

# State Grammars with Stores <sup>☆,☆☆</sup>

Oscar H. Ibarra<sup>a,1</sup>, Ian McQuillan<sup>b,2</sup>

<sup>a</sup>*Department of Computer Science*

*University of California, Santa Barbara, CA 93106, USA*

<sup>b</sup>*Department of Computer Science, University of Saskatchewan  
Saskatoon, SK S7N 5A9, Canada*

---

## Abstract

State grammars are context-free grammars where the productions have states associated with them, and a production can only be applied to a nonterminal if the current state matches the state in the production. Once states are added to grammars, it is natural to add various stores, similar to machine models. With such extensions, productions can only be applied if both the state and the value read from each store matches between the current sentential form and the production. Here, generative capacity results are presented for different derivation modes, with and without additional stores. In particular, with the standard derivation relation, it is shown that adding reversal-bounded counters does not increase the capacity, and states are enough. Also, state grammars with reversal-bounded counters that operate using leftmost derivations are shown to coincide with languages accepted by one-way machines with a pushdown and reversal-bounded counters, and these are surprisingly shown to be strictly weaker than state grammars with the standard derivation relation (and no counters). The complexity of the emptiness problem involving state grammars with reversal-bounded counters is also studied.

*Keywords:* grammars, reversal-bounded counters, automata models, matrix grammars, emptiness problem, P, NP, NP-completeness.

---

## 1. Introduction

State grammars were created by Kasai [1], and they have context-free grammar rules with additional state components. As originally defined, they consist of a set of nonterminals  $V$ , a set of terminals  $\Sigma$ , an initial nonterminal  $S \in V$ , a set of states  $Q$ , an initial state  $q_0 \in Q$ , and a set of productions  $P$ . Instead of normal context-free productions of the form  $A \rightarrow w$ , where  $A \in V, w \in (V \cup \Sigma)^*$ , now productions are of the form  $(q, A) \rightarrow (p, w)$ , where  $q, p \in Q$ , and  $w$  was forced to be non-empty in Kasai's original formulation. Sentential forms are of the form  $(q, \alpha)$  where  $q \in Q, \alpha \in (V \cup \Sigma)^*$ . A production is only applicable to a sentential form if the state of the production matches the state of the sentential form. The original derivation relation considered by Kasai (later called the *leftish* derivation relation in [2] which we will call it here as well), was as follows:  $(q, uAv) \Rightarrow_{\text{lt}} (p, uww)$  if  $(q, A) \rightarrow (p, w) \in P$ , and  $A$  is the leftmost nonterminal in the sentential form that has a production that is applicable from the current state. A word is generated if there is some leftish derivation starting at the initial state and initial nonterminal that produces a word over  $\Sigma^*$ .

---

<sup>☆</sup>©2022. This manuscript version is made available under the CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 license <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/> The manuscript is published in O.H. Ibarra, I. McQuillan. State Grammars with Stores. *Theoretical Computer Science* 798, 23–39 (2019).

<sup>☆☆</sup>A preliminary version of this paper has appeared in the Springer LNCS Proceedings of the 20th International Workshop on Descriptive Complexity of Formal Systems (DCFS 2018), pp. 163–174.

*URL:* [ibarra@cs.ucsb.edu](mailto:ibarra@cs.ucsb.edu) (Oscar H. Ibarra), [mcquillan@cs.usask.ca](mailto:mcquillan@cs.usask.ca) (Ian McQuillan)

<sup>1</sup>Supported, in part, by NSF Grant CCF-1117708 (Oscar H. Ibarra).

<sup>2</sup>Supported, in part, by Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada Grant 2016-06172 (Ian McQuillan).

The family of languages generated by such systems with  $\lambda$ -free rules, denoted by  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{lt}}(\lambda\text{-free-CFG-S})$ , was shown to be equal to the family of context-sensitive languages [1]. Later, it was shown that when including  $\lambda$  rules, the family produced,  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{lt}}(\text{CFG-S})$ , is equal to the family of recursively enumerable languages [3].

The definition of state grammars was extended shortly afterwards by Moriya [4] to also include a final state set  $F$ . Furthermore, he defined another derivation relation called the *free interpretation*, whereby any nonterminal can be rewritten that has a production defined on the current state, rather than the leftmost. With this derivation relation, the family of languages generated by state grammars,  $\mathcal{L}(\text{CFG-S})$ , was proven to equal the languages generated by matrix grammars (or  $\lambda$ -free matrix grammars for  $\lambda$ -free state grammars) [5].

The notion of combining grammars with states is a powerful one. It becomes easy and natural to add various stores to grammars that operate like machine models. It can also enable the study of trade-offs between numbers of states, nonterminals, productions, and stores, relevant to the area of descriptonal complexity. Changing the derivation relation and the rules allowed can also significantly change the families generated, obtaining many important language families as special cases.

In this paper, we will collate some of the existing generative capacity results on state grammars. In doing so, we provide a shorter alternative proof that state grammars (with the free interpretation) generate the same family as matrix grammars by using context-free grammars with regular control. A new derivation mode is defined where all nonterminals are rewritten from left-to-right until the last nonterminal, then this repeats starting again at the first nonterminal. State grammars with this mode are found to generate the recursively enumerable languages (or context-sensitive languages for  $\lambda$ -free grammars). We will then consider adding multiple reversal-bounded counters to state grammars (with the free interpretation) and find that this does not change the capacity beyond only having states. However, this system provides quite an easy way of describing languages. Furthermore, it is shown that leftmost derivations for state grammars are strictly weaker than leftmost derivations for state grammars with counters, which are then strictly weaker than state grammars with no counters using the free interpretation. Lastly, the complexity of the emptiness problem for several restrictions of state grammars with counters is investigated.

## 2. Preliminaries

We refer to [6] for an introductory treatment of automata and formal languages. We assume knowledge of deterministic and nondeterministic finite automata, context-free grammars, context-sensitive languages, and the recursively enumerable languages.

An *alphabet*  $\Sigma$  is a finite set of symbols, a *word* over  $\Sigma$  is a finite sequence of symbols  $a_1 \cdots a_n$ ,  $n \geq 0$ ,  $a_i \in \Sigma$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq n$ , and  $\Sigma^*$  (respectively  $\Sigma^+$ ) is the set of all words (non-empty words) over  $\Sigma$ . The set  $\Sigma^*$  contains the empty word, denoted by  $\lambda$ . Given a word  $w \in \Sigma^*$ , the length of  $w$  is denoted by  $|w|$ , for  $a \in \Sigma$ ,  $|w|_a$  is the number of  $a$ 's in  $w$ , and for subsets  $X$  of  $\Sigma$ ,  $|w|_X = \sum_{a \in X} |w|_a$ . The set of letters occurring in  $w$  is denoted by  $\text{alph}(w) = \{a \in \Sigma \mid |w|_a > 0\}$ , and for  $X \subseteq \Sigma$ ,  $\text{alph}_X(w) = \{a \in X \mid |w|_a > 0\}$ . Given  $\Sigma = \{a_1, \dots, a_k\}$ , the Parikh image of  $w$  is  $\psi(w) = (|w|_{a_1}, \dots, |w|_{a_k})$ , extended to languages  $L$ ,  $\psi(L) = \{\psi(w) \mid w \in L\}$ . The commutative closure of  $L$  is denoted by  $\text{comm}(L) = \{v \in \Sigma^* \mid \psi(v) = \psi(w) \text{ for some } w \in L\}$ . We will not define the notion of semilinear sets and languages here, but an equivalent definition is that a language  $L$  is semilinear if and only if it has the same commutative closure as some regular language [7]. Given  $u, v \in \Sigma^*$ , the shuffle of  $u$  and  $v$ , denoted by  $u \sqcup v$  is  $\{u_1 v_1 \cdots u_n v_n \mid u = u_1 u_2 \cdots u_n, v = v_1 v_2 \cdots v_n, u_i, v_i \in \Sigma^*, 1 \leq i \leq n\}$ .

The context-free languages are denoted by  $\mathcal{L}(\text{CFG})$ , the linear languages are denoted by  $\mathcal{L}(\text{LG})$ , the context-sensitive languages by  $\mathcal{L}(\text{CS})$ , and the right linear (regular languages) are denoted by  $\mathcal{L}(\text{REG})$ .

Moreover, we will discuss other families and grammars systems summarized in [5], such as matrix grammars. The languages generated by matrix grammars are denoted by  $\mathcal{L}(\text{M})$ , and the languages generated by  $\lambda$ -free matrix grammars are denoted by  $\mathcal{L}(\lambda\text{-free-M})$ .

## 3. State Grammars

We will formally define state grammars with final (accepting) states, following the notation of [4].

**Definition 1.** A state grammar (CFG-S), is a 7-tuple  $G = (V, \Sigma, P, S, Q, q_0, F)$ , where  $V$  is the finite nonterminal alphabet,  $\Sigma$  is the finite terminal alphabet,  $S \in V$  is the initial nonterminal,  $Q$  is the finite set of states ( $V, \Sigma, Q$  are pairwise disjoint),  $q_0 \in Q$  is the initial state,  $F \subseteq Q$  is the set of final states, and  $P$  is a finite set of productions of the form:

$$(q, A) \rightarrow (p, w),$$

where  $A \in V, w \in (V \cup \Sigma)^*, q, p \in Q$ . The grammar is said to be linear (called LG-S) if, for all productions  $(q, A) \rightarrow (p, w)$ ,  $w \in \Sigma^*(V \cup \{\lambda\})\Sigma^*$ . The grammar is said to be right linear (called RLG-S) if, for all productions  $(q, A) \rightarrow (p, w)$ ,  $w \in \Sigma^*(V \cup \{\lambda\})$ . In all cases,  $G$  is  $\lambda$ -free if all productions are to some  $(p, w)$  where  $w \in (V \cup \Sigma)^+$ .

A sentential form of  $G$  is any element of  $Q \times (V \cup \Sigma)^*$ . Four different methods of derivation will be defined, with the last one being new. They are as follows:

1. The free interpretation derivation relation is defined such that  $(q, uAv) \Rightarrow (p, uxv)$  if,  $(q, A) \rightarrow (p, x) \in P$ , and  $u, v \in (V \cup \Sigma)^*$ . This is extended to the reflexive, transitive closure  $\Rightarrow^*$ . The language generated by  $G$  is

$$L(G) = \{w \mid (q_0, S) \Rightarrow^* (f, w), f \in F, w \in \Sigma^*\}.$$

2. The leftmost derivation relation is defined such that  $(q, uAv) \Rightarrow_{\text{lm}} (p, uxv)$  if,  $(q, A) \rightarrow (p, x) \in P$ ,  $(q, uA) \Rightarrow (p, ux)$ , and  $u \in \Sigma^*$ . This is extended to the reflexive, transitive closure  $\Rightarrow_{\text{lm}}^*$ . The leftmost language generated by  $G$  is

$$L_{\text{lm}}(G) = \{w \mid (q_0, S) \Rightarrow_{\text{lm}}^* (f, w), f \in F, w \in \Sigma^*\}.$$

3. The leftish derivation relation is defined such that  $(q, uAv) \Rightarrow_{\text{lt}} (p, uxv)$  if,  $(q, A) \rightarrow (p, x) \in P$ ,  $(q, uA) \Rightarrow (p, ux)$ , and for all  $B \in \text{alph}(u)$  with  $B \in V$ , then there is no production from  $(q, B)$ . This is extended to the reflexive, transitive closure  $\Rightarrow_{\text{lt}}^*$ . The leftish language generated by  $G$  is

$$L_{\text{lt}}(G) = \{w \mid (q_0, S) \Rightarrow_{\text{lt}}^* (f, w), f \in F, w \in \Sigma^*\}.$$

4. The circular derivation relation is, for  $v_0A_1v_1 \cdots A_nv_n, A_i \in V, v_i \in \Sigma^*, 0 \leq i \leq n$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} (p_0, v_0A_1v_1A_2 \cdots A_nv_n) &\Rightarrow_{\circ} (p_1, v_0x_1v_1A_2 \cdots A_nv_n) \Rightarrow_{\circ} \\ (p_2, v_0x_1v_1x_2v_2A_3 \cdots A_nv_n) &\Rightarrow_{\circ} \cdots \Rightarrow_{\circ} (p_n, v_0x_1v_1x_2v_2 \cdots x_nv_n), \end{aligned}$$

where  $(p_i, A_{i+1}) \rightarrow (p_{i+1}, x_{i+1}) \in P$  for all  $i, 0 \leq i < n$ . In this case, it is written

$$(p_0, v_0A_1v_1A_2 \cdots A_nv_n) \Rightarrow_{\bullet} (p_n, v_0x_1v_1x_2v_2 \cdots x_nv_n).$$

This is extended to  $\Rightarrow_{\bullet}^*$ , the reflexive, transitive closure of  $\Rightarrow_{\bullet}$ . Therefore, this relation rewrites all nonterminals from left-to-right, then repeats in a circular fashion. The circular language generated by  $G$  is

$$L_{\bullet}(G) = \{w \mid (q_0, S) \Rightarrow_{\bullet}^* (f, w), f \in F, w \in \Sigma^*\}.$$

We also sometimes associate a new alphabet  $\hat{P}$  in bijective correspondence with the productions of  $P$ , and write  $u \xRightarrow[p]{\hat{p}} v$  where  $p \in \hat{P}$ , if the production associated with  $p$  was applied from  $u$  to  $v$  (and similarly for the other derivation relations).

