

ICCS310: Assignment 5

Possawat Sanorkam

possawat2017@hotmail.com

March 25, 2021

1: Reject TM

$$\text{REJECT}_{\text{TM}} = \{\langle M, x \rangle \mid M \text{ is a TM that rejects input } x\}$$

Show directly (i.e., without resorting to reduction) that $\text{REJECT}_{\text{TM}}$ is undecidable.

Proof:

We want to show that $\text{REJECT}_{\text{TM}}$ is undecidable by showing the contradiction.

Assume for the sake of contradiction that the TM M_{REJECT} decides $\text{REJECT}_{\text{TM}}$.

On input $\langle M, w \rangle$:

$$M_{\text{REJECT}} = \begin{cases} \text{reject} & \text{if } M \text{ accepts } w \\ \text{accept} & \text{if } M \text{ rejects } w \\ \text{reject} & \text{if } M \text{ loops on } w \end{cases}$$

Also, define TM $Y(\langle X \rangle)$ where X is a TM. On input $\langle X \rangle$,

1. Run M_{REJECT} on $\langle X, \langle X \rangle \rangle$.
2. If M_{REJECT} accepts, we accept. If M_{REJECT} rejects, we reject.

So we have,

$$Y(\langle X \rangle) = \begin{cases} \text{reject} & \text{if } X \text{ accepts } \langle X \rangle \\ \text{accept} & \text{if } X \text{ rejects } \langle X \rangle \\ \text{reject} & \text{if } X \text{ loops on } \langle X \rangle \end{cases}$$

Then,

$$Y(\langle Y \rangle) = \begin{cases} \text{reject} & \text{if } Y \text{ accepts } Y \\ \text{accept} & \text{if } Y \text{ rejects } Y \\ \text{reject} & \text{if } Y \text{ loops on } Y \end{cases}$$

We have that whatever Y try to decides on $\langle Y \rangle$ turns out to be that there is no certain answer and possibly failed to predict the outcome. Since Y cannot decides, then W also cannot decides. Hence, it contradicts to our assumption that M_{REJECT} decides $\text{REJECT}_{\text{TM}}$. Therefore, $\text{REJECT}_{\text{TM}}$ is undecidable. \square

2: Accept vs. Reject

$$\text{ACCEPT}_{\text{TM}} = \{\langle M, x \rangle \mid M \text{ is a TM that accepts input } x\}$$

(i) Prove that $\text{ACCEPT}_{\text{TM}} \leq \text{REJECT}_{\text{TM}}$

Proof:

Suppose that TM M_{REJECT} decides $\text{REJECT}_{\text{TM}}$ and TM M_{ACCEPT} decides $\text{ACCEPT}_{\text{TM}}$, we want to show how to decide $\text{ACCEPT}_{\text{TM}}$ using M_{REJECT} .

Given $\langle M, w \rangle$ as input:

1. Make TM M' from M by reversing the accept and reject states.
2. Run M_{REJECT} with $\langle M', w \rangle$.
3. If M_{REJECT} accepts, we accept. If M_{REJECT} rejects, we reject.

Notice that this mechanism accepts if and only if M accepts w and rejects if and only if M' rejects w .

$$M_{\text{REJECT}} \text{ accepts } \langle M', w \rangle \iff M_{\text{ACCEPT}} \text{ accepts } \langle M, w \rangle$$

Hence, M_{ACCEPT} can correctly decide $\text{ACCEPT}_{\text{TM}}$ provided that there is a TM M_{REJECT} . Therefore, $\text{ACCEPT}_{\text{TM}} \leq \text{REJECT}_{\text{TM}}$. \square

(ii) Prove that $\text{REJECT}_{\text{TM}} \leq \text{ACCEPT}_{\text{TM}}$

Proof:

Suppose that TM M_{REJECT} decides $\text{REJECT}_{\text{TM}}$ and TM M_{ACCEPT} decides $\text{ACCEPT}_{\text{TM}}$, we want to show how to decide $\text{REJECT}_{\text{TM}}$ using M_{ACCEPT} .

Given $\langle M, w \rangle$ as input:

1. Make TM M' from M by reversing the accept and reject states.
2. Run M_{ACCEPT} with $\langle M', w \rangle$.
3. If M_{ACCEPT} accepts, we accept. If M_{ACCEPT} rejects, we reject.

