CS310 : Automata Theory 2019

Lecture 35: Efficiency in computation

Instructor: S. Akshay

IITB, India

02-04-2019



Recap

Turing machines and computability

- 1. Turing machines
 - (i) Definition
 - (ii) Variants
 - (iii) Decidable and Turing recognizable languages
 - (iv) Church-Turing Hypothesis



Recap

Turing machines and computability

- 1. Turing machines
 - (i) Definition
 - (ii) Variants
 - (iii) Decidable and Turing recognizable languages
 - (iv) Church-Turing Hypothesis
- 2. Undecidability
 - (i) A proof technique by diagonalization
 - (ii) Via reductions
 - (iii) Rice's theorem



Recap

Turing machines and computability

- 1. Turing machines
 - (i) Definition
 - (ii) Variants
 - (iii) Decidable and Turing recognizable languages
 - (iv) Church-Turing Hypothesis
- 2. Undecidability
 - (i) A proof technique by diagonalization
 - (ii) Via reductions
 - (iii) Rice's theorem
- 3. Applications: showing (un)decidability of other problems
 - (i) A string matching problem: Post's Correspondance Problem
 - (ii) A problem for compilers: Unambiguity of Context-free languages
 - (iii) Between TM and PDA: Linear Bounded Automata



$\mathsf{DFA}/\mathsf{NFA} < \mathsf{PDA} < \mathsf{LBA} < \mathsf{Algorithms}/\mathsf{Halting}\ \mathsf{TM} < \mathsf{Semi-algorithms}/\mathsf{TM}$



 $\mathsf{DFA}/\mathsf{NFA} < \mathsf{PDA} < \mathsf{LBA} < \mathsf{Algorithms}/\mathsf{Halting} \ \mathsf{TM} < \mathsf{Semi-algorithms}/\mathsf{TM}$ $\mathsf{Regular} \subsetneq \mathsf{CFL} \subsetneq ? \subsetneq \mathsf{Decidable} \subsetneq \mathsf{Recursively} \ \mathsf{Enumerable} \subsetneq \mathsf{All} \ \mathsf{languages}$



 $\mathsf{DFA}/\mathsf{NFA} < \mathsf{PDA} < \mathsf{LBA} < \mathsf{Algorithms}/\mathsf{Halting} \ \mathsf{TM} < \mathsf{Semi-algorithms}/\mathsf{TM}$ Regular $\subsetneq \mathsf{CFL} \subsetneq ? \subsetneq \mathsf{Decidable} \subsetneq \mathsf{Recursively} \ \mathsf{Enumerable} \subsetneq \mathsf{All} \ \mathsf{languages}$

Homework problem: Show PDA < LBA



 $\mathsf{DFA}/\mathsf{NFA} < \mathsf{PDA} < \mathsf{LBA} < \mathsf{Algorithms}/\mathsf{Halting} \ \mathsf{TM} < \mathsf{Semi-algorithms}/\mathsf{TM}$ Regular $\subsetneq \mathsf{CFL} \subsetneq$? \subsetneq Decidable \subsetneq Recursively Enumerable \subsetneq All languages

Homework problem: Show PDA < LBA

Challenging questions/Find out!

- ► Why is LBA < Halting TM?
- What is a notion of languages/grammar for LBA?
- ► Are non-deterministic LBA more powerful than deterministic LBA?



LBA are an example of resource bounded TMs Can you think of other resources?



LBA are an example of resource bounded TMs

- Can you think of other resources?
- Resources for computation:
 - Space/memory
 - Time



- LBA are an example of resource bounded TMs
- Can you think of other resources?
- Resources for computation:
 - Space/memory
 - Time
 - Cost
 - Energy
 - What else?



- LBA are an example of resource bounded TMs
- Can you think of other resources?
- Resources for computation:
 - Space/memory
 - Time
 - Cost
 - Energy
 - What else?number of times a state is visited, number of tape reversals, number of writes



LBA are an example of resource bounded TMs

- Can you think of other resources?
- Resources for computation:
 - Space/memory
 - Time
 - Cost
 - Energy
 - What else?number of times a state is visited, number of tape reversals, number of writes

Why consider resources?

