The validity of weighted automata

Jacques Sakarovitch

CNRS / Université Denis-Diderot and Telecom ParisTech

Joint work with

Sylvain Lombardy

LaBRI, CNRS / Université de Bordeaux / Institut Polytechnique de Bordeaux

CIAA, 31 July 2018, Charlottetown, PEI

Dedicated to the memory of Zoltan Ésik

First version presented at CIAA 2012 under the title:

The removal of weighted ε-transitions,

in: *Proc. CIAA 2012*, *Lect. Notes in Comput. Sci.* n° 7381.

Published in

International Journal of Algebra and Computation **23** (2013)

DOI: 10.1142/S0218196713400146

Supported by ANR Project 10-INTB-0203 VAUCANSON 2.

The automaton model

$\mathcal{B}_1$



The automaton model

$\mathcal{B}_1$



$L(\mathcal{B}_1) = A^* b \, A^*$

$$\longrightarrow p \xrightarrow{b} p \xrightarrow{a} p \xrightarrow{b} q \longrightarrow$$

The weighted automaton model

$\mathcal{C}_1$



The weighted automaton model



$$\xrightarrow{1} p \xrightarrow{\frac{1}{2}\,b} p \xrightarrow{\frac{1}{2}\,a} p \xrightarrow{\frac{1}{2}\,b} q \xrightarrow{1}$$

$$\xrightarrow{1} p \xrightarrow{\frac{1}{2}\,b} q \xrightarrow{a} q \xrightarrow{b} q \xrightarrow{1}$$

The weighted automaton model

$\mathcal{C}_1$



$$\xrightarrow{1} p \xrightarrow{\frac{1}{2}\,b} p \xrightarrow{\frac{1}{2}\,a} p \xrightarrow{\frac{1}{2}\,b} q \xrightarrow{1}$$

$$\xrightarrow{1} p \xrightarrow{\frac{1}{2}\,b} q \xrightarrow{a} q \xrightarrow{b} q \xrightarrow{1}$$

- Weight of a path c: *product* of the weights of transitions in c
- Weight of a word w: *sum* of the weights of paths with label w

$$b\,a\,b \quad \longmapsto \quad \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{8} = \frac{5}{8}$$

The weighted automaton model



$$\xrightarrow{1} p \xrightarrow{\frac{1}{2}\,b} p \xrightarrow{\frac{1}{2}\,a} p \xrightarrow{\frac{1}{2}\,b} q \xrightarrow{1}$$

$$\xrightarrow{1} p \xrightarrow{\frac{1}{2}\,b} q \xrightarrow{a} q \xrightarrow{b} q \xrightarrow{1}$$

- Weight of a path c: *product* of the weights of transitions in c
- Weight of a word w: *sum* of the weights of paths with label w

$$b\,a\,b \quad \longmapsto \quad \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{8} = \frac{5}{8} \quad = \langle 0.101 \rangle_2$$

The weighted automaton model

$\mathcal{C}_1$



$|\mathcal{C}_1| \in \mathbb{Q}\langle\langle A^* \rangle\rangle$

$$\xrightarrow{1} p \xrightarrow{\frac{1}{2}\,b} p \xrightarrow{\frac{1}{2}\,a} p \xrightarrow{\frac{1}{2}\,b} q \xrightarrow{1}$$

$$\xrightarrow{1} p \xrightarrow{\frac{1}{2}\,b} q \xrightarrow{a} q \xrightarrow{b} q \xrightarrow{1}$$

- Weight of a path c: *product* of the weights of transitions in c
- Weight of a word w: *sum* of the weights of paths with label w

$$b\,a\,b \quad \longmapsto \quad \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{8} = \frac{5}{8}$$

$$|\mathcal{C}_1| \colon A^* \longrightarrow \mathbb{Q}$$

The weighted automaton model

$\mathcal{C}_1$



$|\mathcal{C}_1| \in \mathbb{Q}\langle\langle A^* \rangle\rangle$

$$\xrightarrow{1} p \xrightarrow{\frac{1}{2}\,b} p \xrightarrow{\frac{1}{2}\,a} p \xrightarrow{\frac{1}{2}\,b} q \xrightarrow{1}$$

$$\xrightarrow{1} p \xrightarrow{\frac{1}{2}\,b} q \xrightarrow{a} q \xrightarrow{b} q \xrightarrow{1}$$

- Weight of a path c: *product* of the weights of transitions in c
- Weight of a word w: *sum* of the weights of paths with label w

$$|\mathcal{C}_1| = \frac{1}{2}\,b + \frac{1}{4}\,a\,b + \frac{1}{2}\,b\,a + \frac{3}{4}\,b\,b + \frac{1}{8}\,a\,a\,b + \frac{1}{4}\,a\,b\,a + \frac{3}{8}\,a\,b\,b + \frac{1}{2}\,b\,a\,a + \ldots$$

The weighted automaton model



$$\mathcal{C}_1 = \langle\, I_1, \underline{E_1}, T_1 \,\rangle = \left\langle \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{2}\,a + \frac{1}{2}\,b & \frac{1}{2}\,b \\ 0 & a + b \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle$$

The weighted automaton model

$$\mathcal{A} = \langle\, I, \underline{E}, T\,\rangle \qquad\qquad \underline{E} = \text{adjacency matrix}$$

$$\underline{E}_{p,q} = \sum \{\mathbf{wl}(e) \mid e \quad \text{transition from } p \text{ to } q\}$$
$$= \qquad \text{linear combination of letters in } A$$

$$\underline{E}^{n}_{p,q} = \sum \{\mathbf{wl}(c) \mid c \quad \text{computation from } p \text{ to } q \text{ of length } n\}$$

$$\underline{E}^{*} = \sum_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \underline{E}^{n}$$

Since $\underline{E}$ is proper, $\underline{E}^{*}$ is well-defined

$$\underline{E}^{*}_{p,q} = \sum \{\mathbf{wl}(c) \mid c \quad \text{computation from } p \text{ to } q\}$$

The weighted automaton model

$\mathcal{C}_1$



$$\mathcal{C}_1 = \langle\, I_1, \underline{E_1}, T_1 \,\rangle = \left\langle \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{2}\,a + \frac{1}{2}\,b & \frac{1}{2}\,b \\ 0 & a + b \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle$$

$$\left|\mathcal{C}_1\right| = I_1 \cdot \underline{E_1}^{*} \cdot T_1$$

The weighted automaton model



$$\mathcal{C}_1 = \langle\, I_1, \underline{E_1}, T_1 \,\rangle = \left\langle \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{2}\,a + \frac{1}{2}\,b & \frac{1}{2}\,b \\ 0 & a+b \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle$$

$$\left|\mathcal{C}_1\right| = I_1 \cdot \underline{E_1}^{*} \cdot T_1$$

Every $\mathbb{K}$-automaton defines a series in $\mathbb{K}\langle\langle A^* \rangle\rangle$

whose coefficients are effectively computable

The weighted automaton model



$$|\mathcal{C}_1| = I_1 \cdot \underline{E_1}^* \cdot T_1$$

Every $\mathbb{K}$-automaton defines a series in $\mathbb{K}\langle\langle A^* \rangle\rangle$

whose coefficients are effectively computable

Where is the problem ?

