Problem 1
Solve Problem 4 from: http://www.cs.nyu.edu/courses/fall07/G22.3520-001/ps2.pdf
Note: This is the problem about the algorithm $A(S)$.

Problem 2 (Pumping Lemma for regular languages)
Consider a DFA with $n$ states and suppose $x$ is a string accepted by the DFA with $|x| > n$. Show that $x$ can be written as $x = uvw$ (i.e. concatenation of three strings $u, v, w$) such that $|v| > 0$ and $uv^i w$ is accepted by the DFA for every integer $i \geq 0$ (i.e. concatenation of $u, v$ repeated $i$ times, and $w$).

Using this lemma, prove that $\{0^k1^k \mid k \geq 1\}$ is not a regular language.

Proof: Consider the path of length $|x|$ that takes the DFA from the starts state $q_0$ to an accept state $q_f$. Since $|x| > n$, there must be a state $q$ that repeats itself on the path. Write $x = uvw$ where $u$ takes the DFA from $q_0$ to $q$, then $v$ takes the DFA from $q$ to itself, and then $w$ takes the DFA from $q$ to $q_f$. Clearly, $|v| > 0$, and for every $i \geq 0$, the string $uv^i w$ takes the DFA from $q_0$ to $q_f$, and hence is accepted by the DFA.

Now suppose on the contrary that $L = \{0^k1^k \mid k \geq 1\}$ is regular and is accepted by a DFA with $n$ states. Consider the string $x = 0^n1^n \in L$. By the pumping lemma, one can write $x = uvw, |v| > 0$ and $uv^i w \in L \forall i \geq 0$. Note however that this is a contradiction since no matter what the partition $x = uvw$ is, the string $uv^2w \notin L$. Depending on what/where $v$ is, the string $uv^2w$ either contains more zeros than ones, or more ones than zeros, or a substring of type 011*0.

Problem 3
The standard procedure for converting an NFA to an equivalent DFA yields an exponential blowup in the number of states. That is, if the original NFA has $n$ states, then the resulting DFA has $2^n$ states. In this problem, you will show that such an exponential blowup is necessary in the worst case.

Define $L_n = \{w : \text{The } n\text{th symbol from the right is } 1\}$.

1. Give an NFA with $n + 1$ states that recognizes $L_n$.

2. Prove that any DFA with fewer than $2^n$ states cannot recognize $L_n$. Hint: Let $M$ be any DFA with fewer than $2^n$ states. Start by showing that there exist two different strings of length $n$ that drive $M$ to the same state.
**Problem 4**

If $A$ is a language, let $A_{\frac{1}{2}}$ be the set of all first halves of strings in $A$, i.e.

$$A_{\frac{1}{2}} = \{ x \mid \text{for some } y, |x| = |y|, \text{and } xy \in A \}.$$

Show that if $A$ is regular, so is $A_{\frac{1}{2}}$. *Hint: Run two DFAs “in parallel”, one forward and the other backward.*

**Solution:** Given a DFA $M$ that accepts $A$, we construct an NFA $M'$ that accepts $A_{\frac{1}{2}}$. The basic idea is as follows: to decide whether a string $x \in A_{\frac{1}{2}}$, we non-deterministically choose $y$ such that $|x| = |y|$. We simulate $M$ on $x$ and at the same time simulate $M$ backwards on string $y$. The simulation on $x$ starts with the start state of $M$ (call it $q_0$) whereas the simulation on $y$ starts with some accept state of $M$ (call it $q_f$). We accept iff both simulations reach the same state of $M$ (call it $q$). Thus we accept iff $x$ takes the DFA from $q_0$ to $q$ and $y$ takes it from $q$ to $q_f$. Since $q_f$ is an accept state of $M$, we ensure that $xy \in A$. The simultaneous simulation on $x$ and $y$ is carried out by the cartesian product construction, similar to proof of Theorem 1.2 in Sipser’s book.