The family of languages generated by CFG-S grammars with the free interpretation (respectively the leftmost, leftish, and circular) derivation relation is denoted by  $\mathcal{L}(\text{CFG-S})$  (respectively  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{lm}}(\text{CFG-S})$ ,  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{lt}}(\text{CFG-S})$ ,  $\mathcal{L}_{\bullet}(\text{CFG-S})$ ). For each of these families, we precede the family with  $\lambda$ -free to represent those languages generated by  $\lambda$ -free systems; e.g.  $\mathcal{L}_{\bullet}(\lambda\text{-free-CFG-S})$ . Similarly, replacing CFG-S with LG-S in these (or RLG-S) restricts the families to grammars where the rules are linear (or right linear).

**Example 1.** Let  $k \geq 2$ ,  $\Sigma = \{a_1, b_1, \dots, a_k, b_k\}$ , and  $G_k = (V, \Sigma, P, S, Q, q_0, F)$  where  $Q = \{q_0, \dots, q_{k-1}\}$ ,  $F = \{q_0\}$ , and  $P$  contains:

- $(q_0, S) \rightarrow (q_0, A_1 A_2 \cdots A_k)$ ,
- $(q_{i-1}, A_i) \rightarrow (q_i, a_i A_i b_i) \mid (q_i, a_i b_i)$ , for  $1 \leq i < k$ ,
- $(q_{k-1}, A_k) \rightarrow (q_0, a_k A_k b_k) \mid (q_0, a_k b_k)$ .

In any successful derivation using the free interpretation, states must follow a pattern in  $q_0(q_0 \cdots q_{k-1})^+ q_0$ , and from  $q_{i-1}$ , only productions on  $A_i$  can be applied, and they all must terminate on the last pass. Hence,  $L(G_k) = \{a_1^n b_1^n \cdots a_k^n b_k^n \mid n > 0\}$ .

Our first result shows that the different derivation relations for linear and right linear grammars with states are the same.

**Proposition 2.**

- $\mathcal{L}(\text{LG}) = \mathcal{L}(\text{LG-S}) = \mathcal{L}_{\text{lm}}(\text{LG-S}) = \mathcal{L}_{\text{lt}}(\text{LG-S}) = \mathcal{L}_{\bullet}(\text{LG-S})$ ,
- $\mathcal{L}(\text{REG}) = \mathcal{L}(\text{RLG-S}) = \mathcal{L}_{\text{lm}}(\text{RLG-S}) = \mathcal{L}_{\text{lt}}(\text{RLG-S}) = \mathcal{L}_{\bullet}(\text{RLG-S})$ .

PROOF. It is obvious that the method of derivation does not matter for linear and right linear grammars.

A linear grammar (resp., a right linear grammar) can easily be simulated by such a grammar with one state. The converse follows by creating nonterminals in  $V \times Q$ . For all productions of the form  $(q, A) \rightarrow (p, uBv)$ ,  $q, p \in Q$ ,  $A, B \in V$ ,  $u, v \in \Sigma^*$ , create a normal production  $(q, A) \rightarrow u(p, B)v$  (i.e. the state stays on the nonterminal; and for all terminating productions of the form  $(q, A) \rightarrow (p, u)$ ,  $q, p \in Q$ ,  $A \in V$ ,  $u \in \Sigma^*$ , create  $(q, A) \rightarrow u$  if and only if  $p \in F$ . It is clear that the languages generated are the same.  $\square$

The following was mentioned in [2], and it follows by considering the standard simulation of context-free grammars with pushdown automata [6], but using the state of the pushdown to simulate the state of the state grammar.

**Proposition 3.**  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{lm}}(\text{CFG-S}) = \mathcal{L}(\text{CFG})$ .

As proven in [4], the family of languages generated by matrix grammars (respectively  $\lambda$ -free matrix grammars) is equal to the family generated by state grammars (respectively  $\lambda$ -free state grammars) with the free interpretation. An alternate, shorter proof will be demonstrated by showing the equivalence of state grammars to context-free grammars with regular control [5]. It is known that such grammars are equivalent to matrix grammars [5].

**Proposition 4.**  $\mathcal{L}(\text{CFG-S}) = \mathcal{L}(\text{M})$ , and  $\mathcal{L}(\lambda\text{-free-CFG-S}) = \mathcal{L}(\lambda\text{-free-M})$ .

PROOF. Instead of using matrix grammars, we use the equivalent formulation of context-free grammars with regular control (the equivalence holds for both the  $\lambda$ -free case, and the normal case [5]). This is a grammar  $G = (V, \Sigma, P, S, R)$ , where  $G' = (V, \Sigma, P, S)$  is a context-free grammar, and for production labels  $\hat{P}$  in bijective correspondence with  $P$ ,  $R \subseteq \hat{P}^*$  is a regular language, and the language generated by  $G$  is

$$L(G) = \{w \in \Sigma^* \mid S \xRightarrow{p_1} w_1 \xRightarrow{p_2} w_2 \xRightarrow{p_3} \cdots \xRightarrow{p_n} w_n = w \in \Sigma^*, p_1 \cdots p_n \in R\}.$$

Let  $G$  be such a grammar, and let  $M = (Q, \hat{P}, \delta, q_0, F)$  be a DFA accepting  $R$ . We construct a CFG-S grammar  $G' = (V, \Sigma, P', S, Q, q_0, F)$  as follows: for  $p \in \hat{P}$  associated with  $A \rightarrow w \in P$  and  $\delta(q, p) = q'$ ,  $q, q' \in Q$ , construct a production  $(q, A) \rightarrow (q', w) \in P'$ .

Let  $w \in L(G)$ . Then  $w_0 = S \xRightarrow{p_1} w_1 \xRightarrow{p_2} \cdots \xRightarrow{p_n} w_n = w \in \Sigma^*$  with  $p_1 \cdots p_n \in L(M)$ . Let  $q'_0 = q_0$  and  $q'_i = \delta(q'_{i-1}, p_i)$  for  $i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq n$ ,  $q'_n \in F$ . Hence, if  $p_i$  is associated with  $A_i \rightarrow \alpha_i$ , then  $(q'_{i-1}, A_i) \rightarrow (q'_i, \alpha_i)$  is a production in  $P'$ . Hence,  $(q'_0, S) \Rightarrow (q'_1, w_1) \Rightarrow \cdots \Rightarrow (q'_n, w_n)$ , and  $w \in L(G')$ .

Conversely, let  $w \in L(G')$ . Then,  $(q'_0, w_0) \xRightarrow{\bar{p}_1} (q'_1, w_1) \xRightarrow{\bar{p}_2} \cdots \xRightarrow{\bar{p}_n} (q'_n, w_n)$ ,  $q'_n \in F$ ,  $w_n = w$ ,  $w_0 = S$ ,  $q'_0 = q_0$ , and  $\bar{p}_1, \dots, \bar{p}_n \in \hat{P}'$ . Let  $p_i \in \hat{P}$  be the production letter obtained from the production associated with  $\bar{p}_i$ , for  $1 \leq i \leq n$  by removing the states. By the construction of  $\bar{p}_i$ ,  $q'_i = \delta(q'_{i-1}, p_i)$ . Hence,  $p_1 \cdots p_n \in R$ , and  $w \in L(G)$ .

Next, let  $G = (V, \Sigma, P, S, Q, q_0, F)$  be a CFG-S. Let  $P'$  be obtained from the productions in  $P$  by removing the states. For  $p \in P$ , let  $p' \in P'$  be the production obtained by removing the state, and if  $\bar{p} \in \hat{P}$  is the corresponding letter, then  $\bar{p}' \in \hat{P}'$  is the corresponding letter. Let  $M = (Q, \hat{P}', \delta, q_0, F)$  be an NFA such that  $\delta$  is defined as follows: if  $\bar{p}$  is associated with  $(q, A) \rightarrow (q', w) \in P$ , then  $q' \in \delta(q, \bar{p}')$ . Furthermore, let  $G' = (V, \Sigma, P', S, L(M))$  be a CFG with regular control.

Let  $w \in L(G)$ . Then  $(q'_0, w_0) \xRightarrow{\bar{p}_1} (q'_1, w_1) \xRightarrow{\bar{p}_2} \cdots \xRightarrow{\bar{p}_n} (q'_n, w_n)$ ,  $q'_n \in F$ ,  $w_n = w$ ,  $q'_0 = q_0$ . Then  $\bar{p}_1' \cdots \bar{p}_n' \in L(M)$  and  $w \in L(G')$ .

Let  $w \in L(G')$ . Then  $S = w'_0 \xRightarrow{\bar{p}_1'} \cdots \xRightarrow{\bar{p}_n'} w'_n = w$ , with  $\bar{p}_1' \cdots \bar{p}_n' \in L(M)$ . Let  $q'_0, \dots, q'_n$  be such that  $q'_0 = q_0$ ,  $q'_i \in \delta(q'_{i-1}, \bar{p}_i')$  and  $q'_n \in F$ . So, if  $\bar{p}_i'$  is associated with  $A_i \rightarrow \alpha_i$ , then  $(q'_{i-1}, A_i) \rightarrow (q'_i, \alpha_i) \in P$ , and  $(q'_0, w'_0) \Rightarrow \cdots \Rightarrow (q'_n, w'_n)$ , and  $w \in L(G)$ .  $\square$

We will see next that when circular derivations are used, CFG-S grammars already generate all recursively enumerable languages. We use the notion of a complete derivation tree  $t$  of a context-free grammar [6], which is a tree where all nodes are labelled by either a nonterminal, a terminal, or  $\lambda$ , the root is labelled by the initial nonterminal, if a parent is labelled by  $A$  and its children are labelled by  $A_1, \dots, A_k$  from left to right, then  $A \rightarrow A_1 \cdots A_k$  is a production, if a node is labelled by  $\lambda$ , then it is the only child of its parent, and all leaves are labelled by terminals. The yield of a derivation tree,  $\text{yd}(t)$ , is the sequence of terminals obtained via a preorder traversal. Given such a tree  $t$ , level  $i$  is all nodes at distance  $i$  from the root, and the level- $i$  word is the sequence of labels on the nodes of level  $i$  concatenated together from left to right. It is known that the set of yields of complete derivation trees of a grammar is exactly the language generated by the grammar [6].

We will show that state grammars with circular derivations are equivalent to *tree controlled grammars* which are defined as follows. A tree controlled grammar is a tuple  $G = (V, \Sigma, P, S, R)$ , where  $G' = (V, \Sigma, P, S)$  is a context-free grammar, and  $R$  is a regular language over  $V \cup \Sigma$ . When considering context-free derivation trees in  $G'$ , a restriction on the trees is used as follows: the language generated by  $G$ ,  $L(G)$ , is equal to

$$\{\text{yd}(t) \mid t \text{ is a complete derivation tree of } G', \text{ for all levels } i \text{ but the last,} \\ \text{the level-}i \text{ word is in } R\}.$$

Let  $\mathcal{L}(\text{TREE})$  (respectively  $\mathcal{L}(\lambda\text{-free-TREE})$ ) be the family of languages generated by (respectively  $\lambda$ -free tree controlled grammars. It is known that tree controlled grammars generate all recursively enumerable languages, and  $\lambda$ -free tree controlled grammars generate exactly the context-sensitive languages [5].

**Proposition 5.**

- $\mathcal{L}_\bullet(\text{CFG-S}) = \mathcal{L}_{\text{lt}}(\text{CFG-S}) = \mathcal{L}(\text{TREE}) = \mathcal{L}(\text{RE})$ ,
- $\mathcal{L}_\bullet(\lambda\text{-free-CFG-S}) = \mathcal{L}_{\text{lt}}(\lambda\text{-free-CFG-S}) = \mathcal{L}(\lambda\text{-free-TREE}) = \mathcal{L}(\text{CS})$ .

PROOF. Obviously,  $\mathcal{L}_\bullet(\text{CFG-S}) \subseteq \mathcal{L}(\text{RE})$ . Also, every  $\lambda$ -free CFG-S with a circular derivation can be simulated by a linear bounded automaton [6] that simulates the sentential forms in a left-to-right fashion, eventually accepting if it matches the input.

For the reverse containment, we first show the case for  $\lambda$ -free grammars. Let  $G = (V, \Sigma, P, S, R)$  be an arbitrary  $\lambda$ -free tree controlled grammar. It is clear that we can assume without loss of generality that  $S$  does not appear on the right hand side of any production. Before constructing a CFG-S, we will transform  $G$  into another tree controlled grammar  $G_1 = (V_1, \Sigma, P_1, S^\$, R_1)$  which generates the same language but generates all terminals on the last level of each tree, the initial nonterminal only appears on the root of every tree, and the rightmost nonterminal on every level but the last (and only those) is tagged with a  $\$$

symbol on the superscript. Let  $\bar{V}_1 = V \cup \{X_a, \bar{X}_a \mid a \in \Sigma\}$ , let  $V_1^\$ = \{A^\$ \mid A \in \bar{V}_1\}$ , and let  $V_1 = \bar{V}_1 \cup V_1^\$$ . Hence, two new nonterminals  $X_a$  and  $\bar{X}_a$ , are associated with each terminal  $a \in \Sigma$ , and then for each of these nonterminals, plus the nonterminals of  $G$ , another nonterminal tagged by  $\$$  is also created. Let  $h$  be a homomorphism from  $(V \cup \Sigma)^*$  to  $\bar{V}_1^*$  that replaces  $a \in \Sigma$  with  $X_a$ , and fixes each letter of  $V$ . Let  $f$  be a function from  $\bar{V}_1^*$  to  $(\bar{V}_1^* V_1^\$) \cup \{\lambda\}$  that puts a  $\$$  as superscript on the last letter. Clearly,  $f$  can be defined by a generalized sequential machine [6]. Let  $R_1 = f(h(R \cup \Sigma^*) \sqcup \{\bar{X}_a \mid a \in \Sigma\}^*)$ . Thus,  $R_1$  is regular since the regular languages are closed under homomorphism, union, shuffle, and mappings defined by generalized sequential machines [6]. Next, create  $P_1$  from  $P$  via the following steps:

1. For all productions  $A \rightarrow w \in P$ , create  $A \rightarrow h(w)$  and  $A^\$ \rightarrow f(h(w))$ .
2. For all  $a \in \Sigma$ , create  $X_a \rightarrow \bar{X}_a, \bar{X}_a \rightarrow \bar{X}_a, \bar{X}_a \rightarrow a, X_a^\$ \rightarrow \bar{X}_a^\$, \bar{X}_a^\$ \rightarrow \bar{X}_a^\$, \bar{X}_a^\$ \rightarrow a$  to  $P_1$ .

