

Name :- Sumit Kumar Yadav

Roll No :- 18CS30042

Page No.

Date

Solⁿ :- 1:- Consider P : property on P

st: $P: C \rightarrow \{T, \perp\}$

where, C is set of partially rec. fn.

now, $P = \{i \mid f_i \in C \ \& \ P(f_i)\}$

where i is the index of partially rec. fn.
(encoding of $M(TM)$ that computes f)

$x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{N}$, $P(x_1) = T$
 $P(x_2) = \perp$

contradiction :-

P is decidable

now \exists a total computable fn σ that computes P

now, define σ , total computable fn.

$$\sigma(y) = \begin{cases} x_2 & P(y) = T \\ x_1 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Since P is decidable, σ is total computable
by fixed point then.

$$\exists x_0, f_{x_0}(y) = f_{\sigma(x_0)}(y).$$

\therefore If $P(x_0) = T$,

f_{x_0} satisfies P

& $f_{\sigma(x_0)}$ satisfies P

& f_{x_2} satisfies P

$\therefore P(x_2) = T$

& $P(x_2) = \perp$.

Solⁿ 2:- consider that

$write1 = \{ M \mid M \text{ is a TM with alphabet } \{0, 1\} \text{ and } M \text{ under 1 at some point on its tape} \}$

Now, we have to prove that

reduction HP to write1

$\therefore HP \leq_m write1$

$(M, x) \mapsto N$

$M, x \rightarrow HP$

$N \rightarrow write1$

Now, consider N to be as

→ description of M & x is in N 's finite control.

→ Also reduction algo,

→ N replaces 1 if it occurs in M 's

→ ~~N replaces~~ input alphabet by $\$$ (not in alphabet)

→ N replaces transition functions having 1 with $\$$

Now, $N \rightarrow$ input y over $\{0, 1\}^*$

→ erase y , replace with blank

→ simulate M on x

→ if M halts on x

then N writes 1 on its tape & halts

else

N continues simulating M on x .

\therefore we can say that M halts on $x \Leftrightarrow N$ writes 1 at some place

$\Rightarrow HP \leq_m write1$ is valid reduction

$\Rightarrow write1$ is undecidable as HP is undecidable.

Sol

3:- (a)

let $\neg(a)$: P is not a monotonic

\therefore TP is not re by direct application of rice's theorem.

So, TP is re $\neq (a)$

(b) $\neg(b)$: A is a finite language S_p and there's no finite subset of A is S_p .

\rightarrow assume L_P was r.e

\rightarrow let M , accepts L

Now construct a reduction: $\langle M, w \rangle \Rightarrow M'$ st x' accepts L if w is not in $L(M)$ and accepts ~~the~~ else accepts finite subset of L .

Now, on input M , M' with input x will simulate M on w for $|x|$ moves & if it fails to accept w after $|x|$ moves, M' accepts x .

Now, let say M accepts w after k moves,

$$L(M') = \{x \mid x \in L \text{ and } |x| < k\} \subseteq L$$

\Rightarrow if M does not accept w , $L(M')$ bring a finite subset of L not in S_p using $\neg(b)$

now, if T_P in re then membership problem is decidable hence T_P is not in re.

(c) Finite language in S_p can be represented in binary encoding.

now ~~as~~ as T_P is r.e.

- Let an enumerable machine N enumerates T_p , we will make $M^{(i)}$ to enumerate binary encodings of finite language (i) is S_p .
- Then we will enumerate the binary pairs (i, j) using k , i is a binary encoding of finite language.
- now, if N has printed $M^{(i)}$ in j steps, k prints (i) followed by a delimiter symbol to differentiate from previous and next step encodings.
- So, k enumerates all binary codes for finite set in S_p .

$\therefore T_p$ is r.e

So, we ~~can~~ can conclude that (a), (b) and (c) imply T_p is r.e.

Solⁿ:-

4:- Let us consider A and B are the two instance of given problem.

ie, $A = \{w_1, \dots, w_n\}$

& $B = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$

such that

$$|w_1| = |w_2| = \dots = |w_n| = |x_1| = |x_2| = \dots = |x_n| = 5$$

\therefore all strings are of length 5

\therefore Solutions exists if there exist a sequence

i_1, \dots, i_k and j_1, \dots, j_k st

$$w_{i_1} = x_{j_1}, \dots \text{ \& } w_{i_k} = x_{j_k}$$

also let C be variant of PCP as PCPV

$$C = (A, B) \in \text{PCPV} \Leftrightarrow \exists \text{ sequence } i_1, \dots, i_m$$

C is decidable using decides to decide PCPV

now, on input (A, B), C:

\rightarrow checks if \exists any index i_1 to i_k : $w_{i_1} = x_{i_1}$

\rightarrow if such index exists, solution to C is found

\Rightarrow C halts for input (A, B)

\rightarrow else C rejects C halts.

Now, checking single index is sufficient as w_i & x_i are strings of length 5

$$\therefore w_{i_1}, w_{i_2}, \dots, w_{i_m} = x_{i_1}, x_{i_2}, \dots$$

$$\Rightarrow w_{i_1} = x_{i_1} \text{ \& so on}$$

\therefore if it matches for multiple i s, it must match for one of i s.

