

4.3 Deciding Regular Separability

Approach: Decompose an initial DMGTS W until the regular separability

$$L_{sj}(W) \mid D_n$$

boils down to

$$L_{z,sj}(W) \mid L_{z,dj}(W') \quad \text{for all } W' \text{ in the decomposition.}$$

Behind this are two lemmas.

Lemma 1 (Decomposition):

We can decompose a faithful DMGTS W into two finite sets

P_{of} and F_{in} of DMGTS,

where

- all $S \in P_{\text{of}}$ are perfect
- all $T \in F_{\text{in}}$ satisfy $L_{sj}(T) \mid D_n$
- $L_{sj}(W) = L_{sj}(P_{\text{of}} \cup F_{\text{in}})$.

Lemma 2 (Separability Transfer):

- If W is faithful, then
 $L_{z,sj}(W) \mid L_{z,dj}(W) \Rightarrow L_{sj}(W) \mid D_n$.
- If W is perfect, then
 $L_{z,sj}(W) \times L_{z,dj}(W) \Rightarrow L_{sj}(W) \times D_n$.

Recall that perfect DMGTs are faithful.

Corollary: Let W be perfect.

Then

$L_{Z, s_j}(W) \cap L_{Z, d_j}(W) \stackrel{\text{iff.}}{=} L_{s_j}(W) \cap D_n.$

The two lemmas give us
the result we are after.

Proposition:

Let U be an initialized VITS over Σ_n .

Then $L(U) \cap D_n$ is decidable.

Proof:

Let $U = ((\overset{\text{VITS}}{\downarrow} \text{tr}, \Sigma_n, \overset{\text{Counters}}{\downarrow} s_j, E), (v_{i_1}), (v_{i_2}))$

We assume to have a VITS.

Every VITS can be turned into a VITS
with the same language.

• Check $L(U) \cap D_n = \emptyset$.

If not, return false.

• Otherwise, we construct an initial DMGT W
that is faithful and satisfies $L_{s_j}(W) = L(U)$.

We can now check $L_{s_j}(W) \cap D_n$.

• Since W is faithful,

we can invoke Lemma 1.

It yields finite sets P_{s_j} and F_{i_n} of DMGTs

with $L_{s_j}(W) = L_{s_j}(P_{s_j} \cup F_{i_n})$.

Hence, to decide

$$L_{sj}(W) \mid D_n$$

We can check

$$L_{sj}(S) \mid D_n \quad \text{for all } S \in P_{sj} \quad \text{and}$$

$$L_{sj}(T) \mid D_n \quad \text{for all } T \in Fin.$$

• For $T \in Fin$, we already have

$$L_{sj}(T) \mid D_n \quad \text{by Lemma 1.}$$

• For $S \in P_{sj}$, we have

$$L_{sj}(S) \mid D_n \quad \text{iff} \quad L_{\mathbb{Z},sj}(S) \mid L_{\mathbb{Z},dy}(S).$$

Our algorithm checks the latter.

Using the lemma from last lecture,

we compute \mathbb{Z} -VRSS V_1 and V_2

$$\text{with} \quad L_{\mathbb{Z}}(V_1) = L_{\mathbb{Z},sj}(S)$$

$$L_{\mathbb{Z}}(V_2) = L_{\mathbb{Z},dy}(S).$$

Then

$$L_{sj}(S) \mid D_n \quad \text{iff} \quad L_{\mathbb{Z}}(V_1) \mid L_{\mathbb{Z}}(V_2).$$

With [ICATP '17], we check $L_{\mathbb{Z}}(V_1) \mid L_{\mathbb{Z}}(V_2)$.

• If the check fails for some $S \in P_{sj}$,

we return false.

Otherwise, we return true. □

Construction of the initial DMGTs W :

We define $W = (G, \mu)$ with $\mu = 1$.

The precovering graph G has the underlying VTS

$$V = (\text{root}, \Sigma_n, \{j \cup dy, E'\}).$$

The edges are

$$(\text{root}, a, (x, y), \text{root}) \quad \text{for every } (v, a, x, v) \in E.$$

Here, y modifies the Dyck counters

as required by Dyck visibility.

We set

$$G = (V, (\text{root}, (c_1, \bar{0})), (\text{root}, (c_2, \bar{0})), E).$$

All counters are decorated ω , $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{N}^\omega$.

Claim 1: $L_{sj}(W) = L(U)$

The only difference between W and U

is that W requires acceptance modulo $\mu = 1$

for the Dyck counters.

This, however, is no restriction as $k \equiv 0 \pmod{1}$ for all $k \in \mathcal{N}$.

Claim 2: W is faithful

• The initial and final markings are zero on the Dyck counters, so W is zero reading.

• For $\text{ITacc}_{\mathbb{Z}, dy}(W) \cap \text{ITacc}_{\mathbb{Z}, E \cup \omega}[dy](W) \in \text{ITacc}_{\mathbb{Z}, dy}(W)$,

We note that

$$\text{Acc}_{\mathbb{Z}, dy}(W) = \text{ITacc}_{\mathbb{Z}, dy}(W)$$

since there are no intermediate precovering graphs / intermediate markings.