

Group separation strikes back

Thomas Place

LaBRI, Univ. Bordeaux, CNRS, France

Email: tplace@labri.fr

Marc Zeitoun

LaBRI, Univ. Bordeaux, CNRS, France

Email: mz@labri.fr

Abstract—Group languages are regular languages recognized by finite groups, or equivalently by finite automata in which each letter induces a permutation on the set of states. We investigate the separation problem for this class of languages: given two arbitrary regular languages as input, we show how to decide if there exists a group language containing the first one while being disjoint from the second. We prove that covering, a problem generalizing separation, is decidable. A simple covering algorithm was already known: it can be obtained indirectly as a corollary of an algebraic theorem by Ash. Unfortunately, while deducing the algorithm from this algebraic result is straightforward, all proofs of Ash’s result itself require a strong background on algebraic concepts, and a wealth of technical machinery outside of automata theory. Our proof is independent of previous ones. It relies exclusively on standard notions from automata theory: we directly deal with separation and work with input languages represented by nondeterministic finite automata.

We also investigate two strict subclasses. First, the *alphabet modulo testable languages* are those defined by counting the occurrences of each letter modulo some fixed integer (equivalently, they are the languages recognized by a commutative group). Secondly, the *modulo languages* are those defined by counting the length of words modulo some fixed integer. We prove that covering is decidable for both classes, with algorithms that rely on the construction made for group languages.

Our proofs lead to tight complexity bounds for separation for all three classes, as well as for covering for both alphabet modulo testable languages and for modulo testable languages.

I. INTRODUCTION

Context. A prominent question in automata theory is to understand natural classes of languages defined by restricting the common definitions of regular languages (such as regular expressions, automata, monadic second-order logic or finite monoids). Of course, “understanding a class” is an informal goal. The standard approach is to show that the class under investigation is recursive by looking for *membership algorithms*: given a regular language as input, decide whether it belongs to the class. Rather than the procedure itself, the motivation is that formulating such an algorithm often requires a deep understanding of the class. This approach was initiated in the 60s by Schützenberger [37], who provided a membership algorithm for the class of *star-free languages* (those defined by a regular expression without Kleene star but with complement instead). This theorem started a fruitful line of research, which is now supported by a wealth of results. In fact, some of the most famous open problems in automata theory are membership questions (see [40], [23], [22] for surveys).

In this paper, we look at two problems, which both generalize membership. The first one is *separation*: given two

regular languages L_1 and L_2 as input, decide whether there exists a third language that belongs to the investigated class, includes L_1 and is disjoint from L_2 . The second one is *covering*. It generalizes separation to an arbitrary number of input languages. These problems have been getting a lot of attention recently, and one could even argue that they have replaced membership as the central question. The motivation is twofold. First, it has recently been shown [28] that separation and covering are key ingredients for solving some of the most difficult membership questions (see [27] for a survey). Yet, the main motivation is tied to our original goal: “understanding classes”. In this respect, separation and covering are more rewarding than membership (albeit more difficult). Intuitively, a membership algorithm for a class \mathcal{C} can only detect the languages in \mathcal{C} , while a covering algorithm provides information on how *arbitrary regular languages* interact with \mathcal{C} .

Group languages. In the paper, we look at three specific classes. The main one is the class of *group languages* GR. While natural, this class is rather unique since its only known definition is based on machines: group languages are those recognized by a finite group, or equivalently, by a *permutation automaton* [41] (a deterministic finite automaton in which each letter induces a permutation on the set of states). On the other hand, no “descriptive” definition of GR is known (*e.g.*, based on regular expressions or on logic). This makes it difficult to get an intuitive grasp about group languages, which may explain why this class remains poorly understood. We also consider two more intuitive subclasses: the first, AMT, consists of all languages recognized by *Abelian* (*i.e.*, commutative) groups. From a language theoretic point of view, these are the languages that can be defined by counting the occurrences of each letter modulo some fixed integer. The second is a subclass of AMT named MOD. A language is in MOD if membership of a word in the language only depends on its length modulo some fixed integer. Like all classes of group languages, these three classes are orthogonal and complementary to the classes for which separation and covering have been recently investigated (*i.e.*, subclasses of the star-free languages, see [27]). Indeed, only the empty and universal languages are simultaneously star-free and group languages.

Motivations. The class GR and its subclasses serve as ingredients for building more complex classes. This is well illustrated by logic: one may associate several classes to a fixed fragment of first-order logic. Each such class corresponds to a choice of *signature* (*i.e.*, the allowed predicates). For a

class of languages \mathcal{C} , define a signature $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{C}}$ as follows: each language L in \mathcal{C} gives rise to a predicate $P_L(x)$ selecting all positions x in a word w such that the prefix of w up to x (excluded) belongs to L . When \mathcal{C} is AMT or MOD, we obtain two natural signatures: the predicates of \mathbb{P}_{AMT} allow one to test, for each letter a of the alphabet, the number of a 's before position x modulo some integer. Likewise, the predicates of \mathbb{P}_{MOD} make it possible to test the value of positions modulo some integer.

More generally, given an arbitrary class \mathcal{G} of group languages, it is natural to consider the signatures $\{<\} \cup \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{G}}$ and $\{<, +1\} \cup \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{G}}$ (where “+1” denotes the successor). It was recently shown that for many fragments of first-order logic \mathcal{F} , membership and sometimes even separation and covering are decidable for $\mathcal{F}(<, \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{G}})$ and $\mathcal{F}(<, +1, \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{G}})$ as soon as *separation* is decidable for \mathcal{G} . Prominent examples include the whole first-order logic [29] (FO), the first levels $\Sigma_1, \mathcal{B}\Sigma_1, \Sigma_2$ and Σ_3 of the well-known quantifier alternation hierarchy of FO [30], [31], [32], as well as two variable first-order logic (FO²) and its whole quantifier alternation hierarchy [25]. The proofs are based on language theoretic definitions of these classes, which are built by applying operators to \mathcal{G} . Consequently, it is desirable to have *accessible language theoretic proofs* that separation is decidable for the most prominent classes of group languages: GR, AMT and MOD.

Connection with other fields. Separation by group languages is related to another area of independent interest: the decidability of separation for GR and AMT can be deduced from purely algebraic results, which were proved even before separation was considered on the side of language theory. For example, the decidability of GR separation follows from a theorem by Ash [7], who solved a conjecture of Rhodes [19], [34] in semigroup theory. In this vast field of research, there are many publications on this topic, including several alternative proofs of Ash's theorem (see *e.g.*, [16], [8], or [35] relying on [24]).

Ash's result spawned other lines of research in algebra. For instance, it motivated the computation of closures of regular languages in profinite topologies. Indeed, deciding whether such profinite closures intersect corresponds to deciding a property of subsets of finite monoids, which in turn is equivalent to deciding covering [3]. Extensions of such properties have been investigated for groups (*e.g.*, [39], [4]), Abelian groups (*e.g.*, [6], [1]) or other algebraic classes (*e.g.*, [5]).

However, this line of research is disconnected from our motivation: to obtain a direct and purely automata theoretic proof of the decidability of GR-covering, in order to understand the involved combinatorics on regular languages. In particular, we should not rely on Ash's result itself (unlike some of the work cited above). Unfortunately, the existing proofs of Ash's result do not meet our motivation. Indeed, they do not involve covering. Their use therefore requires a detour: abstract the problem as a purely algebraic/topological question, do the proof in this framework and then come back to covering.

From our perspective, this detour has several drawbacks. First, it relies on “black box” results: to get a complete proof

requires to gather and understand a lot of material. Secondly, the proofs demand a solid background on algebraic concepts and a wealth of technical machinery outside automata theory: for instance, for Ash's theorem, some proofs [7], [8] are based on the theory of inverse semigroups while others rely on topological arguments [24], [21], [35]. For these reasons, beyond their intrinsic difficulty, these proofs do not bring any intuition *at the level of languages*. This means that these results and their proofs are not satisfactory with respect to our primary objective: “understanding classes of languages”.

It has been shown that this detour can be avoided for almost all natural classes [25], [32], [31], [30]: one can work directly with languages and use only basic algebraic notions (typically, the definition of regular languages by morphisms into finite monoids and standard combinatorics on monoids). This direct approach is much more rewarding with respect to our original goal. In particular, the proofs of separation algorithms provide an explicit description of generic separators (when they exist).

Group languages are among the few classes for which it is not known whether a fully language-theoretic approach is possible. This is the question we address in this paper.

Contributions. We present self-contained proofs that covering and separation are decidable for GR, AMT and MOD. They avoid the detour through algebra and are based on new ideas that are independent of any pre-existing indirect proofs in this area. Of course, our proofs remain involved: these are hard questions. However, they rely exclusively on basic notions of automata theory, which makes them accessible to computer scientists. We work with nondeterministic finite automata (NFA). Paradoxically, we use very few algebraic notions beyond the standard definition of a group. Roughly speaking, proofs are based on word combinatorics for GR, on arithmetic for AMT, while MOD reduces to the other two for unary alphabets.

All separation and covering algorithms are neat and simple. They work directly with input languages represented by NFAs. However, it is worth mentioning that the main value of the paper lies not in the algorithms themselves, but in their proofs. Indeed, it is actually easy to derive these algorithms from the aforementioned independent algebraic results. In particular, the covering algorithm we present for GR is essentially a reformulation on automata and a simple corollary of the original algorithm obtained from Ash's theorem [7], which uses inputs represented by monoid morphisms rather than automata. Actually, we show how to deduce our algorithm from Ash's one. Furthermore, an algorithm similar to ours is given in [24]. It relies on a conjecture proved later in [35], and on an algorithm to compute closures of certain regular languages in an appropriate topology [10], [18], itself based on Stallings foldings [38]. In contrast, our new proof is direct, matching our original objective: to remain in the framework of automata throughout the whole argument. In fact, NFAs are a key ingredient of this proof: we use nondeterminism in a crucial way.

Let us illustrate the simplicity of the algorithms using GR. We present a simple construction that inputs an NFA \mathcal{A} and

outputs a new one $\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle_\varepsilon$. Then, we show that the languages recognized by two NFAs \mathcal{A}_1 and \mathcal{A}_2 can be separated by a group language if and only if the languages recognized by $\langle \mathcal{A}_1 \rangle_\varepsilon$ and $\langle \mathcal{A}_2 \rangle_\varepsilon$ do *not* intersect. Since $\langle \mathcal{A}_1 \rangle_\varepsilon$ and $\langle \mathcal{A}_2 \rangle_\varepsilon$ can be computed in polynomial time, this shows that GR-separation is in P (this goes up to PSPACE for covering as this boils down to deciding intersection between an arbitrary number of NFAs). The approach for AMT is similar with one key difference: we look at *Parikh images*. More precisely, we show that whether the languages recognized by two NFAs \mathcal{A}_1 and \mathcal{A}_2 can be separated by AMT boils down to some specific condition on the Parikh images of $\langle \mathcal{A}_1 \rangle_\varepsilon$ and $\langle \mathcal{A}_2 \rangle_\varepsilon$. The standard result that states that existential Presburger arithmetic is in NP [36] implies then that AMT-separation is in co-NP. Actually, we show that both AMT-separation and AMT-covering are co-NP-complete. Finally, we show that in the much simpler case of MOD, separation is NL-complete and covering co-NP-complete.

Organization. In Section II, we introduce preliminary definitions and a key automata construction used in all algorithms. Section III is devoted to separation and covering for the class GR of all group languages (in particular, in Section III-D, we show how to deduce our algorithm from Ash’s original one). Section IV is devoted to covering for AMT. Finally, Section V is devoted to covering for MOD.

This paper is the full version of [33].

II. PRELIMINARIES

A. Words, languages, separation and covering

Languages. We fix an arbitrary finite alphabet A for the paper. As usual, A^* denotes the set of all finite words over A , including the empty word ε . We let $A^+ = A^* \setminus \{\varepsilon\}$. For $u, v \in A^*$, we let uv be the word obtained by concatenating u and v . A *language* (over A) is a subset of A^* . Finally, a *class of languages* \mathcal{C} is a set of languages, *i.e.*, a subset of 2^{A^*} . Additionally, we say that \mathcal{C} is a *Boolean algebra* when it is closed under union, intersection and complement: for every $K, L \in \mathcal{C}$, we have $K \cup L \in \mathcal{C}$, $K \cap L \in \mathcal{C}$ and $A^* \setminus K \in \mathcal{C}$. In this paper, we consider *regular languages*: those that can be equivalently defined by finite automata, finite monoids or monadic second-order logic. We work with the definition based on automata. We shall also consider monoids in order to connect our statements to historical results. Let us recall these two definitions.

Automata. A nondeterministic finite automaton (NFA) over A is a tuple $\mathcal{A} = (Q, I, F, \delta)$ where Q is a finite set of states, $I \subseteq Q$ and $F \subseteq Q$ are sets of initial and final states, and $\delta \subseteq Q \times A \times Q$ is a set of transitions. We define the language recognized by \mathcal{A} , denoted by $L(\mathcal{A})$, as follows. Given $q, r \in Q$ and $w \in A^*$, we say that there exists a *run labeled by w from q to r* (in \mathcal{A}) if there exist $q_0, \dots, q_n \in Q$ and $a_1, \dots, a_n \in A$ such that $w = a_1 \cdots a_n$, $q_0 = q$, $q_n = r$ and $(q_{i-1}, a_i, q_i) \in \delta$ for every $1 \leq i \leq n$. Given $q, r \in Q$, we write $L(\mathcal{A}, q, r)$ for the language consisting of all words $w \in A^*$ such that there

exists a run labeled by w from q to r (note that $\varepsilon \in L(\mathcal{A}, q, q)$ for every $q \in Q$). The *language $L(\mathcal{A})$ recognized by \mathcal{A}* is $\bigcup_{q \in I} \bigcup_{r \in F} L(\mathcal{A}, q, r)$. We say that a language is *regular* when it is recognized by an NFA.

We also consider NFAs with ε -transitions. In such an NFA $\mathcal{A} = (Q, I, F, \delta)$, a transition may also be labeled by the empty word “ ε ” (that is, $\delta \subseteq Q \times (A \cup \{\varepsilon\}) \times Q$). We use the standard semantics: an ε -transition can be taken without consuming an input letter. Unless otherwise specified, the NFAs that we consider are assumed to be *without* ε -transitions.

In the examples, we represent NFAs by graphs, as usual: nodes are the states (the initial states have an incoming arrow and the final ones an outgoing arrow), and each transition (q, a, r) is depicted by an a -labeled edge from q to r .

Monoids. A *monoid* is a set M endowed with an associative multiplication $(s, t) \mapsto st$ having an identity element 1_M , *i.e.*, such that $1_M s = s 1_M = s$ for every $s \in M$. Clearly, A^* is a monoid whose multiplication is concatenation (the identity element is ε). Therefore, we may consider monoid morphisms $\alpha : A^* \rightarrow M$ where M is an arbitrary monoid: they are the mappings satisfying $\alpha(\varepsilon) = 1_M$ and $\alpha(uv) = \alpha(u)\alpha(v)$ for all $u, v \in A^*$. Given such a morphism and some language $L \subseteq A^*$, we say that L is *recognized* by α when there exists a set $F \subseteq M$ such that $L = \alpha^{-1}(F)$. It is well-known and simple to verify that a language is regular if and only if it is recognized by a morphism into a *finite* monoid.

B. Separation and covering

We now define two decision problems, which depend on an arbitrary fixed class \mathcal{C} . They are used as mathematical tools for investigating \mathcal{C} . They take finitely many regular languages as input (which we represent with NFAs in the paper).

Given two languages L_1, L_2 , we say that L_1 is \mathcal{C} -*separable* from L_2 if there exists $K \in \mathcal{C}$ such that $L_1 \subseteq K$ and $L_2 \cap K = \emptyset$. The \mathcal{C} -*separation problem* takes two regular languages L_1 and L_2 as input and asks whether L_1 is \mathcal{C} -separable from L_2 .

Covering is a generalization introduced in [26]. Given a language L , a \mathcal{C} -*cover* of L is a *finite* set of languages \mathbf{K} such that every $K \in \mathbf{K}$ belongs to \mathcal{C} and $L \subseteq \bigcup_{K \in \mathbf{K}} K$. Given a pair (L_1, \mathbf{L}_2) where L_1 is a language and \mathbf{L}_2 a *finite set of languages*, we say that (L_1, \mathbf{L}_2) is \mathcal{C} -*coverable* when there exists a \mathcal{C} -cover \mathbf{K} of L_1 such that for every $K \in \mathbf{K}$, there exists $L \in \mathbf{L}_2$ satisfying $K \cap L = \emptyset$. The \mathcal{C} -*covering problem* takes as input a regular language L_1 and a finite set of regular languages \mathbf{L}_2 and asks whether (L_1, \mathbf{L}_2) is \mathcal{C} -coverable.

Covering generalizes separation when \mathcal{C} is closed under union: in this case, one may verify that L_1 is \mathcal{C} -separable from L_2 , if and only if $(L_1, \{L_2\})$ is \mathcal{C} -coverable. Additionally, the definition of covering may be simplified when \mathcal{C} is a *Boolean algebra*: it suffices to consider the case when the language L_1 that needs to be covered is A^* . Indeed, in that case, (L_1, \mathbf{L}_2) is \mathcal{C} -coverable if and only if $(A^*, \{L_1\} \cup \mathbf{L}_2)$ is \mathcal{C} -coverable (the proof is simple, see [26]).

We say that a finite set of languages \mathbf{L} is \mathcal{C} -*coverable* when (A^*, \mathbf{L}) is \mathcal{C} -coverable. If \mathcal{C} is a Boolean algebra, the above


remark shows that \mathcal{C} -covering boils down to deciding whether a finite input set \mathbf{L} of regular languages is \mathcal{C} -coverable [26]. Also, \mathcal{C} -separation is the special case when $|\mathbf{L}| = 2$.

Remark 1. *When discussing complexity, we consider the alphabet A as part of the input.*

C. Group languages

A group is a monoid G such that every element $g \in G$ has an inverse $g^{-1} \in G$, i.e., $gg^{-1} = g^{-1}g = 1_G$. We write GR for the class of all group languages, i.e., which are recognized by a morphism into a finite group. One can verify that GR is a Boolean algebra.

