

2/2 Exercise 7.1

(a)

$$x_1 = \text{dec}(101) = 5, \quad x_2 = \text{dec}(0) = 0, \quad x_3 = \text{dec}(11) = 3, \quad y = \text{dec}(1001) = 9 \quad \checkmark$$

(b)

$$x_1 = \text{dec}(11) = 3, \quad x_2 = \text{dec}(100) = 4, \quad x_3 = \text{dec}(1) = 1, \quad y = \text{undefined} \quad \checkmark$$

2/2 Exercise 7.2

Step 1. Check if $n_2 = 0$: if **true** write $n_1 = 1$, remove n_2, n_3 from tape and terminate. \checkmark

Step 2. Check if $n_2 = 1$: if **true** remove n_2, n_3 from tape and terminate. \checkmark

Step 3. Copy n_1 to n_3 .

Step 4. $M_{pred_1}(n_2)$.

Step 5. $M_{mul}(n_1, n_3)$ and write result to n_1 .

Step 6. Check if $n_2 = 1$: if **true** remove n_2, n_3 from tape and terminate. \checkmark

Step 7. Jump to Step 4. \checkmark

2/2 Exercise 7.3

To show that the composition $(f \circ g) : \Sigma_1^* \rightarrow \Sigma_2^*$ is Turing-computable, we can build a TM that simulates the computations of f and g sequentially. This TM would work as follows:

1. Start the TM with the input x .
2. Use a Turing machine that simulates the computation of g on x . If $g(x)$ is undefined, then halt and output *undefined*.
3. Use a Turing machine that simulates the computation of f on $g(x)$. If $f(g(x))$ is undefined, then halt and output *undefined*.
4. If $f(g(x))$ is defined, output it as the result of the composition. \checkmark

Since we assume that f and g are Turing-computable, we know that there exist Turing machines that can compute f and g respectively. Therefore, we can construct a Turing machine that combines the computations of these two machines, and this new machine can compute the composition of f and g for any input. Therefore, we have shown that the composition of two Turing-computable partial functions is also Turing-computable. \checkmark

0/2 **Exercise 7.4** this is not about set relations \leq is for reductions

Let w be an arbitrary string in A . Since A is a subset of B , we know that w is also in B . Similarly, since B is a subset of C , we know that w is also in C . Therefore, w is in A and in C , which implies that A is a subset of C , or $A \leq C$.

Thus, we have shown that if $A \leq B$ and $B \leq C$, then $A \leq C$ for any languages A, B and C . This is a result of the transitive property of set inclusion. \times

1/2 **Exercise 7.5**

- (a) If $R \leq L$, and R is not decidable, then L is also not decidable. \checkmark However, since R is Turing-recognizable, L must also be Turing-recognizable. \times
- (b) If $L \leq U$, and U is not Turing-recognizable, then L is also not Turing-recognizable and cannot be decidable either. \times
- (c) If $D \leq L$, and D is decidable, then we cannot tell from the given information whether L is decidable and/or Turing-recognizable. \checkmark
- (d) If $L \leq D$, and D is decidable, then L is also decidable. However, since D is decidable, it is also Turing-recognizable. Therefore, L is both decidable and Turing-recognizable. \checkmark