

Sean Williams

Notes 4.3 through 4.15

Prove Real Numbers are uncountable:

N	Real Number:
1	. <u>5</u> 000...
2	.2 <u>5</u> 00...
3	.32 <u>5</u> 0...
4	.411 <u>6</u> ...

$d_i = n_i(d_i) + 1$ | ith digit of n_i

Using this formula we obtain .6667...-> which is not on the list

f: $\mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$

	1	2	3	4
F1	<u>3</u>	1	2	10
F2	2	<u>2</u>	2	2
F3	1	2	<u>3</u>	4
g	4	3	4	...

$$g(1) = F1(1) + 1$$

$$g(2) = F2(2) + 1$$

$$g(k) = Fk(k) + 1$$

$P(\mathbb{N})$ = the subsets of the natural numbers

	1	2	3	4
S1	<u>1</u>	0	1	1
S2	0	<u>1</u>	1	1
S3	1	1	<u>0</u>	0
t	0	0	1	...

If $k \subseteq S_k$ then $k \in t$

If $k \not\subseteq S_k$ then $k \notin t$

Turing Recognizable \Leftrightarrow Enumerable

Turing Recognizable: TM M recognizes the language

try out all strings of length i or less for i steps

$\epsilon, 0, 1$
 $\epsilon, 00, 01, 10, 11, 01$

Whenever a string gets accepted, output it.
(keep track of accepted strings and don't run these again)

If we have an enumerator E, we will create a TM M as follows:
Given an input string s, run the enumerator, if s ever shows up on the output, accept.

Hilbert's Problem:

Polynomial $6x^3y + 3x^2z - 4xz + 5$
This is unsolvable

Equivalent:

Turing's definition of an algorithm: What can be computed on a Turing machine
Church's definition of an algorithm: Using λ calculus

Our intuitive notion of an algorithm \Leftrightarrow Formal notion

Decidable Qs:

Given a graph G, is G connected?

$L = \{ \langle G \rangle \mid G \text{ is a connected graph} \}$
Where $\langle G \rangle$ is a string encoding of the graph

$A_{DFA} = \{ \langle B \rangle \mid B \text{ is an NFA that accepts } w \}$
Simulate w on B, return the end result

$A_{NFA} = \{ \langle B \rangle \mid B \text{ is an NFA that accepts } w \}$
1) Algorithm to convert NFA \Rightarrow DFA B'
2) Run w on B'

$E_{DFA} = \{ \langle B \rangle \mid L(B) = \emptyset \}$
k states: all strings of length k or less

$EQ_{DFA} = \{ \langle A, B \rangle \mid L(A) = L(B) \}$
iff $L(A) = L(B)$
then $L(A) \cap \sim L(B) = \emptyset$
 $\sim L(A) \cap L(B) = \emptyset$
if $L(A) \neq L(B)$ then
can $L(A) \cap \sim L(B) = \emptyset$
and $\sim L(A) \cap L(B) = \emptyset$
A, create B' to accept $\sim L(B)$