A language (or its, associated decision problem) was acceptable is there is a machine that for every input string in the language the machine la lts + accepts (say Yes to) the string. (may reject or diverge otherwise) A language is decidable if there is a machine that always halts & correctly reports eccept or reject (les or No) otherwise. Undecidable otherwist. Noften use a description SMV of a

machine M as input.

The canonical undecidable problem Halt:= f(M, w> | M halts on w3 Accept, Rejeat, Diverge also undecidable.

Not acceptable To prove a language L is undecidable problem to reduce a known undecidable problem to language

NeverHalt:= f(M) Halt(M) = Ø3 make M halt Thm: Never Halt is und ecidable. Reduction <u>From</u> Halt, Proof: Suppose there is a machine NH that decides Never Halt. Given instance (M, w) of Halt, let Mw 6e the following machine. lveturn M(w)

1H(CM, w>): Need to proup & decides Halt. Suppose IN halts on w. Ma halts on every input x. So NH rejects (M.). So Haccepts (M, w). Suppose M diverges on W. Mu diverges on every imput x => NH accepts < Mn > => H rejects < M, w>

Build a machine

to devide Halt.

So H decides Halt.

However, Halt is undecidable. I NH cannot exist!

Never Accept, Never Reject, Never Diverge also

undecidable.

Halt Same = { (M, M,) = Halt (M,) = Halt (M2)} Do M, + M2 half on the same set of strings? Thm: Halt Samr is undecidable. (Reduce From Never Halt) Proof: Suppose there is a machine HS that decides Halt Same. Let N Ge a machine that never halts (immediate infinite loop). Build a machine NH for NeverHalt.

NH(CM7): return HS(<M,N>) Need to prove NH devides Never Italt. Suppose M never halts on any input. Neither does N so HS accepts < M N >.

Neither does N, so DS accepts (N, N).

=> NH accepts < M>.

Suppose M Loes halt on some input.

[Nachine N never halts, so HS reject < M, N>.

=> NH reject < M>.

NH does decide Never Halt.

But Nevertall is undecidable so HS cannot exist.

(Accept Some etc. undecidable)

"Given CM", does M accopt languages with property?" Rices Theorem: Let & be any family of languages (set ob sets ob strings) s.t. -there is a machine Y s.t. Accept (4) & L an strings Y accepts
-there is a machine N sit. Accept (N) & L

Then, Accept In (2):= { (M > | Accept (M) & 23 is undecidable. Proof: (Reduction from Halt) Assump أ L, and Six a machine Y sit. Accept (4) & L. (symmetry dor Ø E L). Suppose there is a machine Az that decides Accept In (2). Given an instance (M, w > of Halt, let M, i return Az ((Mw >)

Need to prove A decides Halt. Suppose M halts on W. For all strings x Accept(Mi) = Accept(Y) & & => A accepts < M *) => H accepts < M, w> Suppose M does not halt on w. Machine Mi diverges on all X. Accept (M+) = Ø + L =) An rejects < Mw

=> A, rejects < Mw >
=> H reject < Mw >
So H decides Halt. I. No machine A,

Thm: The follow decision problems that take a machine description (M) are undecidable: - Does Maccept &? - l: all languages containing E - Rice's thm - Y; accepts all strings (all E))
- N; accepts nothing · Does Maccept all palindromes with length - L'all languages with all palindromes of length prime. -Y: accepts all strings -N: accepts nothing

- Does M accept a non-regular language?

-R:all non-regular languages

-Y:accepts The language for | u = 0}

-N:accepts all strings

(z* is not non-regular)