1. Regular or not? Prove or disprove that each of the languages below is regular (or not). Let $\Sigma^{+}$ denote the set of all nonempty strings over alphabet $\Sigma$; in other words, $\Sigma^{+}=\Sigma \cdot \Sigma^{*}$. Denote $n(w)$ the integer corresponding to the binary string $w$.
(a) $\left\{3 x=y: x, y \in\{0,1\}^{*}, n(y)=3 n(x)\right\}$

Solution: Denote the language in the problem 1(a) as $L_{a}$. We prove that $L_{a}$ is not regular by constructing a fooling set for $L_{a}$ of infinite size.

Let $F=\left\{310^{i}: i \geq 0\right\}$. For two distinct prefixes $x=310^{i}$ and $y=310^{j}$ in $F$, let $z$ be $=110^{i}$.

- $x z=310^{i}=110^{i}$; because $n\left(110^{i}\right)=3 n\left(10^{i}\right)$, we have $x z$ in $F$.
- $y z=310^{j}=110^{i}$; because $n\left(110^{i}\right) \neq 3 n\left(10^{j}\right)$ if $i \neq j$, we have $y z$ not in $F$.

This implies that $F$ is a fooling set of infinite size, and thus $L_{a}$ is not regular.
(b) $\left\{\begin{array}{l}3 \mathrm{x} \\ =\mathrm{y}\end{array}: \underset{\mathrm{y}}{\mathrm{x}} \in\left\{\begin{array}{l}0 \\ 0\end{array},{ }_{1}, 1,{ }_{0}^{1},{ }_{1}^{1}\right\}^{*}, n(y)=3 n(x)\right\}$

Solution: Denote the language in the problem 1 (b) as $L_{b}$. We prove that $L_{b}$ is regular by constructing an NFA recognizing $L_{b}$.

We construct NFA recognizing the reverse of the language, $L_{b}^{R}$; by the exercise problems, $L_{b}$ is regular if and only if $L_{b}^{R}$ is regular.


The NFA reads the input from the least significant bits of $x$ and $y$, and records the amount of carry at any moment. The transitions are implemented so that the machine only continues if the current digit of $y$ equals to (the least significant bit of) three times the corresponding digit in the $x$ plus the carry. After reading the full strings $x$ and $y$, if there is any carry left then we reject; otherwise the NFA finishes off by reading the leading ${ }_{=}^{3}$ and accepts.
(c) $\left\{w x w^{R}: w, x \in \Sigma^{+}\right\}$

Solution: Denote the language in the problem 1(c) as $L_{c}$. We prove that $L_{c}$ is regular by constructing an NFA recognizing $L_{c}$, which is equivalent to the following language:

$$
L_{c}^{\prime}:=\left\{\sigma x^{\prime} \sigma: x^{\prime} \in \Sigma^{+}, \sigma \in \Sigma\right\} .
$$

For $L_{c}^{\prime} \subseteq L_{c}$, take $w=\sigma$ and $x=x^{\prime}$; for $L_{c} \subseteq L_{c}^{\prime}$, take $\sigma$ to be the first symbol in $w$ and $x^{\prime}$ to be whatever is left.


The constructed NFA reads the first and the last symbol, and accepts if they match; therefore the NFA correctly recognizes language $L_{c}^{\prime}$. More formally, create one state $q_{\sigma}$ for each symbol
$\sigma \in \Sigma$; and add two extra states $s$ and $t$. Let $s$ be the only starting state and $t$ be the only accepting state. For each symbol $\sigma$, add transitions $s$ to $q_{\sigma}$ and $q_{\sigma}$ to $t$ on reading $\sigma$, and self-loop transition at $q_{\sigma}$ on reading all symbols.
(d) $\left\{w w^{R} x: w, x \in \Sigma^{+}\right\}$

Solution: Denote the language in the problem 1 (d) as $L_{d}$. We prove that $L_{d}$ is not regular by constructing a fooling set for $L_{d}$ of infinite size. Without loss of generality we assume that 0 and 1 are in $\Sigma$.