Remark 2. *No language theoretic definition of GR is known (i.e., by specific regular expressions). There is however an automata-based definition: group languages are those recognized by permutation automata (i.e., which are simultaneously deterministic, co-deterministic and complete). For instance, $(ab^*a + ba^*b)^*$ is a group language. Indeed, it is recognized by the permutation automaton drawn below, and by the morphism into the symmetric group on $\{1, 2, 3\}$ that maps a to the transposition $(1, 2)$ and b to the transposition $(1, 3)$.*



We also look at two subclasses. The first one is the class MOD of modulo languages. For $w \in A^*$, we write $|w| \in \mathbb{N}$ for the length of w (its number of letters). For all $q, r \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $r < q$, we let $L_{q,r} = \{w \in A^* \mid |w| \equiv r \pmod{q}\}$. The class MOD consists of all finite unions of languages $L_{q,r}$. We turn to the class AMT of alphabet modulo testable languages. If $w \in A^*$ and $a \in A$, let $|w|_a \in \mathbb{N}$ be the number of copies of “ a ” in w . For all $q, r \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $r < q$ and all $a \in A$, let $L_{q,r}^a = \{w \in A^* \mid |w|_a \equiv r \pmod{q}\}$. We let AMT be the least class containing all languages $L_{q,r}^a$ and closed under union and intersection. It can be verified that both MOD and AMT are Boolean algebras and that $\text{MOD} \subsetneq \text{AMT} \subsetneq \text{GR}$. In the paper, we prove that covering and separation are decidable for GR, AMT and MOD. The proofs are based exclusively on elementary arguments from automata theory. We rely on a common automata-based construction, which we now present.

D. Automata-based construction

We extend A as a larger alphabet denoted by \tilde{A} . For each $a \in A$, we create a fresh letter a^{-1} (by “fresh”, we mean that $a^{-1} \notin A$) and define $A^{-1} = \{a^{-1} \mid a \in A\}$. We let \tilde{A} be the disjoint union $\tilde{A} = A \cup A^{-1}$. Observe that we have a bijection $a \mapsto a^{-1}$ from A to A^{-1} . We extend it as an involution of \tilde{A}^* : for every $a \in A$, we let $(a^{-1})^{-1} = a$. Then, for every $w = b_1b_2 \dots b_n \in \tilde{A}^*$ (with $b_1, \dots, b_n \in \tilde{A}$), we define $w^{-1} = b_n^{-1} \dots b_2^{-1}b_1^{-1}$ (we let $\varepsilon^{-1} = \varepsilon$). The map $w \mapsto w^{-1}$ is an involution of \tilde{A}^* : $(w^{-1})^{-1} = w$.

Every morphism $\alpha : A^* \rightarrow G$ into a group G can be extended as morphism $\alpha : \tilde{A}^* \rightarrow G$. For all $a^{-1} \in A^{-1}$,

we let $\alpha(a^{-1}) = (\alpha(a))^{-1}$ (i.e., $\alpha(a^{-1})$ is the inverse of $\alpha(a)$ in G). One may verify that the definition implies $\alpha(w^{-1}) = (\alpha(w))^{-1}$ for every $w \in \tilde{A}^*$. We shall use this fact implicitly.

Remark 3. *This construction is standard, and used to introduce the free group over A (which is a quotient of \tilde{A}^*). We do not need this notion. We use \tilde{A} as a syntactic tool: we build auxiliary NFAs over \tilde{A} from NFAs over A . We shall never consider arbitrary objects over \tilde{A} : all arbitrary NFAs that we encounter are implicitly assumed to be over A .*

We turn to the main construction. Let $\mathcal{A} = (Q, I, F, \delta)$ be an arbitrary NFA over the original alphabet A (i.e., $\delta \subseteq Q \times A \times Q$). We build a new NFA $\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle$ over the extended alphabet \tilde{A} . We say that two states $q, r \in Q$ are strongly connected if we have $L(\mathcal{A}, q, r) \neq \emptyset$ and $L(\mathcal{A}, r, q) \neq \emptyset$ (i.e., q and r are in the same strongly connected component of the graph representation of \mathcal{A}). This is an equivalence relation. We let $\langle \delta \rangle \subseteq Q \times \tilde{A} \times Q$ as the following extended set of transitions:

$$\langle \delta \rangle = \delta \cup \left\{ (r, a^{-1}, q) \mid \begin{array}{l} (q, a, r) \in \delta \text{ and} \\ q, r \text{ are strongly connected} \end{array} \right\}.$$

We let $\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle = (Q, I, F, \langle \delta \rangle)$, so that $L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle) \subseteq \tilde{A}^*$. Observe that for all $u \in \tilde{A}^*$ and all strongly connected $q, r \in Q$, we have $u \in L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle, q, r)$ if and only if $u^{-1} \in L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle, r, q)$. Moreover, we can compute $\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle$ from \mathcal{A} in polynomial time: this boils down to computing the pairs of strongly connected states, i.e., to directed graph reachability. The following lemma is used to “simulate” the runs in $\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle$ into the original NFA \mathcal{A} .

Lemma 4. *Let $\mathcal{A} = (Q, I, F, \delta)$ be an NFA and $\alpha : A^* \rightarrow G$ be a morphism into a finite group. For every $q, r \in Q$ and $w \in L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle, q, r) \subseteq \tilde{A}^*$, there exists a word $w' \in A^*$ such that $w' \in L(\mathcal{A}, q, r)$ and $\alpha(w) = \alpha(w')$.*

Proof. We have to show that for every $(s, a^{-1}, t) \in \langle \delta \rangle$ where $a \in A$, there exists $x \in L(\mathcal{A}, s, t)$ such that $\alpha(x) = (\alpha(a))^{-1}$. By definition of $\langle \delta \rangle$, we have $(t, a, s) \in \delta$ and s, t are strongly connected. Hence, we get $y \in L(\mathcal{A}, s, t)$. Since G is a finite group, it is standard that there exists $p \geq 1$ such that $g^p = 1_G$ for all $g \in G$. Thus, $\alpha((ay)^p) = 1_G$. Let $x = y(ay)^{p-1}$. By hypothesis on a and y , we know that $x \in L(\mathcal{A}, s, t)$. Since $\alpha(ax) = \alpha((ay)^p) = 1_G$, we obtain $\alpha(x) = (\alpha(a))^{-1}$, as desired. \square

III. COVERING FOR GROUP LANGUAGES

We prove that separation and covering are decidable for GR. Historically, this was first obtained as a corollary of a difficult independent algebraic theorem by Ash [7] (see [15] for details and [3] for the link with separation). Our algorithm is essentially the one obtained from this theorem. Yet, we choose a different presentation: our inputs are represented by NFAs whereas the original algorithm considers a single monoid morphism recognizing all inputs. In itself, the NFA-based procedure is merely a natural reformulation of the one based on monoids (see Section III-D for details). On the other

hand, we work exclusively with NFAs, which is a new idea, and nondeterminism is a key ingredient in our proof.

This proof is our main contribution. The known proofs of Ash's theorem (e.g., [7], [8], [35], [16]) are arduous. Typically, they rely on specialized notions from independent fields such as algebra, topology or model theory. Moreover, they use black box results. In contrast, our proof is direct. While still difficult, it is fully self-contained and relies only on elementary notions from automata theory and combinatorics on words.

A. Statement

The procedure is based on a theorem characterizing the finite sets of regular languages that are GR-coverable. We first extend the core construction $\mathcal{A} \mapsto \langle \mathcal{A} \rangle$ introduced in the previous section (this extension is specific to GR-covering).


Given an arbitrary NFA \mathcal{A} , we further modify the NFA $\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle$ and construct a new NFA with ε -transitions $\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle_\varepsilon$ (these are the only NFAs with ε -transitions that we consider). The definition is based on a language $L_\varepsilon \subseteq \tilde{A}^*$ that we define first. We introduce a standard rewriting rule that one may apply to words in \tilde{A}^* . If $w \in \tilde{A}^*$ contains an infix of the form aa^{-1} or $a^{-1}a$ for some $a \in A$, one may delete it. More precisely, given $w, w' \in \tilde{A}^*$, we write $w \rightarrow w'$ if there exist $x, y \in \tilde{A}^*$ and $a \in A$ such that either $w = xaa^{-1}y$ or $w = xa^{-1}ay$, and $w' = xy$. We write " $\xrightarrow{*}$ " for the reflexive transitive closure of " \rightarrow ". That is, given $w, w' \in \tilde{A}^*$, we have $w \xrightarrow{*} w'$ if $w = w'$ or there exist words $w_0, \dots, w_n \in \tilde{A}^*$ with $n \geq 1$ such that $w = w_0 \rightarrow w_1 \rightarrow w_2 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow w_n = w'$. We let $L_\varepsilon = \{w \in \tilde{A}^* \mid w \xrightarrow{*} \varepsilon\}$. This is a variant of the well-known Dyck language which is not regular (it is only context-free).

Consider an NFA $\mathcal{A} = (Q, I, F, \delta)$ and the associated NFA $\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle = (Q, I, F, \langle \delta \rangle)$. We extend $\langle \delta \rangle$ with ε -transitions. We define $\langle \delta \rangle_\varepsilon \subseteq Q \times (\tilde{A} \cup \{\varepsilon\}) \cup Q$ as follows:


$$\langle \delta \rangle_\varepsilon = \langle \delta \rangle \cup \{(q, \varepsilon, r) \mid q, r \in Q \text{ and } L_\varepsilon \cap L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle, q, r) \neq \emptyset\}.$$

Moreover, we let $\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle_\varepsilon = (Q, I, F, \langle \delta \rangle_\varepsilon)$.

Example 5. Let $L_1 = b(ab)^*$ and $L_2 = aa^*$. These languages are recognized by the following two NFAs \mathcal{A}_1 and \mathcal{A}_2 :



We compute $\langle \mathcal{A}_1 \rangle_\varepsilon$ and $\langle \mathcal{A}_2 \rangle_\varepsilon$ (omitting ε -labeled self-loops).



Note that one may compute $\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle_\varepsilon$ from $\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle$ (hence from \mathcal{A}) in polynomial time. Indeed, the construction creates a new ε -transition (q, ε, r) if and only if $L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle, q, r)$ (which is regular) intersects L_ε (which is context-free). It is standard that this

problem is decidable in polynomial time [9]. We complete the definition with two simple but useful properties.

Fact 6. Let $\mathcal{A} = (Q, I, F, \delta)$ be an NFA, $q, r \in Q$ and $w \in \tilde{A}^*$ such that $w \in L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle_\varepsilon, q, r)$. If $w \in L_\varepsilon$, then $(q, \varepsilon, r) \in \langle \delta \rangle_\varepsilon$. Also, if q, r are strongly connected, then $w^{-1} \in L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle_\varepsilon, r, q)$.

Proof. Since $w \in L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle_\varepsilon, q, r)$, the definition of $\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle_\varepsilon$ yields $u_0, \dots, u_n \in \tilde{A}^*$, $v_1, \dots, v_n \in L_\varepsilon$ and $x \in L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle, q, r)$ such that $w = u_0 \dots u_n$ and $x = u_0 v_1 u_1 \dots v_n u_n$. Assume first that $w \in L_\varepsilon$. Since $v_1, \dots, v_n \in L_\varepsilon$, we have $v_i \xrightarrow{*} \varepsilon$ for every $i \leq n$. Hence, $x \xrightarrow{*} w$ and since $w \in L_\varepsilon$, we get $x \xrightarrow{*} \varepsilon$. Since $x \in L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle, q, r)$, we get $(q, \varepsilon, r) \in \langle \delta \rangle_\varepsilon$ by definition. Assume now that q, r are strongly connected. Since $x \in L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle, q, r)$, we get $x^{-1} \in L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle, r, q)$ by definition of $\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle$. Moreover, $x^{-1} = u_n^{-1} v_n^{-1} \dots u_1^{-1} v_1^{-1} u_0^{-1}$ and since $v_i \xrightarrow{*} \varepsilon$ for all $i \leq n$, we have $v_i^{-1} \xrightarrow{*} \varepsilon$ for all $i \leq n$. Thus, $x^{-1} \in L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle, r, q)$ implies that $u_n^{-1} \dots u_0^{-1} \in L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle_\varepsilon, r, q)$. Since $u_n^{-1} \dots u_0^{-1} = w^{-1}$, this completes the proof. \square

Let us now extend Lemma 4 to this new automaton $\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle_\varepsilon$.

Lemma 7. Let $\mathcal{A} = (Q, I, F, \delta)$ be an NFA and $\alpha : A^* \rightarrow G$ be a morphism into a finite group. For every $q, r \in Q$ and $w \in L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle_\varepsilon, q, r) \subseteq \tilde{A}^*$, there exists a word $w' \in A^*$ such that $w' \in L(\mathcal{A}, q, r)$ and $\alpha(w) = \alpha(w')$.

Proof. As $w \in L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle_\varepsilon, q, r)$, there are $u_0, \dots, u_n \in \tilde{A}^*$ and $v_1, \dots, v_n \in L_\varepsilon$ such that $x = u_0 v_1 u_1 \dots v_n u_n \in L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle, q, r)$ and $w = u_0 \dots u_n$. Lemma 4 yields a word $w' \in A^*$ such that $w' \in L(\mathcal{A}, q, r)$ and $\alpha(x) = \alpha(w')$. Moreover, since $v_1, \dots, v_n \in L_\varepsilon$, we have $v_i \xrightarrow{*} \varepsilon$ for all $i \leq n$. Hence, $\alpha(v_i) = 1_G$. We get $\alpha(w) = \alpha(x) = \alpha(w')$, as desired. \square

We now state the main theorem. It characterizes GR-coverability using the construction $\mathcal{A} \mapsto \langle \mathcal{A} \rangle_\varepsilon$.

Theorem 8. Let $k \geq 1$ and let $\mathcal{A}_1, \dots, \mathcal{A}_k$ be NFAs. The following conditions are equivalent:

- 1) The set $\{L(\mathcal{A}_1), \dots, L(\mathcal{A}_k)\}$ is GR-coverable.
- 2) We have $\bigcap_{i \leq k} L(\langle \mathcal{A}_i \rangle_\varepsilon) = \emptyset$.

Clearly, the second condition in Theorem 8 can be decided. Indeed, for every $i \leq k$, we can compute $\langle \mathcal{A}_i \rangle_\varepsilon$ from \mathcal{A}_i in polynomial time. Moreover, it one can decide whether an arbitrary number of NFAs intersect (in polynomial space). Hence, we obtain as desired that GR-covering is decidable and in PSPACE (it is unknown whether this is tight). Additionally, when the number k of inputs is fixed, intersection can be decided in polynomial time. In particular, GR-separation (the case $k = 2$) is in P. We prove at the end of the section that the problem is P-complete.

Example 9. Recall the languages from Example 5. Observe that $a^{-1} \in L(\langle \mathcal{A}_1 \rangle_\varepsilon) \cap L(\langle \mathcal{A}_2 \rangle_\varepsilon)$. We deduce from Theorem 8 that no group language can separate L_1 from L_2 .

B. Proof argument

We fix a number $k \geq 1$ and for every $j \leq k$, we consider an NFA $\mathcal{A}_j = (Q_j, I_j, F_j, \delta_j)$. The two implications in the theorem are handled independently. Let us start with 1) \Rightarrow 2).

Implication 1) \Rightarrow 2). We prove the contrapositive. Assume that there exists $w \in \bigcap_{j \leq k} L(\langle \mathcal{A}_j \rangle_\varepsilon)$. We prove that $\{L(\mathcal{A}_1), \dots, L(\mathcal{A}_k)\}$ is not GR-coverable. Hence, we fix an arbitrary GR-cover \mathbf{K} of A^* and exhibit $K \in \mathbf{K}$ such that $K \cap L(\mathcal{A}_j) \neq \emptyset$ for every $j \leq k$.

For all $i \leq n$, let $\alpha_i : A^* \rightarrow G_i$ be a morphism into a finite group recognizing $K_i \in \text{GR}$. Clearly, $G = G_1 \times \dots \times G_n$ is a finite group for the componentwise multiplication and the morphism $\alpha : A^* \rightarrow G$ defined by $\alpha(w) = (\alpha_1(w), \dots, \alpha_n(w))$ recognizes all languages K_i . Since $w \in L(\langle \mathcal{A}_j \rangle_\varepsilon)$ for every $j \leq k$, Lemma 7 yields $w_j \in A^*$ such that $w_j \in L(\mathcal{A}_j)$ and $\alpha(w_j) = \alpha(w)$. Since \mathbf{K} is a cover of A^* , there exists $K \in \mathbf{K}$ such that $w_1 \in K$. Hence, since K is recognized by α and $\alpha(w_1) = \dots = \alpha(w_k) = \alpha(w)$, we get $w_1, \dots, w_k \in K$. Thus, $K \cap L(\mathcal{A}_j) \neq \emptyset$ for all $j \leq k$, as desired.

Implication 2) \Rightarrow 1). Let $Q = \bigcup_{j \leq k} Q_j$ (we assume without loss of generality that the sets Q_j are pairwise disjoint) and $\delta = \bigcup_{j \leq k} \delta_j$. Let $\mathcal{A} = (Q, \emptyset, \emptyset, \delta)$. A synchronizer (for \mathcal{A}) is a morphism $\alpha : A^* \rightarrow G$ into a finite group G such that for all $n \geq 1$ and $q_1, \dots, q_n, r_1, \dots, r_n \in Q$, if there exists $g \in G$ such that $\alpha^{-1}(g) \cap L(\mathcal{A}, q_j, r_j) \neq \emptyset$ for all $j \leq n$, then there exists $u \in \tilde{A}^*$ such that $u \in L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle_\varepsilon, q_j, r_j)$ for all $j \leq n$.

Proposition 10. *There exists a synchronizer for \mathcal{A} .*

We first use this result to prove 2) \Rightarrow 1). Assume that $\bigcap_{j \leq k} L(\langle \mathcal{A}_j \rangle_\varepsilon) = \emptyset$. By Proposition 10, there exists a synchronizer $\alpha : A^* \rightarrow G$ for \mathcal{A} . Let $\mathbf{K} = \{\alpha^{-1}(g) \mid g \in G\}$, which is a GR-cover of A^* . We show that for every $g \in G$, there exists $j \leq k$ such that $\alpha^{-1}(g) \cap L(\mathcal{A}_j) = \emptyset$. This implies as desired that $\{L(\mathcal{A}_1), \dots, L(\mathcal{A}_k)\}$ is GR-coverable. Let $g \in G$. By contradiction, assume that $\alpha^{-1}(g) \cap L(\mathcal{A}_j) \neq \emptyset$ for every $j \leq k$. For each $j \leq k$, this yields $q_j \in I_j$ and $r_j \in F_j$ such that $\alpha^{-1}(g) \cap L(\mathcal{A}, q_j, r_j) \neq \emptyset$. Since α is a synchronizer for \mathcal{A} , we obtain $u \in \tilde{A}^*$ such that $u \in L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle_\varepsilon, q_j, r_j)$ for every $j \leq k$. Since $q_j \in I_j$ and $r_j \in F_j$, it follows that $u \in L(\langle \mathcal{A}_j \rangle_\varepsilon)$ for every $j \leq k$, contradicting the hypothesis that $\bigcap_{j \leq k} L(\langle \mathcal{A}_j \rangle_\varepsilon) = \emptyset$. This concludes the main argument.