Formally, if $(Q, \Sigma, \delta, q_0, F)$ describes the DFA $M$, then the NFA $M' = (Q', \Sigma, \delta', q_{start}, F')$ is defined as follows:

- $Q' = Q \times Q \cup \{q_{start}\}$.
- $F' = \{(q, q) \mid q \in Q\}$.
- There is $\epsilon$-move from $q_{start}$ to all the states in $\{(q_0, q_f) \mid q_f \in F\}$. These are the only moves possible from $q_{start}$.
- There is a move from $(q_1, q_2)$ to $(q_3, q_4)$ on input symbol $a \in \Sigma$ iff $\delta(q_1, a) = q_3$ and $\delta(q_4, b) = q_2$ for some $b \in \Sigma$. Formally,

  $$(q_3, q_4) \in \delta'((q_1, q_2), a) \text{ iff } \delta(q_1, a) = q_3 \text{ and } \exists b \in \Sigma \text{ s.t. } \delta(q_4, b) = q_2$$

**Problem 5**

For a language $A$, let $\text{SUFFIX}(A)$ denote the set of all suffixes of strings in $A$, i.e.

$$\text{SUFFIX}(A) = \{v \mid uv \in A \text{ for some string } u\}.$$

Show that if $A$ is a context-free language, so is $\text{SUFFIX}(A)$. *Hint: Design a PDA.*
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**Solution:** Let $A$ be a context-free language recognized by a PDA $M$. We will construct a PDA $R$ that recognizes $\text{SUFFIX}(A)$. On input $v$, the PDA $R$ works in two phases. The first phase operates without looking at the input. The PDA non-deterministically generates a symbol $a \in \Sigma$ and simulates (one or more) steps of $M$ until the symbol $a$ is read. The PDA repeats this sequence of moves (as many times as it wishes). It non-deterministically decides when to switch to second phase. In the second phase, the PDA looks at the input $v$ and simulates $M$ on $v$.

Note that $R$ accepts $v$ if and only if there exists $u \in \Sigma^*$ such that $M$ accepts $uv$. The string $u$ (and its length!) is ”guessed”.

**Problem 6**

Show that the following languages are decidable:

1. $\text{INFINITE}_{\text{DFA}} = \{ \langle D \rangle \mid D \text{ is a DFA such that } L(D) \text{ is infinite} \}$.

2. $L = \{ \langle R, S \rangle \mid R \text{ and } S \text{ are regular expressions such that } L(R) \subseteq L(S) \}$.

**Solution:** Using the proof of pumping lemma from Problem 2, it is clear that $L(D)$ is infinite if and only if there is a state $q$ of the DFA such that (i) $q$ is reachable from the start state $q_0$ (ii) some accept state is reachable from $q$ (iii) $q$ is on some non-trivial cycle. All three conditions can be checked for every state $q$ using standard algorithms.

**Solution:** We observe that $L(R) \subseteq L(S)$ if and only $L(R) \cap \overline{L(S)} = \emptyset$. Therefore the following TM decides

$$L = \{ \langle R, S \rangle : \text{R and S are regular expressions and } L(R) \subseteq L(S) \}.$$}

On input $\langle R, S \rangle$:

1. Construct a DFA $D$ such that $L(D) = L(R) \cap \overline{L(S)}$.

2. Run a TM $T$ that decides $E_{\text{DFA}}$ on input $\langle D \rangle$ (i.e. decides whether $L(D)$ is empty. We did this in class).

3. If $T$ accepts, output ACCEPT. If $T$ rejects, output REJECT.

**Problem 7**

In this problem, we explore the notion of oracle reducibility. If $A$ is a language, then a Turing machine with oracle $A$ is a Turing machine with a “magical” subroutine that decides membership in $A$. In other words, the subroutine, when given a string $w$, tells the machine whether or not $w \in A$. Let

$$\text{HALT}_{\text{TM}} = \{ \langle M, x \rangle \mid M \text{ is a Turing machine that halts on } x \}.$$}

Show that there is a Turing machine with oracle $\text{HALT}_{\text{TM}}$ that decides the following problem with only two questions to the oracle: Given three (machine, input) pairs $\langle M_1, x_1 \rangle, \langle M_2, x_2 \rangle, \langle M_3, x_3 \rangle$, decide for each pair whether the Turing machine halts on the corresponding input.

Note: This is trivial if one allows three questions. Just ask the oracle whether $\langle M_i, x_i \rangle \in \text{HALT}_{\text{TM}}$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$.
Solution: Suppose that exactly $k$ of the machines \{$M_1, M_2, M_3$\} halt on corresponding inputs. The idea is to figure out the value of $k$. Once we know $k$, we can decide which ones halt: simply simulate the three machines on corresponding inputs simultaneously (one step of every machine at a time), and halt when exactly $k$ of them halt. Since we know $k$, we are guaranteed to halt.

This is how we figure out the value of $k$. First construct a machine $M$ that simulates the three machines on corresponding inputs simultaneously and halts if at least two of them halt. Now decide whether $M$ halts by asking the oracle.

(Case 1): If $M$ halts, we know that $k \geq 2$. By running the machines simultaneously again, we figure out which two of the machines halt. Then by asking the oracle, we can figure out whether the third machine halts.

