CS310 : Automata Theory 2019

Lecture 28: Reductions

Instructor: S. Akshay

IITB, India

14-03-2019



Recap of previous lecture

 $\begin{aligned} \text{Regular} \subsetneq \text{Decidable} \subsetneq \text{Recursively Enumerable} \varsubsetneq \text{All languages} \\ \text{DFA/NFA} < \text{Algorithms/Halting TM} < \text{Semi-algorithms/TM} \end{aligned}$

Properties

- 1. There exist languages that are not R.E.
- 2. There exist languages that are R.E but are undecidable. Eg. universal TM lang $L_{TM}^A = \{\langle M, w \rangle \mid M \text{ is a TM and } M \text{ accepts } w\}$
- 3. Decidable languages are closed under complementation.
- 4. *L* is decidable iff *L* is *R*.*E* and \overline{L} is also R.E.

The halting problem

The halting problem for Turing Machines is undecidable Does a given Turing machine halt on a given input?

• $L_{TM}^{HALT} = \{ \langle M, w \rangle \mid M \text{ is a TM and } M \text{ halts on input } w \}.$



The halting problem

The halting problem for Turing Machines is undecidable

Does a given Turing machine halt on a given input?

• $L_{TM}^{HALT} = \{ \langle M, w \rangle \mid M \text{ is a TM and } M \text{ halts on input } w \}.$

Proof: Suppose there exists TM *H* deciding L_{TM}^{HALT} , then construct a TM *D* s.t., on input $\langle M, w \rangle$:

- ▶ runs TM *H* on input $\langle M, w \rangle$
- ▶ if *H* rejects then reject.
- if H accepts, then simulate M on w until it halts.
- ▶ if at halting *M* has accepted *w*, accept, else reject.

But D decides L_{TM}^A which is undecidable. A contradiction.



The halting problem

The halting problem for Turing Machines is undecidable

Does a given Turing machine halt on a given input?

• $L_{TM}^{HALT} = \{ \langle M, w \rangle \mid M \text{ is a TM and } M \text{ halts on input } w \}.$

Proof: Suppose there exists TM *H* deciding L_{TM}^{HALT} , then construct a TM *D* s.t., on input $\langle M, w \rangle$:

- ▶ runs TM *H* on input $\langle M, w \rangle$
- ▶ if *H* rejects then reject.
- if H accepts, then simulate M on w until it halts.
- ▶ if at halting *M* has accepted *w*, accept, else reject.

But D decides L_{TM}^A which is undecidable. A contradiction.

This proof strategy is called a reduction.



Reduction from the acceptance problem

The halting problem for Turing Machines is undecidable Does a given Turing machine halt on a given input?

• $L_{TM}^{HALT} = \{ \langle M, w \rangle \mid M \text{ is a TM and } M \text{ halts on input } w \}.$





The emptiness problem for TMs

Does a given Turing machine accept any word?

• $L_{TM}^{\emptyset} = \{ \langle M \rangle \mid M \text{ is a TM and } L(M) = \emptyset \}.$



The emptiness problem for TMs is undecidable Does a given Turing machine accept any word?

• $L_{TM}^{\emptyset} = \{ \langle M \rangle \mid M \text{ is a TM and } L(M) = \emptyset \}.$

Proof:

► For contradiction, assume its decidable, say by TM *R*.



The emptiness problem for TMs is undecidable

Does a given Turing machine accept any word?

• $L_{TM}^{\emptyset} = \{ \langle M \rangle \mid M \text{ is a TM and } L(M) = \emptyset \}.$

Proof:

- For contradiction, assume its decidable, say by TM R.
- Define M_1 which on input x,
 - if $x \neq w$, it rejects
 - ▶ if x = w, run M on w and accept if M accepts.

The emptiness problem for TMs is undecidable

Does a given Turing machine accept any word?

• $L_{TM}^{\emptyset} = \{ \langle M \rangle \mid M \text{ is a TM and } L(M) = \emptyset \}.$

Proof:

For contradiction, assume its decidable, say by TM R.

• Define M_1 which on input x,

• if $x \neq w$, it rejects

• if x = w, run M on w and accept if M accepts.

• Construct *S* which decides A_{TM} : Given input $\langle M, w \rangle$,



The emptiness problem for TMs is undecidable

Does a given Turing machine accept any word?

• $L_{TM}^{\emptyset} = \{ \langle M \rangle \mid M \text{ is a TM and } L(M) = \emptyset \}.$

Proof:

For contradiction, assume its decidable, say by TM R.

• Define M_1 which on input x,

• if $x \neq w$, it rejects

• if x = w, run M on w and accept if M accepts.

- Construct *S* which decides A_{TM} : Given input $\langle M, w \rangle$,
 - Construct M₁ on tape from M and w,



The emptiness problem for TMs is undecidable

Does a given Turing machine accept any word?

• $L_{TM}^{\emptyset} = \{ \langle M \rangle \mid M \text{ is a TM and } L(M) = \emptyset \}.$

Proof:

► For contradiction, assume its decidable, say by TM *R*.

• Define M_1 which on input x,

• if $x \neq w$, it rejects

• if x = w, run M on w and accept if M accepts.

- Construct *S* which decides A_{TM} : Given input $\langle M, w \rangle$,
 - Construct M₁ on tape from M and w,
 - Run *R* on input $\langle M_1 \rangle$.



