pp. 176-176-182. **Variants of Turing Machines** (Sec. 3.2)

- Remember: a language is **Turing recognizable** if some TM accepts it.
- Adding "features" may simplify programmability but DO NOT affect what a TM can compute.
  - Anything a "fancy" TM can compute, can be computed with a basic TM (perhaps with more complex set of δs.)
- **Option to "stay still"** (p. 176) (not move head)
  - δ:QxΓ -> QxΓx {L, R, **S**} – S means stay still
  - δ(q,a) -> (r,b,S) can be replaced by 2 transitions of standard TM
    - $\delta(q,a) \to (r_1,b,R)$
    - $\delta(r_1,x) \to (q,x,L)$ for all x in Γ
  - Thus no TM with "S" option can compute anything not computable by basic TM
    - But may be "faster" or easier to program

- **MultiTape TM** (p. 176)
  - Assume M has **k tapes:** all use same Γ
    - 1st one as in basic machine (i.e. holds initial input)
    - Rest are initially all blank
  - Separate read/write head under each tape
    - That can be moved individually
  - δ: Q x Γ^k -> Q x Γ^k x $\{L,R,S\}^k$
    - $\delta(q,a_1, \ldots a_k) = (r, b_1, \ldots b_k, d_1, \ldots d_k)$ means
      - If in state q, and for all $1 \le i \le k$, tape i has a_i under its head
      - Then for all I, change a_i to b_i on tape i
      - And for all I, move tape i in direction d_i
  - Proof: assume M is a k tape TM $(Q,\Sigma,\Gamma,\delta,q_{start},q_{accept},q_{reject})$. Construct equivalent 1-tape TM S $(Q',\Sigma,\Gamma',\delta',q_{start'},q_{accept},q_{reject})$ as follows:
    - Assume starting tape is $w_1 \ldots w_n$
    - Add new characters to Γ'
      - For each x in Γ, add a new symbol x' to Γ'
        - ' indicates a tape head is on that cell
      - Include a □'
      - Add a special symbol # to Γ'
        - To mark start of a new simulated "tape"

- Add new initial states with transitions that do following
  - Insert a # onto left of tape, moving w right one place
  - Replace w_1 by w_1’
  - Write k-1 copies of #□’ to end of w
  - Write a final # at end
  - Resulting tape looks like #w_1’…w_n#□’#□’ … #□’#
  - The ith “#” indicate the start of the ith tape
  - The ith ‘ed symbol indicates the current position of the ith tape head
  - (p. 177) Fig. 3.14 diagrams 3-tape example
- To simulate with S a single transition of M from state q
  - Sequentially try each rule from M that starts with q:
    - Move to the ith ‘ed symbol and compare to a_i
    - If we find a mismatch, quit and try next rule
    - If we have match on all a_is, go back to start of tape and go back to each ‘ed symbol in sequence
      - Replace by b_i
      - Move simulated tape head i by moving L, R, or S, and replace that symbol by its ‘ed version
      - On a move R where we hit a #
        - 1st move entire rest of string right one position
        - Then write a blank

- **B: Bidirectional Infinite Tape**
  - Tape goes on forever in both directions, not just right
  - First emulate on a 2-tape TM
    - Tape 1 is the right hand side of the double sided tape
    - Tape 2 is the left handed side of the double sided tape
    - Have a special # on start of both sides of tape
    - Two sets of states from B:
      - one where we are on right hand side of B's tape
      - other where we are on left hand side of B's tape
    - If in a right-side of tape state and move L, add additional states to check if new cell is cell 0
      - This is case where B has crossed the center of its tape, moving left
      - If so, switch to correct state on 2nd tape
        - And whenever original state says move left, new transition says more right, and vice versa
    - If on 2nd tape, and move right into a cell with a #
      - I.E. have crossed the center of the original tape and moving right
      - Move left to cell 0, switch to equivalent state that uses 1st tape
  - Then emulate 2-tape machine on a basic TM