Notice  $R_1$  is over  $V_1$  and does not contain any terminals.

Let  $t$  be a complete derivation tree of  $G$ , where the level- $i$  word, for all  $i$  but the last,  $n$  say, is in  $R$ . Let  $t'$  be the  $n+2$ -level tree obtained from  $t$  by replacing all nodes labelled by  $a \in \Sigma$  in any level  $i$  with a subtree with root  $X_a$  that has  $\bar{X}_a$  for all levels between  $i$  and  $n+1$ , and  $a$  at level  $n+2$ , and let  $t''$  be obtained from  $t'$  by tagging the rightmost node of every level but the last with  $\$$  on the superscript. From the construction of  $P_1$ ,  $t''$  is a (context-free) complete derivation tree with the same yield. And, for each level- $i$  word,  $i < n$ , is in  $h(R)$  with some number of letters from  $\{\bar{X}_a \mid a \in \Sigma\}$  in it (which are allowed by the shuffle), with the final nonterminal tagged by  $\$$  (using the function  $f$ ). The level- $n$  word is in  $f(h(\Sigma^*) \sqcup \{\bar{X}_a \mid a \in \Sigma\}^*)$ , and the level- $(n+1)$  word is in  $f(\{\bar{X}_a \mid a \in \Sigma\}^*)$ . Hence,  $L(G) \subseteq L(G_1)$ .

Let  $t$  be a complete derivation tree of  $G_1$ , where the level- $i$  word for all  $i$  but the last,  $n$  say, is in  $R_1$ . For all such  $i$ , the last, and only the last nonterminal is tagged with  $\$$ . Without the tag, each is in  $h(R) \sqcup \{\bar{X}_a \mid a \in \Sigma\}^*$  or  $h(\Sigma^*) \sqcup \{\bar{X}_a \mid a \in \Sigma\}^*$ . Create a new derivation tree  $t'$  as follows: for all subtrees rooted by  $X_a$ , they must have one child at every level, labelled by  $\bar{X}_a$ , until the last level, labelled by  $a$ ; replace this subtree with a single node labelled by  $a$ . After this process, any level  $i$  of  $t$  with the level- $i$  word in  $h(R) \sqcup \{\bar{X}_a \mid a \in \Sigma\}^*$  must correspond to a level- $i$  word in  $t'$  in  $R$ . For any level  $i$  of  $t$  with the level- $i$  word  $\alpha$  in  $h(\Sigma^+) \sqcup \{\bar{X}_a \mid a \in \Sigma\}^*$ , level  $i$  would only have terminals in  $t'$ . If  $\alpha'$  is obtained from  $\alpha$  by removing letters of  $\{\bar{X}_a \mid a \in \Sigma\}$ , and changing  $X_a$  to  $a$ , for  $a \in \Sigma$ , then the level- $i$  word in  $t'$  would be  $\alpha'$ , and would be labelled by  $h^{-1}(\alpha)$ , and would therefore be the last level and is ignored (i.e. the last level is not verified to be in the regular language for a tree controlled grammar). All levels  $i$  below that one in  $t$ , have a level- $i$  word in  $\lambda \sqcup \{\bar{X}_a \mid a \in \Sigma\}^*$ , which do not exist in  $t'$ . Thus, the yield of  $t$  is equal to that of  $t'$ ,  $t'$  is a complete derivation tree, and every level- $i$  word before the last  $i$  is in  $R$ . Hence,  $L(G_1) \subseteq L(G)$ .

Hence,  $L(G) = L(G_1)$ , and in  $G_1$ , all terminal derivations occur at the final level of the trees, the initial nonterminal  $S^\$$  appears only at the root, and all complete derivation trees of  $G_1$  have the rightmost node of every level except the last tagged with  $\$$ .

Let  $M = (Q_1, V_1, \delta, q_0, F)$  be a DFA accepting  $R_1$ . Since every word ends with a symbol tagged with  $\$$ , we can assume without loss of generality that  $F = \{q_f\}$ , there are no transitions out of  $q_f$ , all transitions into  $q_f$  are on a  $\$$  tagged symbol, and there are no transitions into  $q_0$ . Let  $G_2 = (V_1, \Sigma, P_2, S^\$, Q_2, q_0, F_2)$  be a CFG-S,  $Q_2 = Q_1 \cup \{q' \mid q \in Q_1\}$  and  $F_2 = \{q'_f\}$ , with  $P_2$  defined as follows:

1. if  $A \rightarrow \alpha \in P_1, A \in \bar{V}_1$  (i.e. not tagged with  $\$$ ),  $\alpha \notin \Sigma^*$ , and  $\delta(q, A) = p$  (and so  $p \neq q_f$ ), create  $(q, A) \rightarrow (p, \alpha)$ ,
2. if  $A^\$ \rightarrow \alpha \in P_1, A \in \bar{V}_1, \alpha \notin \Sigma^*$ , and  $\delta(q, A^\$) = q_f$ , create both  $(q, A^\$) \rightarrow (q_0, \alpha)$  and  $(q, A^\$) \rightarrow (q'_0, \alpha)$ ,
3. if  $A \rightarrow \alpha \in P_1, A \in \bar{V}_1$  (not tagged with  $\$$ ),  $\alpha \in \Sigma^*$ , and  $\delta(q, A) = p$  (and so  $p \neq q_f$ ), create  $(q', A) \rightarrow (p', \alpha)$ ,
4. if  $A^\$ \rightarrow \alpha \in P_1, A \in \bar{V}_1, \alpha \in \Sigma^*$ , and  $\delta(q, A^\$) = q_f$ , create  $(q', A^\$) \rightarrow (q'_f, \alpha)$ .

Notice that since all words in  $L(M)$  end in a  $\$$  tagged symbol, then the only productions to state  $q'_f$  in  $G_2$  are of the form  $(q', \bar{X}_a^\$) \rightarrow (q'_f, \alpha), \alpha = a \in \Sigma$ .

We will show  $L(G_1) = L(G_2)$ . Let  $w \in L(G_1)$  with a complete derivation tree  $t$  with  $n$  levels, where the level- $i$  word is  $\gamma_i$ , for  $1 \leq i \leq n$ . Each level less than  $n$  is tagged with a single  $\$$  at the end. We know  $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_{n-1} \in L(M)$ . Then  $t$  can be simulated in  $G_2$  by deriving each level, one production at a time using a circular derivation with rules created in step 1 according to  $\delta$ , until the last node of each level. In  $M$ , reading this nonterminal takes  $M$  to  $q_f$ . But in  $G_2$ , as long as it is before the second last level, it switches to  $q_0$  with the first rule of step 2, so that it can continue the simulation at the next level. At the second last level,  $G_2$  switches to  $q'_0$  with the second rule of step 2 and it simulates this entire level with primed states created in step 3 (every production applied in this level generating terminals), and then the last  $\$$ -tagged nonterminal can switch to  $q'_f$  with rules of type 4. Thus,  $G_2$  can derive the yield of  $t$ . Hence,  $L(G_1) \subseteq L_\bullet(G_2)$ .

Conversely, let  $w \in L_\bullet(G_2)$ . Then

$$(p_0, \gamma_0) \Rightarrow_\circ (p_1, \gamma_1) \Rightarrow_\circ \dots \Rightarrow_\circ (p_n, \gamma_n),$$

$\gamma_0 = S^\$, p_0 = q_0, p_n = q'_f, \gamma_n = w \in \Sigma^*$ . Let  $i_0, \dots, i_m$  be such that  $0 = i_0 \leq \dots \leq i_m < n$ , are exactly those indices where  $(p_{i_j}, \gamma_{i_j})$  is having its first nonterminal rewritten in the circular derivation. Consider a complete derivation tree  $t$  corresponding to this derivation where the nonterminals rewritten between  $i_0$  and  $i_1 - 1$  are at level 0 from left-to-right, between  $i_1$  and  $i_2 - 1$  are at level 1, etc. until  $i_m$  to  $n$  are at level  $m$ . Notice that by the construction, all terminal productions must appear at the last level of  $t$  by the primed states of  $G_2$ . Also, since  $p_n$  is the only state in the derivation that is  $q'_f$ , all of  $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_{n-1}$  end in a symbol tagged with  $\$$ , and no other  $\$$ -tagged symbol appears in each. And, in every context-free derivation tree of  $G_2$  where all terminals appear in the last level, a  $\$$ -tagged symbol always appears in the rightmost node of each level between the first and the second last. Hence, in  $t$ , applying the state transitions of  $G_2$  to the nonterminals in each level but the last from left-to-right leads from  $q_0$  back to  $q_0$ , which implies that the level would be accepting in  $M$ . Hence,  $w \in L(G_1)$  and  $L_\bullet(G_2) \subseteq L(G_1)$ .

The case where  $\lambda$  productions are allowed is similar, except, if  $A \rightarrow \lambda$  is a production, then  $A^\$ \rightarrow X_\lambda^\$$  needs to be included so that the tagged nonterminal does not end before the last level.  $\square$

Combining Propositions 2, 3, 4, and 5, the known matrix languages that are not context-free, and the known context-sensitive languages that are not matrix languages [8], the following hierarchies are obtained:

**Corollary 6.**

- $\mathcal{L}(\text{CFG}) = \mathcal{L}_{\text{lm}}(\text{CFG-S}) \subsetneq \mathcal{L}(\text{CFG-S}) = \mathcal{L}(\text{M}) \subsetneq \mathcal{L}_\bullet(\text{CFG-S}) = \mathcal{L}_{\text{lt}}(\text{CFG-S}) = \mathcal{L}(\text{RE})$ ,
- $\mathcal{L}(\lambda\text{-free-CFG}) = \mathcal{L}_{\text{lm}}(\lambda\text{-free-CFG-S}) \subsetneq \mathcal{L}(\lambda\text{-free-CFG-S}) = \mathcal{L}(\lambda\text{-free-M}) \subsetneq \mathcal{L}_\bullet(\lambda\text{-free-CFG-S})$   
 $= \mathcal{L}_{\text{lt}}(\lambda\text{-free-CFG-S}) = \mathcal{L}(\text{CS})$ .

#### 4. State Grammars with Stores

Now that states are attached to grammars, it is quite natural to attach one or more stores as well, just like machine models. Then, store contents can be part of sentential forms just as states are with state grammars. For example, one could define context-free grammars with states plus a pushdown store. This would be represented with a tuple just like a CFG-S but with an additional word over the pushdown alphabet  $\Gamma$  and a bottom-of-pushdown marker  $Z_0$ . In particular, the productions would be of the form  $(q, X, A) \rightarrow (p, \alpha, w)$ , where  $q, p$  are states,  $A$  is a nonterminal,  $w$  is over the nonterminal and terminal alphabets,  $X$  is the topmost symbol of the pushdown, and  $\alpha$  is the string to replace the topmost symbol of the pushdown. Sentential forms are therefore in  $Q \times \Gamma^+ \times (V \cup \Sigma)^*$ , and the derivation relation is defined in the obvious way. Here, we will attach multiple reversal-bounded counters as stores as they are defined with reversal-bounded counter machines [9]. Explained briefly, a one-way  $k$ -counter machine is an NFA with  $k$  counters, each containing some non-negative integer, and the transition function can detect whether each counter is empty or not, and can increment, keep the same, or decrement each counter by one. Such a machine is  $r$ -reversal-bounded if the number of times each counter switches between non-decreasing and non-increasing is at most  $r$ . Then  $\mathcal{L}(\text{NCM})$  is the family of languages accepted by machines that are  $r$ -reversal-bounded  $k$ -counter machines,

for some  $k, r \geq 1$ . This type of machine is able to accept relatively complex languages, while maintaining a polynomial time emptiness problem when there are a fixed number of 1-reversal-bounded counters [10]. They therefore provide an interesting store to attach to state grammars.

Since grammars with states using either circular or leftish derivations already generate all recursively enumerable languages, we will not consider those derivation relations with stores.

Denote the set of all context-free grammars with states and some number of reversal-bounded counters by CFG-SC, and the languages they generate with the free interpretation and the leftmost derivation modes by  $\mathcal{L}(\text{CFG-SC})$  and  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{lm}}(\text{CFG-SC})$  respectively. For each such grammar  $G = (V, \Sigma, P, S, Q, q_0, F)$  with  $k$  counters, productions are of the form  $(q, i_1, \dots, i_k, A) \rightarrow (p, l_1, \dots, l_k, w)$ , where  $p, q \in Q, i_j \in \{0, 1\}$  (a production with  $i_j = 0$  is applied if and only if counter  $j$  is 0),  $l_j \in \{-1, 0, +1\}$  (which changes the counter),  $A \in V, w \in (V \cup \Sigma)^*$ .