The emptiness problem for TMs is undecidable

Does a given Turing machine accept any word?

• $L_{TM}^{\emptyset} = \{ \langle M \rangle \mid M \text{ is a TM and } L(M) = \emptyset \}.$

Proof:

► For contradiction, assume its decidable, say by TM *R*.

• Define M_1 which on input x,

• if $x \neq w$, it rejects

• if x = w, run M on w and accept if M accepts.

• Construct *S* which decides A_{TM} : Given input $\langle M, w \rangle$,

- Construct M_1 on tape from M and w,
- Run *R* on input $\langle M_1 \rangle$.
- If R accepts,

The emptiness problem for TMs is undecidable

Does a given Turing machine accept any word?

• $L_{TM}^{\emptyset} = \{ \langle M \rangle \mid M \text{ is a TM and } L(M) = \emptyset \}.$

Proof:

- ► For contradiction, assume its decidable, say by TM R.
- **•** Define M_1 which on input x,

• if $x \neq w$, it rejects

• if x = w, run M on w and accept if M accepts.

- Construct *S* which decides A_{TM} : Given input $\langle M, w \rangle$,
 - Construct M_1 on tape from M and w,
 - Run *R* on input $\langle M_1 \rangle$.
 - ▶ If *R* accepts, *reject*; if *R* rejects then *accept*.



The regularity problem for TMs

Does a given Turing machine accept a regular language?

• $L_{TM}^{REG} = \{ \langle M \rangle \mid M \text{ is a TM and } L(M) \text{ is a regular language } \}.$



The regularity problem for TMs

Does a given Turing machine accept a regular language?

• $L_{TM}^{REG} = \{ \langle M \rangle \mid M \text{ is a TM and } L(M) \text{ is a regular language } \}.$

Proof: By contradiction, assume R decides Reg. We define S



The regularity problem for TMs

- $L_{TM}^{REG} = \{ \langle M \rangle \mid M \text{ is a TM and } L(M) \text{ is a regular language } \}.$
- Proof: By contradiction, assume R decides Reg. We define S
 - $S = \text{On input } \langle M, w \rangle;$
 - construct TM M_2 as follows:

The regularity problem for TMs

- $L_{TM}^{REG} = \{ \langle M \rangle \mid M \text{ is a TM and } L(M) \text{ is a regular language } \}.$
- Proof: By contradiction, assume R decides Reg. We define S
 - $S = \text{On input } \langle M, w \rangle;$
 - construct TM M₂ as follows: M₂ on input x does the foll:
 - if x has the form $0^n 1^n$, accept.
 - ▶ If not, run *M* on *w* and accept if *M* accepts *w*.

The regularity problem for TMs

- $L_{TM}^{REG} = \{ \langle M \rangle \mid M \text{ is a TM and } L(M) \text{ is a regular language } \}.$
- Proof: By contradiction, assume R decides Reg. We define S
 - $S = \text{On input } \langle M, w \rangle;$
 - construct TM M₂ as follows: M₂ on input x does the foll:
 - if x has the form $0^n 1^n$, accept.
 - ▶ If not, run *M* on *w* and accept if *M* accepts *w*.
 - Run *R* on $\langle M_2 \rangle$.

The regularity problem for TMs

- $L_{TM}^{REG} = \{ \langle M \rangle \mid M \text{ is a TM and } L(M) \text{ is a regular language } \}.$
- Proof: By contradiction, assume R decides Reg. We define S
 - $S = \text{On input } \langle M, w \rangle;$
 - construct TM M₂ as follows: M₂ on input x does the foll:
 - if x has the form $0^n 1^n$, accept.
 - ▶ If not, run *M* on *w* and accept if *M* accepts *w*.
 - Run R on $\langle M_2 \rangle$.
 - ▶ If *R* accepts, *accept*; if *R* rejects, *reject*.



- Convert instance of P_1 to instance of P_2
- answer is yes for P_1 iff answer is yes for P_2



- Convert instance of P_1 to instance of P_2
- answer is yes for P_1 iff answer is yes for P_2
- then P₂ is at least as hard as P₁, i.e.,



- Convert instance of P₁ to instance of P₂
- answer is yes for P_1 iff answer is yes for P_2
- then P_2 is at least as hard as P_1 , i.e.,
 - if P_1 is not decidable, neither is P_2



- Convert instance of P₁ to instance of P₂
- answer is yes for P_1 iff answer is yes for P_2
- ▶ then P₂ is at least as hard as P₁, i.e.,
 - if P_1 is not decidable, neither is P_2
 - if P_1 is not r.e., neither is P_2 .



- Convert instance of P₁ to instance of P₂
- answer is yes for P_1 iff answer is yes for P_2
- then P₂ is at least as hard as P₁, i.e.,
 - if P_1 is not decidable, neither is P_2
 - if P_1 is not r.e., neither is P_2 .
- note that every instance of P₂ need not be covered!



The regularity problem for TMs

Does a given Turing machine accept a regular language?

• $L_{TM}^{EQ} = \{ \langle M_1, M_2 \rangle \mid M \text{ are TMs and } L(M_1) = L(M_2) \}.$



The regularity problem for TMs

Does a given Turing machine accept a regular language?

• $L_{TM}^{EQ} = \{ \langle M_1, M_2 \rangle \mid M \text{ are TMs and } L(M_1) = L(M_2) \}.$

Proof: Exercise.

