- 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  $\forall x \ f(x+1) > f(x)$ .

**DONE** in class and notes.

 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<sub>A</sub> and B by f<sub>B</sub>

- a) A  $\cup$  B: must be re as it is semi-decided by  $f_{A \cup B}(x) = \exists t [stp(f_A, x, t) | | stp(f_B, x, t)]$
- b) A  $\cap$  B: must be re as it is semi-decided by  $f_{A \cap B}(x) = \exists t [stp(f_A, x, t) \&\& stp(f_B, x, t)]$
- c) ~A: can be non-re. If ~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 ~A is not re.

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.

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

```
{ f | \phi_f evaluates to 0 for some input}
This can be shown re by the predicate
{f | \exists < x,t > [stp(f,x,t) && value(f,x,t) = 0] }
```

- 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  $f_E(z) = \exists \langle x,y,t \rangle [stp(f_S, x, t) \&\& stp(f_T, y, t) \&\& (z = value(f_S, x, t) *value(f_T, y, t))]$
  - (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  $T = \frac{1}{5}$ , then  $E = \{x \mid x \ge min (S)\}$  which is a co-finite set and hence rec.

Assuming TOTAL is undecidable, use reduction to show the undecidability of Incr = { f | ∀x φ<sub>f</sub> (x+1) > φ<sub>f</sub> (x) }
Let f be arb.
Define G<sub>f</sub> (x) = φ<sub>f</sub> (x) - φ<sub>f</sub> (x) + x
f ∈ TOTAL iff ∀xφ<sub>f</sub> (x)↓ iff ∀x G<sub>f</sub>(x)↓ iff ∀x φ<sub>f</sub> (x) - φ<sub>f</sub> (x) + x = x iff G<sub>f</sub> ∈ Incr

7. Let Incr = { f |  $\forall x, \varphi_f(x+1) > \varphi_f(x)$  }. Let **TOT** = { f |  $\forall x, \varphi_f(x) \downarrow$  }. Prove that  $Incr \equiv_m TOT$ . Note Q#6 starts this one. Let f be arb. Define  $G_f(x) = \exists t[stp(f,x,t) \&\& stp(f,x+1,t)]$ && (value(f,x+1,t) > value(f,x,t))]  $f \in Incr iff \forall x \varphi_f(x+1) > \varphi_f(x) iff$  $\forall x G_f(x) \downarrow iff G_f \subseteq TOT$ 

8. Let Incr = { f |  $\forall x \ \phi_f(x+1) > \phi_f(x)$  }. Use Rice's theorem to show 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  $\forall x \ \phi_f(x)=\phi_g(x)$   $f \in \text{Incr iff } \forall x \ \phi_f(x+1) > \phi_f(x) \text{ iff}$   $\forall x \ \phi_g(x+1) > \phi_g(x) \text{ iff } g \in \text{Incr}$ 

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 ⊂ S?

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

10. Define the pairing function <x,y> and its two inverses <z><sub>1</sub> and <z><sub>2</sub>, where if z = <x,y>, then x = <z><sub>1</sub> and y = <z><sub>2</sub>.

Right out of Notes.

11. Assume  $A \leq_m B$  and  $B \leq_m C$ . Prove  $A \leq_m C$ .

Done in class

12. Let **P** = { **f** | **∃ 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.