

The Emptiness Problem

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

Theorem. E_{TM} is undecidable.

Proof a TM R deciding $E_{\text{TM}} \rightarrow$ a TM S deciding A_{TM}
 S 's algorithm: On input x ,

1. **Check that $x = \langle M, w \rangle$.** If “fail” reject x .
2. Construct a machine M_1 such that for each input y ,
(*) **simulates M on w and accepts y if M has accepted.**
3. **Simulate R on $\langle M_1 \rangle$.** Accept x if R has accepted and reject x otherwise. ■

Reducibility

Testing Whether a TM Accepts a Regular Language

$$REGULAR_{\text{TM}} = \{\langle M \rangle \mid M \text{ is a TM and } L(M) \text{ is regular}\}.$$

Theorem. $REGULAR_{\text{TM}}$ is undecidable.

Proof a TM R deciding $REGULAR_{\text{TM}} \rightarrow$ a TM S deciding A_{TM}
 S 's algorithm: on input x ,

1. **Check that $x = \langle M, w \rangle$.** If “fail” reject x .
2. Construct a machine M_1 : Let a, b be two distinct symbols in the input alphabet Σ of M . On input y ,
 - (a) **Accept y if $y = a^n b^n$ for some n .**
 - (b) Otherwise, simulate M on w , then **accept y if and only if M on w has accepted.**■ ■ ■

The Halting Problem

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

Theorem. $HALT_{\text{TM}}$ is undecidable.

Proof We can construct a machine S for A_{TM} from a machine R for $HALT_{\text{TM}}$. On input x :

1. **Check that $x = \langle M, w \rangle$.** If “fail” reject x .
 2. **Simulate R on w .** Reject x if R has rejected.
 3. M is guaranteed to halt on w .
simulate M on w . Accept x if M has accepted and reject x otherwise.
- ■ ■

Linear Bounded Automata

A **linear bounded automaton** is a Turing machine wherein the head is not permitted to move beyond the region in which the input was written. If the head attempts to move beyond the region it is kept at the same position.

Lemma. Let M be an LBA with q states and with a tape alphabet of size s . For every $n \geq 1$, for every input of length n , there are precisely qns^n possible configurations.

The Acceptance Problem for LBA

$A_{\text{LBA}} = \{\langle M, w \rangle \mid M \text{ is a TM and accepts } w \text{ when restricted to be an LBA}\}.$

Theorem. A_{LBA} is decidable.

Proof Let M be a TM with q states and s symbols in the tape alphabet and w be an input to M of length n . By the previous lemma, there are only qns^n configurations, so if M on w accepts, it should do so within qns^n steps. So we have only to simulate M on w for qns^n steps. ■

1. **Check that $x = \langle M, w \rangle$.** If “fail” reject x .
2. Construct a machine M_1 as in the previous proof. Construct a machine M_2 that accepts Σ^* .

Then $L(M_1) = L(M_2)$ if and only if M does not accept w .

3. **Simulate R on $\langle M_1, M_2 \rangle$.** Accept x if R has rejected and reject x otherwise. ■

Proof (cont'd)

The machine M_1 satisfies:

- (*) $L(M_1) = \{a^n b^n \mid n \geq 1\}$ if M accepts w and Σ^* otherwise, so M accepts w if and only if $L(M_1)$ is not regular.
3. Simulate R on $\langle M_1 \rangle$. Accept x if R has rejected and reject x otherwise. ■

Testing Equivalence Between TMs

$E_{\text{TM}} = \{\langle M_1, M_2 \rangle \mid M_1 \text{ and } M_2 \text{ are TMs and } L(M_1) = L(M_2)\}.$

Theorem. E_{TM} is undecidable.

Proof a TM R deciding $E_{\text{TM}} \rightarrow$ a TM S deciding A_{TM}
 S 's algorithm: on input x ,

1. **Check that $x = \langle M, w \rangle$.** If “fail” reject x .
2. Construct a machine M_1 as in the previous proof. Construct a machine M_2 that accepts Σ^* .