(Case 2): If $M$ does not halt, we know that $k \leq 1$. Construct a machine $M'$ that simulates the three machines on corresponding inputs simultaneously and halts if at least one of them halts. Decide whether $M'$ halts by asking the oracle. If $M'$ halts, then we know that $k = 1$. If $M'$ does not halt, we know that $k = 0$.

Problem 8

Show that the collection of Turing-recognizable languages is closed under the operation of (a) union (b) concatenation (c) star and (d) intersection. What about complementation operation?

Solution:

(a) Let $L_1$ and $L_2$ be two Turing-recognizable languages, and let $M_1$ and $M_2$ be TMs that recognizes $L_1$ and $L_2$ respectively. We construct a TM $M$ that recognizes $L_1 \cup L_2$: On input $w$,

1. Run $M_1$ and $M_2$ on $w$ “in parallel”. That is, in each step, $M$ runs one step of $M_1$ and one step of $M_2$.
2. If either of $M_1$ and $M_2$ accepts, output ACCEPT. If both reject, output REJECT.

If $M_1$ or $M_2$ accepts $w$, then $M$ will halt and accept $w$ since $M_1$ and $M_2$ are run in parallel and an accepting TM will halt and accept $w$ in a finite number of steps. If both $M_1$ and $M_2$ reject $w$, then $M$ will reject $w$. If neither $M_1$ nor $M_2$ accepts $w$ and one of them loops on $w$, then $M$ will loop on $w$. Thus $L(M) = L_1 \cup L_2$, and Turing-recognizable languages are closed under union.

(b) Let $L_1$ and $L_2$ be two Turing-recognizable languages, and let $M_1$ and $M_2$ be TMs that recognizes $L_1$ and $L_2$ respectively. We construct a NTM $N$ that recognizes $L_1 \circ L_2$: On input $w$,

1. Nondeterministically split $w$ into two parts $w = xy$.
2. Run $M_1$ on $x$. If it rejects, halt output REJECT. If it accepts, go to Step 3.
3. Run $M_2$ on $w$. If it accepts, output ACCEPT. If it rejects, output REJECT.

If $w \in L_1 \circ L_2$, then there is a way to split $w$ into two parts $w = xy$ such that $x \in L_1$ and $y \in L_2$, thus, $M_1$ halts and accepts $x$, and $M_2$ halts and accepts $y$. Hence at least one branch of $N$ will accept $w$. On the other hand, if $w \notin L_1 \circ L_2$, then for every possible splitting $w = xy$, $x \notin L_1$ or $y \notin L_2$, so $M_1$ does not accept $x$ or $M_2$ does not accept $y$. Thus, all branch of $N$ will reject $w$. Therefore, $L(N) = L_1 \circ L_2$, and Turing-recognizable languages are closed under concatenation.

(c) Let $L$ be a Turing-recognizable languages, and let $M$ be a TM that recognizes $L$. We construct a TM $M'$ that recognizes $L^*$: On input $w$,
1. Nondeterministically choose an integer \( k \) and split \( w \) into \( k \) parts \( w = w_1 w_2 \cdots w_k \).

2. Run \( M \) on each \( w_i \). If \( M \) accepts all of \( w_1, \ldots, w_k \), output ACCEPT. If \( M \) rejects one of \( w_1, \ldots, w_k \), output REJECT.

If \( w \in L^* \), then there is a splitting of \( w = w_1 w_2 \cdots w_k \) such that \( w_i \in L \) for each \( i \), and thus at least one branch of \( M' \) will accept \( w \). On the other hand, if \( w \not\in L^* \), then for every possible splitting \( w = w_1 w_2 \cdots w_k \), \( w_i \not\in L \) for at least one \( i \), thus all branches of \( M' \) will reject \( w \). Therefore, \( L(M') = L^* \), and Turing-recognizable languages are closed under the star operation.

(d) Let \( L_1 \) and \( L_2 \) be two Turing-recognizable languages, and let \( M_1 \) and \( M_2 \) be TMs that recognizes \( L_1 \) and \( L_2 \) respectively. We construct a TM \( M \) that recognizes \( L_1 \cap L_2 \): On input \( w \),

1. Run \( M_1 \) on \( w \). If it rejects, halt and output REJECT. If it accepts, go to Step 2.
2. Run \( M_2 \) on \( w \). If it accepts, output ACCEPT. If it rejects, output REJECT.

Clearly \( L(M) = L_1 \cap L_2 \), and thus Turing-recognizable languages are closed under intersection.

