## Answers to the CSCE 551 Final Exam, April 30, 2008

1. (15 points) Use the Pumping Lemma to show that the language
$L=\left\{x \in\{0,1\}^{*} \mid\right.$ the number of 0 s and 1 s in $x$ differ (in either direction) by at most 2008$\}$ is not regular.

Answer: Given $p>0$, let $s=0^{p} 1^{p+2008}$. Clearly, $|s|=2 p+2008 \geq p$ and $s \in L$. If $x, y, z$ are such that $x y z=s,|x y| \leq p$, and $|y|>0$, then we must have $y=0^{m}$ for some $m>0$. Letting $i=0$, we remove $m$ zeros to get

$$
x y^{i} z=x y^{0} z=x z=0^{p-m} 1^{p+2008} \notin L .
$$

Thus by the Pumping Lemma, $L$ is not regular. (There are many other workable choices of $s$ and $i$.)
2. (10 points) The following DFA is not minimum:


Using any method you like, find the minimum equivalent DFA. (Draw its transition diagram.)

Answer: States $A$ and $C$ are the only pair of indistinguishable states. Combining them, we get the minimum DFA:

3. (15 points) Give an m-reduction from $A_{\mathrm{TM}}$ to the language

$$
B=\{\langle R\rangle \mid R \text { is a TM that accepts a string } w \text { iff }|w|=2008\} .
$$

Answer: Let
$f=$ "On input $\langle M, w\rangle$ where $M$ is a TM and $w$ is a string:
(a) Let $R=$ 'On input $x$ :
i. If $|x| \neq 2008$ then reject
ii. Simulate $M$ on $w$ (and do what $M$ does) ${ }^{\prime}$
(b) Output $\langle R\rangle$ "

Then $f$ m-reduces $A_{\mathrm{TM}}$ to $B$.
4. (25 points total) Fix some enumerator $E$. Let $A$ be the language of all strings $w$ such that

- E prints $w$ at least once, and
- $w$ is at least as long as any string that $E$ prints before it first prints $w$.

Show:
(a) (15 points) $A$ is decidable.
(b) (10 points) If $E$ enumerates an infinite language, then $A$ is infinite.
[This proves that every infinite Turing recognizable set has an infinite decidable subset.]

Answer: Let $L$ be the language enumerated by $E$. It follows from the definition that $A \subseteq L$.
(a) There are two cases:
$L$ is finite: Then $A$ is also finite. Since every finite language is decidable (regular even), then $A$ is decidable.
$L$ is infinite: Let $D$ implement the following algorithm:
"On input $w$ :
i. Run $E$ until it either prints $w$ or it prints some string longer than $w$, whichever comes first
ii. If $E$ prints $w$, then accept
iii. If $E$ prints a string longer than $w$, then reject"

Since $E$ enumerates an infinite language (by assumption), it must print strings that are arbitrarily long. Thus on any input $w$, Step (i) will eventually complete, and so $D$ is a decider. It is also straightforward to see that $w \in A$ iff $D$ accepts $w$. Thus $D$ decides $A$, and so $A$ is decidable.
[Note that in general we cannot compute, given $\langle E\rangle$, which case holds-finite or infinite. This question is undecidable, but it does not affect the decidability of A.]
(b) Assume that $L$ is infinite. For any length $n \geq 0$, there are only finitely many strings of length $\leq n$, and so $E$ must eventually print a string longer than $n$. The first such string printed by $E$ is in $A$ (clearly). So $A$ contains a string longer than $n$. Since $n$ is arbitrary, $A$ must contain arbitrarily long strings, so $A$ must be infinite.
5. (10 points) Prove that if TQBF $\in \mathrm{NP}$, then $\mathrm{NP}=\mathrm{PSPACE}$.

Answer: We already know that NP $\subseteq$ PSPACE (this was proven in class), so it suffices to show that PSPACE $\subseteq$ NP. Let $A$ be any language in PSPACE. We know that TQBF is PSPACE-complete, so in particular, TQBF is PSPACE-hard, which means $A \leq_{\mathrm{m}}^{\mathrm{p}}$ TQBF because $A \in$ PSPACE. Now suppose that TQBF $\in \mathrm{NP}$. We proved in class that for any languages $C$ and $D$, if $C \leq_{\mathrm{m}}^{\mathrm{p}} D$ and $D \in \mathrm{NP}$, then $C \in$ NP. In this case, we have $A \leq_{\mathrm{m}}^{\mathrm{p}} \mathrm{TQBF}$ and TQBF $\in$ NP (by assumption), and thus $A \in$ NP. Since $A$ was any PSPACE language, this shows that PSPACE $\subseteq$ NP.
6. (15 points) Let

$$
L=\left\{\langle M, w\rangle \mid M \text { is a DFA that accepts } w^{n} \text { for all } n \geq 0\right\} .
$$

Show that $L \in \mathbf{P}$ by giving a polynomial-time decision procedure for $L$. (A high-level algorithm will suffice.)

## Answer: Let

$N=$ "On input $\langle M, w\rangle$ where $M$ is a DFA and $w$ is a string:
(a) Let $n$ be the number of states of $M$
(b) For $i:=0$ to $n-1$ do
i. Run $M$ on input $w^{i}$
ii. If $M$ rejects $w^{i}$, then reject
(c) Accept"

Why this works: Clearly, $N$ runs in polynomial time (quartic time, actually, although this is not optimal). It is also clear that if $\langle M, w\rangle \in L$ then $N$ accepts $\langle M, w\rangle$. But the converse is also true: Suppose $M=\left(Q, \Sigma, \delta, q_{0}, F\right)$, where $|Q|=n$. Let $q_{0}, q_{1}, q_{2}, \ldots$ be the sequence of states that $M$ enters after reading inputs $w^{0}, w^{1}, w^{2}, \ldots$, respectively. That is, let $q_{i}=\delta\left(q_{0}, w^{i}\right)$ for all $i \geq 0$, and note that $q_{i+1}=\delta\left(q_{i}, w\right)$. By its construction, $N$ accepts $\langle M, w\rangle$ if and only if $\left\{q_{0}, q_{1}, \ldots, q_{n-1}\right\} \subseteq F$. Since $M$ has only $n$ states, by the Pigeon Hole Principle, there must be some $0 \leq i<j \leq n$ such that $q_{i}=q_{j}$ (this is similar to the proof of the Pumping Lemma). But then, $q_{i+1}=q_{j+1}, q_{i+2}=q_{j+2}$, etc. That is, we have a loop, which implies that all states in the sequence are in the set $\left\{q_{0}, q_{1}, \ldots, q_{n-1}\right\}$. Thus $N$ only needs to test whether these states are all in $F$.
7. (20 points total) Let $\varphi$ be the quantified Boolean formula

$$
\left(\exists x_{1}\right)\left(\forall x_{2}\right)\left(\exists x_{3}\right)\left[\left(x_{1} \vee x_{3}\right) \wedge\left(x_{2} \vee \overline{x_{3}}\right) \wedge\left(\overline{x_{1}} \vee \overline{x_{2}}\right)\right] .
$$

(a) (15 points) Give the instance $\langle G, s\rangle$ of GG that $\varphi$ maps to via the p-m-reduction of TQBF to GG described either in the book or in class. (Draw the digraph $G$ and label the start vertex s.)

## Answer:


(b) (5 points) Is $\varphi$ true?

Answer: No, $\varphi$ is false. For any truth value Alice picks for $x_{1}$, Bob picks the same truth value for $x_{2}$, which guarantees that at least one clause is violated, regardless of Alice's choice of $x_{3}$. This shows that Bob has a winning strategy, not Alice.