The weighted automaton model



$$|\mathcal{C}_1| = I_1 \cdot \underline{E_1}^* \cdot T_1$$

Every $\mathbb{K}$-automaton defines a series in $\mathbb{K}\langle\langle A^* \rangle\rangle$

whose coefficients are effectively computable

Where is the problem ?

We want to be able to deal with weighted automata

where transitions *might be* labelled by the empty word

The need for a richer model: eg, the concatenation product



The need for a richer model: eg, the concatenation product





The need for a richer model: eg, the concatenation product



The need for a richer model: eg, the concatenation product



The need for a richer model: eg, the concatenation product



A basic result in (classical) automata theory

Theorem (Folk–Lore)

Every ε-NFA is equivalent to an NFA

A basic result in (classical) automata theory

Theorem (Folk–Lore)

Every ε-NFA is equivalent to an NFA

Usefulness of ε-transitions:

Preliminary step for many constructions on NFA's:

- *Product* and *star* of position (Glushkov, standard) automata
- *Thompson construction*
- Construction of the *universal automaton*
- Computation of the *image of a transducer*
- ...

May correspond to the *structure* of the computations

A basic result in (classical) automata theory

Theorem (Folk–Lore)

Every ε-NFA is equivalent to an NFA

Usefulness of ε-transitions:

Preliminary step for many constructions on NFA's:

- *Product* and *star* of position (Glushkov, standard) automata
- *Thompson construction*
- Construction of the *universal automaton*
- Computation of the *image of a transducer*
- ...

May correspond to the *structure* of the computations

Removal of ε-transitions is implemented in all automata software

A basic result in (classical) automata theory



A basic result in (classical) automata theory



A basic result in (classical) automata theory



A basic result in (classical) automata theory



A basic result in (classical) automata theory



A basic result in (classical) automata theory



A basic result in (classical) automata theory



A basic result in (classical) automata theory



A basic result in (classical) automata theory

Theorem (Folk–Lore)

Every ε-NFA is equivalent to an NFA

A proof

$\mathcal{A} = \langle\, I, \underline{E}, T \,\rangle$ $\quad\quad$ $\underline{E}$ transition matrix of $\mathcal{A}$

Entries of $\underline{E}$ = subsets of $A \cup \{\varepsilon\}$

$$L(\mathcal{A}) = I \cdot \underline{E}^* \cdot T$$

$$\underline{E} = \underline{E}_0 + \underline{E}_{\mathsf{p}}$$

$$L(\mathcal{A}) = I \cdot (\underline{E}_0 + \underline{E}_{\mathsf{p}})^* \cdot T = I \cdot (\underline{E}_0^* \cdot \underline{E}_{\mathsf{p}})^* \cdot \underline{E}_0^* \cdot T$$

$\mathcal{A} = \langle\, I, \underline{E}, T \,\rangle$ equivalent to $\mathcal{B} = \left\langle\, I, \underline{E}_0^* \cdot \underline{E}_{\mathsf{p}}, \underline{E}_0^* \cdot T \,\right\rangle$

A basic result in (classical) automata theory

Theorem (Folk–Lore)

Every ε-NFA is equivalent to an NFA

A proof

$\mathcal{A} = \langle\, I, \underline{E}, T \,\rangle$ $\qquad$ $\underline{E}$ transition matrix of $\mathcal{A}$

Entries of $\underline{E}$ = subsets of $A \cup \{\varepsilon\}$

$$L(\mathcal{A}) = I \cdot \underline{E}^* \cdot T$$

$$\underline{E} = \underline{E}_0 + \underline{E}_{\mathrm{p}}$$

$$L(\mathcal{A}) = I \cdot (\underline{E}_0 + \underline{E}_{\mathrm{p}})^* \cdot T = I \cdot (\underline{E}_0^* \cdot \underline{E}_{\mathrm{p}})^* \cdot \underline{E}_0^* \cdot T$$

$\mathcal{A} = \langle\, I, \underline{E}, T \,\rangle$ equivalent to $\mathcal{B} = \left\langle\, I, \underline{E}_0^* \cdot \underline{E}_{\mathrm{p}}, \underline{E}_0^* \cdot T \,\right\rangle$

One *proof* = several *algorithms* for *computing* $\underline{E}_0^*$ or $\underline{E}_0^* \cdot \underline{E}_{\mathrm{p}}$

Automata and expressions

$$E_2 = (a^* + b^*)^*$$

Automata and expressions

$$E_2 = (a^* + b^*)^*$$



The Thompson automaton of E_2

Automata and expressions

$$E_2 = (a^* + b^*)^*$$



The Thompson automaton of E_2

Theorem (Folk–Lore ?)

The closure of the Thompson automaton of E

yields the position automaton of E

A basic question in weighted automata theory

Question

Is every ε-WFA is equivalent to a WFA?

A basic question in weighted automata theory

Question

Is every ε-WFA is equivalent to a WFA?



A basic question in weighted automata theory

Question

Is every ε*-WFA is equivalent to a WFA?*



A basic question in weighted automata theory

Question

Is every ε-WFA is equivalent to a WFA?



A basic question in weighted automata theory

Question

Is every ε-WFA is equivalent to a WFA?



A basic question in weighted automata theory

Question

Is every ε-WFA is equivalent to a WFA?



A basic question in weighted automata theory

Question

Is every ε-WFA is equivalent to a WFA?





A basic question in weighted automata theory

Question

Is every ε-WFA is equivalent to a WFA?



A basic question in weighted automata theory

Question

Is every ε-WFA is equivalent to a WFA?





A basic question in weighted automata theory

Question

Is every ε-WFA is equivalent to a WFA?





$\xrightarrow{1} p \xrightarrow{a} r \xrightarrow{1}$,

A basic question in weighted automata theory

Question

Is every ε-WFA is equivalent to a WFA?





$\xrightarrow{1} p \xrightarrow{a} r \xrightarrow{1}$, $\quad \xrightarrow{1} p \xrightarrow{2\,\varepsilon} p \xrightarrow{a} r \xrightarrow{1}$,

A basic question in weighted automata theory

Question

Is every ε-WFA is equivalent to a WFA?



$$\xrightarrow{1} p \xrightarrow{a} r \xrightarrow{1} \quad , \qquad \xrightarrow{1} p \xrightarrow{2\,\varepsilon} p \xrightarrow{a} r \xrightarrow{1} \quad ,$$

$$\xrightarrow{1} p \xrightarrow{2\,\varepsilon} p \xrightarrow{2\,\varepsilon} p \xrightarrow{a} r \xrightarrow{1} \quad , \qquad \ldots$$

A basic question in weighted automata theory

Question

Is every ε-WFA is equivalent to a WFA?





$$\xrightarrow{1} p \xrightarrow{a} r \xrightarrow{1} \quad , \qquad \xrightarrow{1} p \xrightarrow{2\,\varepsilon} p \xrightarrow{a} r \xrightarrow{1} \quad ,$$

$$\xrightarrow{1} p \xrightarrow{2\,\varepsilon} p \xrightarrow{2\,\varepsilon} p \xrightarrow{a} r \xrightarrow{1} \quad , \qquad \ldots$$

$$a \quad \longmapsto \quad 1 + 2 + 4 + \cdots$$

A basic question in weighted automata theory

Question

Is every ε-WFA is equivalent to a WFA?





$$\xrightarrow{1} p \xrightarrow{a} r \xrightarrow{1} \quad , \qquad \xrightarrow{1} p \xrightarrow{2\,\varepsilon} p \xrightarrow{a} r \xrightarrow{1} \quad ,$$

$$\xrightarrow{1} p \xrightarrow{2\,\varepsilon} p \xrightarrow{2\,\varepsilon} p \xrightarrow{a} r \xrightarrow{1} \quad , \quad \ldots$$

$a \quad \longmapsto \quad 1 + 2 + 4 + \cdots$ undefined

A basic question in weighted automata theory

Question

Is every ε-WFA is equivalent to a WFA?