(e) Not closed under complementation. Suppose it were true that whenever \( L \) is Turing-recognizable, so is \( \overline{L} \). So whenever \( L \) is Turing-recognizable, then both \( L, \overline{L} \) would be Turing-recognizable, and hence \( L \) would be decidable (as proved in class). This is a contradiction since there exists a language that is Turing-recognizable but not decidable, e.g. the language \( A_{TM} \).

Problem 9
Show that every context free language is in \( P \). In other words, for any fixed grammar \( G \), design a polynomial time algorithm to test whether a given string \( w \) is generated by the grammar. The algorithm should run in time polynomial in \( |w| \). The size of the grammar itself is thought of as a constant. Hint: Use dynamic programming. Assume w.l.o.g. that the grammar is in Chomsky normal form.

Problem 10
Show that \( P \) is closed under the star operation (Hint: Use dynamic programming.) Recall that for a language \( L \),

\[
L^* = \{x_1 x_2 \cdots x_k \mid k \geq 0, \ x_i \in L \ \forall 1 \leq i \leq k\}
\]

Solution: We show that \( P \) is closed under the star operation by dynamic programming. Let \( L \in P \), and let \( A \) be a polynomial-time algorithm that decides \( L \). We construct a polynomial-time algorithm \( B \) that decides \( L^* \), as follows. On input \( w = w_1 \cdots w_n \), algorithm \( B \) constructs a table \( T \) such that \( T[i, j] = 1 \) if \( w_i \cdots w_j \in L^* \), and \( T[i, j] = 0 \) otherwise. Details follow.

Algorithm B:
On input \( w = w_1 \cdots w_n \),

1. If \( w = \varepsilon \), output ACCEPT and halt.
2. Initialize $T[i, j] = 0$ for each $0 \leq i \leq j \leq n$.

3. For $i = 1$ to $n$:  
   (a) Run $M$ on $w_i$ to decide whether $w_i \in L$.
   (b) If $w_i \in L$, then set $T[i, i] = 1$.

4. For $\ell = 2$ to $n$: 
   For $i = 1$ to $n - \ell + 1$:  
      (a) Let $j = i + \ell - 1$.
      (b) Run $M$ on $w_i \cdots w_j$ to decide whether $w_i \cdots w_j \in L$.
      (c) If $w_i \cdots w_j \in L$, then set $T[i, j] = 1$.
      (d) For $k = i$ to $j - 1$:  
         If $T[i, k] = 1$ and $T[k, j] = 1$, then set $T[i, j] = 1$.

5. Output ACCEPT if $T[1, n] = 1$; else output REJECT.

It is not hard to see that Algorithm $B$ correctly decides $L^*$ provided that Algorithm $A$ correctly
decides $L$. Moreover, Algorithm $B$ runs in $O(n^3)$ stages, and each stage takes polynomial-time as
$A$ runs in polynomial-time. Therefore, Algorithm $B$ is a polynomial-time algorithm that decides $L^*$.

Problem 11 (Do not submit)

Show that these problems are NP-complete (you can assume that SAT and CLIQUE are NP-complete).

1. DOUBLE-SAT = $\{\langle \phi \rangle \mid \phi$ is a boolean formula that has at least two satisfying assignments$\}$.

2. HALF-CLIQUE = $\{\langle G \rangle \mid G$ is a graph with a clique of size at least $|G|/2\}$.

Solution: Clearly Double-SAT $\in$ NP, since a NTM can decide Double-SAT as follows: On input a
Boolean formula $\varphi(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$, nondeterministically guess 2 assignments and verify whether both satisfy $\varphi$. To show that Double-SAT is NP-Complete, we give a reduction from SAT to Double-SAT, as follows:

On input $\varphi(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$:

1. Introduce a new variable $y$.

2. Output formula $\varphi'(x_1, \ldots, x_n, y) = \varphi(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \land (y \lor \overline{y})$.

---

1. Test each substring of length 1
2. $\ell$ is the length of the substring
3. $i$ is the start position of the substring
4. $j$ is the end position of the substring
5. $k$ is the split position
6. $T[1, n] = 1$ if and only if $w = w_1 \cdots w_n \in L^*$. 
If \( \varphi(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \in \text{SAT} \), then \( \varphi \) has at least 1 satisfying assignment, and therefore \( \varphi'(x_1, \ldots, x_n, y) \) has at least 2 satisfying assignments as we can satisfy the new clause \((y \lor \overline{y})\) by assigning either \( y = 1 \) or \( y = 0 \) to the new variable \( y \), so \( \varphi'(x_1, \ldots, x_n, y) \in \text{Double-SAT} \). On the other hand, if \( \varphi(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \notin \text{SAT} \), then clearly \( \varphi'(x_1, \ldots, x_n, y) = \varphi(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \land (y \lor \overline{y}) \) has no satisfying assignment either, so \( \varphi'(x_1, \ldots, x_n, y) \notin \text{Double-SAT} \). Therefore, SAT \( \leq_P \) Double-SAT, and hence Double-SAT is \( \text{NP-Complete} \).