**Example 2.** Let  $G = (V, \{a, b\}, P, S, Q, q_0, \{q_f\})$  be a CFG-SC with 2 counters accepting  $\{w\$w \mid w \in \{a, b\}^*, |w|_a = |w|_b \geq 0\}$ , where  $P$  is as follows:

- $(q_0, 0, 0, S) \rightarrow (q_0, 0, 0, A_1 A_2)$ ,
- $(q_0, i, j, A_1) \rightarrow (q_a, 1, 0, aA_1) \mid (q_b, 0, 1, bA_1)$ , for  $i, j \in \{0, 1\}$ ,
- $(q_a, i, j, A_2) \rightarrow (q_0, 0, 0, aA_2)$ ,  $(q_b, i, j, A_2) \rightarrow (q_0, 0, 0, bA_2)$ , for  $i, j \in \{0, 1\}$ ,
- $(q_0, i, i, A_1) \rightarrow (q_1, 0, 0, A_1)$ , for  $i \in \{0, 1\}$ ,
- $(q_1, 1, 1, A_1) \rightarrow (q_1, -1, -1, A_1)$ ,
- $(q_1, 0, 0, A_2) \rightarrow (q_1, 0, 0, \lambda)$ ,  $(q_1, 0, 0, A_1) \rightarrow (q_f, 0, 0, \$)$ .

To start,  $G$  switches to  $(q_0, 0, 0, A_1 A_2)$ . Then the derivation repeatedly guesses either that  $A_1$  derives an  $a$  or a  $b$ ; if it guesses it derives an  $a$ , it switches to  $q_a$  and increases the first counter, and then from  $q_a$ , only  $A_2$  can be rewritten and it must derive an  $a$  (similarly with the  $b$  case using  $q_b$  and the second counter). Therefore,  $A_1$  derives some sequence of terminals  $w$  and  $A_2$  must derive the same sequence, and the first counter contains  $|w|_a$  and the second contains  $|w|_b$ . At any point while in state  $q_0$ ,  $G$  can switch to  $q_1$  which repeatedly decreases both counters in parallel until both are verified to be zero at the same time, at which point  $A_2$  is erased and  $A_1$  generates  $\$$ .

Before studying the generative capacity of CFG-SC, we need a definition. A CFG-SC  $G$  is in normal form if each counter makes exactly 1 reversal (once they decrease, they can no longer increase), and a terminal string is successfully generated when  $G$  enters a unique accepting state  $f$  and all the counters are zero. We also assume that the state remembers when each counter enters a decreasing mode. So, e.g., when counter  $i$  enters the decreasing mode, the state remembers that from that point on, counter  $i$  can no longer increase. When another counter  $j$  enters the decreasing mode, the state now remembers that counters  $i$  and  $j$  can no longer increase, etc.

**Lemma 7.** Let  $G$  be an CFG-SC. We can effectively construct a CFG-SC  $G'$  in normal form such that  $L(G) = L(G')$ .

PROOF. Let  $G = (V, \Sigma, P, S, Q, q_0, F)$  with  $k$   $r$ -reversal-bounded counters. We will describe how to create  $G_1 = (V \cup \{X\}, \Sigma, P_1, S, Q_1, q_0, F_1)$ ,  $X$  a new symbol, such that one of the counters (assume without loss of generality that it is the first counter) that is  $r$ -reversal-bounded is replaced with  $n = \lfloor r/2 \rfloor + 1$  counters (the first  $n$  counters of  $G'$  are the new counters, and  $G'$  has  $n + k - 1$  counters) that are 1-reversal-bounded and  $L(G) = L(G_1)$ .

Intuitively, instead of using counter 1 of  $G$ ,  $G'$  will use the first counter until the second reversal, then it will empty the first counter into the second counter until it is empty, then simulate using the second counter until the fourth reversal, etc., until the last reversal.

To do this, let, for  $0 \leq i \leq n$ ,  $Q_0^{(i)} = \{p_0^{(i)} \mid p \in Q\}$  (used to simulate transitions where the first counter is zero; when  $i = 0$ , they are used to simulate when the counter is 0 before the first increase, and when



$i > 0$ , they are used after the  $2i - 1$ st reversal and the counter returns to zero before increasing again (if it does return to zero). For  $1 \leq i \leq n$ , let  $Q_{\uparrow}^{(i)} = \{p_{\uparrow}^{(i)} \mid p \in Q\}$  (used when counter is increasing before the  $2i - 1$ st reversal), and  $Q_{\downarrow}^{(i)} = \{p_{\downarrow}^{(i)} \mid p \in Q\}$  (used during the next decreasing section). For  $2 \leq i \leq n$ , let  $\bar{Q}_{\uparrow}^{(i)} = \{\bar{p}_{\uparrow}^{(i)} \mid p \in Q\}$  (used to empty each counter into the next counter). Let  $Q_1$  be the union of all these sets, and let  $F_1 = \{p_{\downarrow}^{(i)}, p_{\uparrow}^{(i)}, p_0^{(j)} \mid 0 \leq j \leq n, 1 \leq i \leq n, p \in F\}$ .

For all productions defined on  $p \in Q$  with counter 1 being empty that do not change the counter,  $(p, 0, i_2, \dots, i_k, A) \rightarrow (r, 0, j_2, \dots, j_k, w)$   $p, r \in Q, i_2, \dots, i_k \in \{0, 1\}, j_2, \dots, j_k \in \{-1, 0, +1\}$ , make

$$\text{for } 0 \leq i \leq n, (p_0^{(i)}, 0, \dots, 0, i_2, \dots, i_k, A) \rightarrow (r_0^{(i)}, 0, \dots, 0, j_2, \dots, j_k, w), \quad (1)$$

$$\text{for } 1 \leq i \leq n, (p_{\downarrow}^{(i)}, 0, \dots, 0, i_2, \dots, i_k, A) \rightarrow (r_0^{(i)}, 0, \dots, 0, j_2, \dots, j_k, w). \quad (2)$$

For all productions on  $p \in Q$  with counter 1 being empty that increases the counter,  $(p, 0, i_2, \dots, i_k, A) \rightarrow (r, +1, j_2, \dots, j_k, w)$ ,  $p, r \in Q, i_2, \dots, i_k \in \{0, 1\}, j_2, \dots, j_k \in \{-1, 0, +1\}$ , make

$$\text{for } 0 \leq i < n, (p_0^{(i)}, 0, \dots, 0, i_2, \dots, i_k, A) \rightarrow (r_{\uparrow}^{(i+1)}, l_1, \dots, l_n, j_2, \dots, j_k, w), \quad (3)$$

$$\text{for } 1 \leq i < n, (p_{\downarrow}^{(i)}, 0, \dots, 0, i_2, \dots, i_k, A) \rightarrow (r_{\uparrow}^{(i+1)}, l_1, \dots, l_n, j_2, \dots, j_k, w), \quad (4)$$

where  $l_{i+1} = +1$  and  $l_m = 0$  for  $m \neq i + 1$ . For all productions defined on the counter being positive that increases or keeps the same counter value,  $(p, 1, i_2, \dots, i_k, A) \rightarrow (r, z, j_2, \dots, j_k, w)$   $z \in \{0, +1\}, p, r \in Q, i_2, \dots, i_k \in \{0, 1\}, j_2, \dots, j_k \in \{-1, 0, +1\}$ , make

$$\text{for } 1 \leq i \leq n, (p_{\uparrow}^{(i)}, x_1, \dots, x_n, i_2, \dots, i_k, A) \rightarrow (r_{\uparrow}^{(i)}, l_1, \dots, l_n, j_2, \dots, j_k, w), \quad (5)$$

where  $x_i = 1$  and  $l_i = x_i + z$ , and  $x_m = l_m = 0$ , for  $m \neq i$ . For those defined on the counter being positive that either decrease or keep the same counter value (note that multiple productions can be created from the same production),  $(p, 1, i_2, \dots, i_k, A) \rightarrow (r, z, j_2, \dots, j_k, w)$   $z \in \{0, -1\}, p, r \in Q, i_2, \dots, i_k \in \{0, 1\}, j_2, \dots, j_k \in \{-1, 0, +1\}$ , make

$$\text{for } 1 \leq i \leq n, (p_{\downarrow}^{(i)}, x_1, \dots, x_n, i_2, \dots, i_k, A) \rightarrow (r_{\downarrow}^{(i)}, l_1, \dots, l_n, j_2, \dots, j_k, w), \quad (6)$$

$$\text{if } z = -1, \quad \text{for } 1 \leq i \leq n, (p_{\uparrow}^{(i)}, x_1, \dots, x_n, i_2, \dots, i_k, A) \rightarrow (r_{\downarrow}^{(i)}, l_1, \dots, l_n, j_2, \dots, j_k, w), \quad (7)$$

where  $x_i = 1$  and  $l_i = z$ , and  $x_m = l_m = 0$ , for  $m \neq i$ . For those defined on the counter being positive that increase,  $(p, 1, i_2, \dots, i_k, A) \rightarrow (r, +1, j_2, \dots, j_k, w)$ ,  $p, r \in Q, i_2, \dots, i_k \in \{0, 1\}, j_2, \dots, j_k \in \{-1, 0, +1\}$ , also make

$$\text{for } 1 \leq i < n, (p_{\downarrow}^{(i)}, x_1, \dots, x_n, i_2, \dots, i_k, A) \rightarrow (\bar{r}_{\uparrow}^{(i+1)}, l_1, \dots, l_n, j_2, \dots, j_k, Xw), \quad (8)$$

where  $x_i = +1, x_m = 0$  for  $m \neq i$ , and  $l_{i+1} = +1, l_m = 0$  for  $m \neq i + 1$  (notice that the new nonterminal  $X$  is used here, which is the nonterminal that gets rewritten as the  $i$ th counter empties into the  $i + 1$ st counter). Lastly, make for all  $2 \leq i \leq n, \bar{r}_{\uparrow}^{(i)} \in \bar{Q}_{\uparrow}^{(i)}, i_2, \dots, i_k \in \{0, +1\}$ ,

$$(\bar{r}_{\uparrow}^{(i)}, x_1, \dots, x_n, i_2, \dots, i_k, X) \rightarrow (\bar{r}_{\uparrow}^{(i)}, l_1, \dots, l_n, 0, \dots, 0, X), \quad (9)$$

where  $x_{i-1} = 1, x_i \in \{0, 1\}, x_m = 0, m \notin \{i, i + 1\}, l_{i-1} = -1, l_i = +1, l_m = 0$  for  $m \notin \{i, i + 1\}$ ; and make

$$\text{for } 2 \leq i \leq n, (\bar{r}_{\uparrow}^{(i)}, x_1, \dots, x_n, i_2, \dots, i_k, X) \rightarrow (r_{\uparrow}^{(i)}, 0, \dots, 0, \lambda), \quad (10)$$

where  $x_i = 1, x_m = 0, m \neq i$ .

Consider a derivation of  $G$ ,

$$(p_0, y_{0,1}, \dots, y_{0,k}, \alpha_0) \Rightarrow \dots \Rightarrow (p_{\beta}, y_{\beta,1}, \dots, y_{\beta,k}, \alpha_{\beta}),$$

$\beta \geq 0, p_l \in Q, y_{l,j} \geq 0, \alpha_l \in (V \cup \Sigma)^*, 0 \leq l \leq \beta, 1 \leq j \leq k$ , with  $p_0 = q_0, \alpha_0 = S, p_\beta \in F, \alpha_\beta \in \Sigma^*, y_{0,j} = 0, 1 \leq j \leq k$ . We refer to the sentential form with  $l$  as subscript as configuration  $l$ . For each  $l, 0 \leq l \leq \beta$ , let  $r_l$  be  $i, 0 \leq i \leq n$ , if counter one has increased after decreasing  $i$  times by configuration  $l$  (it is 0 before having increased), and let

$$d_l = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if either } l = 0 \text{ or } y_{l-1,1} = y_{l,1} = 0, \\ \downarrow & \text{if } y_{l-1,1} > 0 \text{ and the last production that changed counter 1 by config. } l \text{ decreased,} \\ \uparrow & \text{if } y_{l,1} > 0 \text{ and the last production that changed counter 1 by config. } l \text{ increased.} \end{cases}$$

We will prove by induction that for all  $l, 0 \leq l \leq \beta$ , there is a derivation of  $G_1$ ,

$$((p_0)_0^{(0)}, 0, \dots, 0, \alpha_0) \Rightarrow^* ((p_l)_{d_l}^{(r_l)}, z_{l,1}, \dots, z_{l,n}, y_{l,2}, \dots, y_{l,k}, \alpha_l),$$

where  $r_l > 0$  implies  $z_{l,r_l} = y_{l,1}$ , and  $z_{l,m} = 0$  for  $m \neq r_l$ . When  $l = 0$ , then  $r_l = 0, d_l = 0, y_{0,j} = 0, 1 \leq j \leq k, z_{0,i} = 0, 0 \leq i \leq n$ , and the base case follows. Assume that it is true for  $l, 0 \leq l < n$ , and consider configuration  $l + 1$ .

**Case 1:** the production applied between  $l$  and  $l + 1$  does not change counter one. Assume that  $y_{l,1} = 0$ , and then  $y_{l,1} = y_{l+1,1} = 0$ . Either  $d_l = 0$  or  $d_l = \downarrow$ . Then a production was created in step (1) or (2) that leads to  $((p_{l+1})_0^{(r_l)}, 0, \dots, 0, y_{l+1,2}, \dots, y_{l+1,k}, \alpha_{l+1})$ , where  $r_{l+1} = r_l$  and induction follows. Assume  $y_{l,1} > 0$ . Induction follows similarly with a production of type (5) or (6).

