

a)  $A_{ANY} = \{ \langle M \rangle : \text{TM } M \text{ accepts at least one string} \}$ .

We show that  $A_{ANY}$  is not in D by reduction from H. Let  $R$  be a mapping reduction from H to  $A_{ANY}$  defined as follows:

$R(\langle M, w \rangle) =$

1. Construct the description  $\langle M\# \rangle$  of a new Turing machine  $M\#(x)$  that, on input  $x$ , operates as follows:
  - 1.1. Erase the tape.
  - 1.2. Write  $w$  on the tape.
  - 1.3. Run  $M$  on  $w$ .
  - 1.4. Accept.
2. Return  $\langle M\# \rangle$ .

If *Oracle* exists and decides  $A_{ANY}$ , then  $C = \text{Oracle}(R(\langle M, w \rangle))$  decides H.  $R$  can be implemented as a Turing machine. And  $C$  is correct.  $M\#$  ignores its own input. It halts on everything or nothing. So:

- $\langle M, w \rangle \in H$ :  $M$  halts on  $w$ , so  $M\#$  accepts everything. So it accepts at least one string.  $\text{Oracle}(\langle M\# \rangle)$  accepts.
- $\langle M, w \rangle \notin H$ :  $M$  does not halt on  $w$ , so  $M\#$  halts on nothing. So it does not accept even one string.  $\text{Oracle}(\langle M\# \rangle)$  rejects.

But no machine to decide H can exist, so neither does *Oracle*.

b)  $A_{ALL} = \{ \langle M \rangle : L(M) = \Sigma_M^* \}$ .

We show that  $A_{ALL}$  is not in D by reduction from H. Let  $R$  be a mapping reduction from H to  $A_{ANY}$  defined as follows:

$R(\langle M, w \rangle) =$

1. Construct the description  $\langle M\# \rangle$  of a new Turing machine  $M\#(x)$  that, on input  $x$ , operates as follows:
  - 1.1. Erase the tape.
  - 1.2. Write  $w$  on the tape.
  - 1.3. Run  $M$  on  $w$ .
  - 1.4. Accept.
2. Return  $\langle M\# \rangle$ .

If *Oracle* exists and decides  $A_{ALL}$ , then  $C = \text{Oracle}(R(\langle M, w \rangle))$  decides H.  $R$  can be implemented as a Turing machine. And  $C$  is correct.  $M\#$  ignores its own input. It accepts everything or nothing. So:

- $\langle M, w \rangle \in H$ :  $M$  halts on  $w$ , so  $M\#$  accepts everything. *Oracle* accepts.
- $\langle M, w \rangle \notin H$ :  $M$  does not halt on  $w$ , so  $M\#$  accepts on nothing. *Oracle* rejects.

But no machine to decide H can exist, so neither does *Oracle*.

c)  $\{ \langle M, w \rangle : \text{Turing machine } M \text{ rejects } w \}$ .

We show that  $L$  is not in  $D$  by reduction from  $H$ . Let  $R$  be a mapping reduction from  $H$  to  $A_{\text{ANY}}$  defined as follows:

$R(\langle M, w \rangle) =$

1. Construct the description  $\langle M\# \rangle$  of a new Turing machine  $M\#(x)$  that, on input  $x$ , operates as follows:
  - 1.1. Erase the tape.
  - 1.2. Write  $w$  on the tape.
  - 1.3. Run  $M$  on  $w$ .
  - 1.4. Reject.
2. Return  $\langle M\#, w \rangle$ .

If  $Oracle$  exists and decides  $L$ , then  $C = Oracle(R(\langle M, w \rangle))$  decides  $H$ .  $R$  can be implemented as a Turing machine. And  $C$  is correct.  $M\#$  ignores its own input. It halts on everything or nothing. So:

- $\langle M, w \rangle \in H$ :  $M$  halts on  $w$ , so  $M\#$  rejects everything. So, in particular, it rejects  $w$ .  $Oracle$  accepts.
- $\langle M, w \rangle \notin H$ :  $M$  does not halt on  $w$ , so  $M\#$  rejects nothing. So it does not reject  $w$ .  $Oracle(\langle M\# \rangle)$  rejects.

But no machine to decide  $H$  can exist, so neither does  $Oracle$ .