A basic question in weighted automata theory

Question

Is every ε-WFA is equivalent to a WFA?



$$\xrightarrow{1} p \xrightarrow{a} r \xrightarrow{1} \quad , \quad \xrightarrow{1} p \xrightarrow{\varepsilon} p \xrightarrow{a} r \xrightarrow{1} \quad ,$$

$$\xrightarrow{1} p \xrightarrow{\varepsilon} p \xrightarrow{\varepsilon} p \xrightarrow{a} r \xrightarrow{1} \quad , \quad \ldots$$

$$a \longmapsto 1 + 1 + 1 + \cdots$$

undefined

A basic question in weighted automata theory

Question

Is every ε-WFA is equivalent to a WFA?





A basic question in weighted automata theory

Question

Is every ε-WFA is equivalent to a WFA?





$\xrightarrow{1} p \xrightarrow{a} r \xrightarrow{1}$, $\xrightarrow{1} p \xrightarrow{\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon} p \xrightarrow{a} r \xrightarrow{1}$,

$\xrightarrow{1} p \xrightarrow{\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon} p \xrightarrow{\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon} p \xrightarrow{a} r \xrightarrow{1}$, ...

A basic question in weighted automata theory

Question

Is every ε-WFA is equivalent to a WFA?





$$\xrightarrow{1} p \xrightarrow{a} r \xrightarrow{1} \ , \quad \xrightarrow{1} p \xrightarrow{\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon} p \xrightarrow{a} r \xrightarrow{1} \ ,$$

$$\xrightarrow{1} p \xrightarrow{\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon} p \xrightarrow{\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon} p \xrightarrow{a} r \xrightarrow{1} \ , \quad \ldots$$

$$a \longmapsto 1 + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{4} + \cdots \qquad \text{undefined?}$$

A basic question in weighted automata theory

Question

Is every ε*-WFA is equivalent to a WFA?*





$$\xrightarrow{1} p \xrightarrow{a} r \xrightarrow{1} \quad , \qquad \xrightarrow{1} p \xrightarrow{\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon} p \xrightarrow{a} r \xrightarrow{1} \quad ,$$

$$\xrightarrow{1} p \xrightarrow{\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon} p \xrightarrow{\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon} p \xrightarrow{a} r \xrightarrow{1} \quad , \quad \ldots$$

$$a \quad \longmapsto \quad 1 + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{4} + \cdots$$

undefined? defined?

A basic question in weighted automata theory

Question

Is every ε-WFA is equivalent to a WFA?





$$\xrightarrow{1} p \xrightarrow{a} r \xrightarrow{1} \quad , \qquad \xrightarrow{1} p \xrightarrow{\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon} p \xrightarrow{a} r \xrightarrow{1} \quad ,$$

$$\xrightarrow{1} p \xrightarrow{\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon} p \xrightarrow{\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon} p \xrightarrow{a} r \xrightarrow{1} \quad , \qquad \ldots$$

$$a \quad \longmapsto \quad 1 + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{4} + \cdots$$

undefined? defined?

A basic question in weighted automata theory

Question

Is every ε-WFA is equivalent to a WFA?





$$\xrightarrow{1} p \xrightarrow{a} r \xrightarrow{1} \quad , \qquad \xrightarrow{1} p \xrightarrow{\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon} p \xrightarrow{a} r \xrightarrow{1} \quad ,$$

$$\xrightarrow{1} p \xrightarrow{\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon} p \xrightarrow{\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon} p \xrightarrow{a} r \xrightarrow{1} \quad , \quad \ldots$$

$$a \quad \longmapsto \quad 1 + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{4} + \cdots$$

undefined? defined?

A basic question in weighted automata theory

Question

Is every ε-WFA is equivalent to a WFA?





$$\xrightarrow{1} p \xrightarrow{a} r \xrightarrow{1} \quad , \qquad \xrightarrow{1} p \xrightarrow{\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon} p \xrightarrow{a} r \xrightarrow{1} \quad ,$$

$$\xrightarrow{1} p \xrightarrow{\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon} p \xrightarrow{\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon} p \xrightarrow{a} r \xrightarrow{1} \quad , \qquad \ldots$$

$$a \quad \longmapsto \quad 1 + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{4} + \cdots$$

undefined? defined?

A basic question in weighted automata theory

Question

Is every ε-WFA is equivalent to a WFA?



A basic question in weighted automata theory

Question

Is every ε-WFA is equivalent to a WFA?



A basic question in weighted automata theory

Question

Is every ε-WFA is equivalent to a WFA?





if $k^* = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} k^n$ is defined in $\mathbb{K}$

A basic question in weighted automata theory

Question

Is every ε-WFA is equivalent to a WFA?

certainly not !

A basic question in weighted automata theory

Question

Is every ε-WFA is equivalent to a WFA?

certainly not !

New questions

Which ε-WFAs have a *well-defined* behaviour?

A basic question in weighted automata theory

Question

Is every ε-WFA is equivalent to a WFA?

certainly not !

New questions

Which ε-WFAs have a *well-defined* behaviour?

How to compute the behaviour of an ε-WFA (when it is *well-defined*)?

A basic question in weighted automata theory

Question

Is every ε-WFA is equivalent to a WFA?

certainly not !

New questions

Which ε-WFAs have a *well-defined* behaviour?

How to compute the behaviour of an ε-WFA (when it is *well-defined*)?

How to decide if the behaviour of an ε-WFA is *well-defined*?

