# Towards Register Minimisation of Streaming String Transducers

Pierre-Alain Reynier

LIS, Aix-Marseille Université & CNRS







# Transducers

Automata accept objects / Transducers transform objects

A transduction is a function (or even a relation) from words to words  $\rightarrow$  In this talk, we focus on functions

Examples:

- $\rightarrow$  ERASE: "Oxford"  $\mapsto$  "xfrd"
- → LAST: "Oxford"  $\mapsto$  "dddddd"
- → REVERSE: "Oxford"  $\mapsto$  "drofxO"
- → COPY: "Oxford"  $\mapsto$  "OxfordOxford"
- → REPLACE: "Oxford#I love  $1" \mapsto$  "I love Oxford"
- → SORT: "Oxford"  $\mapsto$  "dfoOrx"

# Transducers

Some applications:

- language and speech processing
- model-checking infinite state-space systems
- verification of web sanitizers
- string pattern matching
- XML transformations (nested word)
- model for recursive programs (nested word)

# (One/Two-way) finite state transducers

#### Example (A transducer T)



Semantics  $\llbracket T \rrbracket$ : ERASE :  $\vdash w \dashv \mapsto a^{\#_a(w)}$ , with  $w \in \{a, b\}^*$ 

Non-determinism: semantics is a relation

# (One/Two-way) finite state transducers

#### Example (A transducer T)



Semantics 
$$\llbracket T \rrbracket$$
: ERASE :  $\vdash w \dashv \mapsto a^{\#_a(w)}$ , with  $w \in \{a, b\}^*$ 

Non-determinism: semantics is a relation

A transducer is:

- functional if it realizes a function
- deterministic if the underlying automaton is deterministic

#### Classes: det1W, fun1W, 1W

→ Too low expressive power (REVERSE, COPY, REPLACE, SORT)

# (One/Two-way) finite state transducers

#### Example (A transducer T)



Semantics 
$$\llbracket T \rrbracket$$
: Sorr :  $\vdash w \dashv \mapsto a^{\#_a(w)} b^{\#_b(w)}$ , with  $w \in \{a, b\}^*$ 

Non-determinism: semantics is a relation

A transducer is:

- functional if it realizes a function
- deterministic if the underlying automaton is deterministic

```
Classes: det1W, fun1W, 1W, det2W, fun2W, 2W
```











- closed under composition
- regular languages are preserved by inverse image
- functionality and equivalence are decidable

1W deterministic autom. + registers

Register updates:

- X:=u.Y.v
- X:=Y.Z

X,Y,Z: registers u,v: words in  $\Sigma^*$ 



 $\vdash w \dashv \mapsto a^{\#_a(w)} h^{\#_b(w)}$ 



Register updates:

- X:=u.Y.v
- X:=Y.Z

X,Y,Z: registers u,v: words in  $\Sigma^*$ 



 $\vdash w \dashv \mapsto a^{\#_a(w)} h^{\#_b(w)}$ 

Expressiveness results :

•  $det1W \equiv 1$ -register appending SST

X:=X.a



Register updates:

- X:=u.Y.v
- X:=Y.Z

X,Y,Z: registers u,v: words in  $\Sigma^*$ 



 $\vdash w \dashv \mapsto a^{\#_a(w)} h^{\#_b(w)}$ 

Expressiveness results :

- det1W  $\equiv$  1-register appending SST X:=X.a
- fun1W  $\equiv$  appending SST

 $X := Y_a$ 



Register updates:

- X:=u.Y.v
- X:=Y.Z

X,Y,Z: registers u,v: words in  $\Sigma^*$ 



 $\vdash w \dashv \mapsto a^{\#_a(w)} h^{\#_b(w)}$ 

Expressiveness results :

- det1W  $\equiv$  1-register appending SST X:=X.a
- fun1W  $\equiv$  appending SST
- fun2W  $\equiv$  copyless SST

(X,Y):=(X,X) is forbidden

 $X := Y_a$ 

Examples of SST

 $\sigma | X := \sigma X$   $\rightarrow \longrightarrow X$ 







Register Minimisation Problem for SST

Motivations: Streaming and simplification of models

- minimisation/determinisation of automata
- normal form  $\sim$  learning
- 2way: reduce number of passes

#### Register Minimisation Problem for class $\mathcal{S}$ of SST

**Input:**  $T \in S$  and  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ **Question:** Does there exist  $T' \in S$  with k registers s.t.  $T \equiv T'$ ?

