Finite automata and formal languages (DIT322, TMV028)

Nils Anders Danielsson, partly based on slides by Ana Bove

2020-01-30

- Nondeterministic finite automata (NFAs).
- Equivalence of NFAs and DFAs.
- Perhaps something about how one can model things using finite automata.

NFAs

- Like DFAs, but multiple transitions may be possible.
- An NFA can be in multiple states at once.
- Can be easier to "program".
- Can be much more compact.



Strings over $\{\,0,1\,\}$ that end with a one:



When a one is read the NFA "guesses" whether it should stay in s_0 or go to s_1 .

An NFA can be given by a 5-tuple (Q,Σ,δ,q_0,F) :

- ► A finite set of states (Q).
- An alphabet (Σ).
- A transition function $(\delta \in Q \times \Sigma \to \wp(Q)).$
- A start state $(q_0 \in Q)$.
- A set of accepting states ($F \subseteq Q$).

The language of an NFA

The language L(A) of an NFA $A=(Q,\Sigma,\delta,q_0,F)$ is defined in the following way:

 A transition function for strings is defined by recursion:

$$\begin{split} &\hat{\delta} \in Q \times \Sigma^* \to \wp(Q) \\ &\hat{\delta}(q,\varepsilon) &= \{ \; q \; \} \\ &\hat{\delta}(q,aw) = \bigcup_{r \in \delta(q,a)} \hat{\delta}(r,w) \end{split}$$

The language is

$$\left\{ \; w \in \Sigma^* \; \Big| \; \widehat{\delta}(q_0,w) \cap F \neq \emptyset \; \right\}.$$

As for DFAs, but with one change:

- For every transition δ(q, a) = S, an arrow marked with a from q to every node in S.
 Note:
 - The alphabet is not defined unambiguously.
 - ► No need for special treatment of missing transitions, because δ(q, a) can be empty.

As for DFAs, but with one change:

 The result of a transition is a set of states instead of a state.



- **1**. *abba*.
- 2. abbaca.
- 3. aaabaa.

- 4. *aaabaaa*.
- 5. aaaabaa.
- 6. abbaaaabaaa.

Which of the following propositions are valid?

$$\begin{aligned} &1. \ \hat{\delta}(q,a) = \delta(q,a). \\ &2. \ \hat{\delta}(q,uv) = \hat{\delta}(q,vu). \\ &3. \ \hat{\delta}(q,uv) = \bigcup_{r \in \hat{\delta}(q,v)} \hat{\delta}(r,u). \\ &4. \ \hat{\delta}(q,uv) = \bigcup_{r \in \hat{\delta}(q,u)} \hat{\delta}(r,v). \end{aligned}$$

You may want to use the following lemma:

$$\bigcup_{y\,\in\,\bigcup_{x\,\in\,X}F(x)}G(y)=\bigcup_{x\,\in\,X}\bigcup_{y\,\in\,F(x)}G(y)$$

NFAs versus DFAs

- Every DFA can be seen as an NFA:
 - $\blacktriangleright \ \text{Turn} \ \delta(s_1,a) = s_2 \ \text{into} \ \delta(s_1,a) = \{ \ s_2 \ \}.$
- Thus every language that can be defined by a DFA can also be defined by an NFA.
- What about the other direction? Are NFAs more powerful?
- ► No.

Given an NFA $N=(Q,\Sigma,\delta,q_0,F)$ we can define a DFA D with the same alphabet in such a way that L(N)=L(D):

$$\begin{split} D &= \left(\wp(Q), \Sigma, \delta', \left\{ \; q_0 \; \right\}, \left\{ \; S \subseteq Q \; | \; S \cap F \neq \emptyset \; \right\} \right) \\ \delta'(S, a) &= \bigcup_{s \in S} \delta(s, a) \end{split}$$

- The DFA keeps track of exactly which states the NFA is in.
- It accepts if at least one of the NFA states is accepting.