It remains to prove Proposition 10. We first define an induction parameter. We say that $(q, a, r) \in \delta$ is a *frontier transition* if the states q and r are not strongly connected. Moreover, given $q, r \in Q$ and $w \in A^*$, we associate a number $d(q, w, r) \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$. If $w \notin L(\mathcal{A}, q, r)$, we let $d(q, w, r) = \infty$. Otherwise, $w \in L(\mathcal{A}, q, r)$ and $d(q, w, r)$ is the least number $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that there is a run from q to r labeled by w in \mathcal{A} using exactly n frontier transitions. Note that $d(q, w, r) = 0$ if and only if $w \in L(\mathcal{A}, q, r)$ and q, r are strongly connected. One may verify the following fact.

Fact 11. *Let $q, r \in Q$ and $w \in A^*$ such that $w \in L(\mathcal{A}, q, r)$. Then, $d(q, w, r) \leq |Q| - 1$. Also, for all $u, v \in A^*$ if $w = uv$, there is $s \in Q$ such that $d(q, u, s) + d(s, v, r) = d(q, w, r)$.*

Let $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$. An ℓ -synchronizer is a morphism $\alpha : A^* \rightarrow G$ into a finite group G satisfying the two following properties:

- 1) for all $q, r \in Q$ and $w \in A^*$ such that $d(q, w, r) \leq \ell$ and $\alpha(w) = 1_G$, we have $\varepsilon \in L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle_\varepsilon, q, r)$.

- 2) for all $n \geq 1$, all $q_1, \dots, q_n, r_1, \dots, r_n \in Q$ and all $w_1, \dots, w_n \in A^*$ such that $\sum_{i \leq n} d(q_i, w_i, r_i) \leq \ell - 1$ and $\alpha(w_1) = \dots = \alpha(w_n)$, there exists $u \in \tilde{A}^*$ such that $u \in L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle_\varepsilon, q_i, r_i)$ for every $i \leq n$.

Remark 12. *There is a subtle difference between Properties 1 and 2. The first requires that $d(q, w, r) \leq \ell$ while the second requires that $\sum_{i \leq k} d(q_i, w_i, r_i) \leq \ell - 1$. In particular, when $\ell = 0$, the second property is trivially satisfied since $\sum_{i \leq k} d(q_i, w_i, r_i)$ cannot be smaller than -1 .*

We first show that thanks to Property 2, any ℓ -synchronizer for ℓ large enough is also a synchronizer (on the other hand, we do not need Property 1 at this stage).

Lemma 13. *Let $\mathcal{A} = (Q, \delta, I, F)$ be an NFA and $\ell = |Q|^3$. Every ℓ -synchronizer is also a synchronizer.*

Proof. Let $\alpha : A^* \rightarrow G$ be an ℓ -synchronizer. We show that it is a synchronizer. Let $q_1, \dots, q_n, r_1, \dots, r_n \in Q$ and let $g \in G$ such that $\alpha^{-1}(g) \cap L(\mathcal{A}, q_j, r_j) \neq \emptyset$ for all $j \leq n$. We exhibit $u \in \tilde{A}^*$ such that $u \in L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle_\varepsilon, q_j, r_j)$ for all $j \leq n$. Clearly, we may assume without loss of generality that for all $i, j \leq n$ such that $i \neq j$, we have $(q_i, r_i) \neq (q_j, r_j)$. This implies that $n \leq |Q|^2$. Our hypothesis yields $w_j \in \alpha^{-1}(g) \cap L(\mathcal{A}, q_j, r_j)$ for every $j \leq n$. By Fact 11, we have $d(q_j, w_j, r_j) < |Q|$. Since $n \leq |Q|^2$, it follows that $\sum_{j \leq n} d(q_j, w_j, r_j) < |Q|^3 = \ell$. Moreover, we have $\alpha(w_1) = \dots = \alpha(w_n) = g$ by definition. Hence, since α is an ℓ -synchronizer, we get $u \in \tilde{A}^*$ such that $u \in L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle_\varepsilon, q_i, r_i)$ for every $i \leq n$, as desired. \square

In view of Lemma 13, it suffices to prove that for each $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists an ℓ -synchronizer. Indeed, the case when $\ell = |Q|^3$ yields the synchronizer described in Proposition 10.

We shall use induction on $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ to build an ℓ -synchronizer (it is for this induction that Property 1 will be useful). We devote the remainder of the section to this proof. Before starting the induction, we state simple lemmas on ℓ -synchronizers.

Preliminaries. For each $q \in Q$, we define a set $L(q) \subseteq \tilde{A}^*$. For $v \in \tilde{A}^*$, we let $v \in L(q)$ if and only if there exists $q' \in Q$ such that q, q' are strongly connected and $v \in L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle_\varepsilon, q, q')$.

Lemma 14. *Let $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\beta : A^* \rightarrow H$ be an ℓ -synchronizer, let $s, t \in Q$ and let $w \in A^*$ such that $d(s, w, t) \leq \ell$. Then:*

- If $v \in L(s)$ and $\beta(w) = \beta(v)$, then $v \in L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle_\varepsilon, s, t)$.
- If $v \in L(t)$ and $\beta(w) = \beta(v)^{-1}$, then $v^{-1} \in L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle_\varepsilon, s, t)$.

Proof. For the first assertion, consider $v \in L(s)$ such that $\beta(w) = \beta(v)$. By definition of $L(s)$, we get $s' \in Q$ such that s, s' are strongly connected and $v \in L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle_\varepsilon, s, s')$. Thus, we get $v^{-1} \in L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle_\varepsilon, s', s)$ by Fact 6 and Lemma 7 yields $x \in L(\mathcal{A}, s', s)$ such that $\beta(x) = \beta(v^{-1})$. Since $d(s, w, t) \leq \ell$ and s', s are strongly connected, it follows that $d(s', xw, t) \leq \ell$. Moreover, since $\beta(w) = \beta(v)$ and $\beta(x) = \beta(v^{-1})$, we have $\beta(xw) = 1_H$. Altogether, since β is an ℓ -synchronizer, we get $\varepsilon \in L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle_\varepsilon, s', t)$ by Property 1. Since $v \in L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle_\varepsilon, s, s')$, we get $v \in L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle_\varepsilon, s, t)$ as desired.

For the second assertion, let $v \in L(t)$ and assume that $\beta(w) = (\beta(v))^{-1}$. By definition of $L(t)$, we have $t' \in Q$ such that t, t' are strongly connected and $v \in L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle_\varepsilon, t, t')$. Lemma 7 yields $y \in L(\mathcal{A}, t, t')$ such that $\beta(y) = \beta(v)$. Since $d(s, w, t) \leq \ell$ and t, t' are strongly connected, we get $d(s, wy, t') \leq \ell$. Also, $\beta(w) = (\beta(v))^{-1}$ and $\beta(y) = \beta(v)$. Thus, $\beta(wy) = 1_H$ and since β is an ℓ -synchronizer, we get $\varepsilon \in L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle_\varepsilon, s, t')$. Finally, since $v \in L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle_\varepsilon, t, t')$ and t, t' are strongly connected, we get $v^{-1} \in L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle_\varepsilon, t', t)$ by Fact 6. Altogether, we obtain $v^{-1} \in L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle_\varepsilon, s, t)$. \square

Let $\beta : A^* \rightarrow H$ be an ℓ -synchronizer. Consider $q \in Q$ and $(h, a) \in H \times A$. We say that (h, a) stabilizes q if there are $x \in A^*$ and $s \in Q$ such that $d(q, xa, s) = 0$ and $\beta(x) = h$. The next lemma follows from Lemma 14.

Lemma 15. *Let $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\beta : A^* \rightarrow H$ be an ℓ -synchronizer. Let $q \in Q$ and $(h, a) \in H \times A$ that stabilizes q . Then:*

- If $v \in L(q)$ and $\beta(v) = h$, then $va \in L(q)$.
- If $v \in L(q)$ and $\beta(v) = h\beta(a)$, then $va^{-1} \in L(q)$.

Proof. Since (h, a) stabilizes q , we have $x \in A^*$ and $s \in Q$ such that $d(q, xa, s) = 0$ and $\beta(x) = h$. Since $d(q, xa, s) = 0$, Fact 11 yields $q' \in Q$ such that $d(q, x, q') = d(q', a, s) = 0$.

Let $v \in L(q)$ such that $\beta(v) = h = \beta(x)$. Lemma 14 yields $v \in L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle_\varepsilon, q, q')$ since $d(q, x, q') = 0 \leq \ell$. Since $(q', a, s) \in \delta$, we get $va \in L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle_\varepsilon, q, s)$. This yields $va \in L(q)$ since q, s are strongly connected.

We now consider $v \in L(q)$ such that $\beta(v) = h\beta(a) = \beta(xa)$. Since $d(q, xa, s) = 0 \leq \ell$, Lemma 14 yields $v \in L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle_\varepsilon, q, s)$. Moreover, since $(q', a, s) \in \delta$ and q', s are strongly connected, we have $(s, a^{-1}, q') \in \langle \delta \rangle$ by definition. Thus, $va^{-1} \in L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle_\varepsilon, q, q')$. Since q, q' are strongly connected, this yields $va^{-1} \in L(q)$, as desired. \square

Construction of ℓ -synchronizers by induction on ℓ . We are ready to prove that for all $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists an ℓ -synchronizer.

Base case: $\ell = 0$. The definition of our 0-synchronizer is based on an equivalence. Let $q, r \in Q$. We write $q \simeq r$ when q and r are strongly connected and $\varepsilon \in L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle_\varepsilon, q, r)$.

Lemma 16. *The relation \simeq is an equivalence. Moreover, for every $q, r, q', r' \in Q$ which are strongly connected and $a \in A$, if $(q, a, q') \in \delta$ and $(r, a, r') \in \delta$, then $q \simeq r \Leftrightarrow q' \simeq r'$.*

Proof. Clearly, \simeq is reflexive: $\varepsilon \in L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle_\varepsilon, q, q)$ for every $q \in Q$. Moreover, if $q \simeq r$, then q and r are strongly connected and $\varepsilon \in L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle_\varepsilon, q, r)$. Consequently, since $\varepsilon = \varepsilon^{-1}$, Fact 6 yields $\varepsilon \in L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle_\varepsilon, r, q)$ and we get $r \simeq q$. Hence \simeq is symmetric. Finally, let $q, r, s \in Q$ such that $q \simeq r$ and $r \simeq s$. By definition, q, r, s are strongly connected, $\varepsilon \in L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle_\varepsilon, q, r)$ and $\varepsilon \in L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle_\varepsilon, r, s)$. Clearly, $\varepsilon \in L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle_\varepsilon, q, s)$ which yields $q \simeq s$ and we conclude that \simeq is transitive.

We now prove that for all $q, r, q', r' \in Q$ which are strongly connected and $a \in A$ such that $(q, a, q') \in \delta$ and $(r, a, r') \in \delta$, we have $q \simeq r \Leftrightarrow q' \simeq r'$. By definition, $(q', a^{-1}, q) \in \langle \delta \rangle$ and $(r', a^{-1}, r) \in \langle \delta \rangle$. Assume first that $q \simeq r$. We have $\varepsilon \in L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle_\varepsilon, q, r)$. Thus, $a^{-1}a \in L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle_\varepsilon, q', r')$ and since

$a^{-1}a \xrightarrow{*} \varepsilon$, Fact 6 yields $\varepsilon \in L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle_\varepsilon, q', r')$. Hence, $q' \simeq r'$. Conversely, if $q' \simeq r'$, we have $\varepsilon \in L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle_\varepsilon, q', r')$. Thus, $aa^{-1} \in L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle_\varepsilon, q, r)$ and since $aa^{-1} \xrightarrow{*} \varepsilon$, Fact 6 yields $\varepsilon \in L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle_\varepsilon, q, r)$. We get $q \simeq r$, as desired. \square

For each $q \in Q$, we write $[q]_{\simeq} \in Q/\simeq$ for the \simeq -class of q . Moreover, we let G be the group of permutations of Q/\simeq . That is, G consists of all bijections $g : Q/\simeq \rightarrow Q/\simeq$ and the multiplication is composition (the neutral element is identity). We have the following fact.

Fact 17. *For every $a \in A$, there exists an element $g_a \in G$ such that for every $q, q' \in Q$ which are strongly connected and such that $(q, a, q') \in \delta$, we have $g_a([q]_{\simeq}) = [q']_{\simeq}$.*

Proof. Consider $q \in Q$. By Lemma 16, if there exists $q' \in Q$ such that q, q' are strongly connected and $(q, a, q') \in \delta$, we know that for every $r, r' \in Q$ which are strongly connected and such that $(r, a, r') \in \delta$, we have $q \simeq r \Leftrightarrow q' \simeq r'$. Hence, we may define $g_a([q]_{\simeq}) = [q']_{\simeq}$. This yields a *partial* function $g_a : Q/\simeq \rightarrow Q/\simeq$ which satisfies the condition described in the fact and is injective. Hence, we may complete g_a into a bijection, concluding the proof. \square

We let $\alpha : A^* \rightarrow G$ be the morphism defined by $\alpha(a) = g_a$ for every $a \in A$ and show that α is a 0-synchronizer. We prove the first property in the definition (the second one is trivially satisfied when $\ell = 0$). Let $q, r \in Q$ and $w \in A^*$, such that $d(q, w, r) = 0$ and $\alpha(w) = 1_G$. By definition, $\alpha(w)$ is a permutation of Q/\simeq . Moreover, since $d(q, w, r) = 0$, we have $w \in L(\mathcal{A}, q, r)$ and q, r are strongly connected. By definition of α from Fact 17 this implies that $\alpha(w)([q]_{\simeq}) = [r]_{\simeq}$. Finally, since $\alpha(w) = 1_G$, we also have $\alpha(w)([q]_{\simeq}) = [q]_{\simeq}$. Hence, $q \simeq r$ and the definition of \simeq yields $\varepsilon \in L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle_\varepsilon, q, r)$. We conclude that α is a 0-synchronizer.

Inductive step: $\ell \geq 1$. By induction on ℓ , we know that there exists an $(\ell - 1)$ -synchronizer $\beta : A^* \rightarrow H$. We use it to construct a new morphism $\alpha : A^* \rightarrow G$ from β . Then, we prove that α is an ℓ -synchronizer.

For every pair $(h, a) \in H \times A$ and every $w \in A^*$, we let $\#_{h,a}(w) \in \mathbb{N}$ be the number of pairs $(x, y) \in A^* \times A^*$ such that $\beta(x) = h$ and $w = xay$. The definition of the morphism $\alpha : A^* \rightarrow G$ is designed with the following goal in mind: for each word $w \in A^*$, we want its image $\alpha(w) \in G$ to determine $\beta(w) \in H$ and, for every $(h, a) \in H \times A$, whether the number $\#_{h,a}(w) \in \mathbb{N}$ is even or odd. The definition is inspired by the work of Auinger [8]. We let $G = H \times \{0, 1\}^{H \times A}$. That is, every element $g \in G$ is a pair $g = (h, f)$ where $h \in H$ and $f : H \times A \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ is a function. We now equip G with a multiplication. Let $g_1, g_2 \in G$ with $g_1 = (h_1, f_1)$ and $g_2 = (h_2, f_2)$. We define $g_1 g_2 = (h_1 h_2, f)$ where $f : H \times A \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ is the function $f : (h, a) \mapsto f_1(h, a) + f_2(h_1^{-1} h, a) \pmod{2}$. One may verify that G is indeed a group for this multiplication (technically, G is a wreath product, see e.g., [2]). For every $w \in A^*$, let $f_w : H \times A \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ be the function defined by $f_w(h, a) = \#_{h,a}(w) \pmod{2}$. One may now verify that the

map $\alpha : A^* \rightarrow G$ defined by $\alpha(w) = (\beta(w), f_w)$ is a monoid morphism. It remains to show that it is an ℓ -synchronizer.

We first explain how to exploit the definition of α . A key point is that we are interested in special pairs $(h, a) \in H \times A$. Given $F \subseteq H$, we say that such a pair (h, a) is F -alternating when $h \in F \Leftrightarrow h\beta(a) \notin F$. Moreover, we say that a word $w \in A^*$ is F -safe if $\#_{h,a}(w)$ is even for every F -alternating pair $(h, a) \in H \times A$. By definition, the image $\alpha(w) \in G$ determines whether w is F -safe or not. In the latter case, we get an F -alternating pair (h, a) such that $\#_{h,a}(w)$ is odd (and thus, $\#_{h,a}(w) \geq 1$). In the former, we use the next lemma.

Lemma 18. *Let $F \subseteq H$ such that $1_H \in F$. For every $w \in A^*$ which is F -safe, $\beta(w) \in F$.*

Proof. We prove a stronger property. For every $w \in A^*$, we write $\#_F(w) \in \mathbb{N}$ for the sum of all numbers $\#_{h,a}(w)$ where $(h, a) \in H \times A$ is F -alternating. We prove that for $w \in A^*$, we have $\beta(w) \in F \Leftrightarrow \#_F(w)$ is even. This implies the lemma: if w is F -safe, then $\#_F(w)$ is even which yields $\beta(w) \in F$.

