CSC236 winter 2020, week 12: (non-)regularity Recommended reading: Chapter 7 Vassos course notes, section 7.6.3—

> Colin Morris colin@cs.toronto.edu http://www.cs.toronto.edu/~colin/236/W20/

> > March 30, 2020

#### Reminders

- A3 due Thursday @ 15:00
  - It's short!
  - Extra office hours available by request
- One last tutorial + quiz this Friday
- Also, final Q&A session Wednesday 12:00-14:00
  - These are really worth attending!
- Marking scheme changes
  - Course website will be updated when vote officially closes on Monday
- ▶ Exam-like final assessment (worth 20%) to be written April 7-9

# Regular languages

A language *L* is **regular** iff

- $\blacktriangleright$  L is denoted by a regular expression
- L is accepted by a deterministic FSA
- L is accepted by a non-deterministic FSA

(We now know that all of these criteria are equivalent.)

A few options to prove that L is regular:

- 1. Construct an RE, or a DFSA, or an NFSA that matches L.
- 2. Use closure properties of regular languages. Show that *L* can be formed by application of union/intersection/complement/Kleene star to some languages that are known to be regular.
- 3. Use the fact that all finite languages are regular

## Example: proving regularity

 $L_1 = \text{strings over } \{0,1\} \text{ of length 236. Prove } L_1 \text{ is regular.}$ 

## Example: proving regularity

 $L_1 = \text{strings over } \{0, 1\} \text{ of length } 236. \text{ Prove } L_1 \text{ is regular.}$ 

 $L_2 =$  strings over  $\{0, 1\}$  where length is a multiple of 236. Prove  $L_2$  is regular.

$$L_2 = L_1^*$$
  
 $L_1$  regular, so  $L_1^*$  do regular

Are all languages regular? Big if true

 $\bigcirc$   $^{\prime}$   $^{\prime}$ 

#### Detour: probing the limits of FSAs

Suppose *M* is a DFSA such that  $\mathcal{L}(M) = \{a^n \mid \exists k \in \mathbb{N}, n = 3k\}$ . What is the minimum number of states *M* can have?



Proving lower bounds on states Recall,  $\mathcal{L}(M) = \{a^n \mid \exists k \in \mathbb{N}, n = 3k\}$ .

Consider

- δ\*(s, a) = q<sub>1</sub>
   δ\*(s, aa) = q<sub>2</sub>
- $\delta^*(s,aa) = q_2$  $\delta^*(s,aaa) = q_3$

Claim:  $q_1$ ,  $q_2$ , and  $q_3$  are distinct. Proof: Show that each of the following possibilities leads to a contradiction  $p = q_3 = q_1 - q_3 \in F$   $q_1 \notin F$   $p = q_3 = q_2 - q_1$   $p = q_2 = q_1$   $f = q_2 = q_2$   $f = q_3$   $f = q_3$  $f = q_3$ 

#### Pigeonhole principle



Figure: 10 pigeons > 9 pigeonholes  $\implies$  pigeon cohabitation

## Recipe: proving lower bound on DFSA states

To prove that any DFSA M that accepts L must have at least n states

- 1. Prove that *n* is *sufficient*, by demonstrating an accepting *n*-state DFSA
  - (May or may not be necessary, depending on how question is worded)
- 2. Find *n* distinct prefixes  $x_1, x_2, \ldots x_n$ , and matching suffixes  $y_1, y_2, \ldots y_n$ , such that
  - $\blacktriangleright x_i y_k \in L \iff j = k$
  - ▶ i.e. for each prefix, exactly one of the suffixes can be concatenated to it to form a string in L
- 3. Prove minimum of *n* states by contradiction
  - 3.1 Assume, for sake of contradiction, that |Q| < n.
  - 3.2 By the pigeonhole principle, there must be two different prefixes,  $x_j$  and  $x_k$  that go to the same state. a

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>It's actually sufficient to find just n-1 suffixes, i.e. we can get away with having one prefix x that doesn't have a matching suffix. See steps 3.2 and 3.3 for the reason why.

# Another (worked out) lower bound example

Find the minimum number of states for a DFSA that accepts

 $L = \{w \in \{0,1\}^* \mid w \text{ ends with '011'}\}.$ Below, we give a 4-state DFSA for L.



# Another (worked out) lower bound example

Find the minimum number of states for a DFSA that accepts

 $L = \{w \in \{0,1\}^* \mid w \text{ ends with '011'}\}.$ Below, we give a 4-state DFSA for *L*.