Behaviour of weighted automata

Behaviour of weighted automata

$\mathcal{A} = \langle\, \mathbb{K}, A, Q, I, E, T \,\rangle$ possibly with ε-transitions

Behaviour of weighted automata

$\mathcal{A} = \langle\, \mathbb{K}, A, Q, I, E, T \,\rangle$ possibly with ε-transitions

$u \in A^*$

Behaviour of weighted automata

$\mathcal{A} = \langle\, \mathbb{K}, A, Q, I, E, T \,\rangle$ possibly with ε-transitions

$u \in A^*$ possibly *infinitely* many paths labelled by u in $\mathcal{A}$

Behaviour of weighted automata

$\mathcal{A} = \langle\, \mathbb{K}, A, Q, I, E, T \,\rangle$ possibly with ε-transitions

$u \in A^*$ possibly *infinitely* many paths labelled by u in $\mathcal{A}$

$\langle\!|\mathcal{A}|, u\rangle$ sum of weights of computations labelled by u in $\mathcal{A}$

Behaviour of weighted automata

$\mathcal{A} = \langle\, \mathbb{K}, A, Q, I, E, T \,\rangle$ possibly with ε-transitions

$u \in A^*$ possibly *infinitely* many paths labelled by u in $\mathcal{A}$

$\langle|\mathcal{A}|, u\rangle$ sum of weights of computations labelled by u in $\mathcal{A}$

if it is defined!

Behaviour of weighted automata

$\mathcal{A} = \langle\, \mathbb{K}, A, Q, I, E, T\,\rangle$ possibly with ε-transitions

$u \in A^*$ possibly *infinitely* many paths labelled by u in $\mathcal{A}$

$\langle |\mathcal{A}|, u \rangle$ sum of weights of computations labelled by u in $\mathcal{A}$

if it is defined!

$|\mathcal{A}|$ is defined if $\langle |\mathcal{A}|, u \rangle$ is defined $\forall u \in A^*$

Behaviour of weighted automata

$\mathcal{A} = \langle\, \mathbb{K}, A, Q, I, E, T \,\rangle$ possibly with ε-transitions

$u \in A^*$ possibly *infinitely* many paths labelled by u in $\mathcal{A}$

$\langle|\mathcal{A}|, u\rangle$ sum of weights of computations labelled by u in $\mathcal{A}$

if it is defined!

$|\mathcal{A}|$ is defined if $\langle|\mathcal{A}|, u\rangle$ is defined $\forall u \in A^*$

Trivial case

Behaviour of weighted automata

$\mathcal{A} = \langle\, \mathbb{K}, A, Q, I, E, T \,\rangle$ possibly with ε-transitions

$u \in A^*$ possibly *infinitely* many paths labelled by u in $\mathcal{A}$

$\langle |\mathcal{A}|, u \rangle$ sum of weights of computations labelled by u in $\mathcal{A}$

if it is defined!

$|\mathcal{A}|$ is defined if $\langle |\mathcal{A}|, u \rangle$ is defined $\forall u \in A^*$

Trivial case

Every u in A^* is the label of a finite number of paths

Behaviour of weighted automata

$\mathcal{A} = \langle\, \mathbb{K}, A, Q, I, E, T \,\rangle$ possibly with ε-transitions

$u \in A^*$ possibly *infinitely* many paths labelled by u in $\mathcal{A}$

$\langle\!|\mathcal{A}|, u\rangle$ sum of weights of computations labelled by u in $\mathcal{A}$

if it is defined!

$|\mathcal{A}|$ is defined if $\langle\!|\mathcal{A}|, u\rangle$ is defined $\forall u \in A^*$

Trivial case

Every u in A^* is the label of a finite number of paths

$$\Uparrow$$

no ε-transitions in $\mathcal{A}$

Behaviour of weighted automata

$\mathcal{A} = \langle\, \mathbb{K}, A, Q, I, E, T \,\rangle$ possibly with ε-transitions

$u \in A^*$ possibly *infinitely* many paths labelled by u in $\mathcal{A}$

$\langle|\mathcal{A}|, u\rangle$ sum of weights of computations labelled by u in $\mathcal{A}$

if it is defined!

$|\mathcal{A}|$ is defined if $\langle|\mathcal{A}|, u\rangle$ is defined $\forall u \in A^*$

Trivial case

Every u in A^* is the label of a finite number of paths

$$\Updownarrow$$

no circuits of ε-transitions in $\mathcal{A}$

Behaviour of weighted automata

$\mathcal{A} = \langle\, \mathbb{K}, A, Q, I, E, T \,\rangle$ possibly with ε-transitions

$u \in A^*$ possibly *infinitely* many paths labelled by u in $\mathcal{A}$

$\langle |\mathcal{A}|, u \rangle$ sum of weights of computations labelled by u in $\mathcal{A}$

if it is defined!

$|\mathcal{A}|$ is defined if $\langle |\mathcal{A}|, u \rangle$ is defined $\forall u \in A^*$

Trivial case

Every u in A^* is the label of a finite number of paths

$\Updownarrow$

no circuits of ε-transitions in $\mathcal{A}$

acyclic $\mathbb{K}$-automata

Behaviour of weighted automata

First solution

behaviour well-defined $\iff$ acyclic

Behaviour of weighted automata

First solution

behaviour well-defined $\iff$ acyclic

Legitimate, as far as the behaviours of the automata are concerned

(Kuich–Salomaa 86, Berstel–Reutenauer 84-88; 11)

Behaviour of weighted automata

First solution

behaviour well-defined $\Longleftrightarrow$ acyclic

Legitimate, as far as the behaviours of the automata are concerned

(Kuich–Salomaa 86, Berstel–Reutenauer 84-88; 11)



not valid

Behaviour of weighted automata

$\mathcal{A}$ not acyclic $\Rightarrow$ weight of u in $\mathcal{A}$ may be an infinite sum.

Behaviour of weighted automata

$\mathcal{A}$ not acyclic $\Rightarrow$ weight of u in $\mathcal{A}$ may be an infinite sum.

Second family of solutions

Accepting the idea of infinite sums

Behaviour of weighted automata

$\mathcal{A}$ not acyclic $\Rightarrow$ weight of u in $\mathcal{A}$ may be an infinite sum.

Second family of solutions

Accepting the idea of infinite sums

First point of view (algebraico-logic)

- Definition of a *new operator for infinite sums* $\sum_I$
- Setting *axioms* on $\sum_I$

  such that the star of a matrix be meaningful

Behaviour of weighted automata

$\mathcal{A}$ not acyclic $\Rightarrow$ weight of u in $\mathcal{A}$ may be an infinite sum.

Second family of solutions

Accepting the idea of infinite sums

First point of view (algebraico-logic)

- Definition of a *new operator for infinite sums* $\sum_I$
- Setting *axioms* on $\sum_I$

  such that the star of a matrix be meaningful

Less a *definition* on automata than *conditions* on $\mathbb{K}$

for all $\mathbb{K}$-automata have well-defined behaviour

Behaviour of weighted automata

$\mathcal{A}$ not acyclic $\Rightarrow$ weight of u in $\mathcal{A}$ may be an infinite sum.

