Define M_E as follows: $M_E =$ "On input w,

1. Run E. For each string x printed by E.
2. Check if $x = w$. If so, accept (and halt); otherwise, continue."

Proof, part 2: Assume L is Turing-recognizable and there is a Turing machine M with $L = L(M)$. We'll use M in a subroutine within a high-level description of an enumerator that we will build to enumerate L.

Goal: build enumerator E_M with $L(E_M) = L(M)$.

Idea: check each string in turn to see if it is in L.

How? Run computation of M on each string. *But*: need to be careful about computations that don't halt.

Recall String order for $\Sigma = \{0, 1\}$: $s_1 = \varepsilon$, $s_2 = 0$, $s_3 = 1$, $s_4 = 00$, $s_5 = 01$, $s_6 = 10$, $s_7 = 11$, $s_8 = 000$, ...

Define E_M as follows: $E_M =$ " *ignore any input.* Repeat the following for $i = 1, 2, 3, \ldots$

1. Run the computations of M on s_1, s_2, ..., s_i for (at most) i steps each
2. For each of these i computations that accept during the (at most) i steps, print out the accepted string."

Chapter 1: DFAs and NFAs are equally expressive.
Chapter 2: DPDAs and PDAs are NOT equally expressive

Nondeterministic Turing machine

At any point in the computation, the nondeterministic machine may proceed according to several possibilities: $(Q, \Sigma, \Gamma, \delta, q_0, q_{acc}, q_{rej})$ where

$$\delta : Q \times \Gamma \to \mathcal{P}(Q \times \Gamma \times \{L, R\})$$

The computation of a nondeterministic Turing machine is a tree with branching when the next step of the computation has multiple possibilities. A nondeterministic Turing machine accepts a string exactly when some branch of the computation tree enters the accept state.

For N a nondeterministic TM, $L(N) = \{w \in \Sigma^* \mid N \text{ accepts } w\}$

Given a nondeterministic machine, we can use a 3-tape Turing machine to simulate it by doing a breadth-first search of computation tree: one tape is "read-only" input tape, one tape simulates the tape of the nondeterministic computation, and one tape tracks nondeterministic branching. Sipser page 178

NTM $\underbrace{\rightsquigarrow}$ simulated by TM

TM $\underbrace{\rightsquigarrow}$ can be thought of NTM

A language is Turing-recognizable iff there is a nondeterministic Turing machine that recognizes it

Summary

Two models of computation are called **equally expressive** when every language recognizable with the first model is recognizable with the second, and vice versa.

To prove the existence of a Turing machine that decides / recognizes some language, it's enough to construct an example using any of the equally expressive models.

But: some of the **performance** properties of these models are not equivalent.

Friday: No class in observance of Thanksgiving Holiday

