

# Sample Question#1. Part a

1. Prove that the following are equivalent

a)  $S$  is an infinite recursive (decidable) set.

b)  $S$  is the range of a monotonically increasing total recursive function.

Note:  $f$  is monotonically increasing means that  $\forall x f(x+1) > f(x)$ .

a) Implies b)

Let  $x \in S \Leftrightarrow \chi_S(x)$

Define  $f_R(0) = \mu x \chi_S(x)$ ;  $f_R(y+1) = \mu x [\chi_S(x) \ \&\& \ (x > f_R(y))]$

Clearly, since  $S$  is non-empty, it has a least one value and so there exist a smallest value such that  $\chi_S(x)$ ; we will enumerate this as  $f_R(0) = \mu x \chi_S(x)$ .

Assume we have enumerated the  $y$ -th value in  $S$  as  $f_R(y)$ . Since  $S$  is infinite, there will be values in  $S$  greater than  $f_R(y)$  and our search  $\mu x [\chi_S(x) \ \&\& \ (x > f_R(y))]$  will find the next largest value for which  $\chi_S(x)$ . Thus, inductively, we will enumerate the elements of  $S$  in increasing order, as desired.

# Sample Question#1 Part b

1. Prove that the following are equivalent

**a)  $S$  is an infinite recursive (decidable) set.**

**b)  $S$  is the range of a monotonically increasing total recursive function.**

**Note:  $f$  is monotonically increasing means that  $\forall x f(x+1) > f(x)$ .**

**b) Implies a)**

**Let  $S$  be enumerated by the monotonically increasing algorithm  $f_S$ .**

**Define  $\chi_S$  by**

$$\chi_S(x) = (f_S((\mu z [f_S(z) \geq x]) == x)$$

**Clearly, if  $x$  is enumerated, it must appear before any values greater than it are enumerated and consequently this is a bounded search to find the first element listed that is at least as large as  $x$ . If this element is  $x$ , then  $x$  is in  $S$ , else it is not. The fact that  $f_S$  is monotonically increasing makes  $S$  infinite. The fact that it has a characteristic function makes it decidable.**

# Sample Question#2

2. Let A and B be re sets. For each of the following, either prove that the set is re, or give a counterexample that results in some known non-re set.

**Let A be semi decided by  $f_A$  and B by  $f_B$**

- a)  $A \cup B$ : must be re as it is semi-decided by**

$$f_{A \cup B}(x) = \exists t [\text{stp}(f_A, x, t) \ || \ \text{stp}(f_B, x, t) ]$$

- b)  $A \cap B$ : must be re as it is semi-decided by**

$$f_{A \cap B}(x) = \exists t [\text{stp}(f_A, x, t) \ \&\& \ \text{stp}(f_B, x, t) ]$$

- c)  $\sim A$ : can be non-re. If  $\sim A$  is always re, then all re are recursive as any set that is re and whose complement is re is decidable. However,  $A = K$  is a non-rec, re set and so  $\sim A$  is not re.**

# Sample Question#3

3. Present a demonstration that the *even* function is primitive recursive.

**even(x) = 1 if x is even**

**even(x) = 0 if x is odd**

You may assume only that the base functions are prf and that prf's are closed under a finite number of applications of composition and primitive recursion.

