

# Separating Strings with Automata and SAT

## 1 Introduction

In this sketch we study how to use SAT to construct a non-deterministic finite automata (NFA) that separates two finite sets of strings. This yields a decision procedure for calculating the metric distance between two regular sets with respect to the (inverse) automata size metric.

## 2 Preliminaries

An alphabet  $\Sigma$  is a finite set of unique symbols. Let  $\Sigma^*$  denote the set of all finite strings consisting of letters from  $\Sigma$ . A language  $\mathcal{L} \subseteq \Sigma^*$  is then a countable set of strings of  $\Sigma$ . Often  $\Sigma$  is implicitly assumed.

A non-deterministic finite automata (NFA)  $\mathcal{A}$  is represented as a tuple  $\mathcal{A} = (\Sigma, Q, \Delta, S, F)$  where  $\Sigma$  is a finite alphabet,  $Q$  is a finite set of states,  $\Delta: (Q \times \Sigma) \rightarrow 2^Q$  is the transition function,  $S \subseteq Q$  is the initial states, and  $F \subseteq Q$  is a set of final states.

For some string  $w$  we say that  $\mathcal{A}$  accepts  $w$  if there exists a sequence of transitions on which  $\mathcal{A}$  ends in a final state when reading  $w$ . We abuse notation and say that  $\mathcal{A}$  accepts  $w$  if  $\mathcal{A}(w) = 1$ . Similarly, we say  $\mathcal{A}(w) = 0$  if  $\mathcal{A}$  rejects  $w$ .

Let  $w_i$  denote the  $i$ th letter of the string  $w$ , and  $\varepsilon$  be the empty string.

## 3 Separating Sets

The question that this sketch attempts to answer can be formalized as follows:

**Question 1.** *Given a positive set  $P \subseteq \Sigma^*$  and negative set  $N \subseteq \Sigma^*$  with  $P$  and  $N$  disjoint, does there exist an NFA  $\mathcal{A} = (\Sigma, Q, \Delta, S, F)$  with  $|Q| = n$  such that for all  $u \in P$  in the positive set  $\mathcal{A}(u) = 1$ , but for all  $v \in N$  in the negative set  $\mathcal{A}(v) = 0$ .*

We achieve this by constructing a boolean satisfiability formula that encodes  $P$  and  $N$ , and is satisfiable if and only if such  $\mathcal{A}$  exists. There are several high-level insights that we leverage:

- (1) NFAs can be represented as directed multi-edge graphs where each edge is labeled by one letter from  $\Sigma$ . In other words, let  $e_{i,j,\sigma}$  be an indicator variable encodes the indicator of a transition from state  $q_i$  to state  $q_j$  on the letter  $\sigma$ .
- (2) For each  $u \in P$ , we can create a formula that forces a sequence of edge walks resulting in a final state in  $\mathcal{A}$ . Similarly for each  $v \in N$  we can encode a sequence that will force a rejection of  $v$  in  $\mathcal{A}$ .

For any  $w \in \Sigma^*$ , consider the following encoding:

$$\pi_w \equiv \bigwedge_{1 \leq t < |w|} \left( \bigvee_{i \neq j \neq k} e_{i,j,w_t} \wedge e_{j,k,w_{t+1}} \right)$$

This forces the existence of a path on  $\mathcal{A}$  for  $w$ . Additionally, to force  $w$  to stop on a final state, we may either have every state be a final state, or just set the following formula:

$$\varphi_w \equiv \left[ \bigwedge_{i \neq j} (e_{i,j,w_1} \implies s_i) \right] \wedge \left[ \bigwedge_{i \neq j} (e_{i,j,w_{|w|}} \implies f_j) \right]$$

Essentially, this forces each  $w$  to begin processing on an initial state as indicated by  $s_i$ , and end on a final state as indicated by  $f_j$ . Thus, the conjunction  $\pi_w \wedge \varphi_w$  will be true if and only if  $\mathcal{A}$  accepts  $w$ . Hence, the satisfaction of its negation will then force  $\mathcal{A}$  to reject  $w$ . We leverage this in order to define over  $P$  and  $N$ :

$$\Phi_{P,N} = \left[ \bigwedge_{u \in P} (\pi_u \wedge \varphi_u) \right] \wedge \left[ \bigwedge_{v \in N} \neg (\pi_v \wedge \varphi_v) \right]$$

Thus,  $\Phi_{P,N}$  defines a formula that will make  $\mathcal{A}$  to accept  $P$  and reject  $N$ .

The variables of the  $\Phi_{P,N}$  are the indicators for edges of form  $e_{i,j,\sigma}$  and final states of form  $f_j$ . Suppose that  $\Sigma$  is known. If  $\Phi_{P,N}$  is satisfiable, then  $\mathcal{A} = (\Sigma, Q, \Delta, S, F)$  can be extracted as:

$$\begin{aligned} Q &= \{q_1, \dots, q_n\} \\ \Delta &= \{((q_i, \sigma), q_j) : e_{i,j,\sigma} = \top\} \\ S &= \{q_i : s_i = \top\} \\ F &= \{q_j : f_j = \top\} \end{aligned}$$

Note that  $\Delta$  is slightly overloaded.