# Automates d'arbre

TD n°1: Recognizable Tree Languages and Finite Tree Automata

# September 18, 2017

## Exercise 1: First constructions of Tree Automatas

Let  $\mathcal{F} = \{f(2), g(1), a(0)\}$ . Give a DFTA and a top-down DFTA for the set G(t) of ground instances of the term t = f(f(a, x), g(y)) which is defined by:

$$G(t) = \left\{ f \big( f(a, u), g(v) \big) \mid u, v \in T(\mathcal{F}) \right\}$$

#### **Solution:**

- top-down DFTA :  $Q = \{q_{f,1}, q_{f,2}, q_g, q_a, q_{\top}\}, I = \{q_{f,1}\} \text{ and } \Delta =$ 
  - $\star q_{f,1}(f(x,y)) \longrightarrow f(q_{f,2}(x), q_g(y))$
  - $\star q_{f_2}(f(x,y)) \longrightarrow f(q_a(x), q_{\top}(y))$
  - $\star q_q(g(x)) \longrightarrow g(q_{\top}(x))$
  - $\star q_a(a) \longrightarrow a$
  - $\star q_{\top}(f(x,y)) \longrightarrow f(q_{\top}(x),q_{\top}(y))$
  - $\star q_{\top}(g(x)) \longrightarrow g(q_{\top}(x))$
  - $\star q_{\top}(a) \longrightarrow a$
- DFTA :  $Q = \{q_a, q_f, q_g, q_\top, q_\bot\}, F = \{q_\top\}$  and  $\Delta =$ 
  - $\star \ a \longrightarrow q_a$
  - $\star f(q_a, q) \longrightarrow q_f \text{ for all } q \in Q$
  - $\star g(q) \longrightarrow q_g \text{ for all } q \in Q$
  - $\star \ f(q_f,q_g) \longrightarrow q_\top$
  - $\star f(q,q') \longrightarrow q_{\perp} \text{ for all } (q,q') \neq (q_a, ), (q_f,q_g)$

### Exercise 2: What is recognizable by an FTA?

Are the following tree languages recognizable (by a bottom-up FTA)?

- $\mathcal{F} = \{g(1), a(0)\}\$ and L the set of ground terms of even height.
- $\mathcal{F} = \{f(2), g(1), a(0)\}$  and L the set of ground terms of even height.

### Solution:

- Yes.
- No. Remark that the pumping lemma does not apply! Assume that it is recognizable by a NFTA with n states. Define:

$$t_n = f(g^{2n+1}(a), g^{2n+2}(a))$$

It has height 2n+2 and so belongs to this language. So there exists an accepting run  $\rho$  for  $t_n$ . By the pigeonhole principle, there exists k < k' such that  $r(1.1^k) = r(1.1^{k'})$  and from that we deduce that for all  $p \in \mathbb{N}$ , the tree

$$t_{n,p} = f(g^{2n+1+p(k'-k)}(a), g^{2n+2}(a))$$

also has an accepting run. But  $t_{n,2}$  has height 2(n+k'-k)+1 which is odd. Contradiction.

# Exercise 3: Bottom-up vs Top-down

- 1) Recall why bottom-up NFTAs, bottom-up DTAs and top-down NFTAs have the same expressiveness.
- 2) Let  $\mathcal{F} = \{f(2), g(1), a(0)\}$ . Give a DFTA and a top-down NFTA for the set M(t) of terms which have a ground instance of the term t = f(a, g(x)) as a subterm, ie. M(t) = $\left\{ C\left[f(a,g(u))\right] \mid C \in \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{F}), u \in T(\mathcal{F}) \right\}.$
- 3) Show that NFTAs and top-down DFTAs do not have the same expressiveness.

```
Solution:
• top-down NFTA : Q = \{q_0, q_\perp, q_a, q_g\}, I = \{q_0\} and \Delta =
       \star q_0(f(x,y)) \longrightarrow f(q_{\perp}(x),q_0(y))
       \star q_0(f(x,y)) \longrightarrow f(q_0(x), q_\perp(y))
       \star q_{\perp}(f(x,y)) \longrightarrow f(q_{\perp}(x),q_{\perp}(y))
       \star q_{\perp}(g(x)) \longrightarrow g(q_{\perp}(x))
       \star q_{\perp}(a) \longrightarrow a
       \star q_0(g(x)) \longrightarrow g(q_0(x))
       \star q_0(f(x,y)) \longrightarrow f(q_a(x), q_q(y))
       \star q_a(a) \longrightarrow a
       \star q_g(g(x)) \longrightarrow g(q_{\perp}(x))
• DFTA : Q = \{q_a, q_g, q_{\top}, q_{\perp}\}, F = \{q_{\top}\} \text{ and } \Delta =
       \star \ a \longrightarrow q_a
       \begin{array}{l} \star \ g(q_\top) \longrightarrow q_\top \\ \star \ g(q) \longrightarrow q_g \ \text{with} \ q \neq q_\top \end{array}
       \star \ f(q,q') \longrightarrow q_{\top} \ \text{if} \ (q,q') = (q_a,q_g) \ \text{or} \ q = q_{\top} \ \text{or} \ q' = q_{\top}
       \star f(q, q') \longrightarrow q_{\perp} \text{ else}
• Let's assume M(t) can be recognized by a top-down DFTA \mathcal{A}. We consider two terms
```

 $t_1 = f(t, a)$  and  $t_2 = f(a, t)$ . A must start with the same transition on both terms, let's say  $q_0(f(x,y)) \longrightarrow f(q_L(x),q_R(y))$ . Then, there is an accepting run for  $q_R(a)$ because  $t_1$  in M(t), and conversely for  $q_L(a)$ . Finally,  $\mathcal{A}$  accepts  $f(a,a) \notin M(t)$ .