**Case 2:** the production applied between  $l$  and  $l + 1$  increases counter one. Assume  $d_l = 0$ . Then a production created in (3) is created, and induction follows. Assume  $d_l = \uparrow$ . Then a production created in (5) is created, and induction follows. Assume  $d_l = \downarrow$ . If  $y_{l,1} = 0$ , then a production created in (4) is created, and induction follows with  $r_{l+1} = r_l + 1$ . If  $y_{l,1} > 0$ , then examining the production created in (8) allows to rewrite to  $(\bar{p}_{l+1\uparrow}^{(r_l+1)}, z'_1, \dots, z'_n, y_{l+1,2}, \dots, y_{l+1,k}, X\alpha_{l+1})$ , where  $r_{l+1} = r_l + 1, z'_{r_{l+1}} = 1, z'_m = z_{l,m}$  for all  $m \neq r_{l+1}$  and then using the production created in (9) and (10), this can get rewritten to  $((p_{l+1})_{\uparrow}^{(r_{l+1})}, z_1, \dots, z_n, y_{l+1,2}, \dots, y_{l+1,k}, \alpha_{l+1})$  where  $z_{r_{l+1}} = y_{l+1,1} = y_{l,1} + 1$ , and  $z_m = 0$  for all  $m \neq r_{l+1}$ . Thus, the induction follows.

**Case 3:** the production applied between  $l$  and  $l + 1$  decreases counter one. Necessarily  $y_{l,1} > 0$ , and so either  $d_l = \uparrow$  or  $d_l = \downarrow$ . Assume  $d_l = \downarrow$ ; then using a production created in (6), then induction follows. Assume  $d_l = \uparrow$ ; then using a production created in (7), the induction follows.

Thus,  $\alpha_\beta \in L(G_1)$  as well.

Consider a derivation of  $G_1$

$$(p_0, z_{0,1}, \dots, z_{0,n}, y_{0,2}, \dots, y_{0,k}, \alpha_0) \Rightarrow \dots \Rightarrow (p_\beta, z_{\beta,1}, \dots, z_{\beta,n}, y_{\beta,2}, \dots, y_{\beta,k}, \alpha_\beta),$$

$\beta \geq 0, \alpha_\beta \in \Sigma^*, p_0 = (q_0)_0^{(0)}, z_{0,i} = 0, 1 \leq i \leq n, y_{0,j} = 0, 2 \leq j \leq k, p_\beta \in F_1$ . Each state  $p_l$  is either of the form  $(t_l)_0^{(i)}, (t_l)_\uparrow^{(i)}, (t_l)_\downarrow^{(i)}$ , or  $(\bar{t}_l)_\uparrow^{(i)}$ . As the construction creates productions that change states as  $G$  does (with the additional subscripts and superscripts), and adds and subtracts to the first  $n$  counters the same amount as  $G$  does to the first counter, then for all  $l$  with  $p_l$  of any of the first 3 forms above, there is a derivation of  $G, (q_0, 0, \dots, 0, \alpha_0) \Rightarrow^* (t_l, z_{l,1} + \dots + z_{l,n}, y_{l,2}, \dots, y_{l,k}, \alpha_l)$ , and for the fourth form, the last component starts with  $X$ , which is removed in the derivation of  $G$ . Thus,  $\alpha_\beta \in L(G)$ .

Hence,  $L(G) = L(G_1)$ .

Applying this construction to each of the  $k$  counters will create a machine with  $kn$  1-reversal-bounded counters. Furthermore, it is evident that the grammar constructed is keeping track, using the subscripts on the states, for each 1-reversal-bounded counters, of which are empty, which are increasing and which are decreasing, as required by the normal form. From this grammar  $G_1$  constructed with final state set  $F_1$ , it is possible to build  $G'$  in normal form by adding a new state  $f$  that is the only final state. Whenever  $G'$  enters a state of  $F_1$ ,  $G'$  can nondeterministically switch to  $f$  and then empty all counters. Hence,  $G'$  is in normal form and generates the same language as  $G$ .  $\square$

Hence, we may assume that a CFG-SC is in normal form.

Next, we will use this normal form to help show that reversal-bounded counters do not increase the generative capacity.

**Proposition 8.**  $\mathcal{L}(\text{CFG-S}) = \mathcal{L}(\text{CFG-SC}) = \mathcal{L}(\text{M})$ .

PROOF. By [4] (Proposition 4),  $\mathcal{L}(\text{CFG-S}) = \mathcal{L}(\text{M})$ , and also it is immediate that  $\mathcal{L}(\text{CFG-S}) \subseteq \mathcal{L}(\text{CFG-SC})$ .

Let  $G = (V, \Sigma, P, S, Q, q_0, F)$  be a CFG-SC. Assume without loss of generality that  $G$  is in normal form, and it therefore has  $k$  1-reversal bounded counters. Make a state grammar  $G'$  (without counters) over  $\Sigma \cup \Delta$  where  $\Delta = \{c_1, d_1, \dots, c_k, d_k\}$  are new symbols. Then,  $G'$  simulates  $G$ , but whenever it adds from counter  $i$ , it instead outputs terminal symbol  $c_i$ , and whenever it decreases from counter  $i$ , it outputs  $d_i$ . The states of  $G'$  also verify that  $G'$  starts by, for each counter  $i$ , 1) simulating only productions associated with counter  $i$  being empty until it adds to the counter for the first time, 2) then it simulates productions defined on counter  $i$  being positive (while outputting  $c_i$ 's), 3) then simulates productions on counter  $i$  being positive (while outputting  $d_i$ 's), until some nondeterministically guessed spot after outputting some  $d_i$ , 4) where it then guesses that the counter is now empty, and then it only simulates productions on counter  $i$  being empty while not outputting any more  $c_i$ 's and  $d_i$ 's.  $G'$  operates in this fashion, as states were specifically marked in the normal form. Therefore,  $G'$  operates just like  $G$ , where it simulates all of the counters, making sure that for each counter, all additions occur before any subtractions, but it does not do any of the counting. If one then restricts the derivations of  $G'$  to those where the number of increases is the same as the number of decreases for each counter, then after erasing the letters of  $\Delta$ , it would give  $L(G)$ . Consider the following regular language  $R = (c_1 d_1)^* \dots (c_k d_k)^* \Sigma^*$ , and the commutative closure of  $R$ ,  $\text{comm}(R)$ . Let  $h$  be a homomorphism that erases all letters of  $\Delta$  and fixes all letters of  $\Sigma$ . Then,  $h(L(G') \cap \text{comm}(R))$  is exactly this language, where  $L(G') \cap \text{comm}(R)$  restricts words to only those that have the same number of  $c_i$ 's as  $d_i$ 's (and hence the same number of increases as decreases for each counter) for each  $i$ , and  $h$  erases the letters of  $\Delta$ . Hence,  $L(G) = h(L(G') \cap \text{comm}(R))$ .

Since  $G'$  is a normal state grammar, it can be converted to a matrix grammar  $G''$  by Proposition 4. It is known that the languages generated by matrix grammars are closed under intersection with  $\mathcal{L}(\text{NCM})$  [11] (there, they used closure under the BLIND multicounter languages which is equivalent to  $\mathcal{L}(\text{NCM})$  [12]). Also, the commutative closure of every regular language is in  $\mathcal{L}(\text{NCM})$  [13]. So  $L''' = L(G'') \cap \text{comm}(R)$  is a language generated by a matrix grammar. Lastly, erasing all  $c_i$ 's and  $d_i$ 's with  $h$  gives  $L(G)$ , and the languages generated by matrix grammars are closed under homomorphism [5]. Since this gives a matrix grammar, it can be converted back to a normal state grammar (without counters) by Proposition 4 generating the same language as  $L(G)$ .  $\square$

We note that in the proof above, in  $G$ , despite the counters being 1-reversal-bounded, productions can be applied to any nonterminal in the sentential form. Thus, some counter additions could occur when rewriting a nonterminal to the right of other nonterminals that get rewritten with a production that decreases. Hence, when intersecting with a language in  $\mathcal{L}(\text{NCM})$ , it must not enforce that all  $c_i$ 's occur before any  $d_i$ 's.

The following corollary follows from the fact that the results are true for matrix grammars [8].

**Corollary 9.**

- *Every unary language generated by a CFG-SC is regular.*
- *The emptiness problem for CFG-SC is decidable.*

Next, we will show that  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{lm}}(\text{CFG-SC}) = \mathcal{L}(\text{NPCM}) \subsetneq \mathcal{L}(\text{CFG-SC})$ , where NPCMs are one-way nondeterministic pushdown automata augmented by reversal-bounded counters [9]. Let NPCM(1) be NPCMs where the pushdown is restricted to be 1-reversal-bounded (once the pushdown pops, it can no longer push). We will need the notion of a CFG with monotonic counters introduced in [14]. This is a simpler model of grammars with counters that do not have states. At each step in the derivation, the counters can be incremented by 0 or +1, but not decremented. A derivation in this grammar system starts with the counters having

value zero. A terminal string  $w$  is in the language of the grammar if there is a derivation of  $w$  that ends with all counters having the same value.

Formally, a CFG with *monotonic counters* (CFG-MC) is a 5-tuple,  $G = (V, \Sigma, P, S)$ , where  $\Sigma$  is the set of terminals,  $V$  is the set of nonterminals,  $S \in V$  is the initial nonterminal,  $k$  is the number of monotonic counters, all are initially set to 0, and  $P$  is the set of rules of the form:  $A \rightarrow (c_1, \dots, c_k, z)$ , where  $A \in V$ ,  $c_i$  is either 0 or +1, and  $z \in (V \cup \Sigma)^*$ . The language defined is  $L(G) = \{w \mid w \in \Sigma^*, (0, \dots, 0, S) \Rightarrow^* (n, \dots, n, w) \text{ for some } n \geq 0\}$ . The languages generated are denoted by  $\mathcal{L}(\text{CFG-MC})$ . Furthermore,  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{lm}}(\text{CFG-MC})$  are those generated by leftmost derivations.

**Example 3.** Consider the CFG-MC  $G$  over the 4-symbol alphabet  $\{a, a', b, b'\}$  with two monotonic counters  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  and the following rules:

- $S \rightarrow (+1, 0, SaSa'S, ) \mid (0, +1, SbSb'S) \mid (0, 0, \lambda)$ .

Clearly, the language we obtain when we ignore the counters in  $G$  is the Dyck language  $D_2$ . Then  $L(G) = \{w \mid w \in D_2, |w|_a = |w|_{b'}\}$ .

If the rules of a CFG-MC are of the form  $A \rightarrow (c_1, \dots, c_k, z)$ , where  $z \in \Sigma^*V\Sigma^* \cup \Sigma^*$  (resp., in  $(V\Sigma^* \cup \Sigma^*)$ ), then the grammar is called an LG-MC (resp., RLG-MC). The following result was shown in [14]:

**Proposition 10.**

- $\mathcal{L}(\text{NPCM}) = \mathcal{L}(\text{CFG-MC}) = \mathcal{L}_{\text{lm}}(\text{CFG-MC})$ ,
- $\mathcal{L}(\text{NPCM}(1)) = \mathcal{L}(\text{LG-MC})$ .
- $\mathcal{L}(\text{NCM}) = \mathcal{L}(\text{RLG-MC})$ .

Moreover, the conversion between devices can be done in polynomial time.

From the proposition above, we have (where LG-SC are linear state grammars with counters, and RLG-SC are right-linear state grammars with counters):

**Proposition 11.**

- $\mathcal{L}(\text{NPCM}) = \mathcal{L}(\text{CFG-MC}) = \mathcal{L}_{\text{lm}}(\text{CFG-MC}) = \mathcal{L}_{\text{lm}}(\text{CFG-SC})$ .
- $\mathcal{L}(\text{NPCM}(1)) = \mathcal{L}(\text{LG-MC}) = \mathcal{L}(\text{LG-SC})$ .
- $\mathcal{L}(\text{NCM}) = \mathcal{L}(\text{RLG-MC}) = \mathcal{L}(\text{RLG-SC})$ .

Moreover, the conversion between devices can be done in polynomial time.

**PROOF.** We will start with the first item. Every CFG-MC  $G$  with a leftmost derivation can be simulated by a CFG-SC with a leftmost derivation. It starts by simulating with one state. Then, before terminating, it guesses all counters are equal, decreases them all to zero to verify the counters were equal, then terminates. Thus,  $\mathcal{L}(\text{NPCM}) \subseteq \mathcal{L}_{\text{lm}}(\text{CFG-SC})$ . For the reverse containment, consider the standard simulation of a CFG with a leftmost derivation by an NPDA [6]. This same construction can work with states while the counters of the CFG-SC can be simulated by the counters of the NPCM.

It is an easy construction to show that every LG-MC (resp., RLG-MC) can be simulated by an LG-SC (resp., RLG-SC). Also, following the standard construction that simulates leftmost derivations of context-free grammars with NPDAs [6], linear grammars are simulated by a 1-reversal-bounded pushdown automaton. By simulating the counters faithfully, every LG-SC (resp., RLG-SC) can be simulated by an NPCM whose stack is 1-reversal-bounded (resp., NCM).  $\square$

**Proposition 12.**  $\mathcal{L}(\text{NPCM}) \subsetneq \mathcal{L}(M)$ .

PROOF. It is immediate that  $\mathcal{L}(\text{CFL}) \subseteq \mathcal{L}(\text{M})$ , and it is known that  $\mathcal{L}(\text{M})$  is closed under intersection with  $\mathcal{L}(\text{NCM})$  [11], and homomorphism [5]. Recently, a Chomsky-Schützenberger-like theorem was shown that demonstrates that every language in  $\mathcal{L}(\text{NPCM})$  can be obtained by some Dyck language (which is context-free) intersected with an  $\mathcal{L}(\text{NCM})$  language, then mapped via a homomorphism [14]. Therefore,  $\mathcal{L}(\text{NPCM}) \subseteq \mathcal{L}(\text{M})$ .

