Lecture 7

Reduction

"A is reducible to B" means I could solve A *if* I had a subroutine for B

Ex:

Finding the max element in a list is reducible to sorting pf: sort the list in increasing order, take the last element (A big hammer for a small problem, but never mind...)

The Halting Problem

 $HALT_{TM} = \{ \langle M, w \rangle | TM M halts on input w \}$

Theorem: The halting problem is undecidable

Proof:

 $A = A_{TM}$, $B = HALT_{TM}$ Suppose I can reduce A to B. We already know A is undecidable, so must be that B is, too.

Suppose TM R decides HALT_{TM}. Consider S:

On input <M,w>, run R on it. If it rejects, halt & reject; if it accepts, run M on w; accept/reject as it does.

Then S decides A_{TM} , which is impossible. R can't exist.



Another Way

Rather than running R on <M,w>, and manipulating that answer, manipulate the input to build a new M' so that R's answer about <M',w> *directly* answers the question of interest.

Specifically, build M' as a clone of M, but modified so that if M halts-and-rejects, M' instead rejects by looping.

Then halt/not-halt for M' == accept/reject for M

Again, this reduces ATM to HALTTM



Reduction

Notation (not in book, but common):

 $A \leq_T B$ means "A is Turing Reducible to B"

I.e., if I had a TM deciding B, I could use it as a subroutine to solve A

Facts:

 $A \leq_T B \& B \text{ decidable implies } A \text{ decidable}$ (definition)

 $A \leq_T B \& A$ undecidable implies B undecidable (contrapositive)

 $A \leq_T B \& B \leq_T C$ implies $A \leq_T C$

$EMPTY_{TM}$ is undecidable

 $\mathsf{EMPTY}_{\mathsf{TM}} = \{ <\mathsf{M}> \mid \mathsf{M} \text{ is a TM s.t. } \mathsf{L}(\mathsf{M}) = \emptyset \}$

REGULAR_{TM} is undecidable

REGULAR_{TM} = { <M> | M is a TM s.t. L(M) is regular }

ATM ST Ray FM Given: < M, WY Duild M' That Ecⁿ 1ⁿ 1 NZO 3 M' on imput X: if X & Ecⁿelⁿ 1 NZO 3 magt if not everse tape Write W Schulach Mon W