Second family of solutions

Accepting the idea of infinite sums

First point of view (algebraico-logic)

- Definition of a *new operator for infinite sums* $\sum_I$
- Setting *axioms* on $\sum_I$

  such that the star of a matrix be meaningful

Less a *definition* on automata than *conditions* on $\mathbb{K}$

for all $\mathbb{K}$-automata have well-defined behaviour

Works of Bloom, Ésik, Kuich (90's –)

based on the axiomatisation described by Conway (72)

Behaviour of weighted automata

Second point of view (more analytical)

Infinite sums are given a meaning via a topology on $\mathbb{K}$

Behaviour of weighted automata

Second point of view (more analytical)

Infinite sums are given a meaning via a topology on $\mathbb{K}$

Topology allows to define summable families in $\mathbb{K}$

Behaviour of weighted automata

Second point of view (more analytical)

Infinite sums are given a meaning via a topology on $\mathbb{K}$

Topology on $\mathbb{K}$ defines a topology on $\mathbb{K}\langle\langle A^* \rangle\rangle$

Behaviour of weighted automata

Second point of view (more analytical)

Infinite sums are given a meaning via a topology on $\mathbb{K}$

Topology on $\mathbb{K}$ defines a topology on $\mathbb{K}\langle\langle A^* \rangle\rangle$

Third solution (Lombardy, S. 03 –)

$\mathcal{A} = \langle\, \mathbb{K}, A, Q, I, E, T \,\rangle$ possibly with ε-transitions

$\mathsf{P}_{\mathcal{A}}$ set of all paths in $\mathcal{A}$

Behaviour of weighted automata

Second point of view (more analytical)

Infinite sums are given a meaning via a topology on $\mathbb{K}$

Topology on $\mathbb{K}$ defines a topology on $\mathbb{K}\langle\langle A^* \rangle\rangle$

Third solution (Lombardy, S. 03 –)

$\mathcal{A} = \langle\, \mathbb{K}, A, Q, I, E, T \,\rangle$ possibly with ε-transitions

$\mathsf{P}_{\mathcal{A}}$ set of all paths in $\mathcal{A}$

$|\mathcal{A}|$ well-defined $\iff$ $\mathbf{WL}(\mathsf{P}_{\mathcal{A}})$ summable

Behaviour of weighted automata

Second point of view (more analytical)

Infinite sums are given a meaning via a topology on $\mathbb{K}$

Topology on $\mathbb{K}$ defines a topology on $\mathbb{K}\langle\langle A^* \rangle\rangle$

Third solution (Lombardy, S. 03 –)

$\mathcal{A} = \langle\, \mathbb{K}, A, Q, I, E, T \,\rangle$ possibly with ε-transitions

$\mathsf{P}_{\mathcal{A}}$ set of all paths in $\mathcal{A}$

$|\mathcal{A}|$ well-defined $\iff$ $\forall p, q \in Q \quad \mathbf{WL}\big(\mathsf{P}_{\mathcal{A}}(p,q)\big)$ summable

Behaviour of weighted automata

Second point of view (more analytical)

Infinite sums are given a meaning via a topology on $\mathbb{K}$

Topology on $\mathbb{K}$ defines a topology on $\mathbb{K}\langle\langle A^* \rangle\rangle$

Third solution (Lombardy, S. 03 –)

$\mathcal{A} = \langle\, \mathbb{K}, A, Q, I, E, T \,\rangle$ possibly with ε-transitions

$\mathsf{P}_{\mathcal{A}}$ set of all paths in $\mathcal{A}$

$|\mathcal{A}|$ well-defined $\iff$ $\forall p, q \in Q \quad \mathbf{WL}\big(\mathsf{P}_{\mathcal{A}}(p, q)\big)$ summable

- Yields a consistent theory

Behaviour of weighted automata

Second point of view (more analytical)

Infinite sums are given a meaning via a topology on $\mathbb{K}$

Topology on $\mathbb{K}$ defines a topology on $\mathbb{K}\langle\langle A^* \rangle\rangle$

Third solution (Lombardy, S. 03 –)

$\mathcal{A} = \langle\, \mathbb{K}, A, Q, I, E, T \,\rangle$ possibly with ε-transitions

$\mathsf{P}_{\mathcal{A}}$ set of all paths in $\mathcal{A}$

$|\mathcal{A}|$ well-defined $\iff$ $\forall p, q \in Q \quad \mathbf{WL}\big(\mathsf{P}_{\mathcal{A}}(p, q)\big)$ summable

- Yields a consistent theory
- Two pitfalls for effectivity
  - *effective computation* of a summable family may not be possible
  - *effective computation* may give values to non summable families

Problems in computing the behaviour of a weighted automaton



Problems in computing the behaviour of a weighted automaton



$$\mathcal{A}_1 = \langle\, I_1, \underline{E_1}, T_1 \,\rangle = \left\langle \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ -1 & -1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle$$

$$|\mathcal{A}_1| = I_1 \cdot \underline{E_1}^* \cdot T_1$$

$$\underline{E_1}^2 = 0 \quad \Longrightarrow \quad \underline{E_1}^* = \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \Longrightarrow \quad |\mathcal{A}_1| = 2$$

Problems in computing the behaviour of a weighted automaton



$$\mathcal{A}_1 = \langle\, I_1, \underline{E_1}, T_1 \,\rangle = \left\langle \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ -1 & -1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle$$

$$|\mathcal{A}_1| = I_1 \cdot \underline{E_1}^* \cdot T_1$$

$$\underline{E_1}^2 = 0 \quad \Longrightarrow \quad \underline{E_1}^* = \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \Longrightarrow \quad |\mathcal{A}_1| = 2$$

Problems in computing the behaviour of a weighted automaton



Problems in computing the behaviour of a weighted automaton



$$\left(-\frac{1}{2}\right)^* = \frac{2}{3}$$

Problems in computing the behaviour of a weighted automaton



Problems in computing the behaviour of a weighted automaton

$\mathcal{A}_2$



$$\left(-\frac{1}{2}\right)^* = \frac{2}{3}$$

Problems in computing the behaviour of a weighted automaton



Problems in computing the behaviour of a weighted automaton



Problems in computing the behaviour of a weighted automaton

$\mathcal{A}_2$



Problems in computing the behaviour of a weighted automaton

$\mathcal{A}_2$



$$\left(\frac{1}{9}\right)^* = \frac{9}{8}$$

Problems in computing the behaviour of a weighted automaton

$\mathcal{A}_2$



Problems in computing the behaviour of a weighted automaton

$\mathcal{A}_2$



$$\mathcal{A}_2 = \langle\, I_2, \underline{E_2}, T_2 \,\rangle = \left\langle \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2} \\ \frac{1}{2} & -\frac{1}{2} \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle$$

$$|\mathcal{A}_2| = I_2 \cdot \underline{E_2}^* \cdot T_2$$

$$\underline{E_2}^3 = \underline{E_2} \quad \Longrightarrow \quad \underline{E_2}^* \quad \text{undefined} \quad \Longrightarrow \quad |\mathcal{A}_2| \quad \text{undefined}$$

Problems in computing the behaviour of a weighted automaton



Problems in computing the behaviour of a weighted automaton

$\mathcal{A}_3$



$(1)^* =$ undefined

$\mathbb{N}$ natural integers $|\mathcal{A}_3|$ not defined

Problems in computing the behaviour of a weighted automaton

$\mathcal{A}_3$



$(1)^* = +\infty$

$\mathbb{N}$		natural integers	$\lvert\mathcal{A}_3\rvert$	not defined
$\mathcal{N}$	$\mathbb{N} \cup +\infty$	compact topology	$\lvert\mathcal{A}_3\rvert$	defined

