

hw9

● Graded

Student

Giancarlos Marte

Total Points

28 / 42 pts

Question 1

countable or uncountable

9.5 / 12 pts

1.1 — **countable**

5.5 / 6 pts

- ✓ - 0.5 pts Not specific enough stating that for bijection, mapping must start with length 1 strings, then length 2, ...

1.2 — **uncountable**

4 / 6 pts

- ✓ - 1 pt Possibility for number to still end up in set

- ✓ - 1 pt diagonalization not correct; cannot assume sets have an order

- 💬 If you're going to do something like this, watch out for corner cases, 2 is both even and prime, and there are multiple odd prime numbers. The point of this is to take a number not in that set without specifying an order to the set, which you do not do since you specify to take a certain number from a certain set.

Question 2

cs420 fall 2022 undecidable

7.5 / 10 pts

- ✓ - 1 pt Did not construct/did not specify inner TM M1 (or equivalent) for accepting "CS420" and "Fall2022"

- ✓ - 0.5 pts Incomplete termination argument

- ✓ - 1 pt Issue with TM construction

- 💬 TM M1 should be checking for x equaling the strings, you shouldn't just assign x to be them or else you're negating all the other possibilities. Also, if R accepts, then that means the simulation with M on w already happened in M1 and M1 accepted.

Question 3

closed op for decidable langs

7 / 9 pts

- ✓ - 1 pt decider input incorrect or didnt specify input; should just be a string w

- ✓ - 1 pt termination argument for decider: missing or incorrect

Question 4

re-proving EQ_{TM} undecidable

3 / 10 pts

✓ - 4 pts didnt construct decider for $CS420_{F22}$

✓ - 1 pt missing termination argument for decider

✓ - 2 pts didnt construct TM that accepts "cs420" and "fall2022", to compare with input M

Question 5

readme

1 / 1 pt

✓ - 0 pts Correct

Question assigned to the following page: [1.1](#)

1) Countable or Not Countable?

1a) Infinite Monkey Theorem

"a monkey hitting keys at random on a typewriter keyboard for an infinite amount of time will almost surely type any given text, such as the complete works of William Shakespeare"

step	statement	justification												
1	prove the set of possible monkey outputs is at least countable.	statement to prove												
2	You may assume that a monkey output is a string drawn from the alphabet $\Sigma = \{a, ..., z, A, ..., Z, _\}$, where $_$ represents a space.	given												
3	A set is countable if it is finite or there exists a bijection between the set and the set of natural numbers.	definition of countable from class												
4	The monkey is hitting keys for an infinite amount of time.	given												
5	<div>Let $\beta = element \in \Sigma$ Let $\alpha(\beta) = natural\ number\ element\ is\ paired\ to$<table><tr><td>$\beta$</td><td>$\alpha(\beta)$</td></tr><tr><td>a</td><td>1</td></tr><tr><td>b</td><td>2</td></tr><tr><td>...</td><td>...</td></tr><tr><td>Z</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>_</td><td>53</td></tr></table><div>a to z = 26 A to Z and space = 27 total = 53</div></div>	β	$\alpha(\beta)$	a	1	b	2	Z		_	53	alphabet is finite
β	$\alpha(\beta)$													
a	1													
b	2													
...	...													
Z														
_	53													
6	Let $f(x)$ be a function that maps all combinations of elements to their own unique natural numbers starting at 54.	computation												
7	There is a bijection between the set of possible monkey outputs and the natural numbers	(5) and (6)												

Question assigned to the following page: [1.1](#)

8	The set of possible monkey outputs is at least countable.	(3)
---	---	-----



Question assigned to the following page: [1.2](#)

1b)

step	statement	justification								
1	Now show that the set of all possible such sets, i.e., the set of all possible infinite subsets of the natural numbers, is not countable	statement to prove								
2	proof by contradiction	proof strategy								
3	assume a bijection between the natural and the set of all possible infinite subsets of the natural numbers exists.	(2)								
4	<table border="1"><tr><td>n</td><td>f(n)</td></tr><tr><td>1</td><td>{even, odd, prime...}</td></tr><tr><td>2</td><td>{odd, prime, even</td></tr><tr><td>...</td><td></td></tr></table> <p>This shows that some infinite subset of the natural number is not mapped to.</p> <p>$x = \{\text{prime, odd, even, ...}\}$ This set is not in the mapping</p>	n	f(n)	1	{even, odd, prime...}	2	{odd, prime, even	...		diagonalization
n	f(n)									
1	{even, odd, prime...}									
2	{odd, prime, even									
...										
5	the set of all possible infinite subsets of the natural numbers, is not countable	(4)								



Question assigned to the following page: [2](#)

2) Trying to decide about CS420, Fall 2022

step	statement	justification
1	prove the following language is undecidable: $CS420_{F22} = \{ \langle M \rangle \mid M \text{ is a TM} \}$ <i>where $CS420 \in L(M)$ and $Fall2022 \in L(M)$</i>	statement to prove
2	proof by contradiction	method of proof
3	Assume $CS420_{F22}$ has a decider R; use it to create a decider for A_{TM}	assumption and (2)
4	Let x be a string from L(M), where $x = CS420 = Fall2022$ $S = \text{"On input } \langle M \rangle, \text{ an encoding of a TM } M:$ 1. run TM R on input $\langle M \rangle$ 2. If R rejects, reject. 3. If R accepts, simulate M on x until it halts. 4. If M has accepted, accept; if M has rejected, reject."	creating a decider
5	Step 1: R is a decider so it always halts Step 3: M always halts because R said it does.	termination argument
6	A_{TM} is undecidable, which means this decider does not exist.	using previous theorem
7	$CS420_{F22}$ is undecidable.	(6)



Question assigned to the following page: [3](#)

3) A closed operation for decidable languages

$OV(L_1, L_2)$ = The largest set of all strings X such that $X \subseteq L_1$ and $X \subseteq L_2$

prove OV is closed for decidable languages

3.1) If L_1, L_2 and the resulting set of $OV(L_1, L_2)$ are decidable languages, then OV is closed for decidable languages.

3.2)

step	statement	justification
1	Let L_1 and L_2 be decidable languages, with A and B being their corresponding deciders.	given
2	Let $F = OV(L_1, L_2)$, where $F = \{ \langle A, X \rangle \mid A \text{ is a decider and } X \text{ is a string} \}$	renaming and given
3	A_F has a decider R ; use it to create a decider for A_{TM} : $S =$ "On input $\langle A, X \rangle$, where A is a TM and X is a string: 1. run TM R on input $\langle A, X \rangle$ 2. If R rejects, reject. 3. If R accepts, simulate A on x until it halts. 4. If A has accepted, accept; if A has rejected, reject."	computation
4	If L_1, L_2 and the resulting set of $OV(L_1, L_2)$ are decidable languages, then OV is closed for decidable languages.	(3)



Question assigned to the following page: [4](#)

4) Re-proving that EQ_TM is undecidable

step	statement	justification
1	prove the following language is undecidable: EQ_TM	statement to prove
2	proof by contradiction	method of proof
3	EQ_TM has decider R; use it to create decider for CS420 _{F22}	assumption
	S= "On input <M> where M is a TM: 1. Run R on input...	



Question assigned to the following page: [5](#)

README

other students: none

websites/books used: lecture slides

time spent: 1hr (did not have time to finish or do it correctly)