We use induction on the length of $w \in A^*$. If $w = \varepsilon$, then $\beta(w) = 1_H \in F$ and $\#_F(w) = 0$. Thus, the property is trivially satisfied. Assume now that $w \in A^+$. This yields $v \in A^*$ and $a \in A$ such that $w = va$. Clearly, $|v| < |w|$ which yields $\beta(v) \in F \Leftrightarrow \#_F(v)$ is even by induction. It follows that $\beta(v) \notin F \Leftrightarrow \#_F(v)$ is odd. There are two cases. First, assume that $(\beta(v), a)$ is F -alternating. In that case, since $w = va$, it follows that $\beta(w) \in F \Leftrightarrow \beta(v) \notin F$ and $\#_F(w) = \#_F(v) + 1$ (i.e., $\#_F(w)$ is even $\Leftrightarrow \#_F(v)$ is odd). Thus, we may combine the equivalences to get $\beta(w) \in F \Leftrightarrow \#_F(w)$ is even as desired. Assume now that $(\beta(v), a)$ is not F -alternating. In that case, as $w = va$, we get $\beta(w) \in F \Leftrightarrow \beta(v) \in F$ and $\#_F(w) = \#_F(v)$ (thus, $\#_F(w)$ is even $\Leftrightarrow \#_F(v)$ is even). Hence, we may again combine the equivalences to get $\beta(w) \in F \Leftrightarrow \#_F(w)$ is even, as desired. \square

We now present the sets $F \subseteq H$ to be used in Lemma 18. Recall that for each $q \in Q$, the language $L(q) \subseteq \tilde{A}^*$ consists of all words $v \in \tilde{A}^*$ satisfying $v \in L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle_\varepsilon, q, q')$ for some $q' \in Q$ such that q, q' are strongly connected. To each $S \subseteq Q$, we associate a set $F_S \subseteq H$ as follows,

$$F_S = \left\{ \beta(v) \mid v \in \bigcap_{q \in S} L(q) \right\}.$$

A key point is that $1_H \in F_S$ for all $S \subseteq Q$. Indeed, $\varepsilon \in L(q)$ for all $q \in Q$ since $\varepsilon \in L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle_\varepsilon, q, q)$. Hence, Lemma 18 applies to F_S . Finally, we present a corollary of Lemma 15. Recall that $(h, a) \in H \times A$ stabilizes q if there exist $x, y \in A^*$ and $s \in Q$ such that $d(q, xay, s) = 0$ and $\beta(x) = h$.

Corollary 19. *If $S \subseteq Q$ and $(h, a) \in H \times A$ is F_S -alternating, there exists $q \in S$ such that (h, a) does not stabilize q .*

Proof. By contradiction, assume that (h, a) stabilizes q for all $q \in S$. We show that $h \in F_S \Leftrightarrow h\beta(a) \in F_S$, contradicting the hypothesis that (h, a) is F_S -alternating. Assume first that $h \in F_S$. By definition, this yields $v \in \bigcap_{q \in S} L(q)$ such that $\beta(v) = h$. As (h, a) stabilizes q for all $q \in S$, the first assertion

in Lemma 15 yields $va \in \bigcap_{q \in S} L(q)$. Thus, $h\beta(a) \in F_S$. Conversely assume that $h\beta(a) \in F_S$. By definition, this yields $v' \in \tilde{A}^*$ such that $v' \in L(q)$ for all $q \in S$ and $\beta(v') = h\beta(a)$. Since (h, a) stabilizes q for all $q \in S$, the second assertion in Lemma 15 yields $v'a^{-1} \in \bigcap_{q \in S} L(q)$. Thus, $h \in F_S$, as desired. \square

We are ready to prove that α is an ℓ -synchronizer. There are two conditions to prove.

Condition 1. Let $q, r \in Q$ and $w \in A^*$ such that $d(q, w, r) \leq \ell$ and $\alpha(w) = 1_G$. We show that $\varepsilon \in L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle_\varepsilon, q, r)$. We have $\beta(w) = 1_H$ by definition of α . Hence, since β is an $(\ell - 1)$ -synchronizer, the result is immediate when $d(q, w, r) \leq \ell - 1$. We assume from now on that $d(q, w, r) = \ell$.

Since $\ell \geq 1$, w is nonempty. Let $a_1, \dots, a_n \in A$ such that $w = a_1 \cdots a_n$. By Fact 11, we have $q_0, \dots, q_n \in Q$ such that $q_0 = q$, $q_n = r$ and $\sum_{1 \leq k \leq n} d(q_{k-1}, a_k, q_k) = d(q, w, r) = \ell$. This means that there are exactly ℓ indices $k < n$ such that $(q_{k-1}, a_k, q_k) \in \delta$ is a frontier transition. For $0 \leq k \leq n$, we let $x_k = a_1 \cdots a_k$ and $y_k = a_{k+1} \cdots a_n$ (we let $x_0 = y_n = \varepsilon$). Clearly, $w = x_k y_k$. We let $h_k = \beta(x_k)$ for every $k \leq n$. Note that since $\beta(w) = 1_H$, we also know that $\beta(y_k) = h_k^{-1}$.

Let $i \leq n$ be the least index such that (q_{i-1}, a_i, q_i) is a frontier transition. Let $j \leq n$ be the greatest index such that (q_{j-1}, a_j, q_j) is a frontier transition. Clearly, $1 \leq i \leq j \leq n$ ($i = j$, if $\ell = 1$). By definition, we have the following fact.

Fact 20. *Let $k \leq n$. If $i \leq k$, then $d(q_k, y_k, r) \leq \ell - 1$. If $k < j$, then $d(q, x_k, q_k) \leq \ell - 1$.*

The hypothesis that $\alpha(w) = 1_G$ implies the next lemma.

Lemma 21. *One of the three following properties holds:*

- 1) *there exists k such that $i \leq k < j$ and $h_k \in F_{\{q, r\}}$, or*
- 2) *$h_{i-1} \in F_{\{q, r\}}$ and (h_{i-1}, a_i) stabilizes r , or*
- 3) *$h_j \in F_{\{q, r\}}$ and (h_{j-1}, a_j) stabilizes q .*

Proof. Since $\alpha(w) = 1_G$ and $w = x_j y_j$, it follows that $\alpha(x_j) = \alpha(y_j^{-1})$. Moreover, $y_j \in L(\mathcal{A}, q_j, r)$. Consequently, $y_j^{-1} \in L(\mathcal{A}, r, q_j)$ since q_j, r are strongly connected by definition of j . Thus, Lemma 4 yields $z \in L(\mathcal{A}, q_j, r)$ such that $\alpha(z) = \alpha(y_j^{-1}) = \alpha(x_j)$. For all $(h, a) \in H \times A$, we have the following two properties:

- By definition of i , we have $d(q, x_{i-1}, q_{i-1}) = 0$. Thus, if $\#_{h,a}(x_{i-1}) \geq 1$, then (h, a) stabilizes q .
- By definition of j , we have $d(r, z, q_j) = 0$. Thus, if $\#_{h,a}(z) \geq 1$, then (h, a) stabilizes r .

We use these properties and their contrapositives repeatedly. We consider two cases depending on whether x_i is $F_{\{q, r\}}$ -safe.

Case 1: x_i is $F_{\{q, r\}}$ -safe. We know that $h_i = \beta(x_i) \in F_{\{q, r\}}$ by Lemma 18. Clearly, if $i < j$, then Assertion 1 in the lemma holds for $k = i$ and we are finished. Assume now that $i = j$. Let $(h, a) = (h_{i-1}, a_i) = (h_{j-1}, a_j)$. The argument depends on whether $\#_{h,a}(x_{i-1}) \geq 1$ or not. If $\#_{h,a}(x_{i-1}) \geq 1$, then $(h, a) = (h_{j-1}, a_j)$ stabilizes q . Thus, Assertion 3 in the lemma holds as $h_j = h_i \in F_{\{q, r\}}$. Otherwise, $\#_{h,a}(x_{i-1}) = 0$. Since $x_i = x_{i-1} a_i$ and $(h, a) = (h_{i-1}, a_i)$, it follows that

$\#_{h,a}(x_i) = 1$. Thus, $\#_{h,a}(x_i)$ is odd and since x_i is $F_{\{q,r\}}$ -safe, it follows that (h, a) is *not* $F_{\{q,r\}}$ -alternating. Since $h\beta(a) = h_i \in F_{\{q,r\}}$, we also have $h_{i-1} = h \in F_{\{q,r\}}$. Finally, as $x_i = x_j$, we have $\alpha(x_i) = \alpha(x_j) = \alpha(z)$. Thus, as $\#_{h,a}(x_i) = 1$, we get that $\#_{h,a}(z)$ is odd by definition of α . Hence, $\#_{h,a}(z) \geq 1$ which yields that $(h_{i-1}, a_i) = (h, a)$ stabilizes r . As $h_{i-1} \in F_{\{q,r\}}$, it follows that Assertion 2 holds.

Case 2: x_i is not $F_{\{q,r\}}$ -safe. The argument depends on whether x_{i-1} is $F_{\{q,r\}}$ -safe or not. Assume first that x_{i-1} is $F_{\{q,r\}}$ -safe. Lemma 18 yields $h_{i-1} = \beta(x_{i-1}) \in F_{\{q,r\}}$. If there exists k such that $i \leq k < j$ and $h_k = h_{i-1}$, then Assertion 1 in the lemma holds. Otherwise, we have $\#_{h_{i-1}, a_i}(x_i) = \#_{h_{i-1}, a_i}(x_j)$. By hypothesis, $x_i = x_{i-1}a_i$ is not $F_{\{q,r\}}$ -safe while x_{i-1} is $F_{\{q,r\}}$ -safe. Thus, (h_{i-1}, a_i) is $F_{\{q,r\}}$ -alternating and $\#_{h_{i-1}, a_i}(x_i) = \#_{h_{i-1}, a_i}(x_j)$ is odd. Since $\alpha(z) = \alpha(x_j)$, it follows that $\#_{h_{i-1}, a_i}(z)$ is also odd by definition of α . Thus, $\#_{h_{i-1}, a_i}(z) \geq 1$ which implies that (h_{i-1}, a_i) stabilizes r . Since $h_{i-1} \in F_{\{q,r\}}$, Assertion 2 in the lemma holds.

Finally, assume that x_{i-1} is not $F_{\{q,r\}}$ -safe: we have (h, a) which is $F_{\{q,r\}}$ -alternating and such that $\#_{h,a}(x_{i-1})$ is odd. Since $x_i = x_{i-1}a_i$ is not $F_{\{q,r\}}$ -safe as well, we may choose (h, a) so that $(h, a) \neq (h_{i-1}, a_i)$. Thus, $\#_{h,a}(x_i)$ is odd as well. Since $\#_{h,a}(x_{i-1}) \geq 1$, we know that (h, a) stabilizes q . By Corollary 19 it follows that (h, a) does *not* stabilize r . This implies $\#_{h,a}(z) = 0$ and since $\alpha(z) = \alpha(x_j)$, it follows that $\#_{h,a}(x_j)$ is even. Since $\#_{h,a}(x_i)$ is odd, this yields k such that $i \leq k < j$ and $(h_k, a_{k+1}) = (h, a)$. Since (h, a) is $F_{\{q,r\}}$ -alternating either $h_k \in F_{\{q,r\}}$ or $h_{k+1} = h_k\beta(a_{k+1}) \in F_{\{q,r\}}$. If $h_k \in F_{\{q,r\}}$, Assertion 1 holds. If $h_{k+1} \in F_{\{q,r\}}$, then either $i \leq k < j-1$ and Assertion 1 in the lemma holds, or $k = j-1$ which means that $h_j = h_{k+1} \in F_{\{q,r\}}$ and $(h_{j-1}, a_j) = (h, a)$ which stabilizes q : Assertion 3 in the lemma holds. \square

We may now prove that $\varepsilon \in L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle_\varepsilon, q, r)$. We treat the three cases depicted in Lemma 21 independently. First, assume that there exists k such that $i \leq k < j$ and $h_k \in F_{\{q,r\}}$. The definition of $F_{\{q,r\}}$ yields $v \in L(q) \cap L(r)$ such that $\beta(v) = h_k$. It follows from Fact 20 that $d(q, x_k, q_k) \leq \ell - 1$. Therefore, since $v \in L(q)$ and $\beta(x_k) = h_k = \beta(v)$, Lemma 14 implies that $v \in L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle_\varepsilon, q, q_k)$. Symmetrically, Fact 20 yields $d(q_k, y_k, r) \leq \ell - 1$. Thus, since we have $v \in L(r)$ and $\beta(y_k) = h_k^{-1} = (\beta(v))^{-1}$, it follows from Lemma 14 that $v^{-1} \in L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle_\varepsilon, q_k, r)$. Hence, $vv^{-1} \in L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle_\varepsilon, q, r)$. Since $vv^{-1} \xrightarrow{*} \varepsilon$, Fact 6 yields $(q, \varepsilon, r) \in \langle \delta \rangle_\varepsilon$ concluding this case.

In the second case, $h_{i-1} \in F_{\{q,r\}}$ and (h_{i-1}, a_i) stabilizes r . By definition of $F_{\{q,r\}}$, we have $v \in L(q) \cap L(r)$ such that $\beta(v) = h_{i-1}$. We have $d(q, x_{i-1}, q_{i-1}) = 0$ by definition of i . Thus, as $v \in L(q)$ and $\beta(x_{i-1}) = \beta(v)$, Lemma 14 yields $v \in L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle_\varepsilon, q, q_{i-1})$. Moreover, since (h_{i-1}, a_i) stabilizes r , $v \in L(r)$ and $\beta(v) = h_{i-1}$, Lemma 15 implies that $va_i \in L(r)$. Fact 20 yields $d(q_i, y_i, r) \leq \ell - 1$. Thus, since $va_i \in L(r)$ and $\beta(y_i) = h_i^{-1} = (\beta(va_i))^{-1}$, Lemma 14 yields $(va_i)^{-1} \in L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle_\varepsilon, q_i, r)$. Hence, since $(q_{i-1}, a_i, q_i) \in \delta$, we get $va_i(va_i)^{-1} \in L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle_\varepsilon, q, r)$. Since $va_i(va_i)^{-1} \xrightarrow{*} \varepsilon$, it follows that $(q, \varepsilon, r) \in \langle \delta \rangle_\varepsilon$ by Fact 6, concluding this case.

In the last case, $h_j \in F_{\{q,r\}}$ and (h_{j-1}, a_j) stabilizes q . By definition, we get $v \in L(q) \cap L(r)$ such that $\beta(v) = h_j$. We have $d(q_j, y_j, r) = 0$ by definition of j . As $v \in L(r)$ and $\beta(y_j) = h_j^{-1} = \beta(v)^{-1}$, we get $v^{-1} \in L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle_\varepsilon, q_j, r)$ by Lemma 14. Moreover, we know that (h_{j-1}, a_j) stabilizes q , $v \in L(q)$ and $\beta(v) = h_j = h_{j-1}\beta(a_j)$. Thus, $va_j^{-1} \in L(q)$ by Lemma 15. We have $d(q, x_{j-1}, q_{j-1}) \leq \ell - 1$ by Fact 20. Thus, since $va_j^{-1} \in L(q)$ and $\beta(x_{j-1}) = h_{j-1} = \beta(va_j^{-1})$, it follows from Lemma 14 that $va_j^{-1} \in L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle_\varepsilon, q, q_{j-1})$. Since $(q_{j-1}, a_j, q_j) \in \delta$, we obtain $va_j^{-1}a_jv^{-1} \in L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle_\varepsilon, q, r)$. Thus, since $va_j^{-1}a_jv^{-1} \xrightarrow{*} \varepsilon$, Fact 6 yields $(q, \varepsilon, r) \in \langle \delta \rangle_\varepsilon$ as desired. This concludes the proof for the first condition.

Condition 2. Consider $q_1, \dots, q_n \in Q$, $r_1, \dots, r_n \in Q$ and $w_1, \dots, w_n \in A^*$ such that $\sum_{i \leq n} d(q_i, w_i, r_i) \leq \ell - 1$ and $\alpha(w_1) = \dots = \alpha(w_n)$. We need to exhibit $u \in \tilde{A}^*$ such that $u \in L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle_\varepsilon, q_i, r_i)$ for every $i \leq k$. By definition of α , we have $\beta(w_1) = \dots = \beta(w_n)$. Let $S = \{q_1, \dots, q_n\}$. There are two cases depending on whether w_1 is F_S -safe or not.

Assume first that w_1 is F_S -safe. By Lemma 18, it follows that $\beta(w_1) \in F_S$. We get $u \in \tilde{A}^*$ such that $u \in \bigcap_{i \leq n} L(q_i)$ and $\beta(u) = \beta(w_1) = \dots = \beta(w_n)$. Since $d(q_i, w_i, r_i) \leq \ell - 1$ by hypothesis, Lemma 14 yields $u \in L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle_\varepsilon, q_i, r_i)$ for every $i \leq k$, concluding this case.

Conversely, we assume that w_1 is *not* F_S -safe. By definition, this yields an F_S -alternating pair (h, a) such that $\#_{h,a}(w_1)$ is odd. By definition of α , it follows that $\#_{h,a}(w_i)$ is odd as well for every index $i \leq n$ since $\alpha(w_1) = \alpha(w_i)$. Therefore, we have $\#_{h,a}(w_i) \geq 1$ for every $i \leq n$. We get $x_i, y_i \in A^*$ such that $w_i = x_i a y_i$ and $\beta(x_i) = h$. Since $d(q_i, w_i, r_i) \in \mathbb{N}$, we get $d(q_i, x_i, s_i) + d(s_i, a, t_i) + d(t_i, y_i, r_i) = d(q_i, w_i, r_i)$ for $s_i, t_i \in Q$ by Fact 11. Thus, $d(t_i, y_i, r_i) \leq d(q_i, w_i, r_i)$ for all $i \leq k$. Also, (h, a) is F_S -alternating and $S = \{q_1, \dots, q_n\}$. Hence, Corollary 19 yields $j \leq k$ such that (h, a) does not stabilize q_j . As $\#_{h,a}(x_j a) \geq 1$, we get $d(q_j, x_j a, t_j) \geq 1$ which yields the *strict* inequality $d(t_j, y_j, r_j) < d(q_j, w_j, r_j)$. Altogether, we obtain $\sum_{i \leq k} d(t_i, y_i, r_i) < \sum_{i \leq k} d(q_i, w_i, r_i)$. By hypothesis, this implies that $\sum_{i \leq k} d(t_i, y_i, r_i) \leq (\ell - 1) - 1$. Moreover, H is a group, $\beta(x_1 a) = \dots = \beta(x_n a) = h\beta(a)$ and $\beta(w_1) = \dots = \beta(w_n)$. Hence, $\beta(y_1) = \dots = \beta(y_n)$ and since β is an $(\ell - 1)$ -synchronizer, we obtain $z \in \tilde{A}^*$ such that $z \in L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle_\varepsilon, t_i, r_i)$ for every $i \leq k$.