Problems in computing the behaviour of a weighted automaton

$\mathcal{A}_3$



$\mathbb{N}$		natural integers	$\lvert\mathcal{A}_3\rvert$	not defined
$\mathcal{N}$	$\mathbb{N} \cup +\infty$	compact topology	$\lvert\mathcal{A}_3\rvert$	defined

Problems in computing the behaviour of a weighted automaton

$\mathcal{A}_3$



$(1)^* = \text{undefined}$

$\mathbb{N}$		natural integers	$\lvert\mathcal{A}_3\rvert$	not defined
$\mathcal{N}$	$\mathbb{N} \cup +\infty$	compact topology	$\lvert\mathcal{A}_3\rvert$	defined
$\mathbb{N}_\infty$	$\mathbb{N} \cup +\infty$	discrete topology	$\lvert\mathcal{A}_3\rvert$	not defined

Problems in computing the behaviour of a weighted automaton

$\mathcal{A}_4$



$\mathcal{N}$ $\mathbb{N} \cup +\infty$ compact topology $|\mathcal{A}_4|$ defined

Problems in computing the behaviour of a weighted automaton



$\mathcal{N}$	$\mathbb{N} \cup +\infty$	compact topology	$\lvert\mathcal{A}_4\rvert$	defined
$\mathbb{N}_\infty$	$\mathbb{N} \cup +\infty$	discrete topology	$\lvert\mathcal{A}_4\rvert$	defined

Problems in computing the behaviour of a weighted automaton



$\mathcal{N}$	$\mathbb{N} \cup +\infty$	compact topology	$\|\mathcal{A}_4\|$	defined
$\mathbb{N}_\infty$	$\mathbb{N} \cup +\infty$	discrete topology	$\|\mathcal{A}_4\|$	defined

Problems in computing the behaviour of a weighted automaton



$(1)^* =$ undefined

$\mathcal{N}$	$\mathbb{N} \cup +\infty$	compact topology	$\|\mathcal{A}_4\|$	defined
$\mathbb{N}_\infty$	$\mathbb{N} \cup +\infty$	discrete topology	$\|\mathcal{A}_4\|$	defined

A chicken and egg problem

automaton $\mathcal{A}$

algorithm A

A chicken and egg problem

automaton

$\mathcal{A}$

valid ?

algorithm

A

success ?

A chicken and egg problem

automaton	algorithm
$\mathcal{A}$	A
valid ?	success ?
valid	

A chicken and egg problem

automaton		algorithm
$\mathcal{A}$		A
valid ?		success ?
valid	$\Longrightarrow$	success

A chicken and egg problem

automaton		algorithm
$\mathcal{A}$		A
valid ?		**success ?**
valid	$\Longrightarrow$	**success**
		success

A chicken and egg problem

automaton		algorithm
$\mathcal{A}$		A
valid ?		**success ?**
valid	$\Longrightarrow$	**success**
valid	$\overset{?}{\Longleftarrow}$	**success**

A new definition of validity for weighted automata

$\mathcal{A} = \langle\, \mathbb{K}, A, Q, I, E, T \,\rangle$ possibly with ε-transitions

E^* *free monoid* generated by E

$\mathsf{P}_{\mathcal{A}}$ *set of paths* in $\mathcal{A}$ (local) rational subset of E^*

A new definition of validity for weighted automata

$\mathcal{A} = \langle\, \mathbb{K}, A, Q, I, E, T \,\rangle$ possibly with ε-transitions

E^* *free monoid* generated by E

$\mathsf{P}_{\mathcal{A}}$ *set of paths* in $\mathcal{A}$ (local) rational subset of E^*

Definition
R rational family of paths of $\mathcal{A}$ $R \in \mathrm{Rat}\, E^* \ \wedge\ R \subseteq \mathsf{P}_{\mathcal{A}}$

A new definition of validity for weighted automata

$\mathcal{A} = \langle\, \mathbb{K}, A, Q, I, E, T \,\rangle$ possibly with ε-transitions

E^* *free monoid* generated by E

$\mathsf{P}_{\mathcal{A}}$ *set of paths* in $\mathcal{A}$ (local) rational subset of E^*

Definition
R rational family of paths of $\mathcal{A}$ $\quad R \in \mathrm{Rat}\, E^* \;\wedge\; R \subseteq \mathsf{P}_{\mathcal{A}}$

Definition
$\mathcal{A}$ is valid iff
$\forall R$ rational family of paths of $\mathcal{A}$, $\mathbf{WL}(R)$ is summable

A new definition of validity for weighted automata

Validity implies the well-definition of behaviour

A new definition of validity for weighted automata

Validity implies the well-definition of behaviour

The notion of validity settles the previous examples

A new definition of validity for weighted automata

Validity implies the well-definition of behaviour

The notion of validity settles the previous examples

Remark

If every subfamily of a summable family in $\mathbb{K}$ is summable, then validity is equivalent to the well-definition of behaviour

Eg. $\mathbb{R}$, $\mathbb{C}$ *(and* $\mathbb{N}$, $\mathbb{Z}$, $\mathcal{N}$ *).*

If every rational subfamily of a summable family in $\mathbb{K}$ is summable, then validity is equivalent to the well-definition of behaviour

Eg. $\mathbb{Q}$.

A new definition of validity for weighted automata

Theorem

$\mathcal{A}$ is valid iff the behaviour of every covering of $\mathcal{A}$ is well-defined

A new definition of validity for weighted automata

Theorem

$\mathcal{A}$ is valid iff the behaviour of every covering of $\mathcal{A}$ is well-defined

Theorem

If $\mathcal{A}$ is valid, then 'every' removal algorithm on $\mathcal{A}$ is successful

A new definition of validity for weighted automata

Theorem

$\mathcal{A}$ is valid iff the behaviour of every covering of $\mathcal{A}$ is well-defined

Theorem

If $\mathcal{A}$ is valid, then 'every' removal algorithm on $\mathcal{A}$ is successful

Nota Bene

We do not know yet how to decide whether a $\mathbb{Q}$ - or an $\mathbb{R}$ -automaton is valid.