- TMs are algorithms...
- Decidability does not implementability!



Given M a halting TM, running time of M is the function $f(n) : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$, which counts the maximum number of steps that M uses on any input of length n.



- Given *M* a halting TM, running time of *M* is the function $f(n) : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$, which counts the maximum number of steps that *M* uses on any input of length *n*.
- Is this the only notion possible? Any others?



Given M a halting TM, running time of M is the function $f(n) : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$, which counts the maximum number of steps that M uses on any input of length n.

- Worst-case complexity longest running time of all inputs of length n (in this course, we consider this)
- Average-case complexity average running time over all inputs of length n.



- Let $f, g : \mathbb{B} \to \mathbb{R}^+$, we say g(n) is an (asymptotic) upper bound for f(n), denoted
- f(n) = O(g(n)) if $\exists c, n_0 \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ s.t $\forall n \ge n_0, f(n) \le c \cdot g(n)$.
 - f is less than or equal to g up to a constant factor.
 - why use this? to estimate instead of precise.



- Let $f, g : \mathbb{B} \to \mathbb{R}^+$, we say g(n) is an (asymptotic) upper bound for f(n), denoted
- f(n) = O(g(n)) if $\exists c, n_0 \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ s.t $\forall n \ge n_0, f(n) \le c \cdot g(n)$.
- Let $f, g: \mathbb{B} \to \mathbb{R}^+$, we write f(n) = o(g(n)) if $\forall c > 0, \exists n_0 \text{ s.t } \forall n \ge n_0$, $f(n) \le c \cdot g(n)$, i.e., $\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{f(n)}{g(n)} = 0$.
 - more like strictly less than (asymptotically)



Let $f, g : \mathbb{B} \to \mathbb{R}^+$, we say g(n) is an (asymptotic) upper bound for f(n), denoted f(n) = O(g(n)) if $\exists c, n_0 \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ s.t $\forall n \ge n_0, f(n) \le c \cdot g(n)$. Let $f, g : \mathbb{B} \to \mathbb{R}^+$, we write f(n) = o(g(n)) if $\forall c > 0, \exists n_0 \text{ s.t } \forall n \ge n_0, f(n) \le c \cdot g(n)$, i.e., $\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{f(n)}{g(n)} = 0$.

Exercises: True or false

1.
$$234n^3 + 345n^2 - 3 = O(n^3)$$

- 2. $84n^3 + 4n^4 + 3 = O(n^5)$
- 3. n = o(nloglogn)

4.
$$2^{O(n)} = o(n^{242345325})$$

5. $O(n) + \frac{n}{2}O(n) + O(n) = O(n^2)$



Let $f, g : \mathbb{B} \to \mathbb{R}^+$, we say g(n) is an (asymptotic) upper bound for f(n), denoted f(n) = O(g(n)) if $\exists c, n_0 \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ s.t $\forall n \ge n_0, f(n) \le c \cdot g(n)$. Let $f, g : \mathbb{B} \to \mathbb{R}^+$, we write f(n) = o(g(n)) if $\forall c > 0, \exists n_0 \text{ s.t } \forall n \ge n_0, f(n) \le c \cdot g(n)$, i.e., $\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{f(n)}{g(n)} = 0$.

Exercises: True or false

- 1. $234n^3 + 345n^2 3 = O(n^3)$ 2. $84n^3 + 4n^4 + 3 = O(n^5)$ 3. n = o(nloglogn)
- 4. $2^{O(n)} = o(n^{242345325})$
- 5. $O(n) + \frac{n}{2}O(n) + O(n) = O(n^2)$

polynomial: n^c for c > 0, exponential: $2^{n^{\delta}}$, $\delta > 0$.



Let $t : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{R}^+$. A language $L \subseteq \Sigma^*$ is said to be in TIME(t(n)) if there exists a deterministic (halting) Turing machine M such that $\forall x \in \Sigma^*$ of length n, M halts on x within time O(t(n)).



