

(1) Define  $L$  to be the language of strings over  $\Sigma = \{a, b\}$  that do not begin with  $aa$  and do not end in  $bb$ . (Note this is different from the language on Prelim 1 by having **and** in place of **xor**.) Find a PD set  $S$  of size 6 for  $L$ .

*Answer:* Among the first few strings in order  $\epsilon, a, b, aa, ab, \dots, \epsilon, a, b, ab, ba$  all belong to  $L$ , whereas  $aa$  and  $bb$  do not. Moreover,  $aa$  is “dead”—no string beginning with  $aa$  can belong to  $L$ —while  $bb$  can be made “live” if an  $a$  comes next since  $bba \in L$ . This already tells us that  $z = a$  distinguishes  $aa$  from  $bb$ , so let’s keep both of them for our set  $S$ .

We need 4 more strings. What if we try those first four,  $\epsilon, a, b, ab$ , to make  $S_0 = \{\epsilon, a, b, ab, aa, bb\}$ ? First thing to note is that each of the first four is distinguished from both of the last two automatically (by  $z = \epsilon$ ) because the first four strings belong to  $L$  and the others do not. This already gives us  $4 \times 2 = 8$  distinguished pairs, plus  $aa \not\sim_L bb$  gives us 9 out of the  $\binom{6}{2} = 15$  pairs we need to consider. Thus we are just left with the  $\binom{4}{2} = 6$  pairs among  $\{\epsilon, a, b, ab\}$ . A little “hacking” distinguishes 5 of those pairs:

	$\epsilon$	$a$	$b$	$ab$
$\epsilon$		$a$	$b$	$b$
$a$			$a$	$a$
$b$				??
$ab$				

But how to separate  $b$  from  $ab$ ? How many strings  $z$  do we need to consider? Well, you’ll never find one: a little reflection shows that  $b$  and  $ab$  leave you in exactly the same “menatl state” regarding the language  $L$ , so in fact  $b \sim_L ab$ . So let’s move on and try  $ba$  in place of  $ab$ , i.e.  $S = \{\epsilon, a, b, ba, aa, bb\}$ . Since  $ba \in L$ , the distinctions from  $aa, bb$  are preserved, so we need only focus in on the  $4 \times 4$  section of the  $6 \times 6$  grid that was suggested:

	$\epsilon$	$a$	$b$	$ba$
$\epsilon$		$a$	$b$	$aa$
$a$			$a$	$a$
$b$				$b$
$ba$				

We distinguished  $b$  from  $ba$  by  $z = b$ . The only other revision that was tricky was that to separate  $\epsilon$  from  $ba$  you can’t use  $z = a$  or  $z = b$  anymore, but  $z = aa$  works. Thus  $S$  is a PD set of size 6, so any DFA  $M$  such that  $L(M) = L$  needs at least 6 states. And you can build an  $M$  with 6 states: Branch off  $a$  and  $b$  apart from the start state  $s$  and each other. Make  $aa$  go to “dead” and  $ab$  go to the same place as  $b$ , which is the middle state of the DFA called  $M_1$  on the Prelim I answer key. Then you just need the other two states of  $M_1$  to make 6.

(2) For the following languages  $L_1, L_2$  over  $\{0, 1\}$ , design context-free grammars  $G_1, G_2$  such that  $L(G_1) = L_1$  and  $L(G_2) = L_2$ . You need not prove your grammars correct, but as usual you should include a few comments explaining how and why the grammars work correctly. ( $2 \times 12 = 24$  pts., for 42 total on the set)

1.  $L_1 = \{0^m 1^n 0^n 1^m : m \geq 1, n \geq 0\}$ ,
2.  $L_2 = \{x0y : \#0(x) = \#1(y)\}$ .

*Answer:*  $G_1$  has rules  $S \rightarrow 0S1 \mid 0T1$ ,  $T \rightarrow 1T0 \mid \epsilon$ . The design pattern is “nesting”— $S$  handles the outer  $0^m$  and  $1^m$  layers, and the fact that the dropdown to  $T$  comes with  $0T1$  ensures  $m \geq 1$ . The inner  $T$  handles  $1^n 0^n$  with  $T \rightarrow \epsilon$  allowing  $n = 0$ .

For  $G_2$  the key idea is that the displayed 0 between  $x$  and  $y$ —which is a movable pain-in-the-neck when you are trying to parse strings—is derived when the grammar halts a recursion on  $S_2$ . So the idea of “on the left of  $S_2$ ” rigorously becomes “on the left of *that* 0.” It follows that we can add a single 1 on the left of  $S_2$  without changing the balance, and likewise add a single 0 on the right of  $S_2$ . But whenever we add a 0 on the left of  $S_2$ , we have to balance it immediately with a 1 on its right. This shows that the following grammar is *sound*:

$$S_2 \rightarrow 0 \mid 1S_2 \mid S_20 \mid 0S_21$$

Is it comprehensive? Let any  $w \in L$  be given, and write  $w = x0y$  such that  $\#0(x) = \#1(y) = k$ , say. Mark the  $k$ -many 0s in  $x$  and the  $k$ -many 1’s in  $y$ . Pair them up in a nested fashion. In-between the 0s in  $x$  you have a “filling” of however-many 1s, and in-between the 1s in  $y$  you have fillings of 0s. Working from the outside-in, use the  $S_2 \rightarrow 1S_2$  and  $S_2 \rightarrow S_20$  rules to handle the “fillings” until you reach a marked pair on both the left and right. Then you use  $S_2 \rightarrow 0S_21$  to generate that pair. Rinse, repeat, enjoy, and finally to  $S_2 \rightarrow 0$  to finish  $w$ . So  $L(G_2) = L_2$ .

There was no requirement to use only one variable. The explanation above is arguably clearer if we apply it to this grammar instead:

$$S_2 \rightarrow 0 \mid TS_2U \mid 0S_21, \quad T \rightarrow 0T \mid \epsilon, \quad U \rightarrow U1 \mid \epsilon.$$

Then using the notation in lecture for the language of each variable, we have  $L_T = 0^*$  and  $L_U = 1^*$ ; these are the classic ways of making lists (and for those in CSE305, of simulating the BNF “star” operator).