Deciding validity

Straightforward cases

- Non starable semirings (eg. $\mathbb{N}$, $\mathbb{Z}$)

  $\mathcal{A}$ valid $\iff$ $\mathcal{A}$ acyclic
- Complete topological semirings (eg. $\mathcal{N}$) every $\mathcal{A}$ valid
- Rationally additive semirings (eg. $\mathrm{Rat}\, A^*$) every $\mathcal{A}$ valid
- Locally closed commutative semirings every $\mathcal{A}$ valid

Deciding validity

Definition
$\mathbb{K}$ topological, ordered, positive, star-domain downward closed

(TOP SDDC)

Deciding validity

Definition

$\mathbb{K}$ topological, ordered, positive, star-domain downward closed

(TOP SDDC)

$\mathbb{N}$, $\mathcal{N}$, $\mathbb{Q}_+$, $\mathbb{R}_+$, $\mathbb{Z}$min, $\mathrm{Rat}\, A^*$,... are TOP SDDC

$\mathbb{N}_\infty$, (binary) positive decimals,... are not TOP SDDC

Deciding validity

Definition

$\mathbb{K}$ topological, ordered, positive, star-domain downward closed

(TOP SDDC)

$\mathbb{N}$, $\mathcal{N}$, $\mathbb{Q}_+$, $\mathbb{R}_+$, $\mathbb{Z}\mathsf{min}$, $\mathrm{Rat}\, A^*$,... are TOP SDDC

$\mathbb{N}_\infty$, (binary) positive decimals,... are not TOP SDDC

Theorem

$\mathbb{K}$ topological, ordered, positive, star-domain downward closed

A $\mathbb{K}$-automaton is valid if and only if

the ε-removal algorithm succeeds

Deciding validity

Definition

If $\mathcal{A}$ is a $\mathbb{Q}$- or $\mathbb{R}$-automaton,

then $\mathsf{abs}(\mathcal{A})$ is a $\mathbb{Q}_+$- or $\mathbb{R}_+$-automaton

Deciding validity

Definition

If $\mathcal{A}$ is a $\mathbb{Q}$- or $\mathbb{R}$-automaton,

then $\mathsf{abs}(\mathcal{A})$ is a $\mathbb{Q}_+$- or $\mathbb{R}_+$-automaton

Theorem

A $\mathbb{Q}$- or $\mathbb{R}$-automaton $\mathcal{A}$ is valid if and only if $\mathsf{abs}(\mathcal{A})$ is valid.

Automata and expressions validity

'Kleene' theorem

Automata	$\Longleftrightarrow$	Expressions
$\mathcal{A}$	$\Longleftrightarrow$	E
Weighted automata	$\Longleftrightarrow$	Weighted expressions

Automata and expressions validity

'Kleene' theorem

Automata $\Longleftrightarrow$ Expressions

$\mathcal{A}$ $\Longleftrightarrow$ E

Weighted automata $\Longleftrightarrow$ Weighted expressions

Validity of expressions

E *valid* $\Longleftrightarrow$ c(E) well-defined

c(E) computed by a bottom-up traversal of the syntactic tree of E

Automata and expressions validity

Valid $\mathcal{A}$ yields valid E

Valid E yields valid $\mathcal{A}$ with Glushkov construction

Valid E may yield non valid $\mathcal{A}$ with Thompson construction

Automata and expressions validity

Valid $\mathcal{A}$ yields valid E

Valid E yields valid $\mathcal{A}$ with Glushkov construction

Valid E may yield non valid $\mathcal{A}$ with Thompson construction



The Thompson automaton of $(a^* + \{-1\}b^*)^*$

Hidden parts

- The removal algorithm itself
- Details on the topology we put semirings
- Validity of automata and covering
- ‘Infinitary’ axioms : *strong*, *star-strong* semirings
- Links with the ‘axiomatic’ approach (Bloom–Ésik–Kuich)
- References to previous work (on removal algorithms):

Conclusion

Conclusion

- Semiring structure is weak, topology does not help so much.

Conclusion

- Semiring structure is weak, topology does not help so much.
- This weakness imposes a restricted definition of validity,
  in order to guarantee success of validity algorithms.

Conclusion

- Semiring structure is weak, topology does not help so much.
- This weakness imposes a restricted definition of validity, in order to guarantee success of validity algorithms.
- Axiomatic approach does not allow to deal wit most common numerical semirings: $\mathbb{Z}$min, $\mathbb{Q}$

Conclusion

- Semiring structure is weak, topology does not help so much.
- This weakness imposes a restricted definition of validity,
  in order to guarantee success of validity algorithms.
- Axiomatic approach does not allow
  to deal wit most common numerical semirings: $\mathbb{Z}$min, $\mathbb{Q}$
- On 'usual' semirings,
  the new definition of validity coincides with the former one.

Conclusion (2)

Conclusion (2)

- Apart the trivial cases, and the TOP SDDC case,
  decision of validity is never granted, and is to be established.

Conclusion (2)

- Apart the trivial cases, and the TOP SDDC case,
  decision of validity is never granted, and is to be established.

- On ‘usual’ semirings, validity is decidable.

Conclusion (2)

- Apart the trivial cases, and the TOP SDDC case,
  decision of validity is never granted, and is to be established.

- On 'usual' semirings, validity is decidable.

- The new definition of validity
  fills the 'effectivity gap' left open by the former one.

Conclusion (2)

- Apart the trivial cases, and the TOP SDDC case,
  decision of validity is never granted, and is to be established.
- On 'usual' semirings, validity is decidable.
- The new definition of validity
  fills the 'effectivity gap' left open by the former one.
- The algorithms implemented in AWALI
  are given a theoretical framework.

Conclusion (2)

- Apart the trivial cases, and the TOP SDDC case,
  decision of validity is never granted, and is to be established.
- On 'usual' semirings, validity is decidable.
- The new definition of validity
  fills the 'effectivity gap' left open by the former one.
- The algorithms implemented in AWALI
  are given a theoretical framework.

All's well, that ends well!

Hidden parts

- The removal algorithm itself

Hidden parts

- The removal algorithm itself:
  - Termination issues (weighted versus Boolean cases)
  - Complexity issues

Hidden parts

- The removal algorithm itself:
  - Termination issues (weighted versus Boolean cases)
  - Complexity issues



Boolean ε-removal procedure does not terminate

if newly created ε-transitions are stored in a stack

Hidden parts

- The removal algorithm itself:
  - Termination issues (weighted versus Boolean cases)
  - Complexity issues



weighted ε-removal procedure does not terminate

if newly created ε-transitions are stored in a queue

Hidden parts

- The removal algorithm itself
- Details on the topology we put semirings

Hidden parts

- The removal algorithm itself
- Details on the topology we put semirings

Definition

$\mathbb{K}$ *topological*: $\mathbb{K}$ regular Hausdorff $\oplus, \otimes$ continuous

Hidden parts

- The removal algorithm itself
- Details on the topology we put semirings

Definition

$\mathbb{K}$ *topological*: $\mathbb{K}$ regular Hausdorff $\oplus, \otimes$ continuous

Definition

$\{t_i\}_{i \in I}$ *summable* of sum t :

$$\forall V \in \mathrm{N}(t)\,,\ \exists J_V \text{ finite}\,,\ J_V \subset I\,,\ \forall L \text{ finite}\,,\ J_V \subseteq L \subset I \quad \sum_{i \in L} t_i \in V\,.$$

Hidden parts

- The removal algorithm itself
- Details on the topology we put semirings

Definition

$\mathbb{K}$ *topological*: $\mathbb{K}$ regular Hausdorff $\oplus, \otimes$ continuous

Definition

$\{t_i\}_{i \in I}$ *summable* of sum t :

$$\forall V \in \mathrm{N}(t)\,,\ \exists J_V \text{ finite}\,,\ J_V \subset I\,,\ \forall L \text{ finite}\,,\ J_V \subseteq L \subset I \quad \sum_{i \in L} t_i \in V\,.$$

Lemma (Associativity)

