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## Deterministic TM

Deterministic Turing machines can recognize only countably many languages. We can write the program of a TM in binary, and then enumerate all possible programs in ascending lexicographical order.

## Countable set

## Uncountable transitions

Probabilistic or quantum models can be defined with real transition values, therefore, their cardinalities are uncountably many.
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\section*{Our scope}

How many resources is enough for probabilistic models to define uncountably many languages?

We investigate different bounded-error probabilistic models.

\section*{All formal languages}


\section*{Probabilistic TM}


Input string
Input string appears on Tape 1
\[
\delta: S \times \tilde{\Sigma} \times \tilde{\Gamma} \rightarrow S \times \tilde{\Gamma} \times\{\leftarrow, \downarrow, \rightarrow\} \times\{\leftarrow, \downarrow, \rightarrow\}
\]
\(\delta: S \times \tilde{\Sigma} \times \tilde{\Gamma} \times S \times \tilde{\Gamma} \times\{\leftarrow, \downarrow, \rightarrow\} \times\{\leftarrow, \downarrow, \rightarrow\} \rightarrow[0,1]\)

\section*{Probabilistic counter automaton}

\[
\delta: S \times \tilde{\Sigma} \times\{0,1\}^{k} \times S \times\{\leftarrow, \downarrow, \rightarrow\} \times\{-1,0,1\}^{k} \rightarrow[0,1]
\]

Operations with the counter:
- check, whether the value is zero \((?=0)\),
- update the value of the counter \(+\{-1,0,1\}\).

\section*{Probabilistic finite automaton}


\section*{Restricted input head}
- 2-way model. Sweeping model.
One-way model.

\section*{Recognition}

Language \(L \subseteq \Sigma^{*}\) is said to be recognized by a machine \(M\) with error bound \(\epsilon\) if:
- any member is accepted by \(M\) with probability at least \(1-\epsilon\),
- any non-member is rejected by \(M\) with probability at least \(1-\epsilon\).

\section*{Bounded error}
- The probability of correct answer is higher than the probability of error.
- We can repeat the calculation and choose the most frequent answer as a result.
Even if the probability of correct answer is a bit higher than \(\frac{1}{2}\), with probability amplification we can obtain arbitrarily small probability of error.

\section*{Interactive proof system}


\section*{Verification}

The language \(L \subseteq \Sigma^{*}\) is verifiable by \(V\) with error bound \(\epsilon<\frac{1}{2}\) if:
- there exists a honest prover \(P\) such that any \(x \in L\) is accepted by \(V\) with probability at least \(1-\epsilon\) by communicating with \(P\), and,
- any \(x \notin L\) is always rejected by \(V\) with probability at least \(1-\epsilon\) when communicating with any possible prover \(P^{*}\).

\section*{Verifier for EQUAL}
\[
E Q U A L=\left\{0^{m} 10^{n} \mid m=n\right\}
\]
- \(w=0001000\)
- \(y=000\)
- \(w=0001000\)
- \(y=000\)

\section*{Interaction with two provers}
- Two provers \(\left(P_{1}, P_{2}\right)\) and a probabilistic verifier ( \(V\) ).
- Different communication channel with each prover.
- One prover does not see the communication with the other prover.
- Multi-Prover model - provers collaborate.
- Noisy-Oracle model - both provers oppose each other.

\section*{Simulation of a work tape}

Uriel Feige, Adi Shamir proposed the following solution:
- \(P_{1}\) and \(P_{2}\).
- Contents of the work tape: \(m=m_{1} m_{2} m_{3} m_{4} \ldots\).
- \(V\) secretly picks random values \(a, b, r_{0}\), each between 0 and \(p-1\), where \(p\) is a prime number.
- \(s_{i}=\left(m_{i} * a+r_{i} * b+r_{i-1}\right) \bmod p\), where \(r_{i}\) is picked randomly and \(0 \leq r_{i} \leq p-1\).

\section*{Simulation of a work tape}
- \(P_{1}\) and \(P_{2}\).
- \(s_{i}=\left(m_{i} * a+r_{i} * b+r_{i-1}\right) \bmod p\).
- \(\left(m_{1}, r_{1}, s_{1}\right),\left(m_{2}, r_{2}, s_{2}\right),\left(m_{3}, r_{3}, s_{3}\right),\left(m_{4}, r_{4}, s_{4}\right), \ldots\).
- To read the content, \(V\) asks all data and checks the correctness of signatures.
- To update the content, \(V\) picks new \(r_{0}\) and scans the input. For each triple \(\left(m_{i}, r_{i}, s_{i}\right), V\) generates new \(r_{i}\), recalculates \(s_{i}\), and asks the provers to replace the values.

