arXiv:1802.04708v1 [cs.FL] 13 Feb 2018

Lengths of Words Accepted by Nondeterministic Finite Automata

Aaron Potechin*
KTH Royal Institute of Technology
Stockholm 114-28
Sweden
aaronpotechin@gmail.com

Jeffrey Shallit†
School of Computer Science
University of Waterloo
Waterloo, ON N2L 3G1
Canada
shallit@uwaterloo.ca

February 16, 2022

Abstract

We consider two natural problems about nondeterministic finite automata. First, given such an automaton M of n states, and a length ℓ, does M accept a word of length ℓ? We show that the classic problem of triangle-free graph recognition reduces to this problem, and give an $O(n^\omega (\log n)^{1+\epsilon} \log \ell)$-time algorithm to solve it, where ω is the optimal exponent for matrix multiplication. Second, provided $L(M)$ is finite, we consider the problem of listing the lengths of *all* words accepted by M. Although this problem seems like it might be significantly harder, we show that this problem can be solved in $O(n^\omega (\log n)^{2+\epsilon})$ time. Finally, we give a connection between NFA acceptance and the strong exponential-time hypothesis.

*This work was supported by the Simons Collaboration for Algorithms and Geometry and by the NSF under agreement No. CCF-1412958.

†Supported in part by NSERC Grant 105829/2013.

1 Introduction

A nondeterministic finite automaton (NFA) $A = (Q, \Sigma, \delta, q_0, F)$ consists of a finite, nonempty set of states $Q = \{q_0, q_1, \ldots, q_{n-1}\}$, an input alphabet Σ, an initial state q_0, a set $F \subseteq Q$ of final states, and a transition function $\delta : Q \times \Sigma \to 2^Q$. This transition function is then extended in the usual way, to the domain $Q \times \Sigma^*$. The language accepted by an NFA A is defined to be

$$L(A) = \{x \in \Sigma^* \ : \ \delta(q_0, x) \cap F \neq \emptyset\}.$$

Our NFA's do not have ϵ-transitions. The *transition diagram* of an NFA A is the directed graph $G = G(A)$ with source q_0, sink vertices given by F, and directed edge from p to q labeled a if $\delta(p, a) = q$. An NFA is *unary* if its input alphabet Σ consists of a single letter. For more information about the model, the reader can consult, for example, [4].

Without loss of generality, we can assume all NFA's under discussion are *initially connected* (i.e., every state is reachable from the start state q_0) and that a final state is reachable from every state. Note that both properties are testable for an NFA A in time linear in the number of edges in its transition diagram.

An NFA A is *acyclic* if its transition diagram has no cycles, or, equivalently, if $L(A)$ is finite. Note that if an n-state NFA is acyclic, then $L(A) \subseteq (\Sigma \cup \{\epsilon\})^{n-1}$.

In this note, we consider the following natural problem about NFA's:

`NFA LENGTH ACCEPTANCE`

Instance: An n-state NFA $A = (Q, \Sigma, \delta, q_0, F)$ and a length ℓ.

Question: Does A accept a word of length ℓ?

Proposition 1. `NFA LENGTH ACCEPTANCE` *can be solved in* $O(n^\omega (\log n)^{1+\epsilon}(\log \ell))$ *time.*

Proof. First, we create a boolean adjacency matrix $M = M(A)$ with a 1 in row i and column j if there is a letter a such that $q_j \in \delta(q_i, a)$. Then standard results on path algebras imply that A accepts a word of length ℓ if and only if $(M^\ell)_{0,j} = 1$ for some j such that $q_j \in F$. A single Boolean matrix multiplication can be carried out using the usual matrix multiplication algorithms modulo $n + 1$, and then converting each element that is ≥ 1 to 1. This involves arithmetic on integers of $\log n$ bits (which can be done in $(\log n)^{1+\epsilon}$ time). Raising M to the ℓ power can be done using the usual "binary method of exponentiation" (see, e.g., [7, §4.6.3]) with $\log \ell$ matrix multiplications. □

In the next section, we prove a lower bound on the complexity of this problem, by reducing from the classic problem of triangle-free graph recognition. The same reduction works even if our NFA is restricted to be over a unary alphabet, and even if it is required to be acyclic. In Section 3 we discuss the problem of listing all the elements of $L(A)$ when A is a unary acyclic NFA.

