

READING

See the course web page.

PROBLEMS**1. Rice's Theorem for Function Indices**

Consider this version of Rice's Theorem stated in terms of function indices rather than set indices.

Theorem: (Rice). Let $P(\phi)$ be a property of functions[†].

$\theta P = \{i \mid P(\phi_i) \text{ is true}\}$ is decidable iff $\theta P = \emptyset \vee \theta P = \mathbb{N}$.

Prove this version of Rice's theorem using the Recursion Theorem. *HINT:* Write A for θP . Suppose P is non-trivial, so that $A \neq \emptyset$ and $A \neq \mathbb{N}$. If A were recursive, then $A \leq_m \bar{A}$ via some t.c.f. f (Why?). Apply the Recursion Theorem to f to obtain a contradiction.

2. No Total Destroyer Function

The recursion theorem states:

$$(\forall t.c.f. f) (\exists x) (\forall y) \phi_x(y) = \phi_{f(x)}(y) \quad (\text{RT})$$

(a) Write down the logical negation of equation (RT), i.e.,

$$(\exists t.c.f. f) \dots \quad (\neg\text{RT})$$

Since (RT) is a theorem, the assertion (\neg RT) must be *false*.

(b) Apply this observation to solve Homework 3.11, p. 57 of the Text.

3. Bounded Quantification

The characteristic function c_P of a k -ary predicate $P(\bar{y})$ is a k -ary function such that $c_P(\bar{y}) = 1$ whenever $P(\bar{y})$ is true, and $c_P(\bar{y}) = 0$ otherwise. A predicate P is said to be a *LOOP predicate* iff c_P is computable by a *LOOP* program.

If Q is a $k+1$ -ary predicate, define its *bounded existential quantification* as the $k+1$ -ary predicate EQ given by

$$EQ(\bar{n}, m) \Leftrightarrow (\exists i \leq m) [Q(\bar{n}, i)]$$

Similarly, its *bounded universal quantification* is the predicate

$$AQ(\bar{n}, m) \Leftrightarrow (\forall i \leq m) [Q(\bar{n}, i)]$$

(a) Prove: If Q is a *LOOP* predicate, then so are its bounded existential and bounded universal quantifications.

(b) What if the word "bounded" is removed in the above so that, for example, we get the k -ary predicate $EQ(\bar{n}) \Leftrightarrow (\exists i) Q(\bar{n}, i)$? Are the resulting predicates still *LOOP* predicates?

[†]for example, " ϕ is bijective", " ϕ is total". The property must be independent of the particular TM that may implement ϕ .

4. Complexity Class Comparisons

What, if any, is the relationship between each of the following pairs of complexity classes? Possible answers are: one is properly contained in the other (e.g., \subsetneq), they are equal, or the classes are *incomparable* with respect to inclusion (neither one contains the other). Prove your answers.

- (a) **DSPACE**(n^2) and **DTIME**(n)
- (b) **DTIME**(2^n) and **DTIME**(3^n).
- (c) **NSPACE**(2^n) and **NSPACE**(5^n)
- (d) **DSPACE**(n) and **DTIME**($\lceil \log n \rceil^n$)

5. Parameters Matter

A *clique* in an undirected graph G is a subgraph wherein every two nodes are connected by an edge. A k -*clique* is a clique with k nodes. Let $\langle G \rangle$ denote the encoding of a graph as a string in some suitable manner. It is known that the following problem is **NP**-complete:

$$CLIQUE = \{ \langle G \rangle, k \mid G \text{ is an undirected graph with a } k\text{-clique} \}.$$

A *triangle* in an undirected graph that is a 3-clique. Show that the problem $TRIANGLE \in \mathbf{P}$, where

$$TRIANGLE = \{ \langle G \rangle \mid G \text{ is an undirected graph with a 3-clique} \}.$$

(Moral: fixing the value of a problem parameter may change the complexity of the resulting “special case” of the problem.)

6. L_U Analogue

Define

$$U_{\mathbf{NP}} = \{ \langle M, x, 1^t \rangle \mid M \text{ is a } \textit{nondeterministic} \text{ TM that accepts input } x \text{ within } t \text{ steps} \}$$

Show that $U_{\mathbf{NP}}$ is **NP**-complete.

$U_{\mathbf{NP}}$ defined in this problem is the “**NP** complexity class analogue” of L_U (which you recall was complete in class **CE**.) *HINT*: Since $3SAT \in \mathbf{NP}$, there is some fixed *nondeterministic* TM M_{3SAT} that decides $3SAT$ in (nondet.) time cn^k , for some fixed positive c and k . This also hints at the reduction to use ...