

C1 Theory (25 points)

Let N denote the set of non-negative integers.

Let $\Sigma = \{a, b\}$.

In this problem (C1) we will make reference to the languages L_1 , L_2 , and L_3 defined just below.

Definition

(i) $L_1 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{w \in \Sigma^* \mid \text{in at least one prefix of } w \text{ there are exactly 4 more } b\text{'s than } a\text{'s}\}.$ ¹

(ii) $L_2 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{a^i b^j \mid i, j \in N \wedge i \neq j\}.$

(iii) $L_3 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{the set of all } w \in \Sigma^* \text{ such that every other symbol of } w \text{ is an } a, \text{ but starting at the first symbol if } |w| \text{ is odd and starting at the second symbol for } |w| \text{ even.}$ ²

a. (8 points)

Use Myhill-Nerode to show that L_1 is not regular.³

b. (8 points)

Use Pumping *directly* to show that L_2 is not regular. No fair working with $\overline{L_2}$ or some such.

Hint for C1b: Consider the word $a^n b^{n+n!}$ for suitable n .

c. (9 points)

Prove that L_3 is regular. N.B. If you do this by programming in relevant system(s), also *document* your "code". Your documentation should be to help the graders understand what you had in mind.

¹For example, $aaaaabbbbaabbbbaabba \in L_1$ since the prefix $aaaaabbbbaabbbba$ has 10 b's and 6 a's.

²For example, $\emptyset, abaaa, baba \in L_3$, where ' $\emptyset$ ' denotes the empty word. $\emptyset$ is in L_3 since it contains no counterexamples.

³Recall that the crucial equivalence relation for Myhill-Nerode applied to the language L_1 is $\equiv_{L_1}$, where, for words $x, y \in \Sigma^*$,

$$x \equiv_{L_1} y \stackrel{\text{def}}{\iff} (\forall z \in \Sigma^*) [xz \in L_1 \iff yz \in L_1]. \quad (1)$$

C2 Theory (25 points)

Suppose n is a *fixed* integer > 1 . Let $\Sigma = \{a, b\}$. Let

$$L = \{a, b\}^* \cdot \{a\} \cdot \{a, b\}^{n-1} \quad (2)$$

a. (10 points)

Explicitly exhibit the state diagram of a non-deterministic finite automaton, $\mathcal{M}_1$, having *exactly* $n + 1$ states and such that $L(\mathcal{M}_1) = L$, where L is defined in (2) above.

b. (15 points)

For this problem (C2b) you may use Myhill-Nerode.⁴

Suppose $\mathcal{M}$ is *any* (deterministic) finite automaton such that $L(\mathcal{M}) = L$ (again, where L is defined in (2) above). *Prove* that $\mathcal{M}$ has *at least* 2^n states.

Hint for C2b: Suppose $x, y \in \Sigma^n$ and $x \neq y$.

Consider an i such that

$$[1 \leq i \leq n \wedge [x, y \text{ differ in their } i\text{-th symbol (reading left to right)}}]. \quad (4)$$

For *each* of the words xb^{i-1} and yb^{i-1} carefully show exactly how many symbols there are from the $i + 1$ -st *through* the last, *inclusive*.

Use the above to show that

$$[xb^{i-1} \in L \Leftrightarrow yb^{i-1} \notin L]. \quad (5)$$

Conclude from (5) just above something interesting and relevant about xb^{i-1} , yb^{i-1} , and $\equiv_L$.

Develop *and justify* a useful formula for $|\Sigma^n|$.

Explain *clearly* how showing the above is *relevant* to solving C2b.

⁴Recall that the crucial equivalence relation for Myhill-Nerode applied to L from (2) above is $\equiv_L$, where, for words $x, y \in \Sigma^*$,

$$x \equiv_L y \stackrel{\text{def}}{\Leftrightarrow} (\forall z \in \Sigma^*) [xz \in L \Leftrightarrow yz \in L]. \quad (3)$$

C3 Theory (25 points)

Let N denote the set of non-negative integers.

We write real numbers r in the closed interval between the real numbers 0 and 1 (inclusive) in binary notation as

$$.r_0r_1r_2r_3\cdots, \quad (6)$$

where each r_i is a 0 or a 1 (a bit) and where

$$r = \sum_{i \in N} \frac{r_i}{2^{i+1}}.^5 \quad (7)$$

Definition Suppose r is a real number in the closed interval between the real numbers 0 and 1 (inclusive), where r is written in binary as in (6) above.

