

1. Consider the lang $XOR = \{M, x, y | M \text{ is a TM that halts on precisely one of the strings } x \text{ or } y\}$

Intuition: We can't determine if one of them is going to loop forever or will eventually halt.

Proof by mapping reduction:

Show that $co-A_{TM}$ reduces to XOR. Assume for the sake of contradiction that TM R decides XOR. Then construct a TM S that uses R to decide $co-A_{TM}$

S = "on input M, x, y :

1. Simulate M on X
if M accepts or rejects x, have M loop forever on y
if M accepts or rejects y, have M loop forever on x
else: reject
2. Run R on M, x, y to determine if it accepts one and loops on the other.
3. if R accepts, M rejects, otherwise M accepts.

We know this properly maps because either x or y will halt and the other will loop forever. Therefore we have built a recognizer for $co-A_{TM}$ which we know is not r.e. This is a contradiction, thus XOR is not r.e.

Now we can prove that $co-A_{TM}$ maps to co-XOR.

Proof by mapping reduction:

Show that $co-A_{TM}$ reduces to co-XOR. Assume for the sake of contradiction that TM R decides co-XOR. Then construct a TM S that uses R to recognize $co-A_{TM}$

S = "on input M, x, y :

1. Simulate M on x
if M accepts or rejects x, and accepts or rejects y, accept
else: loop
2. Run R on M, x, y to determine if it halts on both or loops on both.
3. if R accepts, M accepts,

We know this properly maps because either x and y will halt or both will loop forever. Therefore we have built a recognizer for $co-A_{TM}$ which we know is not r.e. This is a contradiction, thus co-XOR is not r.e.

Thus we have proven that XOR is neither r.e. or co-r.e.