We now consider two subcases. Since the pair (h, a) is F_S -alternating, either $h \in F_S$ or $h\beta(a) \in F_S$. If $h \in F_S$, we get a word $v \in \bigcap_{i \leq k} L(q_i)$ such that $\beta(v) = h = \beta(x_i)$ for all $i \leq n$. Thus, since $d(q_i, x_i, s_i) \leq d(q_i, w_i, r_i) \leq \ell - 1$, Lemma 14 yields $v \in L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle_\varepsilon, q_i, s_i)$ for all $i \leq k$. Moreover, we have $(s_i, a, t_i) \in \delta$. Altogether, it follows that $v a z \in L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle_\varepsilon, q_i, r_i)$ for every $i \leq k$. This concludes the first subcase. Finally, assume that $h\beta(a) \in F_S$. This yields $v' \in \bigcap_{i \leq k} L(q_i)$ such that $\beta(v') = h\beta(a) = \beta(x_i a)$ for all $i \leq n$. Since we know that $d(q_i, x_i a, t_i) \leq d(q_i, w_i, r_i) \leq \ell - 1$, Lemma 14 yields $v' \in L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle_\varepsilon, q_i, t_i)$ for every $i \leq k$. Altogether, it follows that $v' z \in L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle_\varepsilon, q_i, r_i)$ for every $i \leq k$. This completes the proof of Proposition 10.

C. P-completeness

We prove that GR-separation is P-complete. We already proved that it is in P. We show that it is P-hard, even when one of the two inputs is the singleton $\{\varepsilon\}$. We reduce the Monotone Circuit Value problem, a variant of the Circuit Value Problem in which all gates are either a disjunction (\vee) or a conjunction (\wedge). It is known to be P-complete [13]. Let us describe it.

A *Boolean circuit* is a finite directed acyclic graph such that:

- There are *input vertices* with no incoming edge and labeled by truth values (0 for *false*, 1 for *true*).
- The other vertices have exactly two incoming edges. They are called *gates* and are labeled by a logical connective: “ \vee ” or “ \wedge ”. They have arbitrarily many outgoing edges.
- There is a single gate with no outgoing edge. It is called the *output vertex*.

We present an Example of a Boolean circuit in Figure 1 below.





Fig. 1. An example of a Boolean circuit, which evaluates to 0.


A Boolean circuit computes a truth value for each gate. The decision problem takes as input a Boolean circuit C and asks if the value computed by the output vertex is true. We present a logarithmic space reduction from this problem to *non-separability* by GR. Given as input a Boolean circuit C , we construct an NFA \mathcal{A}_C such that C evaluates to true if and only if $\{\varepsilon\}$ is not GR-separable from $L(\mathcal{A}_C)$. This implies that GR-separation is P-hard, as desired. We only present the construction of \mathcal{A}_C . That it can be implemented in logarithmic space is straightforward and left to the reader.

We fix C and describe the NFA $\mathcal{A}_C = (Q, I, F, \delta)$. We let n be the number of vertices in C and $\{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$ be the set of all these vertices, with v_n as the output vertex. The NFA \mathcal{A} uses an alphabet $A = \{a_1, \dots, a_n\}$ of size n . For each $i \leq n$, the set of states Q contains three states q_i, r_i and s_i associated to the vertex v_i (note that s_i is only useful when v_i is a gate labeled by “ \wedge ”). Moreover, we also associate several transitions in δ connecting these three states to those associated to other vertices. There are several cases depending on v_i .

First, assume that v_i is an input vertex. If v_i is labeled by “0” (false), we add the following transition to \mathcal{A}_C :




If v_i is labeled by “1”, we add the following transitions:



Assume now that v_i is a gate. Let $j, k \leq n$ be the two indices such that C contains edges from v_j to v_i and from v_k to v_i . If v_i is labeled by “ \vee ”, we add the following transitions to \mathcal{A}_C :



If v_i is labeled by “ \wedge ”, we add the following transitions:



We let $\mathcal{A}_C = (Q, \{q_n\}, \{r_n\}, \delta)$. One may verify that the output vertex v_n of C evaluates to *true* if and only if $\{\varepsilon\}$ is not GR-separable from $L(\mathcal{A}_C)$. Note that the proof argument does not look at GR-separation directly: we use Theorem 8 instead. Indeed, it implies that $\{\varepsilon\}$ is not GR-separable from $L(\mathcal{A}_C)$ if and only if $\varepsilon \in L(\langle \mathcal{A}_C \rangle_\varepsilon)$. It is straightforward to verify that the latter property holds if and only if the output vertex of C evaluates to *true*. One use induction to show that each gate i evaluates to *true* if and only if $\varepsilon \in L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle_\varepsilon, q_i, r_i)$. This completes the presentation of our reduction.

D. Connection with Ash’s historical result

We compare Theorem 8 with the historical GR-covering algorithm that can be deduced from Ash’s results. We prove that the former is essentially a reformulation of the latter.

Preliminaries. Let \mathcal{C} be a Boolean algebra and $\alpha : A^* \rightarrow M$ be a morphism into a finite monoid. We define $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{C}}[\alpha] \subseteq 2^M$ as the set of all subsets $S \subseteq M$ such that $\{\alpha^{-1}(s) \mid s \in S\}$ is *not* \mathcal{C} -coverable. It carries enough information to decide \mathcal{C} -covering for every input set consisting only of languages recognized by α . More precisely, for $F_1, \dots, F_n \subseteq M$, one may verify that $\{\alpha^{-1}(F_i) \mid i \leq n\}$ is not \mathcal{C} -coverable if and only if there is $S \in \mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{C}}[\alpha]$ such that $S \cap F_i \neq \emptyset$ for all $i \leq n$.

Thus, a procedure computing $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{C}}[\alpha] \subseteq 2^M$ from an input morphism $\alpha : A^* \rightarrow M$ yields an algorithm for \mathcal{C} -covering. Given a finite set of languages \mathbf{H} , one first computes a single morphism $\alpha : A^* \rightarrow M$ recognizing all $H \in \mathbf{H}$ (this is straightforward). Then, one computes $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{C}}[\alpha] \subseteq 2^M$. It carries enough information to decide whether \mathbf{H} is \mathcal{C} -coverable.

Historical algorithm. Ash’s results [7] yield a characterization of $\mathcal{J}_{\text{GR}}[\alpha]$. We present this characterization (we use a formulation taken from [15]) and prove that Theorem 8 is a natural reformulation on automata and a simple corollary.

We need weak inverses (they are the counterpart of automata construction $\mathcal{A} \mapsto \langle \mathcal{A} \rangle$ of Section II). Let $\alpha : A^* \rightarrow M$ be a morphism into a finite monoid. For $s \in M$, a *weak inverse* of s in an element $t \in M$ such that $tst = t$. We use this definition to associate a second morphism $\gamma_\alpha : \tilde{A}^* \rightarrow 2^M$ over the extended alphabet \tilde{A} . For $a \in A$, we let,

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_\alpha(a) &= \{\alpha(a)\} \in 2^M, \\ \gamma_\alpha(a^{-1}) &= \{s \in \alpha(A^*) \mid s \text{ is a weak inverse of } \alpha(a)\}. \end{aligned}$$

We now present the characterization. Recall that we write $L_\varepsilon = \{w \in \tilde{A}^* \mid w \xrightarrow{*} \varepsilon\}$ (see Section III). We extend this notation to all words $u \in \tilde{A}^*$: we let $L_u = \{w \in \tilde{A}^* \mid w \xrightarrow{*} u\}$.

Theorem 22 ([7], [15]). *Let $\alpha : A^* \rightarrow M$ be a morphism into a finite monoid. Then, $\mathcal{J}_{\text{GR}}[\alpha] \subseteq 2^M$ consists of all sets $\bigcup_{w \in L_u} \gamma_\alpha(w) \subseteq M$ for $u \in \tilde{A}^*$.*

Remark 23. *It is simple to verify that this yields an algorithm for computing $\mathcal{J}_{\text{GR}}[\alpha]$ from α . Roughly, one first needs to verify that the set $S_\varepsilon = \bigcup_{w \in L_\varepsilon} \gamma_\alpha(w)$ can be computed using a least fixpoint procedure (this is the counterpart of the construction $A \mapsto \langle A \rangle_\varepsilon$ in Theorem 8). Then, Theorem 22 implies that $\mathcal{J}_{\text{GR}}[\alpha]$ is the least subset of 2^M closed under multiplication and containing S_ε and all sets $\gamma_\alpha(b)$ for $b \in \tilde{A}$. It can be computed using again a least fixpoint procedure.*

Let us explain why Theorem 22 implies Theorem 8. Let $k \geq 1$ and $\mathcal{A}_j = (Q_j, I_j, F_j, \delta_j)$ a NFA for $1 \leq j \leq k$. Theorem 8 states that $\{L(\mathcal{A}_j) \mid j \leq k\}$ is GR-coverable if and only if $\bigcap_{j \leq k} L(\langle \mathcal{A}_j \rangle_\varepsilon) = \emptyset$. We use Theorem 22 to prove the right to left implication (the converse is simple as seen in Section III). Actually, we prove the contrapositive. Assume that $\{L(\mathcal{A}_j) \mid j \leq k\}$ is not GR-coverable. We show that $\bigcap_{i \leq k} L(\langle \mathcal{A}_i \rangle_\varepsilon) \neq \emptyset$.

First, we build a morphism recognizing all languages $L(\mathcal{A}_j)$ (we use the standard transition morphism construction). Let $Q = \bigcup_{j \leq k} Q_j$ (we assume that the sets Q_j are pairwise disjoint) and $\delta = \bigcup_{j \leq k} \delta_j$. Let $\mathcal{A} = (Q, \emptyset, \emptyset, \delta)$. Let $M = 2^{Q^2}$ be the monoid equipped with the standard multiplication: for $P, P' \in 2^{Q^2}$, we let PP' as the set of all pairs $(q, s) \in Q^2$ such that $(q, r) \in P$ and $(r, s) \in P'$ for some $r \in Q$ (the set $\{(q, q) \mid q \in Q\}$ is the identity element). It is standard that the map $\alpha : A^* \rightarrow M$ defined by $\alpha(w) = \{(q, r) \mid w \in L(\mathcal{A}, q, r)\}$ is a morphism. One may verify that $L(\mathcal{A}_j) = \alpha^{-1}(\{P \in 2^{Q^2} \mid P \cap (I_j \times F_j) \neq \emptyset\})$ for every $j \leq k$. The proof is based on the following simple lemma. It connects the NFA $\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle_\varepsilon$ to weak inverses.

Lemma 24. *Let $a \in A$ and let $P \in \alpha(A^*)$ be a weak inverse of $\alpha(a)$. For all $(q, r) \in P$, we have $a^{-1} \in L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle_\varepsilon, q, r)$.*

Proof. Let $P_a = \alpha(a)$ and $u \in \alpha^{-1}(P)$. By hypothesis, $PP_aP = P$. Thus P_aP is idempotent. Since $\alpha(au) = P_aP$, we get $\alpha((au)^n) = P_aP$ and $\alpha(u(au)^n) = PP_aP = P$ for all $n \geq 1$. As $(q, r) \in P$, this yields $u(au)^n \in L(\mathcal{A}, q, r)$ for all $n \geq 1$. Thus, a pumping argument yields $s \in Q$ and $h, i, j \geq 1$ such that $u(au)^h \in L(\mathcal{A}, q, s)$, $(au)^i \in L(\mathcal{A}, s, s)$ and $(au)^j \in L(\mathcal{A}, s, r)$. Since $\alpha((au)^n) = P_aP = \alpha(au)$ for all $n \geq 1$, we get $uau \in L(\mathcal{A}, q, s)$, $au \in L(\mathcal{A}, s, s)$ and $au \in L(\mathcal{A}, s, r)$. The second property yields $t \in Q$ such that $a \in L(\mathcal{A}, s, t)$ and $u \in L(\mathcal{A}, t, s)$. Clearly, s and t are strongly connected. Hence, we get $u^{-1} \in L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle, s, t)$ and $a^{-1} \in L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle, t, s)$ by definition of $\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle$. Altogether, we obtain that $w_1 = uauu^{-1}a^{-1}u^{-1} \in L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle, q, t)$ and $w_2 = u^{-1}a^{-1}au \in L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle, s, r)$. Since $w_i \xrightarrow{*} \varepsilon$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$, we get the ε -transitions $(q, \varepsilon, t), (s, \varepsilon, r) \in \langle \delta \rangle_\varepsilon$. Together with $a^{-1} \in L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle, t, s)$, this yields $a^{-1} \in L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle_\varepsilon, q, r)$. \square

We prove that $\bigcap_{j \leq k} L(\langle \mathcal{A}_j \rangle_\varepsilon) \neq \emptyset$. Since $\{L(\mathcal{A}_j) \mid j \leq k\}$ is not GR-coverable, we get $S \in \mathcal{J}_{\text{GR}}[\alpha]$ such that for all $j \leq k$, there is $P_j \in S$ such that $P_j \cap (I_j \times F_j) \neq \emptyset$. Theorem 22 yields $u \in \tilde{A}^*$ such that $S = \bigcup_{w \in L_u} \gamma_\alpha(w)$. We use Lemma 24 to show that $u \in L(\langle \mathcal{A}_j \rangle_\varepsilon)$ for each $j \leq k$, completing the proof.

As $P_j \in S$, we get $w \in L_u$ such that $P_j \in \gamma_\alpha(w)$. We show that $w \in L(\langle \mathcal{A}_j \rangle_\varepsilon)$. As $w \xrightarrow{*} u$ (by definition of L_u), this yields $u \in L(\langle \mathcal{A}_j \rangle_\varepsilon)$ by Fact 6. Let $(q, r) \in P_j \cap (I_j \times F_j)$ and $b_1, \dots, b_n \in A$ such that $w = b_1 \cdots b_n$. As $(q, r) \in P_j$ and $P_j \in \gamma_\alpha(w) \subseteq M$, we get $T_1, \dots, T_n \in M = 2^{Q^2}$ and $q_0, \dots, q_n \in Q$ such that $q_0 = q, q_n = r, (q_{i-1}, q_i) \in T_i$ and $T_i \in \gamma_\alpha(b_i)$ for $i \leq n$. We show that $b_i \in L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle_\varepsilon, q_{i-1}, q_i)$ for all $i \leq n$. This yields $w = b_1 \cdots b_n \in L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle_\varepsilon, q, r)$, i.e. $w \in L(\langle \mathcal{A}_j \rangle_\varepsilon)$ as desired since $(q, r) \in I_j \times F_j$. Let $i \leq n$. If $b \in A$, then $\gamma_\alpha(b_i) = \{\alpha(b_i)\}$. Hence, $T_i = \alpha(b_i)$ and since $(q_{i-1}, q_i) \in T_i$, we get $b_i \in L(\mathcal{A}, q_{i-1}, q_i)$ by definition of α . Otherwise, if $b_i = a^{-1} \in A^{-1}$, the fact that $T_i \in \gamma_\alpha(b_i)$ implies that $T_i \in \alpha(A^*)$ is a weak inverse of $\alpha(a)$. Hence, since $(q_{i-1}, q_i) \in T_i$, Lemma 24 yields $b_i = a^{-1} \in L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle_\varepsilon, q_{i-1}, q_i)$, completing the proof.

IV. COVERING FOR ALPHABET MODULO TESTABLE LANGUAGES

We consider the alphabet modulo testable languages. We first prove formally that these are the languages that can be recognized by a commutative group (this will be useful later). We then prove that AMT-covering is decidable in Theorem 27 below. Finally, we prove that AMT-separation and AMT-covering are co-NP-complete.

A. Algebraic characterization of AMT

For every number $d \geq 1$, we associate an equivalence \sim_d over A^* and use it to characterize the languages in AMT. Let $d \geq 1$ and $w, w' \in A^*$, we write $w \sim_d w'$ if and only if $|w|_a \equiv |w'|_a \pmod{d}$ for every $a \in A$. It is immediate from the definition that \sim_d is an equivalent of finite index.

Lemma 25. *Let $L \subseteq A^*$. We have $L \in \text{AMT}$ if and only if there exists $d \geq 1$ such that L is a union of \sim_d -classes.*

Proof. Assume first that $L \in \text{AMT}$: L is built from finitely many languages $L_{q,r}^a$ (for $a \in A$ and $q, r \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $r < q$) using only unions and intersections. Let d be the least common multiplier of all numbers $q \geq 1$ used in these languages. We show that L is a union of \sim_d -classes. Let $w, w' \in A^*$ such that $w \sim_d w'$. We prove that $w \in L \Leftrightarrow w' \in L$. Clearly, it suffices to show that each language $L_{q,r}^a$ used to define L satisfies $w \in L_{q,r}^a \Leftrightarrow w' \in L_{q,r}^a$. Since d is a multiple of q , the hypothesis that $w \sim_d w'$ yields $|w|_a \equiv |w'|_a \pmod{q}$. Hence, since $L_{q,r}^a = \{w \in A^* \mid |w|_a \equiv r \pmod{q}\}$ by definition, we have $w \in L_{q,r}^a \Leftrightarrow w' \in L_{q,r}^a$ as desired.

Assume now that L is a union of \sim_d -classes for $d \geq 1$. We show that $L \in \text{AMT}$. Since \sim_d has finite index, it suffices to show that all \sim_d -classes belongs to AMT. Let $w \in A^*$ and consider its \sim_d -class. For every $a \in A$, let $r_a < d$ by the remainder of the Euclidean division of $|w|_a$ by d . By definition, for every $w' \in A^*$, we have $w' \sim_d w$ if and only if $|w'|_a \equiv$

$r_a \bmod d$ for every $a \in A$. It follows that the \sim_d -class of w is $\bigcap_{a \in A} L_{d,r_a}^a$ which belongs to AMT by definition. \square

We now prove the algebraic characterization of AMT.

Lemma 26. *The class AMT consists of all languages that are recognized by a morphism into a finite commutative group.*

Proof. First consider $L \in \text{AMT}$. We show that L is recognized by a morphism into a finite commutative group. By definition of AMT, it suffices to prove that this property is true for all basic languages $L_{q,r}^a$ and that it is preserved by union and intersection. by definition $L_{q,r}^a = \{w \in A^* \mid |w|_a \equiv r \pmod{q}\}$ for $a \in A$ and $q, r \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $r < q$. It is recognized by the morphism $\alpha : A^* \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}/q\mathbb{Z}$ (where $\mathbb{Z}/q\mathbb{Z} = \{0, \dots, q-1\}$ is the standard cyclic group) defined by $\alpha(a) = 1$ and $\alpha(b) = 0$ for $b \in A \setminus \{a\}$. We have $L_{q,r}^a = \alpha^{-1}(r)$. Finally, if $L_1, L_2 \subseteq A^*$ are such that L_i is recognized by a morphism $\alpha_i : A^* \rightarrow G_i$ into a finite commutative group for $i \in \{1, 2\}$, then $L_1 \cup L_2$ and $L_1 \cap L_2$ are recognized by the natural morphism $\alpha : A^* \rightarrow G_1 \times G_2$ (where $G_1 \times G_2$ is equipped with the componentwise multiplication).

