BU CS 332 – Theory of Computation

Lecture 2:

- Deterministic Finite Automata, Regular languages
- Non-deterministic FAs



Ran Canetti September 8, 2020

Review: What is a Computational Problem?

A computational problem is represented by way of a function

$$f: D \to R$$
(*D* is the domain, *R* is the range).
$$f: \mathcal{D} \to \mathcal{R}$$
(*D* is the domain, *R* is the range).
$$f: \mathcal{D} \to \mathcal{D} \to \mathcal{D}$$
(*D* is the domain, *R* is the range).
$$f: \mathcal{D} \to \mathcal{D} \to \mathcal{D}$$
(*D* is the domain, *R* is the range).
$$f: \mathcal{D} \to \mathcal{D} \to \mathcal{D}$$
(*D* is the domain, *R* is the range).
$$f: \mathcal{D} \to \mathcal{D} \to \mathcal{D}$$
(*D* is the domain, *R* is the range).

Elements of D	Corresponding value of f
\times	RCV
	\

Note: $D \rightarrow R$ can be infinite! (That's the interesting case...)

What is a Computational Problem?

We will concentrate on functions from <u>strings</u> to $\{0,1\}$.

(Or: recognizing whether a *string* is in a *language*.)

- Alphabet: A finite set Σ Ex. $\Sigma = \{a, b, ..., z\}$
- **String:** A finite concatenation of alphabet symbols (order matters) Ex. *bqr*, *ababb*

The length of a string is the number of symbols.

 ε denotes empty string, length 0

$$\Sigma^*$$
 = set of all finite strings over Σ

• Language: A (possibly infinite) set L of strings : $L \subseteq \Sigma^*$

Š

Examples of Languages (Computational problems)

Parity: Given a string consisting of a's and b's, does it contain an even number of a's?

$$\Sigma = \{a, b\}$$
 $L = \int X \left(X has an even $\Rightarrow Df c'r\}$$

Primality: Given a natural number x (represented in binary), is x prime?

 $\Sigma = \int O_{1,1} L = \int X [X represents a number which is]$

Halting Problem: Given a C program, can it ever get stuck in an infinite loop?

$$\Sigma = \begin{cases} ascii \\ etilde \end{cases} \quad L = \begin{cases} \chi \\ < \chi > (ci) \\ gete etilde i. t. \end{cases}$$

Models of computation: Machines

Computation is the processing of information by the **repeated application** of a **small set** of **Simple** operations.

→ What is the simplest "machine model" that can capture computation?



<u>Abstraction:</u> We don't care how the control is implemented. We simply consider "states" of the control. We want the possible number of states to be small/bounded, and to transition between states using fixed rules.

Machine Models

 <u>Finite Automata (FAs)</u>: Machine with a finite amount of unstructured memory



Control scans input left-to-right Can check simple patterns Can't perform unlimited counting

Useful for modeling chips, simple control systems, choose-yourown adventure games, streaming algorithms...

Machine Models

 <u>Pushdown Automata (PDAs)</u>: Machine with unbounded structured memory in the form of a stack



Useful for modeling parsers, compilers, some math calculations

Machine Models

 <u>Turing Machines (TMs)</u>: Machine with unbounded, unstructured memory



Control can scan in both directions Control can both read and <u>write</u>

Model for general sequential computation Church-Turing Thesis: Everything we intuitively think of as "computable" is computable by a Turing Machine

What would we like to know?

We will classify languages (computational problems) based on which types of machines can recognize them

Then we will show thing like:

Inclusion: Every language recognizable by a FA is also recognizable by a TM

Non-inclusion: There exist languages recognizable by TMs which are not recognizable by FAs

Hardness: Identify a "hard" and "easy" languages Robustness: Alternative definitions of the same class

Ex. Languages recognizable by FAs = regular expressions

Why study theory of computation?

- You will learn how to formally reason about computation
- You will learn the technology-independent foundations of CS

Philosophically interesting questions:

- Are there well-defined problems which cannot be solved by computers?
- Can we always find the solution to a puzzle faster than trying all possibilities?
- Can we say what it means for one problem to be "harder" than another?
- This is the core of CS!