Notice that this mechanism accepts if and only if M accepts w and rejects if and only if M' rejects w .

$$M_{\text{REJECT}} \text{ accepts } \langle M', w \rangle \iff M_{\text{ACCEPT}} \text{ accepts } \langle M, w \rangle$$

Hence, M_{REJECT} can correctly decide $\text{REJECT}_{\text{TM}}$ provided that there is a TM M_{ACCEPT} . Therefore, $\text{REJECT}_{\text{TM}} \leq \text{ACCEPT}_{\text{TM}}$. \square

3: Reverse on TM

$$\text{T} = \{ \langle M \rangle \mid M \text{ is a TM that accepts } \mathbf{rev}(w) \text{ whenever it accepts } w \}$$

where $\mathbf{rev}(w)$ is the reverse of the string w . Show that T is undecidable.

Proof: ($\text{ACCEPT}_{\text{TM}} \leq \text{T}_{\text{TM}}$)

Suppose that TM M_{T} decides T_{TM} and TM M_{ACCEPT} decides $\text{ACCEPT}_{\text{TM}}$, we want to show how to decide $\text{ACCEPT}_{\text{TM}}$ using M_{T} .

On input $\langle M, w \rangle$:

1. Make TM M' that accepts a string w , then it also accepts w^R . On input x :
 - 1.1 If $x = 01$, then accept x .
 - 1.2 If $x \neq 01$, then run M on input w and accept if M accepts.
2. Run M_{T} on $\langle M', w \rangle$.

3. If M_T accepts, we accept. If M_T rejects, we reject.

Notice that this mechanism accepts if and only if M accepts w and rejects if and only if M' rejects w .

$$M_T \text{ accepts } \langle M', w \rangle \iff M_{\text{ACCEPT}} \text{ accepts } \langle M, w \rangle$$

From observation, if M accepts w , then M' accepts every string, so $\langle M' \rangle \in T_{TM}$. If M does not accept w , then only 01 will be accepted which means $\langle M' \rangle \notin T_{TM}$.

Then, M_{ACCEPT} can correctly decide ACCEPT_{TM} provided that there is a TM M_T .

So, $\text{ACCEPT}_{TM} \leq T_{TM}$. Therefore, T is undecidable. \square

4: Undecidability

(i) Show that

$$\text{TOTAL} = \{ \langle M \rangle \mid M \text{ is a Turing machine that halts on every input} \}$$

is undecidable

Proof: ($\text{ACCEPT}_{TM} \leq \text{TOTAL}_{TM}$)

Suppose that TM M_{TOTAL} decides TOTAL_{TM} and TM M_{ACCEPT} decides ACCEPT_{TM} , we want to show how to decide ACCEPT_{TM} using M_{TOTAL} .

Given $\langle M, w \rangle$ as input:

1. Make TM M' from M where if M accepts, we accept and enter loops when M rejects.
2. Run M_{TOTAL} with $\langle M', w \rangle$.
3. If M_{TOTAL} accepts, we accept. If M_{TOTAL} rejects, we reject.

Notice that this mechanism accepts if and only if M accepts w and rejects if and only if M' rejects w .

$$M_{\text{TOTAL}} \text{ accepts } \langle M', w \rangle \iff M_{\text{ACCEPT}} \text{ accepts } \langle M, w \rangle$$

Hence, M_{ACCEPT} can correctly decide ACCEPT_{TM} provided that there is a TM M_{TOTAL} . So, $\text{ACCEPT}_{TM} \leq \text{TOTAL}_{TM}$. Therefore, TOTAL is undecidable. \square

(ii) Show that

$$\text{FINITE} = \{ \langle M \rangle \mid M \text{ is a Turing machine and } L(M) \text{ is a finite set} \}$$

is undecidable

Proof: ($\text{ACCEPT}_{TM} \leq \text{FINITE}_{TM}$)

Suppose that TM M_{FINITE} decides FINITE_{TM} and TM M_{ACCEPT} decides ACCEPT_{TM} , we want to show how to decide ACCEPT_{TM} using M_{FINITE} .

Given $\langle M, w \rangle$ as input:

1. Make TM M' from M where if M accepts, we accept and enter loops when M rejects.
2. Run M_{FINITE} with $\langle M', w \rangle$.
3. If M_{FINITE} accepts, we accept. If M_{FINITE} rejects, we reject.