**Solution:** Clearly \( \text{Half-CLIQUE} \in \text{NP} \), since a NTM can decide \( \text{Half-CLIQUE} \) as follows: On input a graph \( G \), nondeterministically choose at least \( n/2 \) nodes and verify whether they form a clique. To show that \( \text{Half-CLIQUE} \) is \( \text{NP-Complete} \), we give a reduction from CLIQUE to Half-CLIQUE, as follows:

On input \( (G, k) \), where \( G \) is a graph on \( n \) vertices and \( k \) is an integer:

1. If \( k = n/2 \), then output \((G)\).
2. If \( k < n/2 \), then construct a new graph \( G' \) by adding a complete graph with \( n - 2k \) vertices and connecting them to all vertices in \( G \), and output \((G')\).
3. If \( k > n/2 \), then construct a new graph \( G'' \) by adding \( 2k - n \) isolated vertices\(^7\) to \( G \), and output \((G'')\).

When \( k = n/2 \), it is clear that \((G, n/2) \in \text{CLIQUE}\) if and only if \((G') \in \text{Half-CLIQUE}\).

When \( k < n/2 \), if \( G \) has a \( k \)-clique, then \( G' \) has a clique of size \( k + (n - 2k) = (2n - 2k)/2 \), and therefore \((G') \in \text{Half-CLIQUE}\) as \( G' \) is a graph with \( 2n - 2k \) vertices. Conversely, if \((G') \in \text{Half-CLIQUE}\), that is, if \( G' \) has a clique of size \( n - k = k + (n - 2k) \), then at most \( n - 2k \) of the clique come from the \( n - 2k \) new vertices. Therefore the remaining at least \( k \) vertices form a clique in \( G \), and hence \((G, k) \in \text{CLIQUE}\).

When \( k > n/2 \), if \( G \) has a \( k \)-clique, then \( G'' \) has a clique size \( k = 2k/2 \), and therefore \((G') \in \text{Half-CLIQUE}\) as \( G'' \) is a graph with \( n + 2k - n = 2k \) vertices. Conversely, if \((G'') \in \text{Half-CLIQUE}\), that is, if \( G'' \) has a clique of size \( k \), then the clique does not contain any of the new vertices as they are isolated. Thus the clique is a \( k \)-clique of \( G \), and hence \((G, k) \in \text{CLIQUE}\).

**Problem 12**

Let \( \{x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n\} \) be boolean variables. A literal is either a variable or its negation, i.e. \( x_i \) or \( \overline{x_i} \). A clause is logical OR of one or more distinct literals. The size of a clause is the number of literals in it. A 2CNF formula \( \phi \) is a collection of \( m \) clauses (possibly with repetition),

\[
\phi = (C_1, C_2, \ldots, C_m)
\]

where each \( C_i \) is of size at most two. Let MAX-2SAT be the following decision problem: Given a pair \((\phi, k)\) where \( \phi \) is a 2CNF formula with \( n \) variables and \( m \) clauses, and \( k \) is a positive integer such that \( k \leq m \), decide whether there exists an assignment to the \( n \) boolean variables that satisfies at least \( k \) clauses. Show that MAX-2SAT is \( \text{NP-complete} \), by giving a polynomial time reduction from VERTEX COVER.

\(^7\)An isolated vertex is one which is not adjacent to any other vertex.
Recall that VERTEX COVER is a problem where, given an undirected graph $G = (V,E)$, with $|V| = n$, and given a positive integer $\ell \leq n$, one needs to decide whether $G$ has a vertex cover of size at most $\ell$. A vertex cover is a subset $V' \subseteq V$ such that for every edge in $E$, at least one of its endpoints is included in $V'$.

**Hint:** To every vertex in the graph, assign a boolean variable which is intended to be TRUE if and only if the vertex is included in the vertex cover. Add clauses of size two corresponding to the edges, and clauses of size one corresponding to the vertices. The clauses corresponding to edges may need to be repeated a number of times.

**Solution:** It appears as Problem-2 here:

http://www.cs.nyu.edu/web/Academic/Graduate/exams/sample/algs_f07_ans.pdf