## Year 2013/14 - Number 10

December 19, 2013

Please keep this file anonymous: do not write your name inside this file. More information about assignments at

http://disi.unitn.it/zunino/teaching/computability/assignments.

**Preliminaries 1.** Recall that for  $a, b \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $min\{a, b\}$  is the least element between a and b. Recall also that a set  $C \subseteq \mathbb{N}$  is called *upward closed* iff  $\forall x \in C. \forall y \in \mathbb{N}(y > x \Rightarrow y \in C).$ 

**Question 2.** Let  $g, h \in \mathcal{R}$ , and define

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} g(x) & \text{whenever } x \in \mathcal{K} \\ \min\{g(x), h(x)\} + 1 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Is it possible to find g and h such that  $f \in \mathcal{R}$  and total? If it is so, provide g, h, and the proof that  $f \in \mathcal{R}$  and total; otherwise, provide a proof of why  $f \notin \mathcal{R}$  or not total regardless of the choice of g and h.

Answer 2.1. We claim that f cannot be recursive and total regardless of the choice of g and h. By contradiction, suppose  $f \in \mathcal{R}$  total. Consider the set  $A = \{n | f(n) = min\{g(n), h(n)\} + 1\}$  and notice that f is total iff g is total, since f(n) depends on g(n) for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . We claim that  $A \in \mathcal{R}$ , since we are able to build a verifier for A:

$$V_A(n)$$
: compute  $f(n) = x$ ; compute  $g(n) = y$ ; if  $x = y$  then return 0 else return 1

(Pay attention: it is always possible to compute f(n) and g(n) since they are recursive total functions. Furthermore f(n) = g(n) iff  $n \in \mathcal{K}$  because if  $n \notin \mathcal{K}$  then f(n) = g(n) + 1 or f(n) = h(n) + 1.)

We conclude that  $A \in \mathcal{R}$ . Since  $A = \{n | n \notin \mathcal{K}\} = \overline{\mathcal{K}}$ , it follows that it should be  $\overline{\mathcal{K}} \in \mathcal{R}$ , which is impossible because we have already proved that this set is not recursive. We reached a contradiction, therefore  $f \notin \mathcal{R}$  total. It is possible to find g and h such that  $f \in \mathcal{R}$  or such that f is total:

•  $f \in \mathcal{R}$ : pick  $g \in \mathcal{R}$  total and h(x) = undefined for all  $x \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} g(x) & \text{whenever } x \in \mathcal{K} \\ undefined & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

By the if-then-else lemma on  $\mathcal{RE}$  sets  $f \in \mathcal{R}$  (g is recursive, undefined is recursive and  $\mathcal{K} \in \mathcal{RE}$ , therefore I can apply the lemma).

• f total: pick  $g, h \in \mathcal{R}$  total.

**Question 3.** Prove or disprove: there exists an upward closed set  $C \notin \mathcal{RE}$ .

Answer 3.1. Let C be a non-empty upward closed set  $(C = \emptyset$  is clearly a  $\mathcal{RE}$  set). Consider the function

$$f(n) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } n \ge k \\ undefined & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

We claim that f is a characteristic function of C, since we have already proved that a upward closed set C can be seen as  $C = \{n | n \ge k\}$  for some  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . By the if-then-else lemma on  $\mathcal{RE}$  sets,  $f \in \mathcal{R} \Rightarrow C \in \mathcal{RE}$ . We conclude that  $\nexists C$  upward set such that  $C \notin \mathcal{RE}$ .

**Question 4.** Prove or disprove: the function f defined below belongs to  $\mathcal{R}$ .

$$f(n) = \begin{cases} (\varphi_n(n))^n \text{ whenever } \varphi_n(n) \text{ is defined} \\ 77 \text{ otherwise} \end{cases}$$

**Answer 4.1.** We claim that  $f \notin \mathcal{R}$ . By contradiction, suppose that  $f \in \mathcal{R}$ . Therefore the set  $A = \{n | f(n) = 77\} \in \mathcal{R}$ , since we are able to build a verifier for A:

 $V_A(n)$ : compute f(n) = z if z = 77 then return 1 (Pay attention: it is always possible to compute f(n) because  $f \in \mathcal{R}$  total.) Notice that  $A = \{n | \varphi_n(n) \text{ undefined}\} = \overline{\mathcal{K}}$ . Since  $A \in \mathcal{R}$ , it should be  $\overline{\mathcal{K}} \in \mathcal{R} \rightsquigarrow \text{CONTRADICTION}!$  We already know that  $\overline{\mathcal{K}} \notin \mathcal{R}$ . We conclude that  $f \notin \mathcal{R}$ . else retu