- **S: TM with a Stack**
  - δ:Q$\times\Gamma_1$x Γ_2 -> Qx Γ1'x Γ_2' x {L, R}
    - Γ_2: tape characters
    - Γ_1: stack characters
  - Having a stack is useful to simplify programming by supporting subroutines and recursive operations
  - Solution: Simulate on a 2-tape machine
    - One tape is original tape
    - 2nd tape is stack
    - Γ1' and Γ_2' include duplicates of Γ_1 and Γ_2 i.e. a and a' where 'ed symbols represent "top of stack'
    - Any push or pop to stack causes switch to states that modify just stack
  - Then emulate 2-tape on single tape

- (p. 178) **NTM**: **NonDeterministic TM**s
  - $\delta: Q \times \Gamma \text{ -> } P(Q \times \Gamma \times \{L, R,\})$
    - Each (q,a) can lead to one of a set of transitions
    - There are multiple choices for each state & tape symbol
    - If *any* of these choices lead to an accept state, then TM accepts its input
  - (p. 179) Theorem 3.16: **Every nondeterministic TM N has equivalent deterministic TM D**
    - Solution: have D work thru each possible variation in N's transitions sequentially
      - In a breadth-first exploration of ***tree*** of choices
        - Each node in tree is a configuration of N
        - Root node is initial configuration
        - Explore all possible set of choices at level k before trying any choices at level k+1
          - If any choice leads to q_{accept}, accept
          - If all choices lead to q_{reject}, reject
          - Looping is still possible

- D has 3 tapes (see Fig. 3.17 on page 179)
  - Tape 1: Input tape – never changed
  - Tape 2: Simulation tape: copy of N's tape having made one set of choices
  - Tape 3: Keeps track of which node in tree Tape 2 represents
    - Let b = size of largest set of possible choices from one transition
    - $\Gamma_3 = \{1, \ldots b\}$
    - Eg. 431 on tape 3 means tape 2 represents
      - Having made 4^{nd} choice at root,
      - Having made 3^{rd} choice from above
      - Having made 1^{st} choice from above
  - Computation as follows:
    - Copy tape 1 to 2
    - Initialize tape 3 to ε
    - Use Tape 2 to simulate one branch of N's tree
      - Before each step of N, consult next symbol on tape 3 to determine which choice to make
        - If accepting configuration found, enter accept state

        - Replace string on tape 3 with next string in tree ordering and restart if any of following
            - No more symbols on tape 3
            - Simulation ended up "invalid"
            - Choice on tape is invalid
    - D clearly computes anything N does but with 3 tapes
        - But a 3-tape TM can be simulated by a 1 tape TM
            - **SLOWLY!!!**
        - Thus N can be simulated by a basic 1-Tape TM!
- (p. 180) Corollary 3.18. **A language is Turing-recognizable if some NTM recognizes it**
    - Proof: all NTMs can be converted into a TM
- A NTM is a **Decider** if all branches halt
    - In proof of Theorem 3.16 we can modify simulation of N so that if N always halts then so does D.
    - Thus Corollary 3.19: L is decidable iff some NTM decides it

- (p. 180) An **Enumerator** of a language L is a TM with
  - A “printer” where each rule can also output a symbol
  - An initial blank “work tape”
  - A set of rules that uses work tape to generate all possible strings from a language
    - And write each string to the printer
- (p. 181) **Theorem 3.21** A language L is Turing-recognizable iff some enumerator can enumerate it.
  - If: assume TM **E** enumerates L , following TM **M** accepts it
    - Given a string w, **M** runs **E** from start
    - For each string that is output, compare it to w
    - If ever a match, accept it
    - All (and only) w’s from L will be accepted!
  - Only if: Assume TM **M** accepts L, construct **E** as follows:
    - Build an enumerator E’ for all strings in Σ^*
    - Do the following for i=1, 2, ….
      - Run E’ to generate next string
      - For each output from E’ run **M** for exactly i steps
        - Guarantees we will stop
      - If accepted, print out string from E’
    - Equivalent logically to running parallel set of Ms, each running on a different string from Σ^*

- **Summary of all this**
  - No computer can compute anything that basic TM cannot
    - With caveat of enough memory
    - Thus all computers compute ***exactly*** the same class of algorithms
  - Any reasonable programming language can be used to write a TM emulator
    - Thus any reasonable programming language can be compiled into any other reasonable language
    - Thus all programming languages describe ***exactly*** the same class of algorithms