Assume now that L is recognized by a morphism $\alpha : A^* \rightarrow G$ into a finite commutative group G . We show that $L \in \text{AMT}$. Since G is a finite group, it is standard that there exists a number $d \geq 1$ such that $g^d = 1_G$ for every $g \in G$. We show that for every $u, v \in A^*$, if $u \sim_d v$, then $\alpha(u) = \alpha(v)$. It will follow that every language recognized by α is a union of \sim_d -classes and therefore belongs to AMT by Lemma 25. Recall that $A = \{a_1, \dots, a_n\}$. As G is commutative, reorganizing the letters in u, v does not change their image under α . Thus,

$$\alpha(u) = \alpha(a_1^{|u|_{a_1}} \dots a_n^{|u|_{a_n}}) \text{ and } \alpha(v) = \alpha(a_1^{|v|_{a_1}} \dots a_n^{|v|_{a_n}}).$$

If $u \sim_d v$, then $|u|_{a_i} \equiv |v|_{a_i} \pmod{d}$ for every $i \leq n$. We get $r_i < d$ and $h_i, k_i \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $|u|_{a_i} = r_i + h_i \times d$ and $|v|_{a_i} = r_i + k_i \times d$. Therefore, since $g^d = 1_G$ for all $g \in G$, we obtain that $\alpha(a_i^{|u|_{a_i}}) = \alpha(a_i^{|v|_{a_i}}) = \alpha(a_i^{r_i})$. Altogether, we get $\alpha(u) = \alpha(v) = \alpha(a_1^{r_1} \dots a_n^{r_n})$, concluding the proof. \square

B. Covering for AMT

We prove that covering is decidable for AMT as well. Let us point out that this can be obtained from an algebraic theorem of Delgado [12]. Yet, this approach is indirect: Delgado's results are purely algebraic and do not mention separation. Formulating them would require a lot of groundwork. We use a direct approach based on standard arithmetical and automata theoretic arguments. As for GR, we present a theorem characterizing the finite sets of regular languages which are AMT-coverable. We reuse the construction $\mathcal{A} \mapsto \langle \mathcal{A} \rangle$ of Section II. We start with terminology that we need to formulate the result.

Let $n = |A|$. Consider an arbitrary linear order A and let $A = \{a_1, \dots, a_n\}$. We define a map $\zeta : A^* \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^n$ (where \mathbb{Z} is the set of integers). Given, $w \in A^*$, we define,

$$\zeta(w) = (|w|_{a_1} - |w|_{a_1^{-1}}, \dots, |w|_{a_n} - |w|_{a_n^{-1}}) \in \mathbb{Z}^n.$$

For a language $L \subseteq \tilde{A}^*$ over \tilde{A} , we shall consider the direct image $\zeta(L) = \{\zeta(w) \mid w \in L\} \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^n$. We may now present the characterization theorem.

Theorem 27. *Let $k \geq 1$ and k NFAs $\mathcal{A}_1, \dots, \mathcal{A}_k$. The following conditions are equivalent:*

- 1) *The set $\{L(\mathcal{A}_1), \dots, L(\mathcal{A}_k)\}$ is AMT-coverable.*
- 2) *We have $\bigcap_{i \leq k} \zeta(L(\langle \mathcal{A}_i \rangle)) = \emptyset$.*

We first explain why Theorem 27 implies the decidability of AMT-covering. This follows from standard results and the decidability of Presburger arithmetic. Let us present a sketch.

The definition of the map $\zeta : \tilde{A}^* \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^n$ is a variation on a standard notion. Given a word $w \in \tilde{A}^*$, its *Parikh image* (also called commutative image) is defined as the following vector,

$$\pi(w) = (|w|_{a_1}, \dots, |w|_{a_n}, |w|_{a_1^{-1}}, \dots, |w|_{a_n^{-1}}) \in \mathbb{N}^{2n}.$$

Clearly, $\pi(w)$ determines $\zeta(w)$ and for every $L \subseteq \tilde{A}^*$, $\pi(L) \subseteq \mathbb{N}^{2n}$ determines $\zeta(L) \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^n$. Consider k NFAs $\mathcal{A}_1, \dots, \mathcal{A}_k$. We know that $\langle \mathcal{A}_i \rangle$ can be computed from \mathcal{A}_i in polynomial time for every $i \leq k$. Moreover, it is known [14] that an *existential* Presburger formula φ_i describing the set $\pi(L(\langle \mathcal{A}_i \rangle)) \subseteq \mathbb{N}^{2n}$ can be computed from $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_i$ in polynomial time. It is then straightforward to combine the formulas φ_i into a single *existential* Presburger sentence which is equivalent to $\bigcap_{i \leq k} \zeta(L(\langle \mathcal{A}_i \rangle)) \neq \emptyset$. Finally, it is known [36] that the existential fragment of Presburger arithmetic can be decided in NP. Hence, deciding whether $\bigcap_{i \leq k} \zeta(L(\langle \mathcal{A}_i \rangle)) \neq \emptyset$ can be achieved in NP. It then follows from Theorem 27 that AMT-covering (and therefore AMT-separation as well) can be decided in co-NP. It turns out that this complexity upper bound is optimal: AMT-covering and AMT-separation are both co-NP-complete (we present a simple proof for the lower bound using a reduction from 3-SAT).

Proof of Theorem 27. We fix a number $k \geq 1$ and for every $j \leq k$, we consider an NFA $\mathcal{A}_j = (Q_j, I_j, F_j, \delta_j)$. The two implications in the theorem are handled independently.

Implication 1) \Rightarrow 2). We prove the contrapositive. Consider $\bar{v} \in \bigcap_{i \leq k} \zeta(L(\langle \mathcal{A}_i \rangle))$. We show that $\{L(\mathcal{A}_1), \dots, L(\mathcal{A}_k)\}$ is *not* AMT-coverable. Thus, we fix an AMT-cover \mathbf{K} of A^* and show that there exists $K \in \mathbf{K}$ such that $K \cap L(\mathcal{A}_j) \neq \emptyset$ for every $j \leq k$. Let $\{K_1, \dots, K_\ell\} = \mathbf{K}$. For each $i \leq \ell$, since $K_i \in \text{AMT}$, Lemma 26 yields a morphism $\alpha_i : A^* \rightarrow G_i$ into a finite *commutative* group recognizing K_i . Clearly, $G = G_1 \times \dots \times G_\ell$ is a commutative group for the componentwise multiplication and each $K \in \mathbf{K}$ is recognized by the morphism $\alpha : A^* \rightarrow G$ defined by $\alpha(w) = (\alpha_1(w), \dots, \alpha_n(w))$.

Since $\bar{v} \in \bigcap_{i \leq k} \zeta(L(\langle \mathcal{A}_i \rangle))$, we get $w_i \in L(\langle \mathcal{A}_i \rangle)$ such that $\zeta(w_i) = \bar{v}$ for all $i \leq \ell$. Also, Lemma 4 yields $u_i \in L(\mathcal{A}_i)$ such that $\alpha(u_i) = \alpha(w_i)$. As G is *commutative*, the image under α of a word $w \in \tilde{A}^*$ depends only on $\zeta(w)$. Hence, $\alpha(w_1) = \dots = \alpha(w_k)$. We get $\alpha(u_1) = \dots = \alpha(u_k)$. As \mathbf{K} is a cover of A^* , we get $K \in \mathbf{K}$ such that $u_1 \in K$. Since K is recognized by α and $\alpha(u_1) = \dots = \alpha(u_k)$, this yields $u_1, \dots, u_k \in K$. Thus, $K \cap L(\mathcal{A}_i) \neq \emptyset$ for all $i \leq \ell$ as desired.

Implication 2) \Rightarrow 1). We use standard arithmetical tools. Consider the componentwise addition on \mathbb{Z}^n . We abuse notation and write “0” for the identity element (*i.e.*, the vector whose

entries are all equal to zero). For a single vector $\bar{v} \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ and a finite set of vectors $V = \{\bar{v}_1, \dots, \bar{v}_\ell\} \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^n$, we write,

$$\mathcal{L}(\bar{v}, V) = \{\bar{v} + k_1\bar{v}_1 + \dots + k_\ell\bar{v}_\ell \mid k_1, \dots, k_\ell \in \mathbb{Z}\} \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^n.$$

Following [11], we call these sets the \mathbb{Z} -linear subsets of \mathbb{Z}^n . Likewise, \mathbb{Z} -semilinear subsets are finite unions of \mathbb{Z} -linear sets (including \emptyset , which is the empty union). We need two results about these sets. The first one is a variation on Parikh's theorem (which implies that the Parikh images of regular languages are semilinear subsets of \mathbb{N}^n). It is specific to the automata built with $\mathcal{A} \mapsto \langle \mathcal{A} \rangle$.

Lemma 28. *Let \mathcal{A} be an NFA. Then, $\zeta(L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle))$ is a \mathbb{Z} -semilinear subset of \mathbb{Z}^n .*

Proof. The proof is based on standard ideas which are typically used to prove the automata variant of Parikh's theorem. However, let us point out that we do require a specific property of the automaton $\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle$ at some point (the lemma is not true for an arbitrary NFA over the extended alphabet \tilde{A}). For all $q \in Q$, we associate a finite set $V_q \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^n$. We define,

$$V_q = \{\zeta(w) \mid w \in L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle, q, q) \text{ and } |w| \leq |Q|^2\}.$$

Observe that if $w \in L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle, q, q)$ for some $w \in \tilde{A}^*$, the states encountered on this run are strongly connected. Hence, in that case, we also have $w^{-1} \in L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle, q, q)$ by definition of $\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle$. Moreover, we have $\zeta(w^{-1}) = -\zeta(w)$ by definition of ζ . Consequently, for every $\bar{v} \in V_q$, the opposite vector also belongs to V_q : we have $-\bar{v} \in V_q$. This property is where we need the hypothesis that are considering an automata built with the construction $\mathcal{A} \mapsto \langle \mathcal{A} \rangle$ (it fails for an arbitrary NFA). For every $P \subseteq Q$, we write $V_P = \bigcup_{q \in P} V_q$.

Finally, we associate a second finite set $X_P \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^n$ to every $P \subseteq Q$. Let $w \in \tilde{A}^*$. We say that w is a P -witness if there exist $q \in I$ and $r \in F$ such that there is a run from q to r labeled by w such that P is exactly the set of all states encountered in that run (in particular, we have $w \in L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle)$). We define,

$$X_P = \{\zeta(w) \mid w \text{ is a } P\text{-witness and } |w| \leq |Q|^2\}.$$

We now prove the following,

$$\zeta(L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle)) = \bigcup_{P \subseteq Q} \bigcup_{\bar{v} \in X_P} \mathcal{L}(\bar{v}, V_P).$$

This equality concludes the proof: $\zeta(L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle))$ is a \mathbb{Z} -semilinear subset of \mathbb{Z}^n , as desired. We start with the right to left inclusion. Let $P \subseteq Q$ and $\bar{v} \in X_P$. We show that $\mathcal{L}(\bar{v}, V_P) \subseteq \zeta(L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle))$.

Let $\bar{u} \in \mathcal{L}(\bar{v}, V_P)$. By definition, we have $\bar{v}_1, \dots, \bar{v}_\ell \in V_P$ and $k_1, \dots, k_\ell \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $\bar{u} = \bar{v} + k_1\bar{v}_1 + \dots + k_\ell\bar{v}_\ell$. Moreover, recall that by construction, for every \bar{v}_i , the opposite vector $-\bar{v}_i$ belongs to V_P as well. Therefore, we may assume without loss of generality that $k_1, \dots, k_\ell \in \mathbb{N}$: they are positive integers. By definition of V_P , we know that for every $i \leq \ell$, we have $\bar{v}_i \in V_{q_i}$ for some $q_i \in P$. Hence, there exists $x_i \in L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle, q_i, q_i)$ such that $\zeta(x_i) = \bar{v}_i$. Let $y_i = (x_i)^{k_i}$

(this is well-defined since $k_i \in \mathbb{N}$). Clearly, $\zeta(y_i) = k_i\bar{v}_i$ and $y_i \in L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle, q_i, q_i)$. Moreover, $\bar{v} \in X_P$ which yields a P -witness $w \in \tilde{A}^*$ such that $\zeta(w) = \bar{v}$. Since $q_1, \dots, q_\ell \in P$ and w is a P -witness, we have $q \in I$ and $r \in F$ such that there exists a run from q to r labeled by w which encounters all states q_1, \dots, q_ℓ . Therefore, we have a permutation σ of $\{1, \dots, \ell\}$ and $w_0, \dots, w_\ell \in \tilde{A}^*$ such that $w = w_0 \dots w_\ell$, $w_0 \in L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle, q, q_{\sigma(1)})$, $w_i \in L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle, q_{\sigma(i)}, q_{\sigma(i+1)})$ for every $1 \leq i \leq \ell - 1$ and $w_\ell \in L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle, q_{\sigma(\ell)}, r)$. Consider the word $w' = w_0 y_{\sigma(1)} w_1 \dots y_{\sigma(\ell)} w_\ell$. It is clear from the definitions that $w' \in L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle, q, r)$ which yields $w' \in L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle)$ and $\zeta(w') \in \zeta(L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle))$. Moreover, it is immediate that $\zeta(w') = \zeta(w) + \zeta(y_1) + \dots + \zeta(y_\ell)$ which yields $\zeta(w') = \bar{v} + k_1\bar{v}_1 + \dots + k_\ell\bar{v}_\ell = \bar{u}$. We get $\bar{u} \in \zeta(L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle))$ as desired.

We turn to the converse inclusion which is based on pumping arguments. Given a word $w \in L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle)$, we need to prove that $\zeta(w) \in \bigcup_{P \subseteq Q} \bigcup_{\bar{v} \in X_P} \mathcal{L}(\bar{v}, V_P)$. Since $w \in L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle)$, there exists $q \in I$ and $r \in F$ such that $w \in L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle, q, r)$. We let $P \subseteq Q$ be the set of all states which are encountered in the corresponding run: w is a P -witness. We use induction on the length of w to show that there exists $\bar{v} \in X_P$ such that $\zeta(w) \in \mathcal{L}(\bar{v}, V_P)$ (which concludes the argument). There are two cases. First assume that $|w| \leq |Q|^2$. This implies $\zeta(w) \in X_P$ by definition and we have $\zeta(w) \in \mathcal{L}(\zeta(w), V_P)$, concluding this case. Assume now that $|w| > |Q|^2$. One may verify with a pumping argument that there exist $x_1, x_2 \in \tilde{A}^*$ and $y \in A^+$ such that $w = x_1 y x_2$, the word $w' = x_1 x_2$ remains a P -witness, $|y| \leq |Q|$ and $y \in L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle, q, q)$ for some $q \in P$. Since $y \in A^+$ and $w = x_1 y x_2$, we have $|w'| < |w|$. Thus, since w' is a P -witness, induction yields $\bar{v} \in X_P$ such that $\zeta(w') \in \mathcal{L}(\bar{v}, V_P)$. Moreover, since $|y| \leq |Q|$ and $y \in L(\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle, q, q)$ for some $q \in P$, we have $\zeta(y) \in V_P$ by definition. Thus, $\zeta(w') + \zeta(y) \in \mathcal{L}(\bar{v}, V_P)$. Finally, since $w = x_1 y x_2$ and $w' = x_1 x_2$, it is clear that $\zeta(w) = \zeta(w') + \zeta(y)$. Altogether, we obtain $\zeta(w) \in \mathcal{L}(\bar{v}, V_P)$ which concludes the proof. \square

The second result is more general.

Proposition 29. *Let $n \geq 1$ and $S \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^n$ be a \mathbb{Z} -semilinear set. Assume that for all $d \geq 1$, there exists a vector $\bar{u} \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ such that $d\bar{u} \in S$. Then, $0 \in S$.*

Proposition 29 is a corollary of a standard theorem about bases of subgroups of free Abelian groups (i.e., the groups \mathbb{Z}^n). We first introduce terminology that we need to state this theorem. Clearly, \mathbb{Z}^n is a commutative group for addition (called "free abelian group of rank n "). We consider the subgroups of \mathbb{Z}^n (the subsets which are closed under addition and inverses). Additionally, we need the notion of *basis*. Given a subgroup G of \mathbb{Z}^n , a basis of G is a finite set of vectors $\{\bar{v}_1, \dots, \bar{v}_m\} \subseteq G$ which satisfies the two following conditions:

- 1) G is generated by $\{\bar{v}_1, \dots, \bar{v}_m\}$. That is, we have $G = \{k_1\bar{v}_1 + \dots + k_m\bar{v}_m \mid k_1, \dots, k_m \in \mathbb{Z}\}$.
- 2) For all $k_1, \dots, k_m \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $k_1\bar{v}_1 + \dots + k_m\bar{v}_m = 0$, we have $k_1 = \dots = k_m = 0$.

We now state the following standard theorem (see for example [17, Theorem 1.6]).

Theorem 30. *Let G be a nontrivial subgroup of \mathbb{Z}^n . There exist a basis $\{\bar{x}_1, \dots, \bar{x}_n\}$ of \mathbb{Z}^n , a number $m \leq n$ and $d_1, \dots, d_m \geq 1$ such that d_i divides d_{i+1} for every $i \leq m-1$ and $\{d_1\bar{x}_1, \dots, d_m\bar{x}_m\}$ is a basis of G .*

We are now ready to prove Proposition 29.

Proof of Proposition 29. Observe first that we may assume without loss of generality that S is a \mathbb{Z} -linear subset of \mathbb{Z}^n . Indeed, by definition S is a finite union of \mathbb{Z} -linear subsets. Hence, by hypothesis, for every $d \geq 1$, there exists $\bar{u} \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ and a \mathbb{Z} -linear set S' in this union such that $d\bar{u} \in S'$. In particular, this is true when $d = h!$ for some $h \geq 1$. Hence, since the union is finite, it contains a fixed \mathbb{Z} -linear set S' such that there exists infinitely many d such that $d = h!$ for some $h \geq 1$ and $d\bar{u} \in S'$. It then follows that for every $d \geq 1$, there exists $\bar{u} \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ such that $d\bar{u} \in S'$. Therefore, we may replace S with S' .