2 A lower bound

In this section, we show that the classic problem of determining whether an undirected graph is triangle-free reduces to `NFA LENGTH ACCEPTANCE` in linear time.

Let G be an undirected graph on n vertices, say $v_0, v_1, \ldots, v_{n-1}$. We assume, without loss of generality, that G has no self-loops. We create a unary acyclic NFA A as follows. The construction consists of four layers, numbered from 1 to 4, with each layer having n states, each corresponding to one of G's vertices. State i in layer j is denoted q_i^j. In the top layer (layer 1), we let q_0^1 be the initial state of A and we add a transition from q_i^1 to q_{i+1}^1 for $0 \leq i \leq n-2$, giving us a linearly-connected chain of states. Next, we add transitions from layer 1 to layer 2, layer 2 to layer 3, and layer 3 to layer 4 as follows: if G has an edge from v_i to v_k, then A has a transition from q_i^j to q_k^{j+1} for $j = 1, 2, 3$. Finally, the bottom layer (layer 4) has transitions from q_i^4 to q_{i+1}^4 for $0 \leq i \leq n-2$. The unique final state of A is q_{n-1}^4. A similar idea was used in [1].

We claim that a^{n+2} is accepted by A if and only if there exists a triangle in G.




Figure 1: The reduction when G is a square. Since a square has no triangle, there is no path of length 6 from q_0^1 to q_3^4.

Suppose a word a^r is accepted by A. Then an accepting path must begin at the initial state q_0^1, follow i edges in layer 1, ending at q_i^1 then transit to layer 2, arriving at state q_j^2, then transit to layer 3, arriving at state q_k^3, then transit to layer 4, arriving at state q_l^4 and finally, end at q_{n-1}^4. The length of this path is then $r = i + 3 + n - 1 - l$. But $r = n + 2$

if and only if $i = l$. Then G has edges (v_i, v_j), (v_j, v_k), and (v_k, v_i) and so has the triangle (v_i, v_j, v_k).

Now suppose G has the triangle (v_i, v_j, v_k). Then there are edges (v_i, v_j), (v_j, v_k), and (v_k, v_i). An acceptance path for a^{n+2} is as follows: from q_0^1 in a linear chain of nodes to q_i^1 by a path of length i, a transition to q_j^2, a transition to q_k^3, a transition to q_i^4, and transitions to q_{n-1}^4 in a linear chain of nodes by a path of length $n-1-i$. The accepted word has length $i+3+n-1-i = n+2$.

Starting with a graph G of n vertices and m edges, this construction produces a unary acyclic NFA with $4n$ vertices and $3m+2n$ edges.

We have proved:

Theorem 2. *There is a linear-time reduction from* `TRIANGLE-FREE GRAPH` *to* `NFA LENGTH ACCEPTANCE`.

The fastest general algorithm for `TRIANGLE-FREE GRAPH` known runs in $O(n^\omega (\log n)^{1+\epsilon})$ time [6, 2, 3]. It consists of computing M^3, where M is G's adjacency matrix, and checking if the diagonal contains a 1. This suggests that finding a significantly faster algorithm for `NFA LENGTH ACCEPTANCE` will require a large advance.

3 Unary acyclic NFA enumeration

In this section we consider a related problem, which we call `UNARY ACYCLIC NFA ENUMERATION`:

Instance: a unary acyclic n-state NFA A.

Problem: to enumerate (list) the elements of $L(A)$.

At first glance, this problem seems like it might be harder than `NFA LENGTH ACCEPTANCE`, since it requires checking the lengths of all possible accepted words, rather than a single word. Nevertheless, we give a $O(n^\omega (\log n)^{2+\epsilon})$-time algorithm for the problem. Since the same argument giving a linear-time reduction from `TRIANGLE-FREE GRAPH` to `NFA LENGTH ACCEPTANCE` works for reducing `TRIANGLE-FREE GRAPH` to `UNARY ACYCLIC NFA ENUMERATION`, it is unlikely we can greatly improve our algorithm, unless a significant advance is made.

