

4. **Problem:** Construct a non-deterministic finite automaton that tests whether in a given binary input sequence the third-to-the-last bit is a 1. Make the automaton deterministic by using the subset construction.


**Solution:** The language is recognized by an automaton  $M = (Q, \Sigma, \delta, q_1, F)$ , where

$$Q = \{q_1, q_2, q_3, q_4\}$$

$$\Sigma = \{a, b\}$$

$$F = \{q_4\},$$

and the transition function  $\delta$  is defined as in the following picture:




We construct a corresponding deterministic automaton  $M'$  by taking all possible subsets of  $Q$  as its states ( $Q' = \mathcal{P}(Q)$ ). These subsets are used to encode all possible computations of  $M$ . For example, when  $M$  has read the input 010 it can be either in state  $q_1$  or in  $q_3$ . Thus, the automaton  $M'$  must end in the state  $\{q_1, q_3\}$  with the same input.

We construct the transition function  $\delta'$  by using the following table:

$q$	0	1	uus nimi
$\{q_1\}$	$\{q_1\}$	$\{q_1, q_2\}$	A
$\{q_1, q_2\}$	$\{q_1, q_3\}$	$\{q_1, q_2, q_3\}$	B
$\{q_1, q_3\}$	$\{q_1, q_4\}$	$\{q_1, q_2, q_4\}$	C
$\{q_1, q_2, q_3\}$	$\{q_1, q_3, q_4\}$	$\{q_1, q_2, q_3, q_4\}$	D
$\{q_1, q_3, q_4\}$	$\{q_1, q_4\}$	$\{q_1, q_2, q_4\}$	E×
$\{q_1, q_4\}$	$\{q_1\}$	$\{q_1, q_2\}$	F×
$\{q_1, q_2, q_3, q_4\}$	$\{q_1, q_3, q_4\}$	$\{q_1, q_2, q_3, q_4\}$	G×
$\{q_1, q_2, q_4\}$	$\{q_1, q_3\}$	$\{q_1, q_2, q_3\}$	H×

All those states of  $Q'$  that contain some original accepting state of  $M$  are accepting states in  $M'$ . In the table they are marked with a cross.



5. **Problem:** Show that if a language  $L \subseteq \{a, b\}^*$  is recognized by some finite automaton, then so is the language  $L^R = \{w^R \mid w \in L\}$ . (The notation  $w^R$  means the reverse of string  $w$ , cf. problem 2/2.)

**Solution:** Let  $M = (Q, \Sigma, \delta, q_0, F)$  be a finite automaton that recognizes  $L$  (that is,  $L = L(M)$ ). We use it to form an automaton  $M'$ :


$$M' = \{Q \cup \{q'_0\}, \Sigma, \delta', q'_0, \{q_0\}\}$$

$$\delta' = \{(q_i, a, q_j) \mid \delta(q_j, a) = q_i\}$$

$$\cup \{(q'_0, \varepsilon, q_i) \mid q_i \in F\},$$

where  $q'_0 \notin Q$ .

Intuitively this definition means that we get an automaton for  $L^R$  by reversing all transitions of  $M$  and by adding a new initial state that has empty transitions to all final states of  $M$ . The new automaton has only one final state, the original initial state.



6. **Problem:** Show that if languages  $A$  and  $B$  over the alphabet  $\Sigma = \{a, b\}$  are recognized by some finite automata, then so are the languages  $\bar{A} = \Sigma^* - A$ ,  $A \cup B$ , and  $A \cap B$ .

**Solution:** Let  $A, B \subseteq \Sigma^*$  be languages that can be recognized by finite automata. We now show that  $\bar{A}$ ,  $A \cup B$ , and  $A \cap B$  can also be recognized by finite automata by showing how such automata can be constructed.

$\bar{A}$ : Let  $M_A = (Q, \Sigma, \delta, q_0, F)$  be a deterministic automaton<sup>1</sup> that recognizes  $A$  ( $L(M_A) = A$ ). We define an automaton  $M_{\bar{A}}$  as follows:


$$M_{\bar{A}} = (Q, \Sigma, \delta, q_0, Q - F) .$$

Automaton  $M_{\bar{A}}$  works otherwise just as  $M_A$ , but its accepting states are exchanged with its rejecting states. Thus,  $M_{\bar{A}}$  accepts precisely those strings that  $M_A$  rejects, and rejects those that  $M_A$  accepts, so  $L(M_{\bar{A}}) = \bar{A}$ .

For example, consider an automaton that recognizes the language:

$$A = \{w \in \Sigma^* \mid w \text{ is of the form } axb, \text{ where } x \in \Sigma^*\} .$$

All strings that start with an  $a$  and end with a  $b$  are in  $L$ . The following two automata recognize languages  $A$  and  $\bar{A}$ :



<sup>1</sup> $M_A$  necessarily exists since any nondeterministic finite automaton can be transformed into an equivalent deterministic one.

Note that this construction works only if  $M_A$  is deterministic. Try to find a counter example for the nondeterministic case.

$A \cup B$ : Let  $M_A = (Q_A, \Sigma, \delta_A, s_A, F_A)$  and  $M_B = (Q_B, \Sigma, \delta_B, s_B, F_B)$  be finite automata that recognize languages  $A$  and  $B$ . We suppose that the state sets are distinct, that is,  $Q_A \cap Q_B = \emptyset$ . This is not a serious limitation since the states of one of the automata can be renamed if necessary.

