

**Problem 1.** (80 points) Let  $A$  be the language of the regular expression  $0^*10 \cup 1^*0$ .

- (a) Construct an NFA that accepts  $A$ .
- (b) Determinize your NFA.
- (c) Minimize the resulting DFA.
- (d) What is the index of  $A$ ?
- (e) What is the index of the complement of  $A$ ?

For part (a), you should follow the algorithm for converting a regular expression to an NFA, but you are allowed to take short-cuts that omit  $\epsilon$ -transitions. For part (b), use the subset construction. For part (c), use the minimization algorithm.

**Problem 2.** (40 points) Let  $A$  be the language over the alphabet  $\{(\,),[,]\}$  that contains all balanced strings of parentheses and brackets. For example,  $(([]))[] \in A$  and  $[] \notin A$ .

- (a) Give a CFG that generates  $A$ .
- (b) Give the transition diagram of a PDA that accepts  $A$ .

**Problem 3.** (80 points) For two languages  $A$  and  $B$ , we define the two languages

$$Split(A, B) = \{x_1yx_2 \mid x_1x_2 \in A \text{ and } y \in B\}$$

and

$$SymSplit(A, B) = \{x_1yx_2 \mid x_1x_2 \in A \text{ and } y \in B \text{ and } 0 \leq |x_1| - |x_2| \leq 1\}.$$

For  $A = 0^*$  and  $B = 1^*$ , describe  $Split(A, B)$  and  $SymSplit(A, B)$  in words. Then prove or disprove each of the following four statements:

- (a) If  $A$  and  $B$  are regular, then  $Split(A, B)$  is regular.
- (b) If  $A$  and  $B$  are regular, then  $Split(A, B)$  is context-free.
- (c) If  $A$  and  $B$  are regular, then  $SymSplit(A, B)$  is regular.
- (d) If  $A$  and  $B$  are regular, then  $SymSplit(A, B)$  is context-free.

To prove (a), given finite automata that accept  $A$  and  $B$ , construct a finite automaton that accepts  $Split(A, B)$ . To disprove (a), find specific languages  $A$  and  $B$  for which you can use the pumping lemma for regular languages to show that  $Split(A, B)$  is not regular. To prove (b), given finite automata that accept  $A$  and  $B$ , construct a pushdown automaton that accepts  $Split(A, B)$ . To disprove (b), find specific languages  $A$  and  $B$  for which you can use the pumping lemma for context-free languages to show that  $Split(A, B)$  is not context-free.

**Problem 4.** (40 points) Consider the following three languages:

$$\begin{aligned} A_1 &= \{ \langle M \rangle \mid M \text{ is a Turing machine that halts on at least one input} \} \\ A_2 &= \{ \langle M \rangle \mid M \text{ is a Turing machine that halts on at most one input} \} \\ A_3 &= \{ \langle M \rangle \mid M \text{ is a Turing machine that halts on exactly one input} \} \end{aligned}$$

Which of these languages are recursive, which are r.e., which are co-r.e., and which are neither? You need to justify your answers briefly. You may assume that `TMMEMBERSHIP` is r.e. but not recursive, `TMEMPTINESS` is co-r.e. but not recursive, and `TMUNIVERSALITY` is neither r.e. nor co-r.e.

**Problem 5.** (80 points) Let  $f$  be a monotonically increasing computable function from  $\mathbf{N}$  to  $\mathbf{N}$ ; that is,  $f(n) < f(n+1)$  for all natural numbers  $n \in \mathbf{N}$ . Let  $\text{range}(f) = \{y \mid (\exists x)f(x) = y\}$ . Prove or disprove each of the following two statements:

- (a)  $\text{range}(f)$  is recursive.
- (b)  $\text{range}(f)$  is r.e.

Let  $g$  be any computable function, from  $\Sigma^*$  to  $\Sigma^*$  for some alphabet  $\Sigma$ . Prove or disprove each of the following two statements:

- (c)  $\text{range}(g)$  is recursive.
- (d)  $\text{range}(g)$  is r.e.

**Problem 6.** (80 points) A linear inequality has the form

$$a_0x_0 + a_1x_1 + \cdots + a_nx_n \leq b$$

or

$$a_0x_0 + a_1x_1 + \cdots + a_nx_n \geq b,$$

where  $a_0, \dots, a_n, b$  are integer constants, and  $x_0, \dots, x_n$  are variables. A linear formula combines linear inequalities using the boolean operations of AND, OR, and NOT. A linear formula is  $\{0, 1\}$ -satisfiable if the formula can be made true by assigning to each variable either 0 or 1. For example, the linear formula

$$(3x_0 + 2x_1 \leq 1 \vee -2x_0 + x_1 \geq 1) \wedge x_0 \leq 0$$

is  $\{0, 1\}$ -satisfiable (take  $x_0 = 0$  and  $x_1 = 1$ ); the linear formula

$$3x_0 + 2x_1 \leq 2 \wedge x_0 \geq 1$$

is not  $\{0, 1\}$ -satisfiable. For each of the following three problems, either prove that the problem is in P, or that it is NP-complete, or that it is not in NP:

- (a) Given a disjunction of linear inequalities, is it  $\{0, 1\}$ -satisfiable?
- (b) Given a conjunction of linear inequalities, is it  $\{0, 1\}$ -satisfiable?
- (c) Given a linear formula, is it  $\{0, 1\}$ -satisfiable?

You need to justify your answers. You may assume that `3SAT`, `CLIQUE`, `HAMPATH`, and `SUBSET-SUM` are NP-complete.