

Exercise Sheet 7

Jun.-Prof. Roland Meyer, Georgel Calin

Due: Tue, Dec 10

Exercise 7.1 Reversal-bounded Counter Machines

Consider the code of 2-counter machine M with counters c_1, c_2 initially set to 0:

```

machine M
  l0: inc(c1); goto l1 // initial control state
  l1: inc(c2); goto l0
  l1: zero(c1); goto l2
  l1: dec(c2); goto l3
  l2: zero(c2); goto la
  l3: dec(c1); goto l1
  l3: inc(c2); goto l4
  l4: dec(c1); goto l5
  l5: inc(c1); goto l3
  la: // accepting control state
    
```

Represent the above code as an automata with $\bigcup_{c \in \{c_1, c_2\}} \{inc(c), dec(c), zero(c)\}$ -labeled transitions and determine how many reversals are needed to reach the accepting state.

Exercise 7.2 NBA Languages = ω -regular Languages (a) not graded

It was discussed in class that ω -regular languages are NBA definable.

(a) Show that if there exists an NBA that accepts $L \subseteq \Sigma^\omega$ then L is ω -regular.

(b) Construct an NBA that accepts $L = (ab + c)^*((aa + b)c)^\omega + (a^*c)^\omega$

Exercise 7.3 Naive Interpretation of NFAs as NBAs

Let $A = (\Sigma, Q, q_0, \rightarrow, Q_F)$ be an NFA with $\emptyset \neq L(A) \subseteq \Sigma^+$ and, for any two states $q, q' \in Q$, define $L_{q,q'}^{\neq \epsilon} := \{w \in \Sigma^+ \mid q \xrightarrow{w} q' \text{ in } A\}$. If $L_\omega(A)$ is the ω -regular language accepted by A (interpreted as an NBA), one can **wrongly** believe that $L_\omega(A) = L(A)^\omega$.

(a) Find a counterexample to $L_\omega(A) = L(A)^\omega$ when $\emptyset \neq L_{q,q}^{\neq \epsilon} \subseteq L(A)$ for all $q \in Q_F$.

(b) Argument that if $L(A) = \bigcup_{q,q' \in Q_F} L_{q,q'}^{\neq \epsilon}$ then $L_\omega(A) = L(A)^\omega$ holds.

(c) Show that if $L(A) = L^+$ for some regular language L then $L_\omega(A) = L(A)^\omega$ holds.

Reminder: if $L \subseteq \Sigma^+$ then $L^\omega := \{w_0 w_1 \dots \in \Sigma^\omega \mid w_i \in L \text{ for all } i \geq 0\}$.

Exercise 7.4 Generalised ω -regular Expressions

Regular expressions over Σ can be extended to encode languages over $\Sigma^* \cup \Sigma^\omega$ as follows:

$$\alpha ::= \emptyset \mid a \mid \alpha + \alpha \mid \alpha.\alpha \mid \alpha^* \mid \alpha^\omega \quad \text{with } a \in \Sigma.$$

The language $L_g(\alpha) \subseteq \Sigma^* \cup \Sigma^\omega$ of a generalised ω -regexp is defined recursively:

$$\begin{aligned} L_g(\emptyset) &= \emptyset & L_g(\alpha + \beta) &= L_g(\alpha) \cup L_g(\beta) \\ L_g(a) &= \{a\} & L_g(\alpha.\beta) &= (L_g(\alpha) \cap \Sigma^*).L_g(\beta) \cup (L_g(\alpha) \cap \Sigma^\omega). \end{aligned}$$

Concatenation of a language $R \subseteq \Sigma^*$ with a subsequent $L \subseteq \Sigma^* \cup \Sigma^\omega$ means

$$R.L := \{u.v \in \Sigma^* \mid u \in R \text{ and } v \in L \cap \Sigma^*\} \cup \{u.v \in \Sigma^\omega \mid u \in R \text{ and } v \in L \cap \Sigma^\omega\}.$$

And, since $\emptyset^* = \{\epsilon\} = \emptyset^\omega$, the Kleene-iteration and ω -iteration require special care:

$$\begin{aligned} L_g(\alpha^*) &= \begin{cases} (L_g(\alpha) \cap \Sigma^\omega) \cup \{\epsilon\} & \text{if } L_g(\alpha) \cap \Sigma^* \subseteq \{\epsilon\} \\ (L_g(\alpha) \cap \Sigma^\omega) \cup (L_g(\alpha) \cap \Sigma^*)^* & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\ L_g(\alpha^\omega) &= \begin{cases} (L_g(\alpha) \cap \Sigma^\omega) \cup (L_g(\alpha) \cap \Sigma^+)^\omega & \text{if } L_g(\alpha) \cap \Sigma^+ \neq \emptyset \\ (L_g(\alpha) \cap \Sigma^\omega) \cup \{\epsilon\} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Your task: show that for every generalised ω -regexp α there is another

$$\alpha' = \gamma + \sum_{i \in I \text{ finite}} \alpha_i.\beta_i^\omega \quad \text{with } \gamma, \alpha_i, \beta_i \subseteq \Sigma^*, \beta_i \cap \Sigma^+ \neq \emptyset \text{ for every } i \in I$$

such that $L_g(\alpha) = L_g(\alpha')$.

Note: generalised ω -regular expressions over Σ^ω describe the ω -regular languages.