**DONE in class.**

# Sample Question#4

4. Given that the predicate **STP** and the function **VALUE** are prf's, show that we can semi-decide

**{ f |  $\varphi_f$  evaluates to 0 for some input }**

This can be shown re by the predicate

**{ f |  $\exists \langle x, t \rangle [stp(f, x, t) \ \&\& \ value(f, x, t) = 0] }$**

# Sample Question#5

5. Let  $S$  be an re (recursively enumerable), non-recursive set, and  $T$  be re, non-empty, possibly recursive set. Let  $E = \{ z \mid z = x + y, \text{ where } x \in S \text{ and } y \in T \}$ .
- (a) Can  $E$  be non re? **No as we can let  $S$  and  $T$  be semi-decided by  $f_S$  and  $f_T$ , resp.,  $E$  is then semi-dec. by  $f_E(z) = \exists \langle x, y, t \rangle [ \text{stp}(f_S, x, t) \ \&\& \ \text{stp}(f_T, y, t) \ \&\& \ (z = \text{value}(f_S, x, t) + \text{value}(f_T, y, t)) ]$**
- (b) Can  $E$  be re non-recursive? **Yes, just let  $T = \{0\}$ , then  $E = S$  which is known to be re, non-rec.**
- (c) Can  $E$  be recursive? **Yes, let  $T = \mathbb{N}$ , then  $E = \{ x \mid x \geq \min(S) \}$  which is a co-finite set and hence rec.**

# Sample Question#6

6. Assuming **TOTAL** is undecidable, use reduction to show the undecidability of **Incr** =  $\{ f \mid \forall x \varphi_f(x+1) > \varphi_f(x) \}$

Let  $f$  be arb.

Define  $G_f(x) = \varphi_f(x) - \varphi_f(x) + x$

$f \in \text{TOTAL}$  iff  $\forall x \varphi_f(x) \downarrow$  iff  $\forall x G_f(x) \downarrow$  iff

$\forall x \varphi_f(x) - \varphi_f(x) + x = x$  iff  $G_f \in \text{Incr}$

# Sample Question#7

7. Let  $\text{Incr} = \{ f \mid \forall x, \varphi_f(x+1) > \varphi_f(x) \}$ .

Let  $\text{TOT} = \{ f \mid \forall x, \varphi_f(x) \downarrow \}$ .

Prove that  $\text{Incr} \equiv_m \text{TOT}$ . Note Q#6 starts this one.

Let  $f$  be arb.

Define  $G_f(x) = \exists t[\text{stp}(f,x,t) \ \&\& \ \text{stp}(f,x+1,t) \ \&\& \ (\text{value}(f,x+1,t) > \text{value}(f,x,t))]$

$f \in \text{Incr}$  iff  $\forall x \varphi_f(x+1) > \varphi_f(x)$  iff

$\forall x G_f(x) \downarrow$  iff  $G_f \in \text{TOT}$



# Sample Question#8

8. Let  $\text{Incr} = \{ f \mid \forall x \varphi_f(x+1) > \varphi_f(x) \}$ . Use Rice's theorem to show  $\text{Incr}$  is not recursive.

**Non-Trivial as**

**$C_0(x)=0 \notin \text{Incr}; S(x)=x+1 \in \text{Incr}$**

**Let  $f, g$  be arb. Such that  $\forall x \varphi_f(x) = \varphi_g(x)$**

**$f \in \text{Incr}$  iff  $\forall x \varphi_f(x+1) > \varphi_f(x)$  iff**

**$\forall x \varphi_g(x+1) > \varphi_g(x)$  iff  $g \in \text{Incr}$**

# Sample Question#9

9. Let  $S$  be a recursive (decidable set), what can we say about the complexity (recursive, re non-recursive, non-re) of  $T$ , where  $T \subset S$ ?

**Nothing. Just let  $S = \mathbb{N}$ , then  $T$  could be any subset of  $\mathbb{N}$ . There are an uncountable number of such subsets and some are clearly in each of the categories above.**

# Sample Question#10

10. Define the pairing function  $\langle x, y \rangle$  and its two inverses  $\langle z \rangle_1$  and  $\langle z \rangle_2$ , where if  $z = \langle x, y \rangle$ , then  $x = \langle z \rangle_1$  and  $y = \langle z \rangle_2$ .

**Right out of Notes.**

# Sample Question#11

11. Assume  $\mathbf{A} \leq_m \mathbf{B}$  and  $\mathbf{B} \leq_m \mathbf{C}$ .  
Prove  $\mathbf{A} \leq_m \mathbf{C}$ .

**Done in class**

# Sample Question#12

12. Let  $P = \{ f \mid \exists x [ STP(f, x, x) ] \}$ . Why does Rice's theorem not tell us anything about the undecidability of  $P$ ?

**This is not an I/O property as we can have implementations of  $C_0$  that are efficient and satisfy  $P$  and others that do not.**