

---

# Invariants for equivalence of finite automata

Mike Spivey

Let  $S = (S, \Sigma, \delta_S, s_0, F_S)$  and  $\mathcal{T} = (T, \Sigma, \delta_T, t_0, F_T)$  be two deterministic finite automata with the same alphabet  $\Sigma$ . We say  $S$  and  $\mathcal{T}$  are *equivalent* if, for each word  $w \in \Sigma^*$ , we have  $\delta_S(s_0, w) \in F_S$  if and only if  $\delta_T(t_0, w) \in F_T$ . In other words,  $S$  and  $\mathcal{T}$  are equivalent if  $R \subseteq E$ , where

$$R = \{ (\delta_S(s_0, w), \delta_T(t_0, w)) \mid w \in \Sigma^* \},$$

and

$$E = \{ (s, t) \mid s \in F_S \Leftrightarrow t \in F_T \}.$$

What's more,  $R$  is the smallest set that contains  $(s_0, t_0)$  and is closed under  $\Delta$ , where

$$\Delta(s, t) = \{ (\delta_S(s, a), \delta_T(t, a)) \mid a \in \Sigma \}.$$

Let us assume that  $S$  and  $T$  are disjoint and let  $X = S \cup T$  and  $\delta = \delta_S \cup \delta_T$  and  $F = F_S \cup F_T$ . Then the problem of determining whether  $S$  and  $\mathcal{T}$  are equivalent amounts to determining whether the states  $s_0$  and  $t_0$  are equivalent in a certain sense in this joined automaton. We can extend the definition of  $\Delta$  to  $X \times X$  by writing

$$\Delta(x, y) = \{ (\delta(x, a), \delta(y, a)) \mid a \in \Sigma \},$$

and  $R$  remains the smallest relation containing  $(s_0, t_0)$  that is closed under this operation.

We'll use the notation  $\overline{Q}$  for the *equivalence closure* of a relation  $Q$ , that is, the smallest equivalence relation that contains  $Q$ . If we take  $Q$  as the set of pairs that have been submitted to the *Union* operation in a disjoint-sets data structure, then  $\overline{Q}$  is the equivalence relation that is tested with  $\text{Find}(x) = \text{Find}(y)$ . This closure operation has the property that if  $U$  is an equivalence relation, and  $Q$  is any relation, then  $Q \subseteq U$  if and only if  $\overline{Q} \subseteq U$ .

Now observe that we can extend the relation  $E \subseteq S \times T$  to an equivalence relation  $E'$  on  $X$ , with  $(x, y) \in E'$  if and only if  $x \in F \Leftrightarrow y \in F$ . For  $s \in S$  and  $t \in T$ , we have  $(s, t) \in E$  if and only if  $(s, t) \in E'$ . Consequently  $R \subseteq E$  if and only if  $R \subseteq E'$ .

Now consider the program shown in Figure 1. I claim that the following are invariants:

- (i)  $(s_0, t_0) \in \overline{Q} \cup W$ ,

## 2 Invariants for equivalence of finite automata

```

Q := ∅; W := {(s0, t0)};
while W ≠ ∅ do
  extract (u, v) from W;

  if (u, v) ∉ E then
    return FALSE
  end;

  if (u, v) ∉ Q̄ then
    Q := Q ∪ {(u, v)};
    W := W ∪ Δ(u, v)
  end
end;
return TRUE

```

Figure 1: Program for testing equivalence

- (ii)  $W \subseteq R$ ,
- (iii)  $Q \subseteq E$ ,
- (iv) If  $(s, t) \in Q$  then  $\Delta(s, t) \subseteq \overline{Q} \cup W$ .

It's easy to check that most of these relationships are maintained and the program is correct. In particular, if the loop body returns *FALSE*, then  $(u, v)$  is in  $R$  but not  $E$ , so  $S$  and  $T$  are not equivalent.

For invariance of (i), observe that the value of  $\overline{Q} \cup W$  only increases: if  $(u, v)$  is chosen and removed from  $W$ , then the loop body ensures that  $(u, v) \in \overline{Q}$ . In particular,  $(s_0, t_0)$  remains in the set. Also for (iv), since  $\overline{Q} \cup W$  only increases, we need worry only about a new pair  $(u, v)$  added to  $Q$ ; but the adjustment to  $W$  deals with keeping the invariant true.

When the loop terminates, we have  $W = \emptyset$ , and invariant (iv) tells us that

$$\text{if } (s, t) \in Q \text{ then } \Delta(s, t) \subseteq \overline{Q}.$$

We can write this property as  $Q \subseteq U$ , where

$$U = \{(x, y) \mid \Delta(x, y) \subseteq \overline{Q}\}.$$

Now  $U$  is an equivalence relation, so it follows by the properties of equivalence closure that  $\overline{Q} \subseteq U$  also, and so  $\overline{Q}$  is closed under  $\Delta$ . But also  $(s_0, t_0) \in \overline{Q}$ , so  $\overline{Q}$  includes all of  $R$ . Appealing to invariant (iii), we have  $Q \subseteq E \subseteq E'$ , with  $E'$  an equivalence relation, and so  $R \subseteq \overline{Q} \subseteq E'$ , making  $S$  and  $T$  equivalent.

Observing that  $Q$  is not used in the program other than via the operations

$$\begin{aligned}
Q &:= \emptyset \\
Q &:= Q \cup \{(s, t)\} \\
(s, t) &\in \overline{Q}
\end{aligned}$$

we can implement  $Q$  with a disjoint sets data structure.