

# Undergrad Complexity Theory: Notes 4

Ben Chaplin

## Contents

<b>1 Complexity</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Complexity classes	1
1.2 Halting problem	1

## 1 Complexity

### 1.1 Complexity classes

**Definition.** Let  $t : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ . The **complexity class TIME** is defined:

$$\text{TIME}(t(n)) = \{L : L \text{ is a language decided by some TM in } O(t(n)) \text{ time}\}.$$

**Example.**  $\text{PALINDROMES} \in \text{TIME}(n^2)$ . Because there is a Turing Machine which decides  $\text{PALINDROMES}$  in  $O(n^2)$  time.

An interesting fact: if there exists a TM deciding some language  $L$  in  $5n^3$  time, then there also exists a TM deciding  $L$  in  $n^3$  time, and  $\frac{1}{1000}n^3$  time... etc. Basically, we can make constants arbitrarily small with Turing Machines by adding states and tape symbols. However the big- $O$  classes remain the same.

**Definition.** The **complexity class P** is defined  $P = \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \text{TIME}(n^k)$ . In other words,  $P$  is the class of languages decidable in polynomial time.

Note that the previous definition is model-agnostic. Even multitape Turing Machines are just a polynomial factor faster than single-tape Turing Machines. So  $P$  is the same no matter which model we choose.

### 1.2 Halting problem

**Definition.**  $\text{ACCEPTS} = \{\langle M, w \rangle : M \text{ is a TM with input alphabet } \Sigma, w \in \Sigma^*, M(w) \text{ accepts}\}.$

**Theorem 1.** *There exists a **Universal TM**  $\mathcal{U}$  that takes as an input  $\langle M, w \rangle$  and simulates  $M(w)$ .*

**Theorem 2** (Turing's Theorem). *There exists no TM  $H$  that decides  $\text{ACCEPTS}$ .*

*Proof.* Assume to the contrary that  $H$  exists. We define another TM  $D$  that takes an input encoding of a Turing machine.  $D$  prepares the input  $\langle M, \langle M \rangle \rangle$  and runs  $H$  on it. Then, if  $H$  accepts,  $D$  rejects, and if  $H$  rejects,  $D$  accepts.

Note that  $D$  is a decider, because  $H$  is a decider. But now, take  $D(\langle D \rangle)$ . The computation will run:

$$H(\langle D, \langle D \rangle \rangle)$$

Say  $D$  accepts  $\langle D \rangle$ . That means  $H$  rejects  $\langle D, \langle D \rangle \rangle$ , which means that  $D$  rejects  $\langle D \rangle$ . We have a contradiction.  $\square$

This argument is known as a diagonalization argument.