$\{t_i\}_{i \in I}$ summable of sum t ,
$I = \bigcup_{j \in J} K_j \quad \forall j \in J \quad \{t_i\}_{i \in K_j}$ summable of sum s_j ,
then $\{s_j\}_{j \in J}$ summable of sum t

Hidden parts

- The removal algorithm itself
- Details on the topology we put semirings
- Validity of automata and covering

Validity of automata and covering



$$\mathbb{S} \subset \mathbb{N}^{2\times 2}, \quad x = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} = 1_{\mathbb{S}}, \quad y = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad x+y = \infty_{\mathbb{S}} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

$\mathbb{S}$ equipped with the discrete topology

$0_{\mathbb{S}}$, y, and $\infty_{\mathbb{S}}$ starable $\qquad$ $x = y^2$ $\qquad$ x not starable

Validity of automata and covering



$$\mathbb{S} \subset \mathbb{N}^{2\times 2}, \quad x = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} = 1_{\mathbb{S}}, \quad y = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad x+y = \infty_{\mathbb{S}} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

$\mathbb{S}$ equipped with the discrete topology

$0_{\mathbb{S}}$, y, and $\infty_{\mathbb{S}}$ starable $\qquad$ $x = y^2$ $\qquad$ x not starable

Validity of automata and covering



$$\mathbb{S} \subset \mathbb{N}^{2\times 2}, \quad x = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} = 1_{\mathbb{S}}, \quad y = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad x+y = \infty_{\mathbb{S}} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

$\mathbb{S}$ equipped with the discrete topology

$0_{\mathbb{S}}$, y, and $\infty_{\mathbb{S}}$ starable $\qquad x = y^2 \qquad x$ not starable

Validity of automata and covering



$$\mathbb{S} \subset \mathbb{N}^{2\times 2}, \quad x = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} = 1_{\mathbb{S}}, \quad y = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad x+y = \infty_{\mathbb{S}} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

$\mathbb{S}$ equipped with the discrete topology

$0_{\mathbb{S}}$, y, and $\infty_{\mathbb{S}}$ starable $\quad x = y^2 \quad$ x not starable

Validity of automata and covering

$\mathcal{A}_5$



$\mathcal{B}_5$

$$\mathbb{S} \subset \mathbb{N}^{2\times 2}, \quad x = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} = 1_{\mathbb{S}}, \quad y = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad x+y = \infty_{\mathbb{S}} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

$\mathbb{S}$ equipped with the discrete topology

$0_{\mathbb{S}}$, y, and $\infty_{\mathbb{S}}$ starable $\qquad x = y^2 \qquad$ x not starable

Validity of automata and covering



$$\mathbb{S} \subset \mathbb{N}^{2\times 2}, \quad x = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} = 1_{\mathbb{S}}, \quad y = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad x+y = \infty_{\mathbb{S}} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

$\mathbb{S}$ equipped with the discrete topology

$0_{\mathbb{S}}$, y, and $\infty_{\mathbb{S}}$ starable $\qquad x = y^2 \qquad$ x not starable

Hidden parts

- The removal algorithm itself
- Details on the topology we put semirings
- Validity of automata and covering
- ‘Infinitary’ axioms : *strong*, *star-strong* semirings

Hidden parts

- The removal algorithm itself
- Details on the topology we put semirings
- Validity of automata and covering
- ‘Infinitary’ axioms : *strong*, *star-strong* semirings

Definition

A topological semiring is a *strong* semiring
if the product of two summable families is a summable family

Hidden parts

- The removal algorithm itself
- Details on the topology we put semirings
- Validity of automata and covering
- ‘Infinitary’ axioms : *strong*, *star-strong* semirings

Definition

A topological semiring is a *strong* semiring
if the product of two summable families is a summable family

Theorem

$\mathbb{K}$ *strong semiring* $s \in \mathbb{K}\langle\langle A^* \rangle\rangle$ *starable iff* $s_0 \in \mathbb{K}$ *starable*

Hidden parts

- The removal algorithm itself
- Details on the topology we put semirings
- Validity of automata and covering
- ‘Infinitary’ axioms : *strong*, *star-strong* semirings

Definition

A topological semiring is a *strong* semiring
if the product of two summable families is a summable family

Theorem

$\mathbb{K}$ *strong semiring* $s \in \mathbb{K}\langle\langle A^* \rangle\rangle$ *starable iff* $s_0 \in \mathbb{K}$ *starable*

Proposition (Madore 18)

There exist (semi)rings $\mathbb{K}$ *that are not strong*

Hidden parts

- The removal algorithm itself
- Details on the topology we put semirings
- Validity of automata and covering
- 'Infinitary' axioms : *strong*, *star-strong* semirings

Definition

A topological semiring is a *star-strong* semiring if
the star of a summable family, whose sum is starable, is summable

Hidden parts

- The removal algorithm itself
- Details on the topology we put semirings
- Validity of automata and covering
- 'Infinitary' axioms : *strong*, *star-strong* semirings

Definition

A topological semiring is a *star-strong* semiring if
the star of a summable family, whose sum is starable, is summable

Proposition

A strong semiring $\mathbb{K}$ is starable and star-strong iff every rational family of $\mathbb{K}$ is summable

Hidden parts

- The removal algorithm itself
- Details on the topology we put semirings
- Validity of automata and covering
- 'Infinitary' axioms : *strong*, *star-strong* semirings

Definition

A topological semiring is a *star-strong* semiring if
the star of a summable family, whose sum is starable, is summable

Proposition

A strong semiring $\mathbb{K}$ *is starable and star-strong iff every rational family of* $\mathbb{K}$ *is summable*

Conjecture

A starable strong semiring star-strong

Hidden parts

- The removal algorithm itself
- Details on the topology we put semirings
- Validity of automata and covering
- ‘Infinitary’ axioms : *strong*, *star-strong* semirings
- Links with the ‘axiomatic’ approach (Bloom–Ésik–Kuich)

Hidden parts

- The removal algorithm itself:
- Details on the topology we put semirings
- Validity of automata and covering
- 'Infinitary' axioms : *strong*, *star-strong* semirings
- Links with the 'axiomatic' approach (Bloom–Ésik–Kuich):

Theorem
A starable star-strong semiring is an iteration semiring

Group identities



Hidden parts

- The removal algorithm itself
- Details on the topology we put semirings
- Validity of automata and covering
- ‘Infinitary’ axioms : *strong*, *star-strong* semirings
- Links with the ‘axiomatic’ approach (Bloom–Ésik–Kuich)
- References to previous work (on removal algorithms):

Hidden parts

- The removal algorithm itself:
- Details on the topology we put semirings
- Validity of automata and covering
- ‘Infinitary’ axioms : *strong*, *star-strong* semirings
- Links with the ‘axiomatic’ approach (Bloom–Ésik–Kuich):
- References to previous work (on removal algorithms):
  - *locally closed* srgs (Ésik–Kuich), *k-closed* srgs (Mohri)
  - links with other algorithms:
    shortest-distance algorithm (Mohri),
    state-elimination method (Hanneforth–Higueira)