It is known that every NPCM language is semilinear [9]. It is known that matrix grammars can generate non-semilinear languages, e.g., a matrix grammar can generate the non-semilinear language [5],  $L = \{a^n b^m \mid 1 \leq n < m \leq 2^n\}$ . It follows that  $\mathcal{L}(\text{NPCM}) \subsetneq \mathcal{L}(\text{M})$ .  $\square$

From Propositions 3, 4, 5, 8, 11, and 12, we have the following hierarchy:

**Proposition 13.**  $\mathcal{L}(\text{CFG}) = \mathcal{L}_{\text{lm}}(\text{CFG-S}) \subsetneq \mathcal{L}_{\text{lm}}(\text{CFG-SC}) = \mathcal{L}(\text{NPCM}) \subsetneq \mathcal{L}(\text{CFG-S}) = \mathcal{L}(\text{CFG-SC}) = \mathcal{L}(\text{M}) \subsetneq \mathcal{L}_{\text{lt}}(\text{CFG-S}) = \mathcal{L}_{\bullet}(\text{CFG-S}) = \mathcal{L}(\text{RE})$ .

This demonstrates that state grammars with counters and leftmost derivations are strictly weaker than state grammars without counters.

## 5. Controlled CFG-S

We know that CFG-S with leftmost derivations are equivalent to CFG (Proposition 3). Under the free interpretation derivation, CFG-S, CFG-SC, and M are equivalent (Proposition 8) and these grammars have more generative power than CFG-SC under leftmost derivation (Proposition 13). We also know that NPCM, CFG-MC, and CFG-SC with leftmost derivations are equivalent (Proposition 11). An interesting question is whether there is a natural restriction of state grammars without any stores (no counters) that coincides with  $\mathcal{L}(\text{NPCM})$ . In this section, such a restriction is provided.

Now define a controlled version of CFG-S, called CCFG-S as follows: A CFG-S  $G = (V, \Sigma, P, S, Q, q_0, F)$  is a CCFG-S if  $V = V_1 \cup V_2$ , where  $S \in V_1$ ,  $V_1$  is disjoint from  $V_2 = \{C_1, \dots, C_k\}$  for some  $k \geq 1$ , and the rules are of the form  $(q, A) \rightarrow (p, z)$ , where

- if  $A \in V_1$ , then  $z \in (V \cup \Sigma)^*$ .
- if  $A \in V_2$ , then  $z \in V_2^*$ .

We require the following concerning the application of the rules:

1. If  $(q, A) \rightarrow (p, z) \in P$  and  $A \in V_1$ , then this rule is applicable to a sentential form if  $A$  is the leftmost nonterminal in  $V_1$  that appears in the sentential form. (Note that nonterminals in  $V_2$  can appear before  $A$  in the sentential form.)
2. A string  $w \in L(G)$  if there exists a derivation  $(q_0, \alpha_0) \Rightarrow \dots \Rightarrow (p_n, \alpha_n)$ ,  $p_0 = q_0, p_n \in F, \alpha_0 = S, \alpha_n \in \Sigma^*, w = \alpha_n$ , such that when a rule of the form  $(q, C_i) \rightarrow (p, z)$  has been applied where  $z \in (V_2 - \{C_i\})^*$  ( $1 \leq i \leq k$ ) from sentential form  $j - 1$  to  $j$  in the derivation, then no more rules of the form  $(q', X) \rightarrow (p', z')$  where  $|z'|_{C_i} \geq 1$  can be applied from  $j$  to  $n$ . This means that once a  $C_i$  is erased, no additional  $C_i$ 's can be added in the derivation.

Note that strictly speaking, a new derivation relation is required that only rewrites the leftmost variable of  $V_1$ , but can rewrite any variable of  $V_2$ . However, we will only consider such a derivation relation informally. For the second condition, the grammar itself can enforce it by adding states. So, if the state set of the grammar is  $Q$ , we can expand the state set to  $Q' = \{[q, s_1, \dots, s_k] \mid q \in Q, s_i \in \{+, -\}\}$ . Then a rule of the form  $(q, A) \rightarrow (p, z)$  is changed to:  $([q, s_1, \dots, s_k], A) \rightarrow ([p, s'_1, \dots, s'_k], z)$  where

- Case:  $A \in V_1$ : If  $s_i = -$  then  $s'_i = -$  and  $z$  must not contain  $C_i$ ; if  $s_i = +$ , then  $s'_i = +$ .
- Case:  $A = C_i$ : If  $s_i = -$ , then  $s'_i = -$  and  $z$  must not contain  $C_i$ ; if  $s_i = +$  and  $z$  does not contain  $C_i$ , then  $s'_i = -$ ;  $s'_j = s_j$  for all  $j \neq i$ .

The initial state is now  $[q_0, +, \dots, +]$  and the accepting states are now  $[q, s_1, \dots, s_k]$  where  $q$  is accepting. Even though this system does not have counters, it coincides with  $\mathcal{L}(\text{NPCM})$ .

**Proposition 14.**  $\mathcal{L}(\text{CCFG-S}) = \mathcal{L}(\text{NPCM}) = \mathcal{L}_{\text{lm}}(\text{CFG-SC}) = \mathcal{L}(\text{CFG-MC})$ .

PROOF. From Proposition 11, we already know that  $\mathcal{L}(\text{NPCM}) = \mathcal{L}_{\text{lm}}(\text{CFG-SC}) = \mathcal{L}(\text{CFG-MC})$ .

First, we show that  $\mathcal{L}(\text{CFG-MC}) \subseteq \mathcal{L}(\text{CCFG-S})$ . Let  $G$  be a CFG-MC with nonterminals  $V$ , start non-terminal  $S$ , and  $k$  counters  $C_1, \dots, C_k$ . Construct a CCFG-S  $G'$  with states  $q_0$  (start state),  $q_1, \dots, q_k, q_f$  (accepting state), and  $V = V_1 \cup V_2, V_1 = \{S'\} \cup V, V_2 = \{C_1, \dots, C_k\}$ , start nonterminal  $S'$ , and the following rules:

1.  $(q_0, S') \rightarrow (q_0, C_1 \cdots C_k S)$ .
2. If  $A \rightarrow (c_1, \dots, c_k, z)$  is a rule in  $G$  where  $c_i \in \{0, 1\}$  ( $1 \leq i \leq k$ ), then add the following rule in  $G'$ :  
 $(q_0, A) \rightarrow (q_0, C_1^{c_1} \cdots C_k^{c_k} z) \mid (q_1, C_1^{c_1} \cdots C_k^{c_k} z)$ .
3.  $(q_i, C_i) \rightarrow (q_{i+1}, \lambda)$  for  $1 \leq i < k$ .  
 $(q_k, C_k) \rightarrow (q_1, \lambda) \mid (q_f, \lambda)$ .

It is straightforward to verify that  $L(G') = L(G)$  since the leftmost derivation of  $G$  can be simulated with only  $q_0$ , and at the last production of the simulation, it switches to  $q_1$ , where it “decreases each counter” one at a time (by erasing blocks of  $C_1 C_2 \cdots C_k$  which do not have to be adjacent in the sentential form) before switching to a final state.

To complete the proof, we now show that  $\mathcal{L}(\text{CCFG-S}) \subseteq \mathcal{L}(\text{NPCM})$ . Let  $G = (V, \Sigma, P, S, Q, q_0, F)$  be a CCFG-S with  $V_2 = \{C_1, \dots, C_k\}$ . Without loss of generality, assume that the accepting states of  $G$  are halting, i.e., there are no transition rules from these states. We construct an NPCM  $M$  with  $k$  1-reversal-bounded counters  $C_1, \dots, C_k$ , initial stack symbol  $Z$  (a new symbol), and  $M$  has states consisting of the initial state  $q_0$ , accepting state  $q_f$  (a new state),  $Q$ , and some additional states as needed in the simulation of  $G$ .

On input  $w$ ,  $M$  in state  $q_0$  and top stack symbol  $Z$ , first replaces  $Z$  with  $SZ$  while remaining in state  $q_0$ . (Convention: If  $Y_1 \cdots Y_n$  is the stack content, the leftmost symbol  $Y_1$  is the top of the stack, and  $Y_n$  is the bottom of the stack.) Then  $M$  simulates the derivation of  $w$  in  $G$  just like in the standard conversion of a CFG (with leftmost derivations) to an NPDA as follows:

Suppose that  $M$  has just completed the simulation of a production rule of  $G$  and is in state  $q$ , and  $q$  is not an accepting state of  $G$ . To simulate a rule  $(q, A) \rightarrow (p, z)$ ,  $M$  executes the following steps (using additional states):

1. If  $x$  is the terminal string to the left of the leftmost nonterminal symbol on the stack (note that  $x = \lambda$  if the leftmost symbol is a nonterminal), then  $M$  reads  $x$  on the input while erasing  $x$  from the stack.
2. If  $A$  is in  $V_1$  and  $A$  is the top of the stack, then:
  - (a)  $M$  increments counter  $C_i$  by the number of  $C_i$ 's in  $z$  for  $1 \leq i \leq k$ .
  - (b)  $M$  rewrites  $A$  by  $y$ , where  $y$  is the string obtained from  $z$  when the symbols in  $V_2$  are deleted.
  - (c)  $M$  enters state  $p$ .
3. If  $A = C_i$  ( $1 \leq i \leq k$ ), then for any top symbol in the stack:
  - (a) If  $C_i$  appears in  $z$  and counter  $C_i > 0$ , then  $M$  increments counter  $C_i$  by  $d_i - 1$ , where  $d_i$  is the number of  $C_i$ 's in  $z$ . If  $C_i$  does not appear in  $z$  and  $C_i > 0$ ,  $M$  decrements counter  $C_i$  by 1 and  $M$  remembers that it can no longer simulate a production where  $C_i$  is on the right hand side.
  - (b)  $M$  increments counter  $C_j$  by the number of  $C_j$ 's in  $z$  for for all  $j \neq i$ .
  - (c)  $M$  enters state  $p$ .

Suppose that  $M$  has just completed the simulation of a transition rule of  $G$  and is in state  $q$ , and  $q$  is an accepting state of  $G$ . (Note that by assumption, there is no transition rule from state  $q$ , since it is an accepting state.) Then  $M$  checks that the stack is of the form  $xZ$ , where  $x$  is a terminal string. To do this,  $M$  verifies that the remaining input is  $x$  (by popping the stack), and then enters state  $q_f$  (i.e.,  $M$  accepts). Clearly,  $M$  accepts  $L(G)$ .  $\square$

**Remark 1.** *In the definition of CCFG-S, rules of the form  $(q, A) \rightarrow (p, z)$ , where  $A$  is in  $V_2$ , assume that  $z$  is in  $V_2^*$ . We tried to generalize the model to see if we can get the same result (as in the proposition above) in two cases:*

1. Allow  $z$  to be in  $(V_2 \cup \Sigma)^*$ ,
2. Allow  $z$  to be in  $(V_1 \cup V_2)^*$ .

However, we were unable to do so, as the following discussion explains.

Consider the first case. Define a grammar  $G$  with states  $q_0$  (start state),  $q_1, q_2$  (accepting state),  $q_a, q_b, p_a, p_b$ ,  $V_1 = \{S\}$ ,  $V_2 = \{C_1, C_2\}$ ,  $\Sigma = \{a, b\}$ , and the following rules:

- $(q_0, S) \rightarrow (q_a, C_1C_2) \mid (q_b, C_1C_2)$
- $(q_1, C_2) \rightarrow (q_2, \lambda)$
- $(q_a, C_1) \rightarrow (p_a, aC_1) \mid (q_1, \lambda)$
- $(p_a, C_2) \rightarrow (q_a, aC_2) \mid (q_b, aC_2)$
- $(q_b, C_1) \rightarrow (p_b, bC_1) \mid (q_1, \lambda)$
- $(p_b, C_2) \rightarrow (q_a, bC_2) \mid (q_b, bC_2)$

It is evident that  $L(G) = \{xx \mid x \in (a+b)^*\}$  which, we conjecture, cannot be accepted by an NPCM.

For the second case, we modify the grammar  $G$  above to a grammar  $G'$  as follows: Let  $V_1 = \{S, A, B\}$ . The rules are obtained by replacing all  $a$ 's with  $A$ 's and  $b$ 's with  $B$ 's in  $P$ , and adding

- $(q_2, A) \rightarrow (q_2, a)$ ,
- $(q_2, B) \rightarrow (q_2, b)$ .

Again,  $L(G') = \{xx \mid x \in (a+b)^*\}$ .

We now look at special cases of CCFG-S where the rules of the form  $(q, A) \rightarrow (p, z)$ , where  $A$  is  $V_1$  are restricted. After deleting symbols from  $V_2$ , if  $z$  can only be in  $(\Sigma^*V_1\Sigma^* \cup \Sigma^*)$ , then call the grammar a CLG-S. Similarly, after deleting, if  $z$  can only be in  $(V_1\Sigma^* \cup \Sigma^*)$ , then call the grammar a CRLG-S.

**Proposition 15.**

- $\mathcal{L}(\text{CLG-S}) = \mathcal{L}(\text{NPCM}(1)) = \mathcal{L}(\text{LG-MC}) = \mathcal{L}(\text{LG-SC})$ .
- $\mathcal{L}(\text{CRLG-S}) = \mathcal{L}(\text{NCM}) = \mathcal{L}(\text{RLG-MC}) = \mathcal{L}(\text{RLG-SC})$ .

