# **Computability Exam Solutions**

## July 11, 2011

### **Exercise 1**

### **Definition of the class PR of primitive recursive functions**

The class PR of primitive recursive functions is the smallest class of functions PR  $\subseteq \bigcup_k (\mathbb{N}^k \to \mathbb{N})$  that:

- 1. Contains the basic functions:
  - Zero function: zero(x) = 0
  - Successor function: succ(x) = x + 1
  - Projection functions:  $\pi_i^k(x_1,...,x_k) = x_i$  for  $1 \le i \le k$
- 2. Is closed under composition: If  $g_1,...,g_m \in PR$  and  $h \in PR$ , then  $f \in PR$  where  $f(\vec{x}) = h(g_1(\vec{x}),...,g_m(\vec{x}))$
- 3. Is closed under primitive recursion: If g,  $h \in PR$ , then  $f \in PR$  where:

$$f(\vec{x}, 0) = g(\vec{x})$$
  
 $f(\vec{x}, y+1) = h(\vec{x}, y, f(\vec{x}, y))$ 

## Proof that $\chi_p$ (characteristic function of even numbers) is primitive recursive

We need to show that  $\chi_p(x) = 1$  if x is even, 0 if x is odd.

**Method:** Use the fact that x is even  $\iff$  x mod 2 = 0.

First, we establish auxiliary functions:

1. **Predecessor function pred(x) = x - 1** (primitive recursive):

```
pred(0) = 0
pred(y+1) = y
```

2. **Subtraction function sub(x,y) = x**  $\dot{}$  **y** (primitive recursive):

```
sub(x,0) = x

sub(x,y+1) = pred(sub(x,y))
```

3. Division by 2 with remainder - define  $rem2(x) = x \mod 2$ :

```
rem2(0) = 0

rem2(1) = 1

rem2(x) = rem2(x \div 2) for x \ge 2
```

This can be implemented using primitive recursion:

```
rem2(0) = 0
rem2(y+1) = {
    1 if rem2(y) = 0
    0 if rem2(y) = 1
} = sg(rem2(y))
```

where  $s\bar{g}(x) = 1$  if x = 0, 0 otherwise (primitive recursive).

4. Characteristic function of even numbers:

```
\chi_p(x) = sg(rem2(x))
```

Since  $s\bar{g}$  and rem2 are primitive recursive, and  $\chi_p$  is obtained by composition,  $\chi_p \in PR$ .

Alternative direct construction:

```
\chi_{P}(0) = 1

\chi_{P}(y+1) = sg(\chi_{P}(y))
```

This alternates between 1 and 0, giving 1 for even numbers and 0 for odd numbers.

### **Exercise 2**

Question: Can there exist non-computable f such that there exists non-computable g where f + g is computable?

Answer: Yes, such functions exist.

#### **Construction:**

Let K be the halting set and define:

- $f = \chi_k$  (characteristic function of K)
- $g = \chi_k^-$  (characteristic function of  $\bar{K}$ )

#### **Verification:**

- 1. **f is not computable:** Since K is not recursive,  $\chi_k$  is not computable.
- 2. **g is not computable:** Since  $\bar{K}$  is not recursive,  $\chi_{\bar{k}}$  is not computable.
- 3. **f** + **g** is computable: For any  $x \in \mathbb{N}$ :

```
(f + g)(x) = \chi_k(x) + \chi_k(x) = \{

1 + 0 = 1 \text{ if } x \in K

0 + 1 = 1 \text{ if } x \notin K

\} = 1
```

So f + g is the constant function 1, which is computable.

Therefore, non-computable functions f and g exist such that f + g is computable.

**Note:** This differs from Exercise 2 in the previous exam, which asked whether f + g is computable for **every** other non-computable g.

#### **Exercise 3**

```
Classification of A = \{x \in \mathbb{N} : \phi_x(x) \downarrow \land \phi_x(x) < x + 1\}
```

A is r.e.:

```
sc_a(x) = 1(\mu t. S(x,x,\phi_x(x),t) \wedge \phi_x(x) < x + 1)
```

More precisely:

```
SC_a(x) = 1(\mu(v,t). S(x,x,v,t) \wedge v < x + 1)
```

This searches for v,t such that  $\phi_x(x) = v$  in exactly t steps and v < x + 1.

**A is not recursive:** We show  $K \leq_m A$ . Define  $g : \mathbb{N}^2 \to \mathbb{N}$  by:

Since we can't compute  $sc_k$  directly, we use:

```
g(x,y) = {
    0 if ∃t. H(x,x,t)
    x + 1 otherwise
}
```

By s-m-n theorem,  $\exists s$  such that  $\phi_{s(x)}(y) = g(x,y)$ .