An NFA:



If we apply the subset construction we get the following DFA:



If an NFA has 10 states, and we use the subset construction to build a corresponding DFA, how many states does the DFA have?

Note that some states cannot be reached from the start state:



If we remove non-accessible states, then we get a DFA which defines the same language:



One can also rename the states:



- Note that one does not have to first construct a DFA with 2^{|Q|} states, and then remove inaccessible states.
- One can instead construct the DFA without inaccessible states right away:
 - Start with the start state.
 - Add new states reachable from the start state.
 - Add new states reachable from those states.
 - And so on until there are no more new states.











If the subset construction is used to build a DFA corresponding to the following NFA over $\{a, b, c\}$, and inaccessible states are removed, how many states are there in the resulting DFA?



Recall the subset construction for $N=(Q,\Sigma,\delta,q_0,F)\text{:}$

$$\begin{split} D &= \left(\wp(Q), \Sigma, \delta', \left\{ \left. q_0 \right. \right\}, \left\{ \left. S \subseteq Q \right. \right| \left. S \cap F \neq \emptyset \right. \right\} \right) \\ \delta'(S, a) &= \bigcup_{s \in S} \delta(s, a) \end{split}$$

How would you prove L(N) = L(D)?

$$\begin{split} L(N) &= \left\{ \left. w \in \Sigma^* \; \middle| \; \widehat{\delta}(q_0, w) \cap F \neq \emptyset \right. \right\} \\ L(D) &= \left\{ \left. w \in \Sigma^* \; \middle| \; \begin{aligned} \widehat{\delta'}(\left\{ \left. q_0 \right. \right\}, w) \in \\ \left. \left\{ \left. S \subseteq Q \right. \right| \left. S \cap F \neq \emptyset \right. \right\} \right. \right\} \end{split} \right\} \end{split}$$

Recall the subset construction for $N=(Q,\Sigma,\delta,q_0,F)\text{:}$

$$\begin{split} D &= \left(\wp(Q), \Sigma, \delta', \left\{ \begin{array}{l} q_0 \end{array} \right\}, \left\{ \begin{array}{l} S \subseteq Q \mid S \cap F \neq \emptyset \end{array} \right\} \right) \\ \delta'(S, a) &= \bigcup_{s \in S} \delta(s, a) \end{split}$$

How would you prove L(N) = L(D)?

$$\begin{split} L(N) &= \left\{ \left. w \in \Sigma^* \; \right| \; \widehat{\delta}(q_0, w) \cap F \neq \emptyset \right. \right\} \\ L(D) &= \left\{ \left. w \in \Sigma^* \; \right| \; \widehat{\delta'}(\left\{ \; q_0 \; \right\}, w) \cap F \neq \emptyset \right. \right\} \end{split}$$

This follows from

$$\forall w \in \Sigma^*. \; \forall q \in Q. \; \widehat{\delta}(q,w) = \widehat{\delta'}(\{\; q\;\},w)\text{,}$$

which can be proved by induction on the structure of the string, using the following lemma:

$$\forall w \in \Sigma^*. \; \forall S \subseteq Q. \; \widehat{\delta'}(S,w) = \bigcup_{s \in S} \widehat{\delta'}(\{\;s\;\}\,,w)$$

The lemma can also be proved by induction on the structure of the string.

- ► Recall that a language M ⊆ Σ* is regular if there is some DFA A with alphabet Σ such that L(A) = M.
- A language M ⊆ Σ* is also regular if there is some NFA A with alphabet Σ such that L(A) = M.

Models

A model of a door



Alphabet: { Lock, Unlock, Open, Close }.

A model of a door



What happens if we try to lock a locked door? Does the system "crash"?

Try to model something as a finite automaton:

- The traffic lights of an intersection.
- A coin-operated vending machine.

... How well does your model work? Does it make sense to model the phenomenon as a finite automaton?



- Nondeterministic finite automata (NFAs).
- The subset construction.
- Models.



Nondeterministic finite automata with ε -transitions.