

## Week6 monday

For Turing machine  $M = (Q, \Sigma, \Gamma, \delta, q_0, q_{accept}, q_{reject})$  the **computation** of  $M$  on a string  $w$  over  $\Sigma$  is:

- Read/write head starts at leftmost position on tape.
- Input string is written on  $|w|$ -many leftmost cells of tape, rest of the tape cells have the blank symbol. **Tape alphabet** is  $\Gamma$  with  $\sqcup \in \Gamma$  and  $\Sigma \subseteq \Gamma$ . The blank symbol  $\sqcup \notin \Sigma$ .
- Given current state of machine and current symbol being read at the tape head, the machine transitions to next state, writes a symbol to the current position of the tape head (overwriting existing symbol), and moves the tape head L or R (if possible). Formally, **transition function** is

$$\delta : Q \times \Gamma \rightarrow Q \times \Gamma \times \{L, R\}$$

- Computation ends if and when machine enters either the accept or the reject state. This is called **halting**. Note:  $q_{accept} \neq q_{reject}$ .

The **language recognized by the Turing machine**  $M$ , is

$$\{w \in \Sigma^* \mid \text{computation of } M \text{ on } w \text{ halts after entering the accept state}\} = \{w \in \Sigma^* \mid w \text{ is accepted by } M\}$$

To define a Turing machine, we could give a

- **Formal definition**, namely the 7-tuple of parameters including set of states, input alphabet, tape alphabet, transition function, start state, accept state, and reject state; or,
- **Implementation-level definition**: English prose that describes the Turing machine head movements relative to contents of tape, and conditions for accepting / rejecting based on those contents.

Conventions for drawing state diagrams of Turing machines: (1) omit the reject state from the diagram (unless it's the start state), (2) any missing transitions in the state diagram have value  $(q_{reject}, \sqcup, R)$ .

*Sipser Figure 3.10*



Computation on input string 01#01

[illegible]

Implementation level description of this machine:

Zig-zag across tape to corresponding positions on either side of  $\#$  to check whether the characters in these positions agree. If they do not, or if there is no  $\#$ , reject. If they do, cross them off.

Once all symbols to the left of the # are crossed off, check for any un-crossed-off symbols to the right of #; if there are any, reject; if there aren't, accept.

The language recognized by this machine is

$$\{w\#w \mid w \in \{0,1\}^*\}$$

A language  $L$  is **recognized by** a Turing machine  $M$  means

A Turing machine  $M$  **recognizes** a language  $L$  if means

A Turing machine  $M$  is a **decider** means

A language  $L$  is **decided by** a Turing machine  $M$  means

A Turing machine  $M$  **decides** a language  $L$  means

Fix  $\Sigma = \{0, 1\}$ ,  $\Gamma = \{0, 1, \sqcup\}$  for the Turing machines with the following state diagrams:

 <p>Implementation level description:</p> <p>Example of string accepted: Example of string rejected:</p> <p>Decider? Yes / No</p>	 <p>Implementation level description:</p> <p>Example of string accepted: Example of string rejected:</p> <p>Decider? Yes / No</p>
 <p>Implementation level description:</p> <p>Example of string accepted: Example of string rejected:</p> <p>Decider? Yes / No</p>	 <p>Implementation level description:</p> <p>Example of string accepted: Example of string rejected:</p> <p>Decider? Yes / No</p>

## Week6 wednesday

Two models of computation are called **equally expressive** when every language recognizable with the first model is recognizable with the second, and vice versa.

True / False: NFAs and PDAs are equally expressive.

True / False: Regular expressions and CFGs are equally expressive.

*Some examples of models that are **equally expressive** with deterministic Turing machines:*

**May-stay machines** The May-stay machine model is the same as the usual Turing machine model, except that on each transition, the tape head may move L, move R, or Stay.

Formally:  $(Q, \Sigma, \Gamma, \delta, q_0, q_{accept}, q_{reject})$  where

$$\delta : Q \times \Gamma \rightarrow Q \times \Gamma \times \{L, R, S\}$$

**Claim:** Turing machines and May-stay machines are equally expressive. *To prove ...*

To translate a standard TM to a may-stay machine:

To translate one of the may-stay machines to standard TM: any time TM would Stay, move right then left.

Formally: suppose  $M_S = (Q, \Sigma, \Gamma, \delta, q_0, q_{acc}, q_{rej})$  has  $\delta : Q \times \Gamma \rightarrow Q \times \Gamma \times \{L, R, S\}$ . Define the Turing-machine

$$M_{new} = ($$

)

**Multitape Turing machine** A multitape Turing machine with  $k$  tapes can be formally represented as  $(Q, \Sigma, \Gamma, \delta, q_0, q_{acc}, q_{rej})$  where  $Q$  is the finite set of states,  $\Sigma$  is the input alphabet with  $\sqcup \notin \Sigma$ ,  $\Gamma$  is the tape alphabet with  $\Sigma \subsetneq \Gamma$ ,  $\delta : Q \times \Gamma^k \rightarrow Q \times \Gamma^k \times \{L, R\}^k$  (where  $k$  is the number of tapes)

If  $M$  is a standard TM, it is a 1-tape machine.

To translate a  $k$ -tape machine to a standard TM: Use a new symbol to separate the contents of each tape and keep track of location of head with special version of each tape symbol. Sipser Theorem 3.13



**FIGURE 3.14**  
Representing three tapes with one

*Extra practice:* **Wikipedia Turing machine** Define a machine  $(Q, \Gamma, b, \Sigma, q_0, F, \delta)$  where  $Q$  is the finite set of states,  $\Gamma$  is the tape alphabet,  $b \in \Gamma$  is the blank symbol,  $\Sigma \subsetneq \Gamma$  is the input alphabet,  $q_0 \in Q$  is the start state,  $F \subseteq Q$  is the set of accept states,  $\delta : (Q \setminus F) \times \Gamma \rightarrow Q \times \Gamma \times \{L, R\}$  is a partial transition function. If computation enters a state in  $F$ , it accepts. If computation enters a configuration where  $\delta$  is not defined, it rejects. Hopcroft and Ullman, cited by Wikipedia

**Enumerators** Enumerators give a different model of computation where a language is **produced, one string at a time**, rather than recognized by accepting (or not) individual strings.