Let $t : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{R}^+$. A language $L \subseteq \Sigma^*$ is said to be in TIME(t(n)) if there exists a deterministic (halting) Turing machine M such that $\forall x \in \Sigma^*$ of length n, M halts on x within time O(t(n)).

TIME(t(n)) is set of all languages decidable by a O(t(n)) TM



- Let $t : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{R}^+$. A language $L \subseteq \Sigma^*$ is said to be in TIME(t(n)) if there exists a deterministic (halting) Turing machine M such that $\forall x \in \Sigma^*$ of length n, M halts on x within time O(t(n)).
- TIME(t(n)) is set of all languages decidable by a O(t(n)) TM
- Exercise: Is $A = \{0^k 1^k | k \ge 0\}$ in $O(n^2)$?



Let $t : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{R}^+$. A language $L \subseteq \Sigma^*$ is said to be in TIME(t(n)) if there exists a deterministic (halting) Turing machine M such that $\forall x \in \Sigma^*$ of length n, M halts on x within time O(t(n)).

TIME(t(n)) is set of all languages decidable by a O(t(n)) TM

Exercise: Is $A = \{0^k 1^k | k \ge 0\}$ in $O(n^2)$?

1. scan tape once to check if input is of form 0^*1^* . else reject.

- 2. repeat until there are no 0's:
- 3. scan tape to cross a single 0 and single 1 (if you cant find 1 to cross off, reject)
- 4. at end if there are 1's remaining reject, otherwise, accept.



Let $t : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{R}^+$. A language $L \subseteq \Sigma^*$ is said to be in TIME(t(n)) if there exists a deterministic (halting) Turing machine M such that $\forall x \in \Sigma^*$ of length n, M halts on x within time O(t(n)).

TIME(t(n)) is set of all languages decidable by a O(t(n)) TM

Exercise: Is $A = \{0^k 1^k | k \ge 0\}$ in $O(n^2)$?

1. scan tape once to check if input is of form 0^*1^* . else reject. O(n) steps

- 2. repeat until there are no 0's:
- 3. scan tape to cross a single 0 and single 1 (if you cant find 1 to cross off, reject)
- 4. at end if there are 1's remaining reject, otherwise, accept.



Let $t : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{R}^+$. A language $L \subseteq \Sigma^*$ is said to be in TIME(t(n)) if there exists a deterministic (halting) Turing machine M such that $\forall x \in \Sigma^*$ of length n, M halts on x within time O(t(n)).

TIME(t(n)) is set of all languages decidable by a O(t(n)) TM

Exercise: Is $A = \{0^k 1^k | k \ge 0\}$ in $O(n^2)$?

1. scan tape once to check if input is of form 0^*1^* . else reject. O(n) steps

- 2. repeat until there are no 0's:
- 3. scan tape to cross a single 0 and single 1 (if you cant find 1 to cross off, reject) O(n) steps
- 4. at end if there are 1's remaining reject, otherwise, accept.

Let $t : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{R}^+$. A language $L \subseteq \Sigma^*$ is said to be in TIME(t(n)) if there exists a deterministic (halting) Turing machine M such that $\forall x \in \Sigma^*$ of length n, M halts on x within time O(t(n)).

TIME(t(n)) is set of all languages decidable by a O(t(n)) TM

Exercise: Is $A = \{0^k 1^k | k \ge 0\}$ in $O(n^2)$?

1. scan tape once to check if input is of form 0^*1^* . else reject. O(n) steps

- 2. repeat until there are no 0's: n/2 repetitions
- 3. scan tape to cross a single 0 and single 1 (if you cant find 1 to cross off, reject) O(n) steps
- 4. at end if there are 1's remaining reject, otherwise, accept.



Let $t : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{R}^+$. A language $L \subseteq \Sigma^*$ is said to be in TIME(t(n)) if there exists a deterministic (halting) Turing machine M such that $\forall x \in \Sigma^*$ of length n, M halts on x within time O(t(n)).

TIME(t(n)) is set of all languages decidable by a O(t(n)) TM

Exercise: Is $A = \{0^k 1^k | k \ge 0\}$ in $O(n^2)$?

