

Definitions:

- A language L is **recognizable** iff there exists a Turing Machine (TM) M such that $L(M) = L$. Here, M is called a **recognizer**.
Note: M will halt and accept only the strings in that language. For strings not in that language, M will either reject it, in which it will halt, or M will loop. With recognizers, there is no requirement to halt.
Note: On a given language L , a recognizer will either
 - a. Halt and accept L or
 - b. Halt and reject L or
 - c. Loop on L**Note:** If a TM, M , doesn't accept a language, L , it doesn't mean that it rejects L . It could reject L or it could loop on L .
- A language is **decidable** iff there exists a TM M such that $L(M) = L$ and M halts on every input. Here, M is called a **decider**.
- U , the universal language, $= \{ \langle M, x \rangle \mid M \text{ accepts } x \}$.
 U is recognizable but not decidable.
- M_u , the universal TM, takes $\langle M, x \rangle$ as input and simulates M on x .
- The halting problem, denoted as **H**, is $H = \{ \langle M, x \rangle \mid M \text{ halts on } x \}$.
 H is recognizable but not decidable.

General Turing Reduction:

- Reduction allows us to easily prove more languages are undecidable or unrecognizable.
- Let P and Q be languages.
- P **Turing-reduces** to Q , denoted as $P \leq_T Q$, if there exists an algorithm for P that uses an algorithm for Q as a "black box".
- Here are the general steps to prove that L is undecidable by using reduction:
 1. Assume L is decidable.
 2. Therefore, there is a TM M_1 that decides it.
 3. Show that we can construct a TM M_2 that uses M to decide U or some other undecidable problem.
 4. Since this contradicts that U is undecidable, L is undecidable.

Mapping Reduction:

- **Definition:** Let P and $Q \subseteq \Sigma^*$ be languages. P is **mapping-reducible** to Q , denoted as $P \leq_m Q$, iff there exists a computable function, $f : \Sigma^* \rightarrow \Sigma^*$, such that $x \in P$ iff $f(x) \in Q$. The function f is called the reduction of P to Q .
Note: The function, f , does not have to be, and is usually not, onto.
Note: The function, f , must be computable.
 To demonstrate a computable function, we will typically write a little program or describe in English how to perform the transformation that f is supposed to do.
Note: f maps yes-instances of P to yes-instances of Q and no-instances of P to no-instances of Q .
- In general, when we are mapping-reducing language P to language Q , f should take an input of P as an input and output something that is an input of Q .
- **Theorems:**
 Suppose that $P \leq_m Q$
 1. **If Q is decidable, then P is decidable.**
 This is because we need to use a given solution to Q to solve P . If Q is decidable, then that means it halts on every input. Since P uses the output of Q on the input, P must halt on every input, too. Hence, P is decidable.

2. **If P is undecidable, then Q is undecidable.**
This is because we need Q to solve P. If P isn't solvable, then neither is Q.
 3. **If Q is recognizable, then P is recognizable.**
This is because we need to use a given solution to Q to solve P. If Q is recognizable, then that means it either accepts, rejects or loops on every input. Since P uses the output of Q on the input, P must accept, reject or loop on every input, too. Hence, P is recognizable.
 4. **If P is unrecognizable, then Q is unrecognizable.**
This is because we need Q to solve P. If P isn't solvable, then neither is Q.
 5. **If $P \leq_m Q$, then $\neg P \leq_m \neg Q$, where $\neg P$ is the complement of P and $\neg Q$ is the complement of Q.**
- Note:** If $P \leq_m Q$ and Q is unrecognizable, it doesn't tell us if P is recognizable or not.
Note: If $P \leq_m Q$ and Q is undecidable, it doesn't tell us if P is decidable or not.
- To prove that a language P is unrecognizable or undecidable, it suffices to prove that $U \leq_m P$, for undecidable, and $\neg U \leq_m P$, for unrecognizable.