Then $L(M_1) = L(M_2)$ if and only if M does not accept w .

3. **Simulate R on $\langle M_1, M_2 \rangle$.** Accept x if R has rejected and reject x otherwise. ■

The Equivalence Problem About CFG

$$ALL_{CFG} = \{\langle G \rangle \mid G \text{ is a CFG and } LG(G) = \sigma^*\}.$$

Theorem. *ALL_{CFG} is undecidable.*

Proof For a string $x = \langle M, w \rangle$ such that M is a Turing machine and w is an input to M , let L_x be the set of all $\#D_1\#\dots\#D_m\#$ for which there exist C_1, \dots, C_m such that:

1. C_1, \dots, C_m are configurations of M ,
2. C_1 is the initial configuration of M on w ,
3. C_m is an accepting configuration of M on w ,
4. for every i , $2 \leq i \leq m$, C_i is the next configuration of C_{i-1} , and
5. for every i , $1 \leq i \leq m$, $D_i = C_i$ if i is odd and $D_i = C_i^R$ otherwise.

CS215, Lecture 9 © 1999 Mitsunori Ogihara

11

The Emptiness Problem About LBA

$$E_{LBA} = \{\langle M \rangle \mid M \text{ is a TM and accepts no input viewed as an LBA}\}.$$

Theorem. *E_{LBA} is undecidable.*

Proof a TM R deciding $E_{LBA} \rightarrow$ a TM S deciding A_{TM}
For a string $x = \langle M, w \rangle$ such that M is a Turing machine and w is an input to M , let L_x to be the set of all strings of the form $\#C_1\#\dots\#C_m\#$ such that

1. C_1, \dots, C_m are configurations of M ,
2. C_1 is the initial configuration of M on w ,
3. C_m is an accepting configuration of M on w , and
4. for every i , $1 \leq i \leq m - 1$, C_{i+1} is the next configuration of C_i .

CS215, Lecture 9 © 1999 Mitsunori Ogihara

9

Proof (cont'd)

Then L_x is empty if and only if M does not accept w .

So, $\overline{L_x} = \Sigma^*$ if and only if M accepts w .

$\overline{L_x}$ is a CFL.

a TM R deciding $ALL_{CFG} \rightarrow$ a TM S deciding A_{TM}
 S 's algorithm: on input x ,

1. **Check that $x = \langle M, w \rangle$.** If “fail” reject x .
2. Construct a TM B that accepts L_x as an LBA.
3. Simulate R on $\langle B \rangle$. Reject x if R has accepted $\langle B \rangle$ and accept x otherwise. ■
3. **Simulate R on $\langle G \rangle$.** Accept x if R has accepted $\langle G \rangle$ and reject x otherwise. ■

CS215, Lecture 9 © 1999 Mitsunori Ogihara

12

Proof (cont'd)

Then L_x can be decided by an LBA.

$L_x \neq \emptyset$ if and only M accepts w .

S 's algorithm: on input x ,

1. **Check that $x = \langle M, w \rangle$.** If “fail” reject x .
2. Construct a TM B that accepts L_x as an LBA.
3. Simulate R on $\langle B \rangle$. Reject x if R has accepted $\langle B \rangle$ and accept x otherwise. ■

CS215, Lecture 9 © 1999 Mitsunori Ogihara

10

The Equivalence Problem (cont'd)

Define $EQ_{CFG} = \{\langle G, H \rangle \mid G \text{ and } H \text{ are CFGs that generate the same language}\}$.

Corollary. EQ_{CFG} is undecidable.

Proof a TM R deciding $EQ_{CFG} \rightarrow$ a TM S deciding ALL_{CFG}
 S 's algorithm: On input x ,

1. **Check that** $x = \langle G \rangle$. If "fail" reject x .
2. Construct a grammar H for Σ^* .
3. **Simulate** R on $\langle G, H \rangle$. Accept x if R has accepted and reject x otherwise. ■