#### Related works

- [AR13] Additive Cost Register Automata
- [BGMP16] concatenation-free funNSST

 $\begin{array}{l} X{:=}Y{+}c,\ c{\in \mathbb{Z}}\\ X{:=}uYv \end{array}$ 

Regular functions

det2W=copyless SST=MSOT









#### In this talk

- Rational functions (X:=Y.u)
  → [LICS16] with L. Daviaud and J.M. Talbot
- Multi-sequential functions (X:=X.u)
  → [FoSSaCS17] with L. Daviaud, I. Jecker and D. Villevalois

Overview



2 Rational functions (X:=Y.u)

Multi-sequential functions (X:=X.u)



#### Overview

#### Introduction

#### 2 Rational functions (X:=Y.u)

#### 3 Multi-sequential functions (X:=X.u)

#### 4 Conclusion

Rational functions and appending SST

```
Appending SST: only updates X:=Y.u
```

Facts:

• appending SST = fun1W

- appending SST  $\rightsquigarrow$  fun1W is polynomial (guess the register)
- appending SST with 1 register = det1W

#### Register minimisation for appending SST

**Input:** an appending SST T and  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ **Question:** does there exist an app. SST T' with k registers s.t.  $T \equiv T'$ ?

→ for k = 1, our problem is the det1W-definability of fun1W

From rational functions to sequential ones

Sequentiality Problem [Choffrut77]

**Input:** a fun1W*T* **Question:** does there exist an equivalent det1W?

Standard technique:

- subset construction starting from the set of initial states.
- output longest common prefix
- store the unproduced outputs in the configuration

Configurations of the form  $\{(p, a), (q, \varepsilon), (s, bb)\}$ 

From rational functions to sequential ones

Sequentiality Problem [Choffrut77]

**Input:** a fun1W*T* **Question:** does there exist an equivalent det1W?

Standard technique:

- subset construction starting from the set of initial states.
- output longest common prefix
- store the unproduced outputs in the configuration

Configurations of the form  $\{(p, a), (q, \varepsilon), (s, bb)\}$ 

Issue: termination (bound the size of unproduced outputs)

An example

 ${\rm LAST}$  on  $\Sigma^3$ 



An example



# Twinning Property [Choffrut77]

We define:

$$delay(u, v) = lcp(u, v)^{-1}.(u, v)$$

Example: lcp(aaa, aab) = aadelay(aaa, aab) = (a, b) For all situations like:



#### Twinning Property [Choffrut77]

We define:

$$delay(u, v) = lcp(u, v)^{-1}.(u, v)$$

Example: lcp(aaa, aab) = aadelay(aaa, aab) = (a, b)



For all situations like.

we have  $delay(w_0, w_1) = delay(w_0 w_0', w_1 w_1')$ 

 $T \models \text{Twinning Property} \implies \forall (p, x) \in \text{subset constr.}, |x| \leq n^2 M$ 

#### Theorem ([Choffrut77])

 $T \models$  Twinning Property  $\iff$  There exists an equivalent det1W

#### Pierre-Alain Reynier (LIS, AMU & CNRS) Towards Register Minimisation of SST

 $lcp(aaa, aab) = aa \qquad \rightarrow \bigcirc \frown$   $delay(aaa, aab) = (a, b) \qquad we have delay(w_0, w_1)$  $T \vdash Twinning Property \rightarrow \forall (a, x) \in subset constr_{int}$ 

 $T \models$  Twinning Property  $\implies \forall (p, x) \in$  subset constr.,  $|x| \le n^2 M$ 

#### Theorem ([Choffrut77])

We define:

Example:

Twinning Property [Choffrut77]

 $delay(u, v) = lcp(u, v)^{-1}.(u, v)$ 

 $T \models T$ winning Property  $\iff$  There exists an equivalent det1W

#### Theorem ([WK95])

Twinning Property can be decided in PTime.



Oxford, Feb 22, 2018

14 / 25

Register minimisation using Twinning Property

**Our objective:** Characterize when a fun1W can be expressed by an appending SST with k registers.

Twinning property characterizes the fact that runs (on the same input) remain close.

#### Intuition:

2 reg. needed if there are 2 runs with arbitrarily large delays

k + 1 reg. needed if there are k + 1 runs with pairwise arb. large delays

k registers are sufficient if for every k + 1 runs, 2 of them remain close

Register minimisation using Twinning Property

**Our objective:** Characterize when a fun1W can be expressed by an appending SST with k registers.

Twinning property characterizes the fact that runs (on the same input) remain close.

#### Intuition:

2 reg. needed if there are 2 runs with arbitrarily large delays

k + 1 reg. needed if there are k + 1 runs with pairwise arb. large delays

k registers are sufficient if for every k + 1 runs, 2 of them remain close

For every k + 1 runs, 2 of them remain close

# Twinning Property of order k

For all situations like:

k synchronised loops



we have  $\operatorname{delay}(w_{1,i} \dots w_{\ell,i}, w_{1,j} \dots w_{\ell,j}) = \operatorname{delay}(w_{1,i} \dots w_{\ell,i} w'_{\ell,i}, w_{1,j} \dots w_{\ell,j} w'_{\ell,j})$ 

# Register minimisation using Twinning Property

#### Lemma

If a fun1W satisfies the TP of order k, then from any set of runs on the same input word, one can extract k runs such that every run is "close" to one of these k runs.