Let $F=\left\{01^{i} 0: i\right.$ is an odd integer $\}$. For two distinct prefixes $u=01^{i} 0$ and $v=01^{j} 0$ in $F$ (without loss of generality assuming $i<j$ ), consider the suffix $z=01^{i} 00$.

- $u z=01^{i} 001^{i} 00$; by taking $w=01^{i} 0$ and $x=0$, this shows that $u z$ is in $F$.
- $v z=01^{j} 001^{i} 00$. Because $j$ is odd, $w w^{R}$ cannot be of the form $01^{j} 0$; which means the first run of 1 s must lie in $w$ completely. But then there are not enough 1 s in the rest of the word to form $w^{R}$. Therefore, not matter what $x$ is, word $v z$ cannot be of the form $w w^{R} x$. This shows that $v z$ is not in $F$.
This implies that $F$ is a fooling set of infinite size, and thus $L_{d}$ is not regular.
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## 2. Telling DFAs apart.

Let $M_{1}$ and $M_{2}$ be two DFAs, each with exactly $n$ states. Assume that the languages associated with the two machines are different (that is, $L\left(M_{1}\right) \neq L\left(M_{2}\right)$ ), there is always some string in the symmetric difference of the two languages.
Prove that there is a string $w$ of length polynomial in $n$ in the symmetric difference of $L\left(M_{1}\right)$ and $L\left(M_{2}\right)$. What is the best upper bound you can get on the length of $w$ ?

Solution: First we construct a DFA $M^{\prime}$, described by ( $Q^{\prime}, s^{\prime}, A^{\prime}, \Sigma^{\prime}, \delta^{\prime}$ ), that recognizes the symmetric difference of the two languages $L\left(M_{1}\right)$ and $L\left(M_{2}\right)$, using the product construction. Denote $M_{i}$ by the tuple ( $Q_{i}, s_{i}, A_{i}, \Sigma_{i}, \delta_{i}$ ) for $i \in\{1,2\}$.

- States $Q^{\prime}: Q_{1} \times Q_{2}$ - pairs of states, one from each $M_{i}$
- Starting state $s^{\prime}:\left(s_{1}, s_{2}\right)$
- Accepting states $A^{\prime}:\left\{\left(r_{1}, r_{2}\right) \in Q^{\prime}:\right.$ either $r_{1} \in A_{1}$ and $r_{2} \notin A_{2}$, or $r_{1} \notin A_{1}$ and $\left.r_{2} \in A_{2}\right\}$
- Alphabet $\Sigma^{\prime}: \Sigma_{1} \cup \Sigma_{2}$
- Transition function $\delta^{\prime}: \delta_{1} \times \delta_{2}$, mapping $\delta^{\prime}\left(\left(q_{1}, q_{2}\right)\right.$, a) to $\left(\delta_{1}\left(q_{1}\right.\right.$, a $), \delta\left(q_{2}\right.$, a $)$ on reading any symbol a $\in \Sigma^{\prime}$

DFA $M^{\prime}$ recognizes the symmetric difference of the two languages $L\left(M_{1}\right)$ and $L\left(M_{2}\right)$ and has $n^{2}$ states. Now by problem statement $M^{\prime}$ accepts at least one word. Now any walk from the starting state $s^{\prime}$ to an accepting state in $M^{\prime}$ can be turned into a simple path between the same two endpoints, without ever visiting the same state twice. This shows that there is a word of length at most $n^{2}$ that is accepted by $M^{\prime}$, and thus in the symmetric difference of $L\left(M_{1}\right)$ and $L\left(M_{2}\right)$.
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[^0]:    Rubric: Standard 5-point grading scale (plus deadly-sins and sudden-death rules) for each subproblem, scaled to 2.5 points. (Thus 10 points in total for problem 1.) Maximum 0.5 points if one tries to prove a regular language to be non-regular, or vice versa. Maximum 0.5 points if the fooling set is in fact not fooling.

    Full credit for subproblem (d) if one correctly proves the language to be regular when $\Sigma$ is unary. This was an oversight.

[^1]:    Rubric: Any complete solution with a (justified) polynomial bound receives full credit. Any subquadratic bound receives extra credit.

    Standard 5-point grading scale plus deadly-sins and sudden-death rules.