PROOF. Again, from Proposition 11, we already know that  $\mathcal{L}(\text{NPCM}(1)) = \mathcal{L}(\text{LG-MC}) = \mathcal{L}(\text{LG-SC})$ , and  $\mathcal{L}(\text{NCM}) = \mathcal{L}(\text{RLG-MC}) = \mathcal{L}(\text{RLG-SC})$ .

Certainly, the first part of the proof of Proposition 14 applies directly to showing that  $\mathcal{L}(\text{LG-MC}) \subseteq \mathcal{L}(\text{CLG-S})$  and  $\mathcal{L}(\text{RLG-MC}) \subseteq \mathcal{L}(\text{CRLG-S})$ .

For the proof that  $\mathcal{L}(\text{CLG-S}) \subseteq \mathcal{L}(\text{NPCM}(1))$ , the construction needs to be modified so that terminals do not get pushed and then immediately popped, causing the NPCM to not be 1-reversal-bounded. Thus, modify the construction of  $M$  in the second part of the proof of Proposition 14 as follows:

Delete item (1) and replace item (2) with the following:

If  $A$  is in  $V_1$  and  $A$  is the top of the stack, then:

- (a)  $M$  increments counter  $C_i$  by the number of  $C_i$ 's in  $z$  for  $1 \leq i \leq k$ .

- (b) – If  $z$ , when the symbols in  $V_2$  are deleted, results in a string of the form  $x_1 B x_2$  for some terminal strings  $x_1, x_2$  and nonterminal  $B$ , then  $M$  reads  $x_1$  on the input and replaces  $A$  with  $B x_2$ .  
– If  $z$ , when the symbols in  $V_2$  are deleted, results in terminal string  $x$ ,  $M$  reads  $x$  on the input and pops  $A$  from the stack.
- (c)  $M$  enters state  $p$ .

The rest of the construction is the same.

For the proof that  $\mathcal{L}(\text{CRLG-S}) \subseteq \mathcal{L}(\text{NCM})$ , the construction above can trivially be modified, noting that we do not need the stack; hence,  $M$  is an NCM.  $\square$

## 6. Complexity of the Emptiness Problem

In this section, we study the emptiness problem for restrictions of CFG-SCs. Given a CFG-S  $G = (V, \Sigma, P, S, Q, q_0, F)$ , a derivation  $(p_0, \alpha_0) \Rightarrow (p_1, \alpha_1) \Rightarrow \dots \Rightarrow (p_n, \alpha_n)$  with  $p_0 = q_0, \alpha_0 = S, p_n \in F, \alpha_n = w \in \Sigma^*$ , is of index  $m$  if  $|\alpha_i|_V \leq m$ , for all  $0 \leq i \leq n$ . The grammar  $G$  is of index  $m$  if, for every  $w \in L(G)$ , there exists some derivation of  $w$  that is of index  $m$ . If it is index  $m$  for some  $m$ , then it is said to be finite-index. This property is more general than requiring that every derivation of a word in the language is of index  $m$ , a notion that is called uncontrolled index  $m$ , or uncontrolled finite-index. These notions are well-studied for different types of grammars [15]. For context-free grammars, finite-index is more general than uncontrolled finite-index, as uncontrolled finite-index grammars correspond to pushdown automata with a reversal-bounded pushdown [16], which cannot accept languages such as  $\{a^n b^n \mid n > 0\}^*$  that can be generated by an index 2 grammar [15]. This notion can be defined similarly for CFG-MCs and CFG-SCs as well.

We begin with the following lemma.

**Lemma 16.** *Given a binary number  $x = b_1 b_2 \dots b_k$  (with  $b_1$  being the least significant bit), we can construct a CFG-MC  $G$  with a monotonic counter  $C$  such that  $G$  generates  $\lambda$  with its monotonic counter containing the number represented by  $x$ . Moreover,  $|G|$  (the size of the grammar) is polynomial in  $k$ , can be built in polynomial time, and  $G$  has finite index that is in  $O(k)$ .*

PROOF. Let  $x = b_1 b_2 \dots b_k$ , where each  $b_j$  is either 0 or 1. Let  $n$  be the number represented by  $x$ . We construct a CFG-MC  $G$  with one monotonic counter and nonterminals  $\{S\} \cup \{[i, 0] \mid 1 \leq i \leq k\} \cup \{[i, 1] \mid 1 \leq i \leq k\}$  with the following rules:

1.  $S \rightarrow (0, [1, b_1][2, b_2] \dots [k, b_k])$ ,
2.  $[i, 0] \rightarrow (0, \lambda)$ , for  $1 \leq i \leq k$ ,
3.  $[i, 1] \rightarrow (+1, [1, 1][2, 1] \dots [i-1, 1][i, 0])$ , for  $1 < i \leq k$ ,
4.  $[1, 1] \rightarrow (+1, [1, 0])$ ,

As  $G$  has  $2k + 1$  nonterminals and  $2k + 1$  productions, each with at most  $k$  letters on the right hand side, the size of  $|G|$  is  $O(k^2)$ .

Next, by induction on  $l, 1 \leq l \leq k$ , we will prove that  $(0, [l, 1]) \Rightarrow \dots \Rightarrow (2^{l-1}, \lambda)$ , which is a derivation of index  $l$ .

For  $l = 1$ ,  $(0, [1, 1]) \Rightarrow (1, [1, 0]) \Rightarrow (1, \lambda)$ , which is of index 1.

Assume it is true for  $l, 1 \leq l < k$ . Then  $(0, [l+1, 1]) \Rightarrow (1, [1, 1][2, 1] \dots [l, 1][l+1, 0])$ . The last term generates 0, while the rest generates  $2^0 + \dots + 2^{l-1}$  by the inductive hypothesis, plus 1 is added, which is equal to  $2^l$ . Generating using a leftmost derivation, it first generates from  $[1, 1]$  (that part of the derivation taking index 1, with the entire sentential form being  $l+1$  index and ending with a sentential form with  $l$  nonterminals), then  $[2, 1]$  (taking index 2, total  $l+1$ , and ending with  $l-1$  nonterminals), then  $[3, 1]$  (taking index 3, total  $l+1$ ), etc. with  $[l, 1]$  taking index  $l$  bringing the total index of this derivation to  $l+1$ . Thus, the statement is true, and  $G$  has index  $k+1$ .  $\square$



This can be used to study non-emptiness for CFG-SC grammars.

**Proposition 17.** *The non-emptiness problem for CFG-SC with the leftmost derivation mode is NP-complete. In fact, it is NP-hard even when the grammar has finite index, and there is only one 1-reversal-bounded counter. (Note that when there is no counter, the problem is polynomial-time decidable [6].)*

PROOF. The first part (NP-completeness in general) follows from Proposition 11 and the fact that the non-emptiness problem for CFG-MC is NP-complete [14].

For the second part, we use the subset-sum problem, which is NP-hard [17]. An instance  $I$  of this problem is the following:

*Given:*  $k \geq 1$ , and positive integers  $x_1, \dots, x_k, x_{k+1}$  represented in binary.

*Question:* Is there a subset of  $\{x_1, \dots, x_k\}$  that sums to  $x_{k+1}$ ?

From Lemma 16, we can construct for each  $1 \leq i \leq k+1$ , a CFG-MC  $G_i$  with start nonterminal  $S_i$  and one monotonic counter which generates  $\lambda$  with counter value  $n_i$  (the number represented by  $x_i$ ).

Assume that the nonterminals used in  $G_1, \dots, G_k, G_{k+1}$  are pairwise distinct. Let  $S_1, \dots, S_k, S_{k+1}$  be their start nonterminals. Let  $A_1, \dots, A_{k+1}, Z$  be new symbols. We construct a CFG-SC  $G$  with a unary terminal alphabet  $\{a\}$ , states  $q_0$  (the start state),  $q_1, q_f$  (the accepting state), and  $A_1$  the start nonterminal.  $G$  has the following rules, where  $v$  denotes 0 or 1:

1.  $(q_0, v, A_i) \rightarrow (q_0, 0, S_i A_{i+1}) \mid (q_0, 0, A_{i+1})$  for  $1 \leq i \leq k$ .
2. If  $X \rightarrow (c, w)$  is a rule in one of the CFG-MCs  $G_1, \dots, G_k$  where  $c$  is either 0 or 1, then  $(q_0, v, X) \rightarrow (q_0, c, w)$  is a rule in  $G$ .
3.  $(q_0, v, A_{k+1}) \rightarrow (q_1, 0, S_{k+1} Z)$ .
4. If  $X \rightarrow (0, w)$  is a rule in CFG-MC  $G_{k+1}$ , then  $(q_1, v, X) \rightarrow (q_1, 0, w)$  is a rule in  $G$ .
5. If  $X \rightarrow (1, w)$  is a rule in CFG-MC  $G_{k+1}$ , then  $(q_1, 1, X) \rightarrow (q_1, -1, w)$  is a rule in  $G$ .
6.  $(q_1, 0, Z) \rightarrow (q_f, 0, a)$  is a rule in  $G$ .

Rules of type 1 are used to pick some subset  $Y$  of  $G_1, \dots, G_k$  in order to add the respective subset of  $x_1, \dots, x_k$  to the counter. Then for each  $G_i, 1 \leq i \leq k$  that is in  $Y$ , any number that can be added to the counter in  $G_i$  can be added to  $G$  using rules of type 2. The entire process thus far occurs entirely in a leftmost fashion using state  $q_0$  only, starting with  $G_1$ , optionally adding  $x_1$  to the counter while generating  $\lambda$ , then doing the same with  $G_2$ , etc. with  $G_k$ . At this point, the sentential form is  $(q_0, x, A_{k+1})$  where  $x$  is the sum of counters of  $X$ .  $G$  then can (and has to) switch to  $q_1$  using the rule of type 3. Rules of type 4 and 5 are then used to decrease any counter value that could be added to  $G_{k+1}$ . Once this completes and the nonterminals of  $G_{k+1}$  are erased, if the counter is zero, then  $Y$  must represent a solution, and type 6 is used, which generates the terminal  $a$  if and only if  $Y$  is a solution.

Hence,  $L_{\text{lm}}(G)$  is non-empty if and only if the subset-sum problem has a solution, which is NP-hard. The reduction also runs in polynomial time as the grammars  $G_1, \dots, G_k$  can be built in polynomial time, and  $|G|$  is linear in  $|G_1| + \dots + |G_{k+1}|$ . Furthermore,  $G$  only has one counter that is 1-reversal-bounded, and has finite index, as it simulates each  $G_i$  from  $1 \leq i \leq k+1$ , each of which is finite index by Lemma 16.  $\square$

Observe that in the NP-hardness proof above,  $G$  has only one 1-reversal-bounded counter, and is finite-index, but the index is not fixed but instead grows linearly with the maximum of  $|x_1|, \dots, |x_{k+1}|$  (in binary), by Lemma 16. In the proof above, suppose instead that  $G$  has index 1 but the number of 1-reversal-bounded counters is not fixed. We will show that the non-emptiness problem is also NP-hard.

First, for the purposes of the proof below, we note that we can generalize the reversal-bounded counters in a CFG-SC by allowing increments in the counters to be binary constants  $c$ , where  $c \geq 0$ , but decrements are still restricted to 1. There can be many such  $c$ 's used in the rules, e.g., a grammar with three counters  $C_1, C_2, C_3$  can have rules like:

$$(q, 0, 1, 1, A) \rightarrow (p, +3, 0, +2, \alpha).$$

The above means: If in state  $q$  and the number in  $C_1$  is 0, the number in  $C_2$  is positive, and the number in  $C_3$  is positive, then  $C_1$  is incremented by 3,  $C_2$  is left unchanged,  $C_3$  is incremented by 2,  $A$  is replaced by  $\alpha$ , and the state changes to  $p$ . We call these generalized CFG-SC. Other grammatical models with states and reversal-bounded counters can similarly be generalized.

We can convert a generalized CFG-SC  $G$  to an equivalent CFG-SC  $G'$  by noting that a constant  $c$  can be computed with 1-reversal-bounded unit counters (i.e., can only increment/decrement by 1) efficiently. For suppose  $c = b_1b_2 \cdots b_k$ , where each  $b_i$  is 0 or 1 (with  $b_1$  the least significant bit). Then the number corresponding to  $c$  is  $n = b_12^0 + b_22^1 + \cdots + b_k2^{k-1}$ . To compute and store  $n$  in a counter, we need to compute the terms and add them up. Clearly, a term  $2^s$  can be computed with 1-reversal-bounded unit counters using “recursive doubling”. For example, if  $2^i$  is in a counter  $C_1$ ,  $2^{i+1}$  can be computed in counter  $C_2$  by adding 1 to  $C_2$  twice for every decrement of 1 in  $C_1$ . The number of 1-reversal-bounded unit counters needed to compute  $n$  would be polynomial in  $k$ . We also need to introduce new temporary nonterminals to implement the conversion. For example, to simulate production  $t: (q, 1, A) \rightarrow (p, +5, \alpha)$ , then  $5 = 1 \cdot 2^0 + 1 \cdot 2^2$ . Then  $G'$  has the one main counter ( $C_1$ ) plus two extra counters (none for the  $2^0$  term and two for the  $2^2$  term) for this rule. Corresponding to this rule, instead  $G'$  uses

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1. $(q, 1, 0, 0, A) \rightarrow (p, +1, +1, 0, X_1^t)$                     | 4. $(p, 1, 1, 1, X_3^t) \rightarrow (p, 0, 0, +1, X_2^t)$   |
| 2. $(p, 1, 1, 0, X_1^t) \rightarrow (p, 0, +1, 0, X_2^t)$                  | 5. $(p, 1, 0, 1, X_2^t) \rightarrow (p, +1, 0, -1, X_2^t)$  |
| 3. $(p, 1, 1, z, X_2^t) \rightarrow (p, 0, -1, +1, X_3^t), z \in \{0, 1\}$ | 6. $(p, 1, 0, 0, X_2^t) \rightarrow (p, 0, 0, 0, \alpha)$ . |

The first two rules add the least significant digit to the main counter, and 2 to the second counter. Then, the third and fourth rule run in a loop, and they empty counter two while doubling its content into counter 3. At this point, counter three can be emptied into  $C_1$ , the new  $X_i^t$  nonterminals go to the original right hand side  $\alpha$ , and the simulation continues. Note that all these rules do not alter the index as all the new rules have one nonterminal on the right hand side until rewriting to  $\alpha$ . The number of rules and the number of counters would also be polynomial in  $|c|$ . Hence,  $|G'|$  (the size of  $G'$ ) is polynomial in  $|G|$ , and can be constructed in polynomial time. Also, if  $G$  has index  $m$ , then the  $G'$  constructed as described will also have index  $m$ . This can be summarized as follows:

**Lemma 18.** *Given a generalized CFG-SC  $G$ , a CFG-SC  $G'$  can be constructed in polynomial time such that  $|G'|$  is polynomial in  $|G|$ , the number of counters is at most  $|G|$ , and if  $G$  is of index  $m$ , then so is  $G'$ . Furthermore, if  $G$  is RLG-SC, then so is  $G'$ .*

From this, we can easily obtain the following:

**Proposition 19.** *The non-emptiness problem for RLG-SC (i.e., right-linear grammar with states and counters) is NP-hard.*

PROOF. Again, we reduce to the subset-sum problem, which is NP-hard. An instance  $I$  of this problem is the following:

*Given:* Numbers  $x_1, \dots, x_k, x_{k+1}$ , represented in binary.