The naive approach to solving `UNARY ACYCLIC NFA ENUMERATION` is to maintain a list L of the states of A (represented, say, as a bit vector) and update this list as we read additional symbols of input. If A has n states, then the longest word accepted is of length $\leq n-1$. To update L after reading each new symbol potentially requires a union of n sets, each with at most n elements. Thus the total running time is $O(n^3)$.

We consider a different approach. Suppose A has n states, labeled $q_0, q_1, \ldots, q_{n-1}$. We create a new NFA $A' = (Q', \{a\}, \delta', q_0', F')$, as follows. Let 2^k be the smallest power of 2 that is $\geq n$. Define $Q' = Q \cup \{p_0, p_1, \ldots, p_{2^k-1}\}$. Let $q_0' = p_0$ be the new initial state, and, in addition to the transitions already present in A, define δ' by adding additional transitions from p_i to p_{i+1} for $0 \leq i < p_{2^k-1}$, and from p_{2^k-1} to q_0. Let M' be the adjacency matrix of A'.

Now A accepts a word of length i if and only if there is a path of length i from q_0 to a final state of A, if and only if there is a path of length 2^k from p_i to a final state of A'. Thus we can compute all words accepted by A with a single exponentiation of M' to the appropriate power.

We now compute M'^{2^k} using exactly k Boolean matrix multiplications, through repeated squaring. To determine if a^i is accepted by A, it suffices to check the entry corresponding to the row for p_i and the columns for the final states of A'. We do this for each possible length, 0 through $n-1$, and so the total cost is $O(n^\omega (\log n)^{2+\epsilon} + n^2)$.

We have proved

Theorem 3. *If M is a unary NFA that accepts a finite language L, we can enumerate the elements of L in $O(n^\omega (\log n)^{2+\epsilon})$ bit operations, where ω is the optimal exponent for matrix multiplication.*

This result previously appeared in [8, §3.8].

4 Hardness of NFA acceptance

In this section, we consider the following decision problem:

`NFA ACCEPTANCE`

Input: An NFA M of total size m (states and transitions) and an input x of length ℓ.

Question: Does M accept x?

The obvious algorithm for this problem keeps track of the current set of states and updates it for each new input letter read; it runs in $O(\ell m)$ time.

In this section, we show that in the case when the NFA is sparse (i.e., m is not much larger than n, the number of states of the NFA), significantly improving this algorithm would disprove the strong exponential time hypothesis (SETH) [5]. However, this does not rule out an improvement when the NFA is dense, and we leave it as an open problem to either find a significant improvement to this algorithm, or show why such an improvement is unlikely.

Recall the following decision problem (e.g., [11]):

`ORTHOGONAL VECTORS`

Input: Two lists $(v_i)_{1 \le i \le n}$ and $(w_i)_{1 \le i \le n}$ of boolean vectors of dimension d.

Question: do there exist i, j such that the boolean product $v_i \cdot w_j = 0$?

Theorem 4. `ORTHOGONAL VECTORS` *reduces in linear time and log space to acyclic* `NFA ACCEPTANCE`.

Proof. The idea is to create an NFA M that accepts the input $00w_1 00w_2 \cdots 00w_n$ if and only if there exist i, j such that $v_i \cdot w_j = 0$.




Figure 2: The gadget for testing whether $w \cdot v$ is 0 when $w \in \{0,1\}^4$ and $v = \{1,0,0,1\}$. Here $*$ means that the NFA can take this edge regardless of what the input bit is.

The NFA is built out of some simple DFA gadgets M_i, one for each v_i. On input w, the DFA M_i accepts iff $w \cdot v_i = 0$. If the vectors are of length d, this can be done with $2d + 1$ states.

The NFA M has the following layers:

1. A path of length $(n-1)(d+2)$, where we assign the label a_j to the $(j-1)(d+2)$-th state on this path. We set the start state to be a_1.
2. A special state x.
3. The gadgets M_i, except for their accept states.
4. A special state y that replaces the accepting state for each gadget.
5. A path of length $(n-1)(d+2)$, where we assign the label b_j to the $(j-1)(d+2)$-th state on this path. We set the accept state to be b_n.

