

Undergrad Complexity: Problem Set 1

Ben Chaplin

Problem 1. 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:

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

for all sequences a_1, \dots, a_n . Thus g determines the length of a sequence and h decodes it back to 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 π defined by:

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

and define f as follows:

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

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

Answer (1.1). First, note that:

$$\binom{x + y + 1}{2} = \frac{(x + y)(x + y + 1)}{2} \tag{1}$$

$$= 1 + 2 + \dots + (x + y) \tag{2}$$

Take $(x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}$ such that $\pi(x_1, y_1) = \pi(x_2, y_2)$. Assume to the contrary that $x_1 + y_1 \neq x_2 + y_2$, and without loss of generality, suppose that $x_1 + y_1 < x_2 + y_2$.

$$\binom{x_1 + y_1 + 1}{2} + x_1 + 1 = \binom{x_2 + y_2 + 1}{2} + x_2 + 1$$

By (1) and (2):

$$\begin{aligned}
1 + 2 + \dots + (x_1 + y_1) + x_1 + 1 &= 1 + 2 + \dots + (x_2 + y_2) + x_2 + 1 \\
x_1 - x_2 &= (1 + 2 + \dots + (x_2 + y_2)) - (1 + 2 + \dots + (x_1 + y_1)) \\
&\geq x_2 + y_2 \\
x_1 &\geq 2x_2 + y_2 \\
x_1 + y_1 &\geq 2x_2 + y_2 + y_1 \\
&\geq x_2 + y_2,
\end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

a contradiction. Thus $x_1 + y_1 = x_2 + y_2$. Then, by (3), $x_1 = x_2$. So $y_1 = y_2$ and π is injective.

Answer (1.2).

Lemma 1. *f is injective over inputs of the same size.*

Proof. We proceed by induction over the size of the input. If $n = 1$, then $f(x) = \pi(0, x)$, so f is injective by the fact that π is injective. Suppose f is injective for inputs of size $n - 1$ and consider inputs of size n : $(a_1, \dots, a_n), (b_1, \dots, b_n) \in \mathbb{N}^n$ where $f(a_1, \dots, a_n) = f(b_1, \dots, b_n)$.

$$\begin{aligned}
f(a_1, \dots, a_n) &= f(b_1, \dots, b_n) \\
\pi(f(a_2, \dots, a_n), a_1) &= \pi(f(b_2, \dots, b_n), b_1)
\end{aligned}$$

So by the fact that π is injective, $a_1 = b_1$ and $f(a_2, \dots, a_n) = f(b_2, \dots, b_n)$. Thus, $a_i = b_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$. \square

Lemma 2. *$f(\mathbb{N}^n)$ and $f(\mathbb{N}^m)$ are disjoint for any $n \neq m \in \mathbb{N}$.*

Proof. Suppose $m < n$ and $f(a_1, \dots, a_m) = f(b_1, \dots, b_n)$. Then:

$$\pi(f(a_2, \dots, a_m), a_1) = \pi(f(b_2, \dots, b_n), b_1)$$

Then $a_1 = b_1$. Furthermore, because π is injective:

$$\pi(f(a_3, \dots, a_m), a_2) = \pi(f(b_3, \dots, b_n), b_2)$$

So $a_2 = b_2$. By the same logic, $a_i = b_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq m$. But then we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\pi(f(\text{nil}), a_m) &= \pi(f(b_{m+1}, \dots, b_n), b_m) \\
f(\text{nil}) &= f(b_{m+1}, \dots, b_n) \\
0 &= f(b_{m+1}, \dots, b_n)
\end{aligned}$$

But this cannot be the case because $f(x) > 0$ for all $x \in \mathbb{N}^* - \{\text{nil}\}$. \square

Lemma 1 and **Lemma 2** show that f is injective over \mathbb{N}^* . Thus, f has a partial inverse. We can now define g and h over all $x \in f(\mathbb{N}^*)$.

$$\begin{aligned}
g(x) &= |(f^{-1}(x))| \\
h(x, i) &= P_i^{|f^{-1}(x)|}(f^{-1}(x))
\end{aligned}$$

where P is the projection function

Answer (1.3). Defining π as:

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

does not change the fact that π is injective. However, it throws a wrench in our proof of **Lemma 2** from **Answer 1.2**. We can no longer assume that $f(x) > 0$ for all $x \in \mathbb{N}^* - \{nil\}$, as now:

$$f(0) = f(0, 0) = \dots = 0$$

Actually, now **Lemma 2** is false. A counterexample: $f(x) = f(x, 0)$. But trailing 0's are the only case—we can see this via the proof of **Lemma 2**. We can define f^{-1} more carefully:

$$f^{-1}(a_1, \dots, a_n) = f^{-1}(a_1, \dots, a_i)$$

where $a_i \neq 0$ for the largest $i \leq n$. h can be saved with a modified projection function that returns 0 for indices greater than what exist. But g is a goner.