Why study theory of computation?

- You will learn how to formally reason about computation
- You will learn the technology-independent foundations of CS

Why study theory of computation?

Practical knowledge for developers





"Boss, I can't find an efficient algorithm. I guess I'm just too dumb."





"Boss, I can't find an efficient algorithm because no such algorithm exists."

Will you be asked about this material on job interviews? No promises, but a true story...

Anatomy of a DFA



Formal Definition of a DFA

A finite automaton is a 5-tuple $M = (Q, \Sigma, \delta, q_0, F)$

Q is the set of states $Q = Q_0, Q_1$ Σ is the alphabet $\Sigma = \int a_1 b_1^2$ $\delta : Q \times \Sigma \rightarrow Q$ is the transition function $q_0 \in Q$ is the start state $F \subseteq Q$ is the set of accept states $F \subseteq Q_0 f$

Formal Definition of DFA Computation

A DFA $M = (Q, \Sigma, \delta, q_0, F)$ accepts a string $w = w_1 w_2 \cdots w_n \in \Sigma^*$ (where each $w_i \in \Sigma$) if there exist $r_0, \ldots, r_n \in Q$ such that

1.
$$r_0 = q_0$$

2. $\delta(r_i, w_{i+1}) = r_{i+1}$ for each $i = 0, ..., n - 1$, and
3. $r_n \in F$

L(M) = the language of machine M = set of all (finite) strings machine M accepts M recognizes the language L(M)

A DFA for Parity

Parity: Given a string consisting of *a*'s and *b*'s, does it contain an even number of *a*'s?

 $\Sigma = \{a, b\} \qquad L = \{w \mid w \text{ contains an even number of } a's\}$



Example: Computing with the Parity DFA



Let w = abbaDoes *M* accept *w*?

A DFA $M = (Q, \Sigma, \delta, q_0, F)$ accepts a string $w = w_1 w_2 \cdots w_n \in \Sigma^*$ (where each $w_i \in \Sigma$) if there exist $r_0, \ldots, r_n \in Q$ such that

1. $r_0 = q_0$

2. $\delta(r_i, w_{i+1}) = r_{i+1}$ for each $i = 0, \dots, n-1$, and 3. $r_n \in F$

9/8/2020

Automata Tutor





Regular Languages S. L L = 2 CM

Definition: A language is regular if it is recognized by a DFA

- ▶ $L = \{ w \in \{a, b\}^* | w \text{ has an even number of } a's \}$ is regular
- $L = \{ w \in \{0, 1\}^* \mid w \text{ contains } 001 \}$ is regular $\{ w \in \{0, 1\}^* \mid w \text{ contains } 001 \}$

Many interesting programs recognize regular languages

NETWORK PROTOCOLS COMPILERS GENETIC TESTING ARITHMETIC

Internet Transmission Control Protocol



Let TCPS = { $w \mid w$ is a complete TCP Session} Theorem. TCPS is regular

Compilers

Comments:

- Are delimited by /* */
- Cannot have nested /* */
- Must be closed by */
- */ is illegal outside a comment

COMMENTS = {strings over {0,1, /, *} with legal comments}

Theorem. COMMENTS is regular.

Genetic Testing

DNA sequences are strings over the alphabet $\{A, C, G, T\}$.

A gene g is a special substring over this alphabet.

A genetic test searches a DNA sequence for a gene.

GENETICTEST_{*g*} = {strings over $\{A, C, G, T\}$ containing *g* as a substring}

Theorem. GENETICTEST $_g$ is regular for every gene g.

Non-deterministic Finite Automata

Nondeterminism

A Nondeterministic Finite Automaton (NFA) accepts if there is a way to make it reach an accept state.

Nondeterminism

Example

Example

$\xrightarrow{0,1}$

Formal Definition of a NFA

An NFA is a 5-tuple $M = (Q, \Sigma, \delta, q_0, F)$

Q is the set of states

M accepts a string *w* if there exists a path from q_0 to an accept state that can be followed by reading *w*.