The transitions for M are as follows. Except for transitions within the gadgets M_j, all of these transitions can be made regardless of the input.

1. For the path containing the states a_j, at each a_j we either choose to transition to x, which means that we read w_j from the input, or we can transition to the next state of the path (unless we are at a_n, in which case we can only transition to x). At each other state in the path, we can only transition to the next state of the path.
2. From x we can transition to the start state of any gadget M_i, which means that we will check $v_i \cdot w_j$.
3. We have the transitions for each gadget M_i, except that if we would transition to the accept state of M_i, we instead transition to y.
4. From y we can transition to any b_j. This flexibility allows the NFA to end up at the accepting state after the correct number of steps.

5. For the path containing the states b_j, at each state we can only transition to the next state in the path.

The total number of states and transitions are both $O(dn)$. □




Figure 3: Structure of the acyclic NFA solving orthogonal vectors.

Corollary 5. *If there is an algorithm for* `NFA ACCEPTANCE` *that runs in* $O(n^{2-\epsilon})$ *time, then* SETH *is false.*

Proof. Such an algorithm would imply an algorithm for `ORTHOGONAL VECTORS` that runs in the same time bound. We then use a result of Williams (e.g., [9] or [10, Thm. 1, p. 22]). □

5 Conclusion

In this paper, we analyzed the complexity of the acyclic NFA acceptance problem, which asks if an acyclic NFA accepts a given input. In the case where the NFA is unary, we showed that there is an algorithm using matrix multiplication that runs in $\tilde{O}(n^\omega)$ time, which in fact enumerates all input lengths that are accepted. We also showed that we can reduce the triangle detection problem to unary acyclic NFA acceptance; improving on this algorithm would imply a breakthrough for triangle detection. In the general case, we show

that significantly improving the trivial $O(nm)$ algorithm (where n is the input length and m is the number of edges in the NFA) when m is $O(n)$ would imply that the strong exponential time hypothesis (SETH) is false.

That said, there are a number of open questions remaining. First, what bounds can we show for acyclic NFA acceptance when the NFA is dense? In particular, can we prove a $\tilde{\Omega}(n^3)$ lower bound under some assumption? Second, can we reduce acyclic unary NFA acceptance and acyclic NFA acceptance to other problems?

References

[1] A. Abboud and V. V. Williams. Popular conjectures imply strong lower bounds for dynamic problems. Preprint, available at https://arxiv.org/abs/1402.0054, 2014.

[2] N. Alon, R. Yuster, and U. Zwick. Color-coding. *J. Assoc. Comput. Mach.* **42** (1995), 844–856.

[3] N. Alon, R. Yuster, and U. Zwick. Finding and counting given length cycles. *Algorithmica* **17** (1997), 209–223.

[4] J. E. Hopcroft and J. D. Ullman. *Introduction to Automata Theory, Languages, and Computation.* Addison-Wesley, 1979.

[5] R. Impagliazzo and R. Paturi. The complexity of k-SAT. In *Proc. 14th IEEE Conf. on Computational Complexity*, pp. 237–240. IEEE Computer Society, 1999.

[6] A. Itai and M. Rodeh. Finding a minimum circuit in a graph. *SIAM J. Comput.* **7** (1978), 413–423.

[7] D. E. Knuth. *The Art of Computer Programming. Volume 2: Seminumerical Algorithms.* Addison-Wesley, 1981. 2nd edition.

[8] J. Shallit. *A Second Course in Formal Languages and Automata Theory.* Cambridge University Press, 2009.

[9] R. Williams. A new algorithm for optimal 2-constraint satisfaction and its implications. *Theoret. Comput. Sci.* **348** (2005), 357–365.

[10] V. Williams. Hardness of easy problems: basing hardness on popular conjectures such as the strong exponential time hypothesis. In T. Husfeldt and I. Kanj, editors, *Proc. 10th Int'l. Symp. Parameterized and Exact Computation (IPEC 2015)*, pp. 16–29. LIPICS Schloss Dagstuhl, 2015. Leibniz Int'l Proceedings in Informatics.

[11] R. Williams and H. Yu. Finding orthogonal vectors in discrete structures. In *Proc. 25th ACM-SIAM Symp. Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pp. 1867–1877, 2014.