We assume from now on that S is \mathbb{Z} -linear: we have $\bar{v} \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ and a finite set $V \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^n$ such that $S = \mathcal{L}(\bar{v}, V)$. If $V = \emptyset$ or $V = \{0\}$, we have $\mathcal{L}(\bar{v}, V) = \{\bar{v}\}$. Thus, for every $d \geq 1$, there exists $\bar{u} \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ such that $\bar{v} = d\bar{u}$. In particular, this holds for a number d which is strictly larger than the absolute values of all entries in \bar{v} . Clearly, this implies $\bar{v} = 0$ and we get $0 \in \mathcal{L}(\bar{v}, V)$. We now assume that V contains a non-zero vector.

Let $G \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^n$ be the subgroup of \mathbb{Z}^n generated by the set $V \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^n$. By hypothesis on V , G is nontrivial. Therefore, Theorem 30 yields a basis $\{\bar{x}_1, \dots, \bar{x}_n\}$ of \mathbb{Z}^n , $m \leq n$ and $d_1, \dots, d_m \geq 1$ such that $\{d_1\bar{x}_1, \dots, d_m\bar{x}_m\}$ is a basis of G .

Since $\{\bar{x}_1, \dots, \bar{x}_n\}$ is a basis of \mathbb{Z}^n , we have $h_1, \dots, h_n \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $\bar{v} = h_1\bar{x}_1 + \dots + h_n\bar{x}_n$. Let d be the least common multiplier of $|h_1| + 1, \dots, |h_n| + 1, d_1, \dots, d_m \geq 1$. By hypothesis, there exists $\bar{u} \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ such that $d\bar{u} \in \mathcal{L}(\bar{v}, V)$. Thus, since G is the subgroup generated by V , there exists $\bar{y} \in G$ such that $d\bar{u} = \bar{v} + \bar{y}$. Since $\{\bar{x}_1, \dots, \bar{x}_n\}$ is a basis of \mathbb{Z}^n , we have $k_1, \dots, k_n \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $\bar{u} = k_1\bar{x}_1 + \dots + k_n\bar{x}_n$. Moreover, since $\{d_1\bar{x}_1, \dots, d_m\bar{x}_m\}$ is a basis of G , we have $\ell_1, \dots, \ell_m \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $\bar{y} = \ell_1 d_1 \bar{x}_1 + \dots + \ell_m d_m \bar{x}_m$. Altogether, we obtain,

$$\sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} h_i \bar{x}_i + \sum_{1 \leq j \leq m} \ell_j d_j \bar{x}_j = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} dk_i \bar{x}_i.$$

Since $\{\bar{x}_1, \dots, \bar{x}_n\}$ is a basis, this implies that for all $i > m$, we have $h_i = dk_i$. By definition $d > |h_i|$ (it is a nonzero multiple of $|h_i| + 1$). Thus, $dk_i = h_i$ implies that $k_i = h_i = 0$. Since this holds for every $i > m$, we obtain,

$$\sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} h_i \bar{x}_i + \sum_{1 \leq j \leq m} \ell_j d_j \bar{x}_j = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq m} dk_i \bar{x}_i.$$

This yields the following,

$$\bar{v} + (\ell_1 d_1 - dk_1) \bar{x}_1 + \dots + (\ell_m d_m - dk_m) \bar{x}_m = 0.$$

By definition d is a multiple of d_i for every $i \leq m$. Therefore, there exists $\ell'_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $\ell_i d_i - dk_i = \ell'_i d_i$. Thus, we obtain,

$$\bar{v} + \ell'_1 d_1 \bar{x}_1 + \dots + \ell'_m d_m \bar{x}_m = 0.$$

Since $\{d_1 \bar{x}_1, \dots, d_m \bar{x}_m\}$ is a basis of G which is the subgroup generated by V , we obtain $0 \in F(\bar{v}, V)$ as desired. \square

We may now prove that 2) \Rightarrow 1) in Theorem 27. We consider the contrapositive. Assume that $\{L(\mathcal{A}_1), \dots, L(\mathcal{A}_k)\}$ is not AMT-coverable. We prove that $\bigcap_{j \leq k} \zeta(L(\langle \mathcal{A}_j \rangle)) \neq \emptyset$. First, we use our hypothesis to prove the following lemma.

Lemma 31. *For every $d \geq 1$, there exist $\bar{x}, \bar{y}_1, \dots, \bar{y}_k \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ such that $\bar{x} + d\bar{y}_j \in \zeta(L(\langle \mathcal{A}_j \rangle))$ for every $j \leq k$.*

Proof. Given $w, w' \in A^*$, we write $w \sim_d w'$ if and only if $|w|_a \equiv |w'|_a \pmod{d}$ for all $a \in A$. Clearly, \sim_d is an equivalence of finite index on A^* . One may verify that each \sim_d -class belongs to AMT. Thus, the partition \mathbf{K} of A^* into \sim_d -classes is an AMT-cover of A^* and since $\{L(\mathcal{A}_1), \dots, L(\mathcal{A}_k)\}$ is not AMT-coverable, there exists a \sim_d -class which intersects $L(\mathcal{A}_j)$ for all $j \leq k$. We get $w_1 \in L(\mathcal{A}_1), \dots, w_k \in L(\mathcal{A}_k)$ such that $w_1 \sim_d \dots \sim_d w_k$. Let $\bar{x} = \zeta(w_1) \in \mathbb{N}^n$. Let $j \leq k$. The fact that $w_j \sim_d w_1$ yields $\bar{y}_j \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ such that $\zeta(w_j) = \bar{x} + d\bar{y}_j$. Since $w_j \in L(\mathcal{A}_j) \subseteq L(\langle \mathcal{A}_j \rangle)$, we have $\zeta(w_j) \in \zeta(L(\langle \mathcal{A}_j \rangle))$ which completes the proof. \square

By Lemma 28, $\zeta(L(\langle \mathcal{A}_j \rangle)) \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^n$ is \mathbb{Z} -semilinear for each $j \leq k$. We build a \mathbb{Z} -semilinear subset of \mathbb{Z}^{kn} . We use vector concatenation: for $i_1, i_2 \geq 1$, $\bar{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^{i_1}$ and $\bar{y} \in \mathbb{Z}^{i_2}$, we write $\bar{x} \cdot \bar{y} \in \mathbb{Z}^{i_1+i_2}$ for the vector obtained by concatenating \bar{x} with \bar{y} . Let $S \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^{kn}$ be the set of all vectors $\bar{u}_1 \dots \bar{u}_k + \bar{x}^k$ such that $\bar{u}_j \in \zeta(L(\langle \mathcal{A}_j \rangle))$ for every $j \leq k$ and $\bar{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^n$.

Since the sets $\zeta(L(\langle \mathcal{A}_j \rangle)) \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^n$ are \mathbb{Z} -semilinear, one may verify that $S \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^{kn}$ is \mathbb{Z} -semilinear as well. Lemma 31 implies that for every $d \geq 1$, there exist $\bar{x}, \bar{y}_1, \dots, \bar{y}_k \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ such that $\bar{x} + d\bar{y}_j \in \zeta(L(\langle \mathcal{A}_j \rangle))$ for all $j \leq k$. By definition of S , this implies $d(\bar{y}_1 \dots \bar{y}_k) \in S$. Altogether, it follows that for all $d \geq 1$, there exists $\bar{y} \in \mathbb{Z}^{kn}$ such that $d\bar{y} \in S$. Since S is \mathbb{Z} -semilinear, this yields $0 \in S$ by Proposition 29. By definition of S , we get $\bar{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ such that $\bar{x} \in \zeta(L(\langle \mathcal{A}_j \rangle))$ for all $j \leq k$. Thus, $\bigcap_{j \leq k} \zeta(L(\langle \mathcal{A}_j \rangle)) \neq \emptyset$ which completes the proof. \square

C. Complexity lower bound

We prove that AMT-covering and AMT-separation are co-NP-complete. As we explained above, the upper bound follows from Theorem 27. Here, we prove the lower bound: both problems are co-NP-hard. Actually since separation is a special case of covering, it suffices to show that AMT-separation is co-NP-hard.

Remark 32. *When considering complexity, it is important to distinguish the case when the alphabet is fixed from the one when it is a parameter of the problem. Here, we consider the latter case: we show that given an alphabet A and two NFAs over A , deciding whether the recognized languages are AMT-separable is co-NP-hard. Actually, when the alphabet is fixed, one may show that the problem is in P (roughly, this boils*

down to disjointedness of Parikh images for NFAs which is known to be in P when the alphabet is fixed [20]).

We actually show that *non* AMT-separability is NP-hard. More precisely, we present a logarithmic space reduction from 3-satisfiability (3-SAT) to this problem. Given a 3-SAT formula φ , we explain how to construct two regular languages L_1, L_2 and show that they are not AMT-separable if and only if φ is satisfiable. We only describe the construction: that NFAs for the regular languages L_1 and L_2 can be computed from φ in logarithmic space is straightforward and left to the reader.

Let C_1, \dots, C_k be the 3-clauses such that $\varphi = \bigwedge_{i \leq k} C_i$ and let x_1, \dots, x_n be the propositional variables in φ . We construct two *finite* languages L_1 and L_2 over the alphabet $A = \{x_1, \dots, x_n, \bar{x}_1, \dots, \bar{x}_n\}$. Intuitively, we code assignments of truth values for the variables $\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ by words in A^* . Given $w \in A^*$, we say that w is an *encoding* if for all $i \leq n$, w contains either the letter x_i or the letter \bar{x}_i , but not both. It is immediate that an assignment of truth values for the variables $\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ can be uniquely defined from any such encoding.

We let $H_i = \{x_i^p \mid 1 \leq p \leq k\} \cup \{\bar{x}_i^p \mid 1 \leq p \leq k\}$ for all $i \leq n$. We may now define $L_1 \subseteq A^*$. We let,

$$L_1 = H_1 H_2 \cdots H_n.$$

Clearly L_1 is finite and all the words in L_1 are encodings. We turn to the definition of L_2 . For every $j \leq k$, we associate a language T_j to the 3-clause C_j . Assume that $C_j = \ell_1 \vee \ell_2 \vee \ell_3$ where $\ell_1, \ell_2, \ell_3 \in \{x_1, \bar{x}_1, \dots, x_n, \bar{x}_n\}$ are literals. We define,

$$T_j = \{\ell_1, \ell_2, \ell_3\}.$$

Finally, we define,

$$L_2 = T_1 \cdots T_k (\{\varepsilon\} \cup H_1) \cdots (\{\varepsilon\} \cup H_n).$$

Clearly, L_2 is finite as well. Observe that the words in L_2 need not be encodings. On the other hand, all encodings within L_2 (if any) correspond to an assignment of truth values which satisfies $\{C_1, \dots, C_k\}$.

It remains to show that L_1, L_2 are not AMT-separable if and only if the φ is satisfiable. We start with the right to left implication. Assume that there exists a truth assignment satisfying φ . By definition of L_1 and L_2 , one may verify that there exists $w_1 \in L_1$ and $w_2 \in L_2$ which are both encodings of this assignment. Moreover, one may verify that we can choose w_1 and w_2 so that $|w_1|_a = |w_2|_a$ for every $a \in A$. This implies that $\alpha(w_1) = \alpha(w_2)$ for every morphism $\alpha : A^* \rightarrow G$ into an commutative group G . Hence, in view of Lemma 26, every language $K \in \text{AMT}$ which contains w_1 must contain w_2 as well. Since $w_1 \in L_1$ and $w_2 \in L_2$, it follows that L_1 and L_2 are not AMT-separable.

Conversely, assume that L_1 and L_2 are not AMT-separable. By definition, L_1 and L_2 are finite. Thus, there exists $d \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $|w| < d$ for every $w \in L_1 \cup L_2$. We consider the equivalence \sim_d over A^* . By Lemma 25, every union of \sim_d -classes belongs to AMT. Hence, since L_1 and L_2 are not AMT-separable, there exists a \sim_d -class which intersects both L_1 and

L_2 . We obtain $w_1 \in L_1$ and $w_2 \in L_2$ such that $w_1 \sim_d w_2$: we have $|w_1|_a \equiv |w_2|_a \pmod{d}$ for every $a \in A$. Moreover, since $|w_1| < d$ and $|w_2| < d$ by definition of d , this yields $|w_1|_a = |w_2|_a$ for every $a \in A$. By definition of L_1 , the word $w_1 \in L_1$ encodes an assignment of truth values. Moreover, since $|w_1|_a = |w_2|_a$ for every $a \in A$, the word w_2 encodes the same assignment of truth values. Finally, since $w_2 \in L_2$, this assignment satisfies φ which completes the proof.

V. COVERING FOR MODULO LANGUAGES

In this section, we reduce MOD-covering to GR-covering and AMT-covering for unary alphabets. Then, we show that MOD-covering is co-NP-complete, while MOD-separation is NL-complete.

A. MOD-covering algorithm

Getting a “naive” direct algorithm for MOD-covering is straightforward. Here, we prove that MOD-covering reduces to both GR-covering and AMT-covering. This approach provides much better complexity upper bounds than the naive one.

The reduction is based on a simple construction. It takes a language $L \subseteq A^*$ as input and builds a new one over a *unary alphabet* (i.e., containing a unique letter). We let $U = \{\$\}$ and $\mu : A^* \rightarrow U^*$ be the morphism defined by $\mu(a) = \$$ for every $a \in A$. It is standard that if $L \subseteq A^*$ is recognized by an input NFA \mathcal{A} , one may compute an NFA recognizing $\mu(L)$ in logarithmic space (all transitions must be relabeled by “\$”).

Theorem 33. *Let $k \geq 1$ and $L_1, \dots, L_k \subseteq A^*$. The following conditions are equivalent:*

- 1) *The set $\{L_1, \dots, L_k\}$ is MOD-coverable.*
- 2) *The set $\{\mu(L_1), \dots, \mu(L_k)\}$ is AMT-coverable.*
- 3) *The set $\{\mu(L_1), \dots, \mu(L_k)\}$ is GR-coverable.*

Proof. We prove that 1) \Rightarrow 2) \Rightarrow 3) \Rightarrow 1). Let us start with 1) \Rightarrow 2). Assume that $\{L_1, \dots, L_k\}$ is MOD-coverable. We get a MOD-cover \mathbf{K} of A^* such that for each $K \in \mathbf{K}$, there is $i \leq k$ satisfying $K \cap L_i = \emptyset$. Let $\mathbf{H} = \{\mu(K) \mid K \in \mathbf{K}\}$. Since \mathbf{K} is a cover of A^* and μ is surjective, \mathbf{H} must be a cover of U^* . One may verify that all $H \in \mathbf{H}$ belongs to MOD since this is the case for all $K \in \mathbf{K}$. Hence, since $\text{MOD} \subseteq \text{AMT}$, we obtain that \mathbf{H} is an AMT-cover of U^* . It remains to verify for each $H \in \mathbf{H}$, there exists $i \leq k$ such that $H \cap \mu(L_i) = \emptyset$. By definition, $H = \mu(K)$ for some $K \in \mathbf{K}$. By hypothesis on \mathbf{K} , we get $i \leq k$ such that $K \cap L_i = \emptyset$. We show that $H \cap \mu(L_i) = \emptyset$. By contradiction, assume that there exists $u \in H \cap \mu(L_i)$. As $H = \mu(K)$, we get $w \in K$ and $w' \in L_i$ such that $\mu(w) = \mu(w') = u$. By definition of μ , we have $|w| = |w'| = |u|$. Since $w \in K$ and $K \in \text{MOD}$, this yields $w' \in K$. Thus, $w' \in K \cap L_i$, a contradiction.

The implication 2) \Rightarrow 3) is trivial as $\text{AMT} \subseteq \text{GR}$. It remains to prove 3) \Rightarrow 1). Assume that $\{\mu(L_1), \dots, \mu(L_k)\}$ is GR-coverable. This yields a GR-cover \mathbf{H} of U^* such that for each $H \in \mathbf{H}$, there exists $i \leq k$ satisfying $H \cap \mu(L_i) = \emptyset$. We let $\mathbf{K} = \{\mu^{-1}(H) \mid H \in \mathbf{H}\}$. By definition of \mathbf{H} , one may verify that \mathbf{K} is a cover of A^* and that for all $K \in \mathbf{K}$, there is $i \leq k$

such that $K \cap L_i = \emptyset$. It remains to show that \mathbf{K} is a MOD-cover (which implies that $\{L_1, \dots, L_k\}$ is MOD-coverable, as desired). Let $H \in \mathbf{H}$. We prove that $\mu^{-1}(H) \in \text{MOD}$. By definition, we have to exhibit $q \geq 1$ such that for $w, w' \in A^*$, if $|w| \equiv |w'| \pmod q$, then $w \in \mu^{-1}(H) \Leftrightarrow w' \in \mu^{-1}(H)$ (i.e., $\mu(w) \in H \Leftrightarrow \mu(w') \in H$). Since $H \in \text{GR}$, we get a morphism $\alpha : U^* \rightarrow G$ into a finite group G recognizing H . It is standard that there is $q \geq 1$ such that $g^q = 1_G$ for all $g \in G$. We now fix $w, w' \in A^*$ such that $|w| \equiv |w'| \pmod q$. This yields $r \geq 0$ and $k, k' \geq 1$ such that $|w| = r + kq$ and $|w'| = r + k'q$. Hence, we have $\mu(w) = \$^{r+qk}$ and $\mu(w') = \$^{r+qk'}$. By definition of q , this yields $\alpha(\mu(w)) = \alpha(\mu(w')) = \alpha(\$^r)$. As α recognizes H , we get $\mu(w) \in H \Leftrightarrow \mu(w') \in H$, as desired. \square

Theorem 33 provides log-space reductions from MOD-covering to AMT-covering and from MOD-separation to GR-separation. Hence by Section IV, MOD-covering is in co-NP and by Section III, MOD-separation is in P. In the next two subsections, we show that the co-NP upper bound for covering is tight, while MOD-separation is in fact NL-complete.

B. Complexity of MOD-covering

As we explained above, MOD-covering is in co-NP: Theorem 33 provides a logarithmic space reduction to AMT-covering which is itself in co-NP. Here, we prove that this upper bound is tight. We actually show that *non* MOD-coverability is NP-hard. More precisely, we present a logarithmic space reduction from 3-satisfiability (3-SAT) to this problem. Given a 3-SAT formula φ , we explain how to construct a finite set of regular languages and show that it is not MOD-coverable if and only if φ is satisfiable. We only describe the construction: that NFAs for the regular languages in the set can be computed from φ in logarithmic space is straightforward and left to the reader.