- 1. scan tape once to check if input is of form 0^*1^* . else reject. O(n) steps
- 2. repeat until there are no 0's: n/2 repetitions
- 3. scan tape to cross a single 0 and single 1 (if you cant find 1 to cross off, reject) O(n) steps
- 4. at end if there are 1's remaining reject, otherwise, accept. O(n) steps



Let $t : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{R}^+$. A language $L \subseteq \Sigma^*$ is said to be in TIME(t(n)) if there exists a deterministic (halting) Turing machine M such that $\forall x \in \Sigma^*$ of length n, M halts on x within time O(t(n)).

TIME(t(n)) is set of all languages decidable by a O(t(n)) TM

Exercise: Is $A = \{0^k 1^k | k \ge 0\}$ in $O(n^2)$?

- 1. scan tape once to check if input is of form 0^*1^* . else reject. O(n) steps
- 2. repeat until there are no 0's: n/2 repetitions
- 3. scan tape to cross a single 0 and single 1 (if you cant find 1 to cross off, reject) O(n) steps
- 4. at end if there are 1's remaining reject, otherwise, accept. O(n) steps

Overall: $O(n) + \frac{n}{2}O(n) + O(n) = O(n^2)$ steps



TIME(t(n)) is set of all languages decidable by a O(t(n)) Turing machine

Questions

- ▶ Is $A = \{0^k 1^k \mid k \ge 0\}$ in $o(n^2)$?
- ▶ Is A in O(n)?



TIME(t(n)) is set of all languages decidable by a O(t(n)) Turing machine

Questions

• Is
$$A = \{0^k 1^k \mid k \ge 0\}$$
 in $o(n^2)$?

ls A in O(n)?

Does crossing two 0s and 1s on every scan instead of just one help?



TIME(t(n)) is set of all languages decidable by a O(t(n)) Turing machine

Questions

- ▶ Is $A = \{0^k 1^k \mid k \ge 0\}$ in $o(n^2)$?
- ls A in O(n)?
- Scan tape and reject, if 0 is to right of 1.
- Scan the 0s and copy them to another tape, until first 1.
- Scan 1s in first tape together with 0s in second tape, if 0's are crossed before 1s are read, reject
- ▶ if all 0s are crossed off at the end, accept, else reject.



TIME(t(n)) is set of all languages decidable by a O(t(n)) Turing machine

Questions

▶ Is $A = \{0^k 1^k \mid k \ge 0\}$ in $o(n^2)$?

▶ Is A in O(n)?

- Scan tape and reject, if 0 is to right of 1.
- Scan the 0s and copy them to another tape, until first 1.
- Scan 1s in first tape together with 0s in second tape, if 0's are crossed before 1s are read, reject
- ▶ if all 0s are crossed off at the end, accept, else reject.

So, with 2-tape can improve "complexity".



TIME(t(n)) is set of all languages decidable by a O(t(n)) 1-tape Turing machine

Questions

• (HW) Is $A = \{0^k 1^k \mid k \ge 0\}$ in $o(n^2)$?

▶ Is A in O(n)?

- Scan tape and reject, if 0 is to right of 1.
- Scan the 0s and copy them to another tape, until first 1.
- Scan 1s in first tape together with 0s in second tape, if 0's are crossed before 1s are read, reject
- ▶ if all 0s are crossed off at the end, accept, else reject.

So, with 2-tape can improve "complexity". Can we improve with 1-tape?



TIME(t(n)) is set of all languages decidable by a O(t(n)) 1-tape Turing machine

Questions

- (HW) Is $A = \{0^k 1^k \mid k \ge 0\}$ in $o(n^2)$?
- (Challenge) Is A in O(n)?

So, with 2-tape can improve "complexity".



TIME(t(n)) is set of all languages decidable by a O(t(n)) 1-tape Turing machine

Questions

- (HW) Is $A = \{0^k 1^k \mid k \ge 0\}$ in $o(n^2)$?
- (Challenge) Is A in O(n)?

So, with 2-tape can improve "complexity".

Conclusions: change of model can change complexity, even if it does not change computability.