Each enumerator machine has finite state control, unlimited work tape, and a printer. The computation proceeds according to transition function; at any point machine may “send” a string to the printer.


$$E = (Q, \Sigma, \Gamma, \delta, q_0, q_{print})$$

$Q$  is the finite set of states,  $\Sigma$  is the output alphabet,  $\Gamma$  is the tape alphabet ( $\Sigma \subsetneq \Gamma, \sqcup \in \Gamma \setminus \Sigma$ ),

$$\delta : Q \times \Gamma \times \Gamma \rightarrow Q \times \Gamma \times \Gamma \times \{L, R\} \times \{L, R\}$$

where in state  $q$ , when the working tape is scanning character  $x$  and the printer tape is scanning character  $y$ ,  $\delta((q, x, y)) = (q', x', y', d_w, d_p)$  means transition to control state  $q'$ , write  $x'$  on the working tape, write  $y'$  on the printer tape, move in direction  $d_w$  on the working tape, and move in direction  $d_p$  on the printer tape. The computation starts in  $q_0$  and each time the computation enters  $q_{print}$  the string from the leftmost edge of the printer tape to the first blank cell is considered to be printed.

The language **enumerated** by  $E$ ,  $L(E)$ , is  $\{w \in \Sigma^* \mid E \text{ eventually, at finite time, prints } w\}$ .



q0						
␣ *	␣	␣	␣	␣	␣	␣
␣ *	␣	␣	␣	␣	␣	␣

**Theorem 3.21** A language is Turing-recognizable iff some enumerator enumerates it. *Proof next time ...*

## Week6 friday

To define a Turing machine, we could give a

- **Formal definition:** the 7-tuple of parameters including set of states, input alphabet, tape alphabet, transition function, start state, accept state, and reject state; or,
- **Implementation-level definition:** English prose that describes the Turing machine head movements relative to contents of tape, and conditions for accepting / rejecting based on those contents.
- **High-level description:** description of algorithm (precise sequence of instructions), without implementation details of machine. As part of this description, can “call” and run another TM as a subroutine.

**Theorem 3.21** A language is Turing-recognizable iff some enumerator enumerates it.

**Proof:**

Assume  $L$  is enumerated by some enumerator,  $E$ , so  $L = L(E)$ . We’ll use  $E$  in a subroutine within a high-level description of a new Turing machine that we will build to recognize  $L$ .

**Goal:** build Turing machine  $M_E$  with  $L(M_E) = L(E)$ .

Define  $M_E$  as follows:  $M_E =$  “On input  $w$ ,

1. Run  $E$ . For each string  $x$  printed by  $E$ .
2. Check if  $x = w$ . If so, accept (and halt); otherwise, continue.”

Assume  $L$  is Turing-recognizable and there is a Turing machine  $M$  with  $L = L(M)$ . We’ll use  $M$  in a subroutine within a high-level description of an enumerator that we will build to enumerate  $L$ .

**Goal:** build enumerator  $E_M$  with  $L(E_M) = L(M)$ .

**Idea:** check each string in turn to see if it is in  $L$ .

*How?* Run computation of  $M$  on each string. *But:* need to be careful about computations that don’t halt.

*Recall* String order for  $\Sigma = \{0, 1\}$ :  $s_1 = \varepsilon$ ,  $s_2 = 0$ ,  $s_3 = 1$ ,  $s_4 = 00$ ,  $s_5 = 01$ ,  $s_6 = 10$ ,  $s_7 = 11$ ,  $s_8 = 000$ , ...

Define  $E_M$  as follows:  $E_M =$  “*ignore any input*. Repeat the following for  $i = 1, 2, 3, \dots$

1. Run the computations of  $M$  on  $s_1, s_2, \dots, s_i$  for (at most)  $i$  steps each
2. For each of these  $i$  computations that accept during the (at most)  $i$  steps, print out the accepted string.”

## Nondeterministic Turing machine

At any point in the computation, the nondeterministic machine may proceed according to several possibilities:  $(Q, \Sigma, \Gamma, \delta, q_0, q_{acc}, q_{rej})$  where

$$\delta : Q \times \Gamma \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(Q \times \Gamma \times \{L, R\})$$

The computation of a nondeterministic Turing machine is a tree with branching when the next step of the computation has multiple possibilities. A nondeterministic Turing machine accepts a string exactly when some branch of the computation tree enters the accept state.

Given a nondeterministic machine, we can use a 3-tape Turing machine to simulate it by doing a breadth-first search of computation tree: one tape is “read-only” input tape, one tape simulates the tape of the nondeterministic computation, and one tape tracks nondeterministic branching. Sipser page 178

Two models of computation are called **equally expressive** when every language recognizable with the first model is recognizable with the second, and vice versa.

**Church-Turing Thesis** (Sipser p. 183): The informal notion of algorithm is formalized completely and correctly by the formal definition of a Turing machine. In other words: all reasonably expressive models of computation are equally expressive with the standard Turing machine.



**Claim:** If two languages (over a fixed alphabet  $\Sigma$ ) are Turing-recognizable, then their union is as well.

**Proof using Turing machines:**

**Proof using nondeterministic Turing machines:**

**Proof using enumerators:**