Example

0,1 0,1 **3,0** \boldsymbol{q}_1 \boldsymbol{q}_2 q_0

 $N = (\boldsymbol{Q}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}, \boldsymbol{\delta}, \boldsymbol{q}_0, \boldsymbol{F})$

 $Q = \{q_{0}, q_{1}, q_{2}, q_{3}\}$

 $\Sigma = \{0, 1\}$

 $F = \{q_3\}$

 $δ(q_0, 0) =$ $δ(q_0, 1) =$ $δ(q_1, ε) =$ $δ(q_2, 0) =$

Nondeterminism

Ways to think about nondeterminism

- (restricted)parallelcomputation
- tree of possible computations
- guessing and verifying the "right" choice

Why study NFAs?

 Not really a realistic model of computation: Real computing devices can't really try many possibilities in parallel

But:

- Useful tool for understanding power of DFAs/regular languages
- NFAs can be simpler than DFAs
- Lets us study "nondeterminism" as a resource (cf. P vs. NP)

NFAs can be simpler than DFAs

Sometimes DFAs **must** be larger

Theorem. Every DFA for the language $\{1\}$ must have at least 3 states.

Equivalence of NFAs and DFAs

Equivalence of NFAs and DFAs

Every DFA *is* an NFA, so NFAs are *at least* as powerful as DFAs

Theorem: For every NFA N, there is a DFA M such that L(M) = L(N)

Corollary: A language is regular if and only if it is recognized by an NFA

Equivalence of NFAs and DFAs (Proof) Let $N = (Q, \Sigma, \delta, q_0, F)$ be an NFA <u>Goal:</u> Construct DFA $M = (Q', \Sigma, \delta', q_0', F')$ recognizing L(N)

Intuition: Run all threads of N in parallel, maintaining the set of states where all threads are.

Formally: Q' = P(Q)

"The Subset Construction"

NFA -> DFA Example

Subset Construction (Formally)

Input: NFA $N = (Q, \Sigma, \delta, q_0, F)$ Output: DFA $M = (Q', \Sigma, \delta', q_0', F')$

 $\begin{array}{l} Q'\\ \delta': \ Q' \times \Sigma \ \rightarrow \ Q' \end{array}$

 $\delta'(R,\sigma) =$

for all $R \subseteq Q$ and $\sigma \in \Sigma$.

 $q_{0}' =$

F' =

Subset Construction (Formally)

Input: NFA $N = (Q, \Sigma, \delta, q_0, F)$ Output: DFA $M = (Q', \Sigma, \delta', q_0', F')$

Q' = P(Q) $\delta': Q' \times \Sigma \to Q'$ $\delta'(R, \sigma) = \bigcup_{r \in R} \quad \delta(r, \sigma) \quad \text{for all } R \subseteq Q \text{ and } \sigma \in \Sigma.$

 $q_0' = \{q_0\}$ $F' = \{R \in Q' \mid R \text{ contains some accept state of } N\}$

Proving the Construction Works

Claim: For every string *w*, running *M* on *w* leads to state

$\{q \in Q | \text{There exists a computation} \ of N \text{ on input } w \text{ ending at } q \}$

Proof idea: By induction on |w|

Historical Note

Subset Construction introduced in Rabin & Scott's 1959 paper "Finite Automata and their Decision Problems"

1976 ACM Turing Award citation

For their joint paper "Finite Automata and Their Decision Problem," which introduced the idea of nondeterministic machines, which has proved to be an enormously valuable concept. Their (Scott & Rabin) classic paper has been a continuous source of inspiration for subsequent work in this field.

Is this construction the best we can do?

Subset construction converts an n state NFA into a 2^n -state DFA

Could there be a construction that always produces, say, an n^2 -state DFA?

Theorem: For every $n \ge 1$, there is a language L_n such that

- 1. There is an (n + 1)-state NFA recognizing L_n .
- 2. There is no DFA recognizing L_n with fewer than 2^n states.

Conclusion: For finite automata, nondeterminism provides an exponential savings over determinism (in the worst case).