(ii) We say r is computable $\stackrel{\text{def}}{=}$ the function

$$\lambda i.(r_i) \text{ is computable.}^6 \quad (8)$$

(i) We say r is primitive recursive $\stackrel{\text{def}}{=}$ the function

$$\lambda i.(r_i) \text{ is primitive recursive.} \quad (9)$$

Definition We associate with each real r between 0 and 1 inclusive a corresponding function g_r thus. For each $x \in N$, let

$$g_r(x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if, in the binary expansion of } r, \text{ there is a} \\ & \text{consecutive run of 1's of length} \\ & \text{exactly } x \text{ and with a 0 on each} \\ & \text{side of the run;} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

For example, if $r = .01011011101110 \cdots$, then g_r is 1 at all arguments > 0 and is 0 at argument 0. If instead $r = .10111000000000 \cdots$, then g_r is 1 at arguments 0 and 3 and it's 0 elsewhere. For this latter example, the initial 1 in the binary expansion does *not* make $g_r(1) = 1$ since this initial 1 does *not* have a 0 on *each* side. $g_r(0) = 1$ since, for example, the 6th and 7th digits are 0's and have a block of 0 1's between them.

a. (20 points)

Prove there is a *computable* real r such that g_r is *not* computable.

Hint for C3a: You may establish computability by exhibiting an informal algorithm (and showing totality), and you may use without proof any standard text book results about r.e. sets *provided you say which result(s) you are using where*.

b. (5 points)

Prove there is a *primitive recursive* real r such that g_r is *not* computable.

Hint for C3b: You may use without proof any of the standard text book closure properties for the class of primitive recursive functions *provided you say which closure properties you are using where*. You may also use without proof any standard text book examples of primitive recursive functions, *but you must say what they are*. Again you may cite without proof suitable results about r.e. sets.

⁵For example, the real number $\frac{1}{2}$ (in binary) is .1000000000 $\cdots$, the real number $\frac{2}{3}$ (in binary) is .1010101010 $\cdots$, and the real number 1 (in binary) is .1111111111 $\cdots$. To see the latter two, just sum corresponding infinite geometric series.

⁶Here we use Church's lambda-notation to name a function defined by a formula (as is standard in Lisp). For example, $\lambda x, y.(x+y)$ denotes the function that maps each pair of non-negative integer x, y to their sum, and $\lambda i.(r_i)$ denotes the function of one non-negative integer i argument mapping it to the bit r_i .

C4 Theory (25 points)

Fix a standard programming formalism φ for computing all the *one-argument* partial computable functions which map the non-negative integers into themselves. Code (Gödel) number the φ -programs *onto* the entire set of non-negative integers. Let φ_p denote the partial function computed by program (number) p in the φ -system. You may assume without proof that, in the φ -system, Universality, S-m-n, and the Kleene Recursion Theorem (KRT) hold. *You may not need all these assumptions — just say which ones you are using where.* Let $W_p \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{the domain of } \varphi_p$.⁷

a. (10 points)

Prove there is a computable function f such that

$$\{W_{f(x)} \mid x \in N\} = \text{the collection of all finite subsets of } N. \quad (11)$$

Hint for C4a: You may establish computability by exhibiting an informal algorithm (and showing totality).

b. (15 points)

Prove there is no computable function g such that

$$\{W_{g(x)} \mid x \in N\} = \text{the collection of all infinite r.e. subsets of } N. \quad (12)$$

Hint for C4b: Suppose for contradiction otherwise. Create an *infinite r.e.* set A differing from each of $W_{g(0)}, W_{g(1)}, W_{g(2)}, \dots$. To do this think informally about how to enumerate algorithmically such an A from dovetailed algorithmic enumerations of $W_{g(0)}, W_{g(1)}, W_{g(2)}, \dots$. Make sure you list into A an element from each $W_{g(i)}$ and that you do *not* list into A at least one element from each $W_{g(i)}$. Be sure to *show why this is possible*.

⁷Then $W_0, W_1, W_2, \dots$ provides a standard listing of *all* the r.e. sets (of non-negative integers).