Theory of Computation Chapter 4: Undecidability

Lectures by Monalisa

• Section 6: Theory of Computation (\cong 10mark)

Regular expressions and finite automata. Context-free grammars and push-down automata. Regular and context free languages, pumping lemma. Turing machines and undecidability.

- Chapter 1:Regular Language [RL,FA,RE,Pumping lemma]
- Chapter 2: Context free Language [Grammar(RG,CFG),CFL,PDA, Pumping lemma]
- Chapter 3: Recursive enumerable Language [CSL, LBA, RS, RES, TM]
- Chapter 4: Undecidability(Undecidable, Rice Theorem ,Reducibility, PCP)

Undecidability

- Problems for which no algorithm exist is called as undecidable & if algorithm exist is called as decidable.
- Undecidable Example
- . Ambiguity of CFG.
- 2. Regularity of CFG
- 3. Equality of CFG
- 4. Completeness problem of $CFG[L(G) = \Sigma^*]$
- 5. Conversion of NPDA to DPDA
- 6. Conversion of ambiguous to unambiguous grammar.
 - . Halting problem of TM
- * Following property of TM are undecidable
 - Emptiness
 - Finiteness
 - Equalness

3.

- 4. Membership
- 5. Regularity
- 6. Context freedom & dependency
- 7. Recursiveness
- 8. Completeness or Totality problem

Rice Theorem:

- Every non trivial properties of REL is Undecidable.
- Formal Definition
- If P is a non-trivial property, and the language holding the property, L_p , is recognized by Turing machine M, then $L_p = \{\langle M \rangle | L(M) \in P\}$ is undecidable.
- Property of languages, P, is simply a set of languages. If any language belongs to P (L ∈ P), it is said that L satisfies the property P.
- A property is called to be trivial if either it is not satisfied by any recursively enumerable languages, or if it is satisfied by all recursively enumerable languages.
- A non-trivial property is satisfied by some recursively enumerable languages and are not satisfied by others. Formally speaking, in a non-trivial property, where L ∈ P, both the following properties hold:
- Property 1 There exists Turing Machines, M1 and M2 that recognize the same language, i.e. either (<M1>, <M2> ∈ L) or (<M1>,<M2> ∉ L)
- Property 2 There exists Turing Machines M1 and M2, where M1 recognizes the language while M2 does not, i.e. <M1> ∈ L and <M2> ∉ L

Reducibility

- P₁ is solvable
- $P_1 \le P_2$ reducible
- Solution of P_2 is solution of P_1 .
- If P_1 is undecidable then P_2 also undecidable
- EX: $P_1 = n^4 1$, $P_2 = n^2 1$, $P_3 = n^2 + 1$
- Solution of P₂ & P₃ are solution of P₁
- $A \leq B$, (A is reducible to B), i. e, solving A cannot be "harder" than solving B.
- 1.If A is reducible to B, and B is decidable, then A is decidable.
- i) if A is reducible to B, and B is recursive, then A is recursive.
- 2.If A is undecidable and reducible to B, then B is undecidable.
- i) if B is recursively enumerable, and A is reducible to B, then A is recursively enumerable.
- ii) if A is not recursively enumerable, and reducible to B, then B is not recursively enumerable.

- Rule 1: If B is recursive then A is recursive
- Rule 2: If B is recursively enumerable then A is recursively enumerable
- Rule 3: If A is not recursively enumerable then B is not recursively enumerable
- Post Correspondence Problem
- The Post Correspondence Problem (PCP) is an undecidable decision problem.
- Given the following two lists, **X** and **Y** of non-empty strings over \sum
- $X = (x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots, x_n)$
- $Y = (y_1, y_2, y_3, \dots, y_n)$
- There is a Post Correspondence Solution, if for some i_1, i_2, \dots, i_k , where $1 \le i_j \le n$, the condition $x_{i1}, \dots, x_{ik} = y_{i1}, \dots, y_{ik}$ satisfies.
- Example 1
- X = (a, ba, aa) and Y = (ab, aa, a)
 - =(1, 2, 3) and =(4, 5, 6)
- w=abaaa ,123=456 or a ba aa= ab aa a
- w=aabaa ,321=645 or aa ba a= a ab aa