"close": (p, x) with  $|x| \leq n^{k+1}M$
## Register minimisation using Twinning Property

#### Lemma

If a fun1W satisfies the TP of order k, then from any set of runs on the same input word, one can extract k runs such that every run is "close" to one of these k runs.

"close": (p, x) with  $|x| \le n^{k+1}M$ 

#### Theorem

- A fun1W is definable by a k-app. SST iff it satisfies the TP of order k
- TP of order k can be decided in PSpace (k given in unary)

## Register minimisation using Twinning Property

#### Lemma

If a fun1W satisfies the TP of order k, then from any set of runs on the same input word, one can extract k runs such that every run is "close" to one of these k runs.

"close": (p, x) with  $|x| \le n^{k+1}M$ 

#### Theorem

- A fun1W is definable by a k-app. SST iff it satisfies the TP of order k
- TP of order k can be decided in PSpace (k given in unary)

#### Corollary

The register minimisation problem for appending SST is PSpace-complete.

How many registers for the following function?

 $\operatorname{LAST}^2 : u_1 \# u_2 \mapsto \operatorname{LAST}(u_1) \# \operatorname{LAST}(u_2)$ 



How many registers for the following function?

 $\operatorname{LAST}^2$ :  $u_1 \# u_2 \mapsto \operatorname{LAST}(u_1) \# \operatorname{LAST}(u_2)$ 



Only 2 registers!



### Overview

#### Introduction

2 Rational functions (X:=Y.u)

3 Multi-sequential functions (X:=X.u)

#### 4 Conclusion

### Definition ( [CS86])

Multi-sequential functions are defined as functions that can be realized as finite union of sequential transducers.

→ allows a parallel evaluation in a streaming scenario Examples:

• LAST on 
$$\Sigma = \{a, b\}$$
 is multi-sequential: split  $\Sigma^+$  as  $\Sigma^* a \uplus \Sigma^* b$ 

### Definition ( [CS86])

Multi-sequential functions are defined as functions that can be realized as finite union of sequential transducers.

→ allows a parallel evaluation in a streaming scenario Examples:

- LAST on  $\Sigma = \{a, b\}$  is multi-sequential: split  $\Sigma^+$  as  $\Sigma^* a \uplus \Sigma^* b$
- LAST<sup>2</sup>: u<sub>1</sub>#u<sub>2</sub> → LAST(u<sub>1</sub>)#LAST(u<sub>2</sub>) is multi-sequential: split the domain according to last(u<sub>1</sub>), last(u<sub>2</sub>) ∈ {a, b}

### Definition ( [CS86])

Multi-sequential functions are defined as functions that can be realized as finite union of sequential transducers.

→ allows a parallel evaluation in a streaming scenario Examples:

- LAST on  $\Sigma = \{a, b\}$  is multi-sequential: split  $\Sigma^+$  as  $\Sigma^* a \uplus \Sigma^* b$
- LAST<sup>2</sup>: u<sub>1</sub>#u<sub>2</sub> → LAST(u<sub>1</sub>)#LAST(u<sub>2</sub>) is multi-sequential: split the domain according to last(u<sub>1</sub>), last(u<sub>2</sub>) ∈ {a, b}
- LAST<sup>\*</sup>:  $u_1 # \dots # u_n \mapsto LAST(u_1) # \dots # LAST(u_n)$  is not multi-seq.

#### Definition ([CS86])

Multi-sequential functions are defined as functions that can be realized as finite union of sequential transducers.

### Definition (Appending SST with independent registers) Only updates X := Xu: "No communication between threads"

#### Definition ([CS86])

Multi-sequential functions are defined as functions that can be realized as finite union of sequential transducers.

#### Definition (Appending SST with independent registers)

Only updates X := Xu: "No communication between threads"

Observations:

- Multi-sequential functions  $\equiv$  app. SST with independent registers
- size of the union = number of registers
- $\clubsuit$  Register minimisation in this class  $\equiv$  Minimisation of size of the union



 $\operatorname{LAST}^2$ :  $u_1 \# u_2 \mapsto \operatorname{LAST}(u_1) \# \operatorname{LAST}(u_2)$ 

→ Requires 4 independent registers

Registers cannot be reset!