For the reduction, we need  $\phi_{s(x)}(s(x))$  since A tests  $\phi_x(x)$ :

- If  $x \in K$ :  $\phi_{s(x)}(s(x)) = 0 < s(x) + 1$ , so  $s(x) \in A$
- If  $x \notin K$ :  $\phi_{s(x)}(s(x)) = s(x) + 1 \not s(x) + 1$ , so  $s(x) \notin A$

Wait, this doesn't work directly because s(x) appears in the inequality.

Let me use a different approach. Define:

Then:

- If  $x \in K$ :  $\phi_{s(x)}(s(x)) = s(x)$ , and we need s(x) < s(x) + 1, which is true, so  $s(x) \in A$
- If  $x \notin K$ :  $\varphi_{s(x)}(s(x)) = s(x) + 1$ , and we need s(x) + 1 < s(x) + 1, which is false, so  $s(x) \notin A$

This gives  $K \leq_m A$ , so A is not recursive.

**Ā is not r.e.:** Since A is r.e. but not recursive, Ā is not r.e.

**Final classification:** A is r.e. but not recursive; Ā is not r.e.

## **Exercise 4**

Classification of B =  $\{x \in \mathbb{N} : 2W_x \subseteq E_x\}$ 

where  $2X = \{2x : x \in X\}$ .

The set B is saturated since B =  $\{x \mid \varphi_x \in B\}$  where B =  $\{f \mid 2 \cdot dom(f) \subseteq cod(f)\}$ .

**B** is not r.e.: We use Rice-Shapiro theorem. Consider the identity function id ∉ B since:

- dom(id) = N
- $2 \cdot dom(id) = 2N = \{0, 2, 4, 6, ...\}$
- cod(id) = N
- 2N ⊆ N is true

Wait, let me recalculate. We have  $2\mathbb{N} \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ , so id  $\in \mathbb{B}$ .

Consider the finite function  $\theta = \{(1, 0)\} \subseteq id$ :

- $dom(\theta) = \{1\}$
- $2 \cdot dom(\theta) = \{2\}$
- $cod(\theta) = \{0\}$
- $\{2\}$  ⊄  $\{0\}$ , so  $\theta$  ∉ B

Since id  $\in$  B and  $\exists$  finite  $\theta \subseteq$  id with  $\theta \notin$  B, by Rice-Shapiro theorem, B is not r.e.

 $\bar{\mathbf{B}}$  is not r.e.: Consider the function f(x) = x + 1:

- $dom(f) = \mathbb{N}$
- $2 \cdot dom(f) = 2N = \{0, 2, 4, 6, ...\}$
- $cod(f) = \{1, 2, 3, 4, ...\}$
- 2N ⊄ {1, 2, 3, 4, ...} since 0 ∉ {1, 2, 3, 4, ...}

So f ∉ B.

Consider the finite function  $\theta = \{(0, 1)\} \subseteq f$ :

- $2 \cdot dom(\theta) = \{0\}$
- $cod(\theta) = \{1\}$
- $\{0\} \not\subset \{1\}$ , so  $\theta \not\in B$ , hence  $\theta \in \bar{B}$

Since  $f \in \bar{B}$  and  $\exists$  finite  $\theta \subseteq f$  with  $\theta \in \bar{B}$ , this doesn't directly apply Rice-Shapiro for  $\bar{B}$ .

By Rice's theorem and the analysis above, both B and B are not r.e.

**Final classification:** B and B are both not r.e. (and hence not recursive).

#### **Exercise 5**

Question: Can there exist an index  $x \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\bar{K} = \{2^y - 1 : y \in E_x\}$ ?

Answer: No, such an index cannot exist.

#### **Proof:**

Suppose there exists x such that  $\bar{K} = \{2^y - 1 : y \in E_x\}$ .

#### **Key observations:**

- 1. K is not r.e.
- 2. The set  $\{2^y 1 : y \in E_x\}$  is r.e. (as the image of  $E_x$  under the computable function  $f(y) = 2^y 1$ )

#### **Detailed argument:**

Since  $E_x$  is r.e. (as the codomain of the partial computable function  $\phi_x$ ), and the function  $f(y) = 2^y - 1$  is total and computable, the set:

```
\{2^y - 1 : y \in E_x\} = f(E_x)
```

is r.e. (as the image of an r.e. set under a computable function).

But  $\bar{K}$  is not r.e., so we cannot have  $\bar{K} = \{2^y - 1 : y \in E_x\}$ .

## Alternative proof using cardinality:

The set  $\{2^y - 1 : y \in \mathbb{N}\} = \{0, 1, 3, 7, 15, 31, ...\}$  has density 0 in  $\mathbb{N}$  (the number of elements  $\leq$  n grows like log n).

However,  $\bar{K}$  has positive density (roughly half of all numbers), so  $\bar{K}$  cannot be equal to any subset of  $\{2^y - 1 : y \in \mathbb{N}\}$ .

Therefore, no such index x can exist.