We construct a nondeterministic finite automaton  $M_{A \cup B}$  as follows:

$$M_{A \cup B} = (Q, \Sigma, \delta, s, F) ,$$

where


$$\begin{aligned} Q &= Q_A \cup Q_B \cup \{s\} \\ F &= F_A \cup F_B \\ \delta &= \delta_A \cup \delta_B \cup \{(s, \varepsilon, s_A), (s, \varepsilon, s_B)\} . \end{aligned}$$

We construct  $M_{A \cap B}$  by combining the automata  $M_A$  and  $M_B$ . The state  $s$  is a new initial state and from there is a nondeterministic  $\varepsilon$ -transition to initial states of  $M_A$  and  $M_B$ .


If string  $x \in A$ ,  $M_{A \cup B}$  accepts it by first making a nondeterministic transition to  $s_A$ , and then doing the same sequence of transitions that  $M_A$  would have done. Similarly, if  $x \in B$ , the first transition is to  $s_B$ .

For example, consider the automaton  $M_A$  that was presented above and a new automaton  $M_B$  that recognizes the language:

$$B = \{w \in \Sigma^* \mid w \text{ has a substring } bb\} .$$



The language  $A \cup B$  can be recognized by the following automaton:




Often also a new final state  $f$  and transitions  $\{(f', \varepsilon, f) \mid f' \in F_A \cup F_B\}$  are added to  $M_{A \cup B}$ . In this case  $F = \{f\}$ .


$A \cap B$ : This claim is a corollary of the two previous constructions, since

$$A \cap B = \overline{\overline{A \cup B}} .$$


Let us examine again the above automata  $M_A$  and  $M_B$  construct  $M_{A \cap B}$  using the above DeMorgan rule.



Before  $M_{\bar{A} \cup \bar{B}}$  can be complemented, it has to be determinised (the following automaton is minimal, details of minimization are left in appendix):



We get the desired automaton by exchanging the accepting and rejecting states:




We could also define the intersection of two automata directly, using a method that is analogous to the solution for the next exercise.

**Appendix: minimizing an automaton**

Using the determinising algorithm we can transform the automaton  $M_{\bar{A} \cup \bar{A}}$  (of exercise 5)

into the following form:



Now we want to find the minimal deterministic automaton that recognizes the same language. One algorithm is to define an equivalence relation  $\equiv^0$  on the set of states and refine it step-by-step until we reach the desired relation  $\equiv$ .

In the first phase of the algorithm we remove all unreachable states. Since in this case all states are reachable, nothing has to be done.

Next, we construct the first equivalence partition such that all accepting states are in one class and all rejecting states in another:

0-equivalence:

Class	State	<i>a</i>	<i>b</i>
I	<i>A</i>	<i>C</i> (I)	<i>B</i> (I)
	<i>B</i>	<i>G</i> (I)	<i>H</i> (I)
	<i>C</i>	<i>C</i> (I)	<i>D</i> (I)
	<i>D</i>	<i>C</i> (I)	<i>E</i> (II)
	<i>F</i>	<i>F</i> (I)	<i>E</i> (II)
	<i>G</i>	<i>G</i> (I)	<i>B</i> (I)
	<i>H</i>	<i>H</i> (I)	<i>H</i> (I)
	II	<i>E</i>	<i>F</i> (I)

We see from the table that from the class I states *D* and *F* the *b*-transition leads to a state in class II, while for all other class I states the same transition leads to a class I state. So we separate the two distinct states into their own class:

1-equivalence:

Class	State	<i>a</i>	<i>b</i>
I	<i>A</i>	<i>C</i> (I)	<i>B</i> (I)
	<i>B</i>	<i>G</i> (I)	<i>H</i> (I)
	<i>C</i>	<i>C</i> (I)	<i>D</i> (III)
	<i>G</i>	<i>G</i> (I)	<i>B</i> (I)
	<i>H</i>	<i>H</i> (I)	<i>H</i> (I)
	II	<i>E</i>	<i>F</i> (III)
III	<i>D</i>	<i>C</i> (I)	<i>E</i> (II)
	<i>F</i>	<i>F</i> (III)	<i>E</i> (II)

This time states *C* and *F* do not fit in their classes and they have to be separated. This procedure is continued until all classes are consistent:

2-equivalence:

Class	State	$a$	$b$
I	$A$	$C$ (IV)	$B$ (I)
	$B$	$G$ (I)	$H$ (I)
	$G$	$G$ (I)	$B$ (I)
	$H$	$H$ (I)	$H$ (I)
II	$E$	$F$ (V)	$E$ (II)
III	$D$	$C$ (IV)	$E$ (II)
IV	$C$	$C$ (IV)	$D$ (III)
V	$F$	$F$ (V)	$E$ (II)

3-equivalence:

Class	State	$a$	$b$
I	$A$	$C$ (IV)	$B$ (VI)
II	$E$	$F$ (V)	$E$ (II)
III	$D$	$C$ (IV)	$E$ (II)
IV	$C$	$C$ (IV)	$D$ (III)
V	$F$	$F$ (V)	$E$ (II)
VI	$B$	$G$ (VI)	$H$ (VI)
	$G$	$G$ (VI)	$B$ (VI)
	$H$	$H$ (VI)	$H$ (VI)

All classes are now consistent so we can construct an automaton whose states are the equivalence classes. The minimized automaton is shown as a state diagram in the solution for exercise 5.

As a term,  $k$ -equivalence means that all states in a equivalence class treat all inputs that are at most  $k$  symbols long in the same way; either they all accept the input or they all reject it.