For all situations like:





there are two runs  $0 \le i < j \le k$  s.t. for every loop  $\ell$  with same input words, we have  $delay(w_{1,i} \dots w_{\ell,i}, w_{1,j} \dots w_{\ell,j}) = delay(w_{1,i} \dots w_{\ell,i} w'_{\ell,i}, w_{1,j} \dots w_{\ell,j} w'_{\ell,j})$ 

Tree representation of input words:



#### Theorem

- A fun1W is definable by a k-app. SST with independent registers iff it satisfies the BTP of order k.
- The BTP of order k is decidable in PSpace (k in unary).

#### Theorem

- A fun1W is definable by a k-app. SST with independent registers iff it satisfies the BTP of order k.
- The BTP of order k is decidable in PSpace (k in unary).

#### Theorem

The register minimisation problem for appending SST with independent registers is PSpace-complete.

### Overview

#### 1 Introduction

2 Rational functions (X:=Y.u)

3 Multi-sequential functions (X:=X.u)















## I did not present ...

Alternative characterizations:

- bounded variation property
- Lipschitz property

## I did not present ...

Alternative characterizations:

- bounded variation property
- Lipschitz property

 $\mathsf{Functional} \rightsquigarrow \mathsf{finite}\mathsf{-valued}$ 

## I did not present ...

Alternative characterizations:

- bounded variation property
- Lipschitz property

 $\mathsf{Functional} \rightsquigarrow \mathsf{finite}\mathsf{-valued}$ 

Extension to "weak" weighted automata on semigroups:

- set semantics
- infinitary semigroup  $(\alpha\beta\gamma\neq\beta\implies|\{\alpha^n\beta\gamma^n\mid n\in\mathbb{N}\}|=+\infty)$
- finitely generated semigroup

### Perspectives

Shift from rational to regular functions

- $\rightarrow$  deal with both prepending and appending: X:=u.Y.v (on-going)
- $\rightarrow$  deal with concatenation of registers

Weighted automata: replace set semantics with other aggregations

Extensions to infinite words, nested words

### Perspectives

Shift from rational to regular functions

- $\rightarrow$  deal with both prepending and appending: X:=u.Y.v (on-going)
- $\rightarrow$  deal with concatenation of registers

Weighted automata: replace set semantics with other aggregations

Extensions to infinite words, nested words

# Thanks!

Regular functions det2W=copyless SST =MSOT

Copy

Reverse







$\overbrace{\qquad\qquad} \text{Kleene Star } u \mapsto$		
Rational relations 1W=appending NSST SUBWORD $u \mapsto \{u'   u' \leq u\}$		$NSST = NMSOT$ $SUBWORDS^{2}$ $u \mapsto$
Rational functions fun1W=appending SST (X:=Y.u) LAST	Regular functions det2W=copyless SST =MSOT COPY	$\{u'u' \mid u' \preceq u\}$
	Reverse	

#### Alternative characterizations

 $f:\Sigma^*\mapsto \Gamma^*$ 

	bounded variation	Lipschitz property
det1W	$orall n \exists N \ \forall u, v \in dom(f), \ d(u,v) \leq n \Rightarrow d(f(u), f(v)) \leq N$	$\exists L \ \forall u, v \in dom(f), \ d(f(u), f(v)) \leq L.(d(u, v) + 1)$
k registers		
k independent registers		

#### Alternative characterizations

 $f:\Sigma^*\mapsto \Gamma^*$ 

	bounded variation	Lipschitz property
det1W	$orall n \exists N \ \forall u, v \in dom(f), \ d(u,v) \leq n \Rightarrow d(f(u), f(v)) \leq N$	$\exists L \ \forall u, v \in dom(f), \ d(f(u), f(v)) \leq L.(d(u, v) + 1)$
k registers	$ \forall n \exists N \forall u_0 \dots u_k \in dom(f), \\ (\forall i \neq j, d(u_i, u_j) \leq n) \\ \Rightarrow \exists i \neq j.d(f(u_i), f(u_j)) \leq N $	?
k independent registers		

#### Alternative characterizations

 $f:\Sigma^*\mapsto \Gamma^*$ 

	bounded variation	Lipschitz property
det1W	$orall n \exists N \ \forall u, v \in dom(f), \ d(u,v) \leq n \Rightarrow d(f(u), f(v)) \leq N$	$\exists L \ \forall u, v \in dom(f), \ d(f(u), f(v)) \leq L.(d(u, v) + 1)$
k registers	$ \forall n \exists N \forall u_0 \dots u_k \in dom(f), \\ (\forall i \neq j, d(u_i, u_j) \leq n) \\ \Rightarrow \exists i \neq j.d(f(u_i), f(u_j)) \leq N $	?
k independent registers	?	$\exists L \ \forall u_0 \dots u_k \in dom(f), \ \exists i \neq j \text{ s.t.} \ d(f(u_i), f(u_j)) \leq L.(d(u_i, u_j) + 1)$