Notice that this mechanism accepts if and only if M accepts w and rejects if and only if M' rejects w .

$$M_{\text{FINITE}} \text{ accepts } \langle M', w \rangle \iff M_{\text{ACCEPT}} \text{ accepts } \langle M, w \rangle$$

Hence, M_{ACCEPT} can correctly decide $\text{ACCEPT}_{\text{TM}}$ provided that there is a TM M_{FINITE} . So, $\text{ACCEPT}_{\text{TM}} \leq \text{FINITE}_{\text{TM}}$. Therefore, FINITE is undecidable. \square

(iii) Show that

$$\text{REGULAR} = \{ \langle M \rangle \mid M \text{ is a Turing machine and } L(M) \text{ is regular} \}$$

is undecidable

Proof: ($\text{ACCEPT}_{\text{TM}} \leq \text{REGULAR}_{\text{TM}}$)

Suppose that TM M_{REGULAR} decides $\text{REGULAR}_{\text{TM}}$ and TM M_{ACCEPT} decides $\text{ACCEPT}_{\text{TM}}$, we want to show how to decide $\text{ACCEPT}_{\text{TM}}$ using M_{REGULAR} .

Given $\langle M, w \rangle$ as input:

1. Make TM M' from M . On input x :
 - 1.1 If x has the form $0^n 1^n$, accepts.
 - 1.2 If x does not have the form $0^n 1^n$, run M on input w and accept if M accepts w .
2. Run M_{REGULAR} with $\langle M', w \rangle$.
3. If M_{REGULAR} accepts, we accept. If M_{REGULAR} rejects, we reject.

Notice that this mechanism accepts if and only if M accepts w and rejects if and only if M' rejects w .

$$M_{\text{REGULAR}} \text{ accepts } \langle M', w \rangle \iff M_{\text{ACCEPT}} \text{ accepts } \langle M, w \rangle$$

Hence, M_{ACCEPT} can correctly decide $\text{ACCEPT}_{\text{TM}}$ provided that there is a TM M_{REGULAR} . So, $\text{ACCEPT}_{\text{TM}} \leq \text{REGULAR}_{\text{TM}}$. Therefore, REGULAR is undecidable. \square

5: Total Is No Harder Than Finite

Prove that

$$\text{TOTAL} \leq_T \text{FINITE}$$

Proof:

Suppose that TM M_{TOTAL} decides TOTAL_{TM} and TM M_{FINITE} decides $\text{FINITE}_{\text{TM}}$, we want to show how to decide TOTAL_{TM} using M_{FINITE} .

Given $\langle M \rangle$ as input:

1. Run M_{FINITE} on $\langle M \rangle$.
2. If M_{FINITE} accepts, we accept. If M_{FINITE} rejects, we reject.

Refer to the fact that M_{FINITE} can determine whether M has finite set of $L(M)$ or not, M will halt on every input only if $L(M)$ is a finite set. If $L(M)$ is not a finite set, we would not be able to determine that it will halt on every input since there would be at least one input that would not halt.

Hence, M_{TOTAL} can correctly decide TOTAL_{TM} provided that there is a TM M_{FINITE} . Therefore, $\text{ACCEPT}_{\text{TM}} \leq \text{REGULAR}_{\text{TM}}$. \square

6: Finite Is No Harder Than Total

Prove that

$$\text{FINITE} \leq_T \text{TOTAL}$$

Proof:

Suppose that TM M_{TOTAL} decides TOTAL_{TM} and TM M_{FINITE} decides $\text{FINITE}_{\text{TM}}$, we want to show how to decide $\text{FINITE}_{\text{TM}}$ using M_{TOTAL} .

Given $\langle M \rangle$ as input:

1. Run M_{TOTAL} on $\langle M \rangle$.
2. If M_{TOTAL} accepts, we accept. If M_{TOTAL} rejects, we reject.

Refer to the fact that M_{TOTAL} can determine whether M halt on every input or not, $L(M)$ has to be finite set if M halt on every input. If M does not halt on every input, we can tell that $L(M)$ is not finite set since there would be another input to be execute.

Hence, M_{TOTAL} can correctly decide TOTAL_{TM} provided that there is a TM M_{FINITE} . Therefore, $\text{ACCEPT}_{\text{TM}} \leq \text{REGULAR}_{\text{TM}}$. \square

7: Extra: Undecidability of Nontrivial Properties

Proof: It is non trivial. How to decide on it though?