

-NoValue-

thy.1 Reducibility

cmp:thy:red:
sec

We now know that there is at least one set, K_0 , that is computably enumerable but not computable. It should be clear that there are others. The method of reducibility provides a powerful method of showing that other sets have these properties, without constantly having to return to first principles.

explanation

Generally speaking, a “reduction” of a set A to a set B is a method of transforming answers to whether or not **membros** are in B into answers as to whether or not **membros** are in A . We will focus on a notion called “many-one reducibility,” but there are many other notions of reducibility available, with varying properties. Notions of reducibility are also central to the study of computational complexity, where efficiency issues have to be considered as well. For example, a set is said to be “NP-complete” if it is in NP and every NP problem can be reduced to it, using a notion of reduction that is similar to the one described below, only with the added requirement that the reduction can be computed in polynomial time.

We have already used the notion of reduction notion implicitly. Define the set K by

$$K = \{x : \varphi_x(x) \downarrow\},$$

O.s., $K = \{x : x \in W_x\}$. Our proof that the halting problem is unsolvable (??) shows most directly that K is not computable. Recall that K_0 is the set

$$K_0 = \{\langle e, x \rangle : \varphi_e(x) \downarrow\},$$

O.s., $K_0 = \{\langle x, e \rangle : x \in W_e\}$. It is easy to extend any proof of the uncomputability of K to the uncomputability of K_0 : if K_0 were computable, we could decide whether or not **um membro** x is in K simply by asking whether or not the pair $\langle x, x \rangle$ is in K_0 . The function f which maps x to $\langle x, x \rangle$ is an example of a *reduction* of K to K_0 .

Definição thy.1. Let A and B be sets of natural numbers. A computable function $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ is a *many-one reduction* of A to B iff, for every natural number x ,

$$x \in A \quad \text{if and only if} \quad f(x) \in B.$$

If such a reduction f exists, we say that A is *many-one reducible* to B , written $A \leq_m B$. If A is many-one reducible to B and vice-versa, then A and B are said to be *many-one equivalent*, written $A \equiv_m B$.

If the function f in the definition above happens to be injective, A is said to be *one-one reducible* to B . Most of the reductions described below meet this stronger requirement, but we will not use this fact.

It is true, but by no means obvious, that one-one reducibility really is a stronger requirement than many-one reducibility. In other words, there are

digression

infinite sets A and B such that A is many-one reducible to B but not one-one reducible to B .

Créditos das Imagens

Referências Bibliográficas