Remark 34. *Note that Theorem 33 also provides a logarithmic space reduction from MOD-covering to GR-covering. Hence, the lower bound for MOD-covering that we prove in this section transfers to GR-covering, which is therefore co-NP-hard (recall that the upper bound for this problem is PSPACE, since it amounts to checking nonemptiness of an intersection of automata).*

Let C_1, \dots, C_k be the 3-clauses such that $\varphi = \bigwedge_{i \leq k} C_i$ and let x_1, \dots, x_n be the propositional variables in φ . Consider the unary alphabet $U = \{\$\}$. We construct a finite set of regular languages over U . We encode the assignment of truth values for x_1, \dots, x_n by single words in U^* . Let $p_1, \dots, p_n \in \mathbb{N}$ be the first n prime numbers. For each $w \in U^*$, we associate an assignment $\text{val}(w) \in \{0, 1\}^n$ that encodes a mapping $x_i \mapsto b_i$ giving truth values for the variables x_1, \dots, x_n . We define $\text{val}(w) = (b_1, \dots, b_n)$ such that for each $i \leq n$, we let $b_i = 1$ if $|w|$ is a multiple of p_i and $b_i = 0$ otherwise. Note that since p_1, \dots, p_n are primes, each assignment of truth values for

x_1, \dots, x_n is encoded by some word in U^* . We now specify the regular languages associated to φ . For every $i \leq n$, we let,

$$\begin{aligned} P_i &= \{w \in U^* \mid |w| \equiv p_i \pmod 0\}, \\ N_i &= \{w \in U^* \mid |w| \not\equiv p_i \pmod 0\} = U^* \setminus P_i. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, with every $j \leq k$, we associate a language L_j to the 3-clause C_j . By definition, we have $i_1, i_2, i_3 \leq n$ such that $C_j = \ell_{i_1} \wedge \ell_{i_2} \wedge \ell_{i_3}$ where $\ell_{i_k} \in \{x_{i_k}, \neg x_{i_k}\}$. For $k \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, we let $H_k = P_k$ if $\ell_{i_k} = x_{i_k}$ and $H_k = N_k$ if $\ell_{i_k} = \neg x_{i_k}$. We then define $L_j = H_1 \cup H_2 \cup H_3$. One may verify from the definition that $L_j \in \text{MOD}$ and that an NFA recognizing L_j can be computed from φ in logarithmic space. Moreover, the following lemma may also be verified.

Lemma 35. *The language $\bigcap_{j \leq k} L_j$ consists of every word $w \in U^*$ such that the assignment $\text{val}(w)$ satisfies φ .*

Since each assignment of truth values is encoded by some word in U^* , Lemma 35 implies that φ is satisfiable if and only if $\bigcap_{j \leq k} L_j \neq \emptyset$. Finally, since $L_1, \dots, L_k \in \text{MOD}$, one may verify that $\bigcap_{j \leq k} L_j \neq \emptyset$ if and only if $\{L_1, \dots, L_k\}$ is *not* MOD-coverable. Altogether, we obtain that φ is satisfiable if and only if $\{L_1, \dots, L_k\}$ is *not* MOD-coverable: this is indeed a logarithmic space reduction from 3-SAT to non-coverability for MOD.

C. Complexity of MOD-separation

We now prove that MOD-separation is in NL, by an analysis the GR-separation procedure for *unary alphabets*. This implies that MOD-separation is NL-complete, as NL is a generic lower bound for separation. Indeed, there exists a straightforward reduction from NFA emptiness (which is NL-complete) to \mathcal{C} -separation for an arbitrary Boolean algebra \mathcal{C} : given an NFA \mathcal{A} , $L(\mathcal{A}) = \emptyset$ if and only if $L(\mathcal{A})$ is \mathcal{C} -separable from A^* .

Theorem 33 presents a log-space reduction from MOD-separation to GR-separation for languages over *unary alphabets*. Hence, it suffices to prove that the latter problem is in NL. Fix a single letter alphabet $A = \{a\}$. We prove that given as input two NFAs \mathcal{A}_1 and \mathcal{A}_2 over A , one may decide in NL whether $L(\mathcal{A}_1)$ is *not* GR-separable from $L(\mathcal{A}_2)$. Since NL = co-NL by the Immerman-Szelepcsényi theorem, this implies as desired that GR-separation is in NL for languages over unary alphabets. By Theorem 8, the two following conditions are equivalent:

- 1) $L(\mathcal{A}_1)$ is not GR-separable from $L(\mathcal{A}_2)$.
- 2) $L(\langle \mathcal{A}_1 \rangle_\varepsilon) \cap L(\langle \mathcal{A}_2 \rangle_\varepsilon) \neq \emptyset$.

Therefore, we have to prove that the second condition can be decided in NL. For $j \in \{1, 2\}$, we write $\mathcal{A}_j = (Q_j, I_j, F_j, \delta_j)$. By definition, $\langle \mathcal{A}_j \rangle_\varepsilon$ is built from \mathcal{A}_j by adding new transitions labeled by a^{-1} (this is the construction of $\mathcal{A}_j \mapsto \langle \mathcal{A}_j \rangle$) and ε -transitions (this is the construction of $\langle \mathcal{A}_j \rangle \mapsto \langle \mathcal{A}_j \rangle_\varepsilon$). It is standard that if we have $\langle \mathcal{A}_1 \rangle_\varepsilon$ and $\langle \mathcal{A}_2 \rangle_\varepsilon$ in hand, deciding whether $L(\langle \mathcal{A}_1 \rangle_\varepsilon) \cap L(\langle \mathcal{A}_2 \rangle_\varepsilon) \neq \emptyset$ can be achieved in NL since this boils down to graph reachability (in the product of \mathcal{A}_1 and \mathcal{A}_2 whose set of states is $Q_1 \times Q_2$). Therefore, we have to prove that one may decide in NL whether a given transition belongs to $\langle \delta_1 \rangle_\varepsilon$ or $\langle \delta_2 \rangle_\varepsilon$.

This is immediate for the transitions labeled by $a \in A$ as they already belong to δ_1 and δ_2 . Let us now consider the transitions labeled by $a^{-1} \in A^{-1}$ which belong to $\langle \delta_1 \rangle$ and $\langle \delta_2 \rangle$. By definition, for $j = 1, 2$, and $q, r \in Q_j$, we have $(r, a^{-1}, q) \in \langle \delta_j \rangle$ if and only if $(q, a, r) \in \delta_j$ and q, r are strongly connected. Clearly, this can be checked in NL since testing whether q, r are strongly connected boils down to graph reachability (which is in NL). It remains to consider the ε -transitions in $\langle \delta_1 \rangle_\varepsilon$ and $\langle \delta_2 \rangle_\varepsilon$. We do so in the following lemma (this is where we use the hypothesis that the alphabet is unary).

Lemma 36. *Let $j \in \{1, 2\}$ and $q, r \in Q_j$, one may decide in NL whether $(q, \varepsilon, r) \in \langle \delta_j \rangle_\varepsilon$.*

Proof. By definition, we have $(q, \varepsilon, r) \in \langle \delta_j \rangle_\varepsilon$ if and only if there exists $w \in L_\varepsilon \subseteq \tilde{A}^*$ such that $w \in L(\langle \mathcal{A}_j \rangle, q, r)$. Observe that since we have $A = \{a\}$, it follows that $L_\varepsilon = \{w \in \tilde{A}^* \mid |w|_a = |w|_{a^{-1}}\}$. We use this property to prove that deciding whether $(q, \varepsilon, r) \in \langle \delta_j \rangle_\varepsilon$ boils down to graph reachability, which again can be decided in NL.

We let $U = Q_j \times \mathbb{Z}$ be a set of vertices and consider the following set of edges:

$$E = \begin{aligned} & \{((q, k), (q', k+1)) \mid (q, a, q') \in \langle \delta_j \rangle\} \\ & \cup \{((q, k), (q', k-1)) \mid (q, a^{-1}, q') \in \langle \delta_j \rangle\}. \end{aligned}$$

Consider the graph $G = (U, E)$. One may verify that $(q, \varepsilon, r) \in \langle \delta_j \rangle_\varepsilon$ if and only if there exists a path from $(q, 0)$ to $(r, 0)$ in G . We prove that the latter condition can be checked in NL. Let $V = \{(q, k) \in U \mid |k| \leq |Q_j|^2\}$. We show that there exists a path $(q, 0)$ to $(r, 0)$ in G if and only if there exists a path from $(q, 0)$ to $(r, 0)$ in G using only states in V . It is then straightforward that this last property can be tested in NL, since this is again a graph reachability problem over a graph with $|V| = |Q_j| \times (2|Q_j| + 1)$ vertices, whose edges can be computed from \mathcal{A}_j in NL.

The right to left implication is immediate. For the converse one, we consider a path from $(q, 0)$ to $(r, 0)$ in G . We prove that if this path contains a vertex in $U \setminus V$, then there exists a strictly shorter path from $(q, 0)$ to $(r, 0)$. One may then iterate the result to build a path that only contains states in V , completing the proof. Let $(s_0, k_0), \dots, (s_n, k_n) \in U$ be the vertices along our path: $(s_0, k_0) = (q, 0)$, $(s_n, k_n) = (r, 0)$, and for every $i \leq n$, we have $((s_i, k_i), (s_{i+1}, k_{i+1})) \in E$. Moreover, we know that there exists some index $h \leq n$ such that $(s_h, k_h) \notin V$, i.e., such that $|k_h| > |Q_j|^2$. By symmetry, we assume that $k_h > |Q_j|^2$ and leave the case $k_h < -|Q_j|^2$ to the reader. We write $m = k_h$ for the proof. By definition of E and since $k_0 = k_n = 0$, there exist,

$$0 < i_1 < \dots < i_{m-1} < h < i'_{m-1} < \dots < i'_1 < n,$$

such that $k_{i_1} = k_{i'_1} = 1, \dots, k_{i_{m-1}} = k_{i'_{m-1}} = m - 1$. We also write $i_0 = 0$ and $i'_0 = n$. By hypothesis, $k_{i_0} = k_{i'_0} = 0$. Since $m > |Q_j|^2$, it now follows from the pigeonhole principle that there exist $0 \leq \ell_1 < \ell_2 \leq m - 1$ such that $s_{i_{\ell_1}} = s_{i_{\ell_2}}$

and $s_{i'_{\ell_1}} = s_{i'_{\ell_2}}$. Let $\ell = \ell_2 - \ell_1$. One may verify from the definition of E that the following paths exist in G :

$$\begin{aligned} & (s_0, k_0) \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow (s_{i_{\ell_1}}, k_{i_{\ell_1}}) \rightarrow (s_{i_{\ell_2+1}}, k_{i_{\ell_2+1}} - \ell) \\ & (s_{i_{\ell_2+1}}, k_{i_{\ell_2+1}} - \ell) \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow (s_h, k_h - \ell) \\ & (s_h, k_h - \ell) \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow (s_{i'_{\ell_2-1}}, k_{i'_{\ell_2-1}} - \ell) \rightarrow (s_{i'_{\ell_1}}, k_{i'_{\ell_1}}) \\ & (s_{i'_{\ell_1}}, k_{i'_{\ell_1}}) \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow (s_n, k_n). \end{aligned}$$

Altogether, we get a strictly shorter path from $(q, 0)$ to $(r, 0)$, which completes the proof. \square

VI. CONCLUSION

We proved simple separation and covering algorithms for the classes GR, AMT and MOD using only standard notions from automata theory. For GR and AMT, the proofs are based on the automata-theoretic construction “ $\mathcal{A} \mapsto \langle \mathcal{A} \rangle$ ”. Since the statements behind the two algorithms (i.e., Theorem 8 and Theorem 27) are similar, a natural question is whether their proofs can be unified (as of now, they are independent). We also obtained tight complexity bounds: separation is NL-complete for MOD, co-NP-complete for AMT and P-complete for GR. Covering is co-NP-complete for both MOD and AMT, and between co-NP and PSPACE for GR. This raises the question of the exact complexity of GR-covering.

REFERENCES

- [1] K. Alibabaei. Every decidable pseudovariety of Abelian groups is completely tame. *Semigroup Forum*, 99(1), 2019.
- [2] J. Almeida. *Finite Semigroups and Universal Algebra*. World Scientific, 1995.
- [3] J. Almeida. Some algorithmic problems for pseudovarieties. *Publicaciones Mathematicae Debrecen*, 54, 1999.
- [4] J. Almeida. Dynamics of implicit operations and tameness of pseudovarieties of groups. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 354, 2001.
- [5] J. Almeida, J. C. Costa, and M. Zeitoun. Tameness of pseudovariety joins involving R. *Monatsh. Math.*, 146, 2005.
- [6] J. Almeida and M. Delgado. Tameness of the pseudovariety of Abelian groups. *Internat. J. Algebra Comput.*, 15(2), 2005.
- [7] C. J. Ash. Inevitable graphs: a proof of the type II conjecture and some related decision procedures. *Internat. J. Algebra Comput.*, 1(1), 1991.
- [8] K. Auinger. A new proof of the Rhodes type II conjecture. *Internat. J. Algebra Comput.*, 14(5-6), 2004.
- [9] Y. Bar-Hillel, M. Perles, and E. Shamir. On formal properties of simple phrase structure grammars. *Zeitschrift für Phonetik, Sprachwissenschaft und Kommunikationsforschung*, 14, 1961. Reprinted in Y. Bar-Hillel. (1964). *Language and Information: Selected Essays on their Theory and Application*, Addison-Wesley 1964, 116–150.
- [10] J.-C. Birget, S. Margolis, J. Meakin, and P. Weil. PSPACE-complete problems for subgroups of free groups and inverse finite automata. *Theoret. Comput. Sci.*, 242(1):247–281, 2000.
- [11] C. Choffrut and A. Frigeri. Deciding whether the ordering is necessary in a Presburger formula. *Discrete Math. Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 12(1), 2010.
- [12] M. Delgado. Abelian poinlikes of a monoid. *Semigroup Forum*, 56(3), 1998.
- [13] L. M. Goldschlager. The monotone and planar circuit value problems are log space complete for P. *SIGACT News*, 9, 1977.
- [14] P. Habermehl, A. Muscholl, T. Schwentick, and H. Seidl. Counting in trees for free. In *Proceedings of the 31st International Colloquium on Automata, Languages and Programming, ICALP'04*. Springer, 2004.
- [15] K. Henckell, S. Margolis, J.-E. Pin, and J. Rhodes. Ash’s type II theorem, profinite topology and Malcev products. *Internat. J. Algebra Comput.*, 1, 1991.
- [16] B. Herwig and D. Lascar. Extending partial automorphisms and the profinite topology on free groups. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 352, 1999.
- [17] T. W. Hungerford. *Algebra*. Springer, 1980.

- [18] I. Kapovich and A. Myasnikov. Stallings foldings and subgroups of free groups. *J. Algebra*, 248(2), 2002.
- [19] J. Karnofsky and J. Rhodes. Decidability of complexity one-half for finite semigroups. *Semigroup Forum*, 24(1), 1982.
- [20] E. Kopczynski and A. W. To. Parikh images of grammars: Complexity and applications. In *Proceedings of the 25th Annual IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science, LICS'10*. ACM, 2010.
- [21] S. W. Margolis and J.-E. Pin. New results on the conjecture of Rhodes and on the topological conjecture. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 80(3), 1992.
- [22] J.-E. Pin. *The dot-depth hierarchy, 45 years later*, chapter 8, pages 177–202. World Scientific, 2017.
- [23] J.-E. Pin. *Open Problems About Regular Languages, 35 Years Later*, chapter 7, pages 153–175. World Scientific, 2017.
- [24] J.-E. Pin and C. Reutenauer. A conjecture on the Hall topology for the free group. *Bull. London Math. Soc.*, 23(4), 1991.
- [25] T. Place. The amazing mixed polynomial closure and its applications to two-variable first-order logic. In *Proceedings of the 37th Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science, LICS'22*. ACM, 2022.
- [26] T. Place and M. Zeitoun. The covering problem. *Log. Methods Comput. Sci.*, 14(3), 2018.
- [27] T. Place and M. Zeitoun. Generic results for concatenation hierarchies. *Theory Comput. Syst.*, 63(4), 2019. Selected papers from CSR'17.
- [28] T. Place and M. Zeitoun. Going higher in first-order quantifier alternation hierarchies on words. *J. ACM*, 66(2), 2019.
- [29] T. Place and M. Zeitoun. On all things star-free. In *Proceedings of the 46th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming, ICALP'19*, volume 132 of *LIPICs*. Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2019.
- [30] T. Place and M. Zeitoun. Separation and covering for group based concatenation hierarchies. In *Proceedings of the 34th Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science, LICS'19*. IEEE, 2019.
- [31] T. Place and M. Zeitoun. Characterizing level one in group-based concatenation hierarchies. In *17th International Symposium Computer Science in Russia, CSR'22*. Springer, 2022.
- [32] T. Place and M. Zeitoun. A generic polynomial time approach to separation by first-order logic without quantifier alternation. In *42nd IARCS Annual Conference on Foundations of Software Technology and Theoretical Computer Science, FSTTCS'22*, LIPICs. Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2022.
- [33] T. Place and M. Zeitoun. Group separation strikes back. In *Proceedings of the 38th Annual IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science, LICS'23*. IEEE, 2023.
- [34] J. Rhodes. New techniques in global semigroup theory. In *Semigroups and Their Applications: Proceedings of the International Conference "Algebraic Theory of Semigroups and Its Applications"*. Springer, 1987.
- [35] L. Ribes and P. A. Zalesskii. On the profinite topology on a free group. *Bull. London Math. Soc.*, 25(1), 1993.
- [36] B. Scarpellini. Complexity of subcases of Presburger arithmetic. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 284, 1984.
- [37] M. P. Schützenberger. On finite monoids having only trivial subgroups. *Inform. and Control*, 8(2), 1965.
- [38] J. R. Stallings. Topology of finite graphs. *Inventiones mathematicae*, 71(3), 1983.
- [39] B. Steinberg. Inevitable graphs and profinite topologies: Some solutions to algorithmic problems in monoid and automata theory, stemming from group theory. *Internat. J. Algebra Comput.*, 11(1), 2001.
- [40] P. Tesson and D. Therien. Logic meets algebra: the case of regular languages. *Log. Methods Comput. Sci.*, 3(1), 2007.
- [41] G. Thierrin. Permutation automata. *Theoret. Comput. Sci.*, 2(1), 1968.