So 4 is sufficient. Is it necessary? Consider

- ►  $x_0 = \varepsilon$
- ▶  $x_1 = 0, y_1 = 11$
- ►  $x_2 = 01, y_2 = 1$
- ► x<sub>3</sub> = 011, y<sub>3</sub> = ε

# Another (worked out) lower bound example

Find the minimum number of states for a DFSA that accepts

 $L = \{w \in \{0,1\}^* \mid w \text{ ends with '011'}\}.$ Below, we give a 4-state DFSA for *L*.



So 4 is sufficient. Is it necessary? Consider

• 
$$x_0 = \varepsilon$$
  
•  $x_1 = 0, y_1 = 11$   
•  $x_2 = 01, y_2 = 1$   
•  $x_3 = 011, y_3 = \varepsilon$ 

By inspection, each suffix  $y_i$  has exactly one prefix  $x_i$  such that  $x_i y_i \in L$ . Suppose FSOC a DFSA with < 4 states accepts L. By the pigeonhole principle, there must be a distinct pair,  $x_i, x_k$ , such that  $\delta^*(s, x_i) = \delta^*(s, x_k) = q$  for some state a. WLOG, suppose  $j \neq 0$ . Then  $\delta^*(q, y_i)$ must be accepting. But that would mean we also accept,  $x_k y_j \notin L$ .  $\Rightarrow \Leftarrow$ 

## An infinite flock of pigeons

Prove that  $L = \{0^n 1^n \mid n \in \mathbb{N}\}$  is non-regular. Suppose M is a PFSA st. L(M)=L 0,00,000,0000... By pigeonhole principle, In, MEN, N ≠ M N S\*(5, 0°) = S\*(s, O") = q, for some state q  $S^*(q, 1^n) \in F?$ If yes we accept Om In Alt Jf no, ve reject of in the

## Recipe: proving non-regularity via pigeonhole principle

Very similar to recipe for proving lower bound on number of states

To prove that L is non-regular

- 1. Find a **infinite** family of distinct prefixes  $x_1, x_2, \ldots$ , and corresponding suffixes  $y_1, y_2, \ldots$ , such that
  - $\flat \ x_j y_k \in L \iff j = k$
  - ▶ i.e. for each prefix, exactly one of the suffixes can be concatenated to it to form a string in L
- 2. Prove non-existence of DFSA for L by contradiction
  - 2.1 Assume, for sake of contradiction, that there is a DFSA M such that  $\mathcal{L}(M) = L$ . Let n be its number of states.
  - 2.2 By the pigeonhole principle, there must be two different prefixes,  $x_j$  and  $x_k$  that go to the same state, q
  - 2.3 So  $\delta^*(q, y_j)$  must be accepting and non-accepting.  $\Rightarrow \Leftarrow$

#### Another approach: the Pumping Lemma

Use whichever approach you prefer. We'll ask you to prove non-regularity, but won't force you to use one approach or the other.

Let *L* be a regular language. Then there exists  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , such that for every  $x \in L$  where  $|x| \ge n$ , x satisfies the following property:

► 
$$\exists y, v, w \in \Sigma^*, x = \underline{uvw} \land v \neq \varepsilon \land |uv| \leq n$$
, and  $\underline{uv^k w \in L}$  for all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ 

## Another approach: the Pumping Lemma

Use whichever approach you prefer. We'll ask you to prove non-regularity, but won't force you to use one approach or the other.

Let *L* be a regular language. Then there exists  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , such that for every  $x \in L$  where  $|x| \ge n$ , x satisfies the following property:

► 
$$\exists y, v, w \in \Sigma^*, x = uvw \land v \neq \varepsilon \land |uv| \leq n$$
, and  $uv^k w \in L$  for all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ 

i.e.

If L is regular, then every sufficiently long string in L contains a (non-empty) part that can be repeated ("pumped") any number of times, to keep getting more strings in L.

# Pumping Lemma proof sketch

The pigeonhole principle returns



Using Pumping Lemma to prove non-regularity: example  $10 101 \le P_{A_{L}}$ 

WTS:  $\underline{PAL} = \{x \in \{0, 1\}^* \mid x \text{ is a palindrome}\}\$  is non-regular. Assume, for sake of contradiction, that PAL is regular. Then the Pumping Lemma applies for some value  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .

Consider 
$$X = 010^{n} \in L$$
  
 $\exists M \in \mathbb{N}^{+}, O^{n+1} \cup O \in L$ , but this is not a pulled rome  
 $\exists X \in \mathbb{N}^{+}, O^{n+1} \cup O \in L$