*Question:* Is there a subset of  $\{x_1, \dots, x_k\}$  that sums to  $x_{k+1}$ ?

From the lemma above, it is sufficient to construct for a given instance  $I$  of the subset-sum problem a generalized RLG-SC  $G$  such that  $L(G) \neq \emptyset$  if and only if the the answer to the instance  $I$  is yes.

The construction of  $G$  is straightforward.  $G$  has a terminal alphabet  $\{a\}$ , nonterminals  $Z, A_1, \dots, A_{k+1}$  with  $A_1$  the start nonterminal, two 1-reversal-bounded counters  $C_1$  and  $C_2$ , and states  $q_0$  (start state),  $q_1, q_f$  (accepting state). The rules in  $G$  are the following (where  $v$  is either 0 or 1):

1.  $(q_0, v, 0, A_i) \rightarrow (q_0, +x_i, 0, A_{i+1}) \mid (q_0, 0, 0, A_{i+1})$  for  $1 \leq i \leq k$ .
2.  $(q_0, v, 0, A_{k+1}) \rightarrow (q_1, 0, +x_{k+1}, Z)$
3.  $(q_1, 1, 1, Z) \rightarrow (q_1, -1, -1, Z)$

$$4. (q_1, 0, 0, Z) \rightarrow (q_f, 0, 0, a).$$

Clearly,  $L(G)$  is either empty or  $\{a\}$ , and it is non-empty if and only if the instance  $I$  has a solution, and it is therefore of index 1. By Lemma 18,  $G$  (which has only two 1-reversal-bounded counters) can be converted in polynomial time to an RLG-SC  $G'$  with 1-reversal-bounded counters, but the number of 1-reversal-bounded counters would depend on the sizes of the constants used in the rules of  $G$ .  $\square$

In contrast to the above results, when both the index and number of 1-reversal-bounded counter are fixed, we have:

**Proposition 20.** *Let  $m, k \geq 1$  be fixed. The emptiness problem for  $m$ -index CFG-SC  $G$  with at most  $k$  1-reversal-bounded counters is decidable in polynomial time. Furthermore, this is also true for every CFG-SC  $G$  with at most  $k$  1-reversal-bounded counters where, if  $L(G) \neq \emptyset$ , there is some derivation of index  $m$ .*

PROOF. Let  $G = (V, \Sigma, P, S, Q, q_0, F)$  be an  $m$ -index CFG-SC with at most  $k$  1-reversal-bounded counters. We first construct from  $G$  a grammar  $G'$  where all terminal symbols are mapped to  $\lambda$ . Clearly,  $L(G')$  is empty if and only if  $L(G)$  is empty. Then all rules in  $G'$  are of the form:

$$(q, i_1, \dots, i_k, A) \rightarrow (p, l_1, \dots, l_k, u),$$

where  $i_j \in \{0, 1\}, l_j \in \{-1, 0, 1\}$  for  $1 \leq j \leq k$ ,  $u \in V^*, 0 \leq |u| \leq m$ . Furthermore, since  $G$  has index  $m$ ,  $L(G) \neq \emptyset$  if and only if  $L(G') \neq \emptyset$  if and only if there is some derivation of  $\lambda$  in  $G'$  such that every sentential form in the derivation has at most  $m$  nonterminals. This is even true if there is some derivation of index  $m$  in  $G$ . Now from  $G'$ , we construct an NCM  $M$  with  $k$  1-reversal-bounded counters as follows: Its initial state is  $[q_0, S]$ . The other states of  $M$  are of the form  $[q, w]$ , where  $q \in Q, w \in V^*, 0 \leq |w| \leq m$ .

Then  $M$  starts in state  $[q_0, S]$  with all its  $k$  counters zero. A move of  $M$  is defined by: if  $G'$  has a rule

$$(q, i_1, \dots, i_k, A) \rightarrow (p, l_1, \dots, l_k, v),$$

$i_j \in \{0, 1\}, l_j \in \{-1, 0, 1\}$  for  $1 \leq j \leq k$ , then in  $M$ , for all strings  $xAy$  where  $x, y$  are strings of nonterminals (possibly empty) with  $|xAy| \leq m$  and  $|xvy| \leq m$ , create transitions from state  $[q, xAy]$  and counter status  $i_1, \dots, i_k$  on  $\lambda$ , that go to state  $[p, xvy]$  and update the counters by  $l_1, \dots, l_k$ . Since  $m$  is fixed, the number of words  $xAy$  is polynomial in  $|V|$ , and therefore this construction runs in polynomial time. The accepting states of  $M$  are of the form  $[p, \lambda]$ , where  $p$  is an accepting state of  $G'$ .

Since  $G'$  is of index  $m$ , then  $L(G')$  is non-empty if and only if there is a derivation of  $\lambda$  in  $G'$

$$(p_0, c_{0,1}, \dots, c_{0,k}, \alpha_0) \Rightarrow \dots \Rightarrow (p_n, c_{n,1}, \dots, c_{n,k}, \alpha_n),$$

where  $p_0 = q_0, \alpha_0 = S, \alpha_n = \lambda, p_n \in F$ , and  $c_{0,i} = 0, 1 \leq i \leq k, |\alpha_j| \leq m, 1 \leq j \leq n$ . If this derivation exists, then there is a computation

$$([p_0, \alpha_0], \lambda, c_{0,1}, \dots, c_{0,k}) \vdash_M \dots \vdash_M ([p_n, \alpha_n], \lambda, c_{n,1}, \dots, c_{n,k}),$$

where  $[p_n, \alpha_n]$  is a final state. Furthermore, if there is such a computation of  $M$ , then there is a corresponding derivation of  $G'$  as well. Hence,  $L(G') = L(M)$ . Clearly, since  $G$  (and, hence,  $G'$ ) is  $m$ -index and  $m$  is fixed, the size of  $M$  is polynomial in the size of  $G'$  (hence, of  $G$ ). Since  $M$  is an NCM with a fixed ( $k$ ) number of 1-reversal-bounded counters and it is known that the emptiness problem for NCM with a fixed number of 1-reversal-bounded counters is decidable in polynomial time [10], the result follows.  $\square$

Finally, we will give an application of the results above.

As noted in the proof of Proposition 19, the generalized RLG-SC  $G$  constructed in that proof (which is obviously 1-index) has two 1-reversal-bounded counters. Although there is a polynomial time algorithm to convert  $G$  to an equivalent RLG-SC  $G'$  (hence,  $|G'|$  is polynomial in  $|G|$ ), the number of 1-reversal-bounded counters of  $G'$  would depend on the the sizes of the length of the constants (in binary) used to increase the counters in the rules of  $G$ . A question arises as to whether there is some fixed  $r$ , such we can always convert in polynomial time a generalized RLG-SC  $G$  with two 1-reversal-bounded counters to an equivalent RLG-SC  $G'$  with at most  $r$  1-reversal-bounded counters. The following corollary says it is unlikely.

**Corollary 21.** *Let  $m$  and  $r$  be any fixed positive integers. If there is a polynomial-time algorithm which can convert any generalized RLG-SC (which is obviously of index 1) with two 1-reversal-bounded counters to an equivalent CFG-SC with at most  $r$  1-reversal-bounded counters and whose index is at most  $m$ , then  $P = NP$ .*

PROOF. This follows from Propositions 19 and 20. □

It is not known whether there is an infinite hierarchy of RLG-SC in terms of 1-reversal-bounded counters (i.e., whether for every  $k \geq 1$ , there is a  $k' > k$  such that there is a language accepted by a RLG-SC with  $k'$  1-reversal-bounded counters that cannot be accepted by a RLG-SC with only  $k$  1-reversal-bounded counters). The following corollary, which also follows from Propositions 19 and 20, says that an infinite hierarchy seems likely.

**Corollary 22.** *Let  $k$  be any fixed positive integer. If there is a polynomial-time algorithm that can convert any RLG-SC (which may have more than  $k$  1-reversal-bounded counters) to an equivalent RLG-SC with at most  $k$  1-reversal-bounded counters, then  $P = NP$ .*

## 7. Conclusions and Future Directions

We studied state grammars, and we showed that with a new circular derivation relation, they generate all recursively enumerable languages. We also studied state grammars with stores (e.g., reversal-bounded counters) under the free interpretation and the leftmost derivation relation. When using the free interpretation derivation relation, the counters do not add any generative capacity, and only states are needed. When using leftmost derivations, the class coincides with the machine model NPCM (pushdown automata with reversal-bounded counters). This leads to the result that state grammars with counters and leftmost derivations are strictly weaker than state grammars with no counters and the free interpretation derivation relation. We also investigated the complexity of the emptiness problem involving state grammars with reversal-bounded counters. It was shown that for  $m$  and  $k$  fixed, the emptiness problem for  $m$ -index state grammars with  $k$  1-reversal-bounded counters can be solved in polynomial time. Also, two results concerning reducing the number of counters, and allowing to add values larger than one in the description of these grammars, are reduced to the question of whether  $P = NP$ .

There are other interesting problems of descriptonal complexity that are open. For example, do state grammars form an infinite hierarchy with the number of states? We conjecture that in Example 1, for each  $k \geq 2$ , it is impossible to generate  $L_k$  with a state grammar with fewer than  $k$  states, which would form such a hierarchy.

## Acknowledgements

We thank the anonymous reviewers for a careful reading of the paper.

## References

- [1] T. Kasai, An hierarchy between context-free and context-sensitive languages, *Journal of Computer and System Sciences* 4 (5) (1970) 492–508.
- [2] E. Moriya, D. Hofbauer, M. Huber, F. Otto, On state-alternating context-free grammars, *Theoretical Computer Science* 337 (1) (2005) 183–216.
- [3] A. Salomaa, Matrix grammars with a leftmost restriction, *Information and Control* 20 (2) (1972) 143–149.
- [4] E. Moriya, Some remarks on state grammars and matrix grammars, *Information and Control* 23 (1973) 48–57.
- [5] J. Dassow, G. Păun, *Regulated Rewriting in Formal Language Theory*, EATCS Monographs on Theoretical Computer Science, Springer, 1989.
- [6] J. E. Hopcroft, J. D. Ullman, *Introduction to Automata Theory, Languages, and Computation*, Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA, 1979.
- [7] M. Harrison, *Introduction to Formal Language Theory*, Addison-Wesley series in computer science, Addison-Wesley Pub. Co., 1978.

- [8] D. Hauschildt, M. Jantzen, Petri net algorithms in the theory of matrix grammars, *Acta Informatica* 31 (8) (1994) 719–728.
- [9] O. H. Ibarra, Reversal-bounded multicounter machines and their decision problems, *J. ACM* 25 (1) (1978) 116–133.
- [10] E. M. Gurari, O. H. Ibarra, The complexity of decision problems for finite-turn multicounter machines, *Journal of Computer and System Sciences* 22 (2) (1981) 220–229.
- [11] R. Stiebe, Slender matrix languages, in: *Developments in Language Theory, Proceedings of the 4th International Conference, 1999*, World Scientific, 2000, pp. 375–385.
- [12] S. Greibach, Remarks on blind and partially blind one-way multicounter machines, *Theoretical Computer Science* 7 (1978) 311–324.
- [13] O. Ibarra, I. McQuillan, The effect of end-markers on counter machines and commutativity, *Theoretical Computer Science* 627 (2016) 71–81.
- [14] O. H. Ibarra, Grammatical characterizations of NPDAs and VPDAs with counters, *Theoretical Computer Science* 746 (2018) 136–150.
- [15] G. Rozenberg, D. Vermeir, On the effect of the finite index restriction on several families of grammars, *Information and Control* 39 (1978) 284–302.
- [16] S. Ginsburg, E. Spanier, Finite turn pushdown automata, *SIAM Journal of Control* 4 (3) (1966) 429–453.
- [17] M. Garey, D. Johnson, *Computers and Intractability: A Guide to the Theory of NP-Completeness*, Series of books in the mathematical sciences, W. H., 1979.