\section*{Simulation of a work tape}
- \(s_{i}=\left(m_{i} * a+r_{i} * b+r_{i-1}\right) \bmod p\).
- The provers cannot learn the values of secretly picked \(a\) and \(b\) from the information provided by the verifier.
- If \(s^{\prime}{ }_{i}=\left(m^{\prime}{ }_{i} * a+r_{i}^{\prime} * b+r_{i-1}\right) \bmod p\) :
\[
\left(s^{\prime}{ }_{i}-s_{i}\right)=\left(\left(m_{i}^{\prime}-m_{i}\right) * a+\left(r_{i}^{\prime}-r_{i}\right) * b+r_{i-1}\right) \bmod p
\]

Exactly \(p\) pairs of \((a, b)\) 's satisfy this equation, and there are total \(p^{2}\) different pairs of \((a, b)\) 's. The probability to cheat successfully is \(\frac{1}{p}\).

\section*{Lemma for \(64^{k}\) coin flips}

Let \(x=x_{1} x_{2} x_{3} \ldots\) be an infinite binary sequence. If a biased coin lands on head with binary probability value \(p=0 . x_{1} 01 x_{2} 01 x_{3} 01 \ldots\), then the value \(x_{k}\) can be determined with probability \(\frac{3}{4}\) after \(64^{k}\) coin tosses.


\section*{Recognition of any language}

Encode the language into \(p=0 . x_{1} 01 x_{2} 01 x_{3} 01 \ldots\), \(x_{k}=1 \leftrightarrow \Sigma^{*}(k) \in L\). So, we order all elements of \(\Sigma^{*}\) lexicographically, \(\Sigma^{*}(1)=\varepsilon\).
- We have \(\Sigma^{*}(k)\) on the input tape, our task is to compute \(k\).
After computing \(k\), write on the work tape \(1(000000)^{k}\), which is \(64^{k}\).
Perform \(64^{k}\) coin tosses, get the value \(x_{k}\).
Exponential space complexity. Double exponential time complexity.

\section*{1PFA verifier}
- Use the algorithm for the recognition of any language with bounded error.
- Interact with two provers to simulate the work tape.
- Read the input once and store it on the "work tape".

\section*{Other results}

\section*{Recognition of any language}
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|c|c|}
\hline Alphabet & Machine & Space & Time \\
\hline unary & PTM & \(O(n)\) & \(O\left(2^{n}\right)\) \\
\hline binary & PTM & \(O\left(2^{n}\right)\) & \(O\left(2^{2^{n}}\right)\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Verification of any language
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|c|c|}
\hline Alphabet & Machine & Space & Time \\
\hline unary & PTM & \(O(\log n)\) & \(O\left(2^{n}\right)\) \\
\hline binary & PTM & \(O(n)\) & \(O\left(2^{2^{n}}\right)\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{Verification of any language}

Condon and Lipton - the prover provides the computational steps for the verifier.
- Constant-space verifier interacts with one prover, but non-members may not be rejected with high probability.
- We first show how to obtain a 1P4CA for every language, and then how to simulate the computation - the prover provides the values of the counters.

\section*{Uncountable set}
\[
\mathrm{I}=\left\{I \mid I \subseteq Z^{+}\right\} \text {, cardinality of } \mathrm{I} \text { is } X_{1}
\]

We can map this set to the set of real numbers in interval \([0 ; 1)\) :
\(0 . x_{1} x_{2} x_{3} \ldots, x_{i}=1 \leftrightarrow i \in I\)

\section*{Uncountably many languages}
\(\left\{a^{64^{k}} \mid k \in I\right\}\) - the potential members of the recognizable language, say \(L_{I}\).
The set \(I\) is encoded into \(p_{I}=0 . x_{1} 01 x_{2} 01 x_{3} 01 \ldots\), \(x_{k}=1 \leftrightarrow k \in I\).
\(\mathrm{I}=\left\{I \mid I \subseteq Z^{+}\right\}\)is uncountable set, bijection between \(I\) and \(L_{I}\).

\section*{Results}

\section*{Verification of uncountably many languages}
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|c|c|}
\hline Alphabet & Machine & Space & Time \\
\hline unary & 2PFA & \(O(1)\) & \(O\left(n^{2}\right)\) \\
\hline binary & sweeping PFA & \(O(1)\) & \(O(n)\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{Open question}

Is it possible to verify any language with constant space by interacting with a single prover and by guaranteeing the rejecting of any nonmember with high probability?
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