\therefore its sufficient to check on index \Rightarrow decidable PCP

\therefore The variant given is decidable.

Solⁿ:- 5:- $S = \{G : G \text{ is a CFG and } L(G) = L(G)^R\}$

to prove : S is undecidable.

\therefore we already prove that $\neg \text{VALCOMPS}(M, x)$ is a CFG.

let $L(G) = \neg \text{VALCOMPS}(M, x)$

now, we make the following reduction :

$$\neg \text{HP} \leq_m \neg \text{VALCOMPS}(M, x)$$

consider the following cases:-

case 1:- M does not halt on x

$$\Rightarrow \text{VALCOMPS}(M, x) = \{\}$$

$$\Rightarrow \neg \text{VALCOMPS}(M, x) = \Sigma^*$$

$$\therefore L(G) = \Sigma^* \text{ so } L(G)^R = \Sigma^*$$

$$\Rightarrow L(G) = L(G)^R$$

case 2:- M halts on x

$$\Rightarrow \text{VALCOMPS}(M, x) = \Sigma^n$$

$$\Rightarrow \neg \text{VALCOMPS}(M, x) \neq \Sigma^*$$

so, for some $j \in \text{VALCOMPS}(M, x)$ and $j = j^R$, the start symbol will be at the end of j^R resulting in an invalid configuration.

Here, ~~$j^R \in L(G)$~~ $j^R \notin L(G)$

$$\Rightarrow L(G) \neq L(G)^R$$

so, we can conclude that

S is undecidable.

Solⁿ:- 6:-

Consider, $VALCOMPST_{M,x}$ be the set of valid computation histories of M on input x ending in accepting submission configuration. Now, If the set accepted by M is finite, the set of valid computations of M is finite & hence a CFL. assume the set of accepted by M is infinite & the set L of valid computation is a CFL.

Since, M accepts an infinite set, there exists a valid computation

$$w_1 \# w_2^R \# w_3 \# \dots$$

where the w_i 's are ID's & $|w_2|$ is ~~greater~~ greater than the constant n in Ogden's lemma.

Now, mark the symbols of w_2 as distinguished. Then we can pump w_2 without pumping both w_1 & w_3 thus getting an invalid computation that must be in L .

Thus, we conclude that the valid computations do not form a CFL.

Solⁿ:- 7:- Let us consider a fn. f be a partial recursive function as follows:-

→ let M be i/p for f then output will be N with M hardcoded it.

→ let's define $x \leq$ as lexicographic ordering of strings.

→ now, non i/p y :-

→ simulate M on every i/p $x \leq y$

→ accept y if M halts on all x .

→ If M is total, $L(M) = \Sigma^* \Rightarrow L(N)$ is recursive.

→ If M is not total, let z be the smallest string such that M doesn't halt on z .

$$\therefore L(N) = \{ z' \mid z' \prec z \}$$

→ As $L(N)$ is finite $\Rightarrow L(N)$ is recursive.

$\therefore \forall M$, $L(f(M))$ is recursive.

→ Also, f is total recursive function.

\therefore we can iterate over $\{0,1\}^*$ & find $f(x)$ for every x we get during iteration & list $f(x)$ if x is valid encoding of a T.M.

→ Let this enumerating machine be called F .

$$\therefore L(E) = \{ f(i) \mid i \in \text{binary encoding of a TM} \}$$

$\therefore L(E)$ is the required r.e. list of TMs that accepts recursive sets.

→ Also, as $L(E)$ contains list of all possible TMs accepting recursive sets, $\exists M$ accepting $x \forall$ recursive set.

$\Rightarrow \therefore L(E)$ is the required r.e. list.

Solⁿ:- 8:-

let us consider $\varphi = Q_1 x_1 Q_2 x_2 \dots Q_l x_l \varphi$

where $Q \in \{\exists, \forall\}$ & φ is quantifier free.

also, let $\varphi_i = Q_{i+1} x_{i+1} Q_{i+2} x_{i+2} \dots Q_l x_l \varphi$ for
 $i = 0$ to l

$\Rightarrow \varphi_0 = \varphi$ & $\varphi_l = \varphi$.

\therefore The formula φ_i has i free variables. for

$a_1, \dots, a_i \in \mathbb{N}$ we can say that

$\varphi_i[a_1, \dots, a_i]$ to be the sentence obtained by substituting the constants a_1, \dots, a_i for the variables x_1, \dots, x_i in φ_i .

\rightarrow The algorithm builds finite automata A_i which recognize the collection of strings representing i -tuples of numbers that make φ_i true.

\rightarrow If first build A_i directly. Then for each $i = 1, \dots, l$ It uses A_i to build A_{i-1} .

Now, once the algorithm has A_0 , it tests whether A_0 accepts ϵ , in which case it shows that φ is true as A_0 accepts any inputs iff φ_0 is true. Therefore if A_0 accepts ϵ , φ is true and A_0 accepts otherwise it rejects.