

# Final

## Note

This is a closed-book exam. Each problem accounts for 10 points, unless otherwise marked.

## Problems

1. For two given languages  $A$  and  $B$ , define  $A \diamond B = \{xy \mid x \in A \text{ and } y \in B \text{ and } |x| = |y|\}$ . Prove that, if  $A$  and  $B$  are regular, then  $A \diamond B$  is context-free. (Hint: construct a PDA where the stack is used to ensure that  $x$  and  $y$  are of equal length.)
2. Give a formal description of a (single-tape deterministic) Turing machine that decides the language  $\{1^k \# 1^{k^2} \mid k \geq 1\}$ .
3. Show that single-tape TMs that cannot write on the portion of the tape containing the input string recognize only regular languages.
4. A *useless state* in a pushdown automaton is a state that is never entered on any input. Show the decidability of the problem of determining whether a given pushdown automaton has a useless state.
5. Let  $CONTAIN_{PDA\_DFA} = \{\langle M_1, M_2 \rangle \mid M_1 \text{ is a PDA and } M_2 \text{ is a DFA such that } L(M_1) \subseteq L(M_2)\}$ . Show that  $CONTAIN_{PDA\_DFA}$  is decidable.
6. Let  $CONTAIN_{DFA\_PDA} = \{\langle M_1, M_2 \rangle \mid M_1 \text{ is a DFA and } M_2 \text{ is a PDA such that } L(M_1) \subseteq L(M_2)\}$ . Show that  $CONTAIN_{DFA\_PDA}$  is undecidable.
7. If  $A$  is reducible to  $B$  and  $B$  is a regular language, does that imply that  $A$  is a regular language? Why or why not?
8. Discuss the applicability of Rice's Theorem for each of the following problems (languages). Please give the reasons why or why not.
  - (a)  $REGULAR_{TM} = \{\langle M \rangle \mid M \text{ is a TM and } L(M) \text{ is regular}\}$ .
  - (b)  $UNCOUNTABLE_{TM} = \{\langle M \rangle \mid M \text{ is a TM and } L(M) \text{ is uncountable}\}$ .
9. In the proof that the  $3SAT$  problem is polynomially reducible to the  $VERTEX\_COVER$  problem, we convert an arbitrary boolean expression in 3CNF (input of the  $3SAT$  problem) to an input graph of the  $VERTEX\_COVER$  problem.
  - (a) Please illustrate the conversion by drawing the graph that will be obtained from the following boolean expression:

$$(\bar{x} + y + z) \cdot (x + \bar{y} + \bar{z}) \cdot (x + y + \bar{z}).$$

- (b) The original boolean expression is satisfiable. As a demonstration of why the reduction is correct, please use the resulting graph to argue that it is indeed the case.
10. In the proof that the *3SAT* problem is polynomially reducible to the *SUBSET-SUM* problem, we convert an arbitrary boolean expression in 3CNF (input of the *3SAT* problem) to a set of numbers and a target number as input of the *SUBSET-SUM* problem.
- (a) Please illustrate the conversion by giving the set of numbers and the target number that will be obtained from the following boolean expression:

$$(\bar{x} + y + z) \cdot (x + \bar{y} + \bar{z}) \cdot (x + y + \bar{z}).$$

- (b) The original boolean expression is satisfiable. As a demonstration of why the reduction is correct, please use the resulting set of numbers and the target number to argue that it is indeed the case.

## Appendix

- Given a language  $L \subseteq \Sigma^*$ , define a binary relation  $R_L$  over  $\Sigma^*$  as follows:

$$xR_Ly \text{ iff } \forall z \in \Sigma^* (xz \in L \leftrightarrow yz \in L)$$

$R_L$  can be shown to be an equivalence relation.

**(Myhill-Nerode Theorem)** With  $R_L$  defined as above, the following are equivalent:

- $L$  is regular.
- $R_L$  is of finite index.

Moreover, the index of  $R_L$  equals the number of states in the smallest DFA that recognizes  $L$ .

Note: the *index* of an equivalence relation is the number of equivalence classes it induces.

- $ALL_{CFG} = \{\langle G \rangle \mid G \text{ is a CFG and } L(G) = \Sigma^*\}$ .  $ALL_{CFG}$  is undecidable.
- (Rice's Theorem)** Any problem  $P$  about Turing machines satisfying the following two conditions is undecidable:
  - For any TMs  $M_1$  and  $M_2$ , where  $L(M_1) = L(M_2)$ , we have  $\langle M_1 \rangle \in P$  iff  $\langle M_2 \rangle \in P$ .
  - $P$  is nontrivial, i.e., there exist TMs  $M_1$  and  $M_2$  such that  $\langle M_1 \rangle \in P$  and  $\langle M_2 \rangle \notin P$ .
- Language  $A$  is **mapping reducible** (many-one reducible) to language  $B$ , written  $A \leq_m B$ , if there is a computable function  $f : \Sigma^* \rightarrow \Sigma^*$ , where for every  $w$ ,

$$w \in A \iff f(w) \in B.$$

- $A \leq_m B$  is equivalent to  $\overline{A} \leq_m \overline{B}$ .
- $3SAT = \{\langle \phi \rangle \mid \phi \text{ is a satisfiable 3CNF-formula}\}$ . (A 3CNF-formula is a CNF-formula where all the clauses have three literals.)  $3SAT$  is NP-complete.
- $VERTEX\_COVER = \{\langle G, k \rangle \mid G \text{ is an undirected graph that has a } k\text{-node vertex cover}\}$ . (A *vertex cover* of an undirected graph  $G$  is a subset of the nodes where every edge of  $G$  touches one of those nodes.)  $VERTEX\_COVER$  is NP-complete.
- $SUBSET\_SUM = \{\langle S, t \rangle \mid S = \{x_1, \dots, x_k\} \text{ and for some } \{y_1, \dots, y_l\} \subseteq S, \text{ we have } \sum y_i = t\}$ .  $SUBSET\_SUM$  is NP-complete.