

## APPENDIX

### A. THE DETAILS OF PROOFS

#### A.1 Proof of Proposition 1

PROOF. According to Proposition 18 in [15], if  $\Sigma$  is a finite alphabet of  $n$  alphabet symbols, the number of pairwise non-equivalent SOREs over  $\Sigma$  is  $s(n)$  with  $n!2^{3n-r \log n} \leq s(n) \leq n!2^{7n}$ , where  $r$  is a constant. This implies there is a finite number of non-equivalent SOREs.

For  $k$ -OREs, every symbol in  $\Sigma$  occurs at most  $k$  times, we treat the same symbol in a  $k$ -ORE as distinct. Then, let  $\Sigma_k$  for  $k$ -OREs be a finite alphabet of  $nk$  alphabet symbols, the number of pairwise non-equivalent  $k$ -OREs over  $\Sigma_k$  is  $s(nk)$  with  $(nk)!2^{3nk-r \log(nk)} \leq s(nk) \leq (nk)!2^{7nk}$ . This implies there is a finite number of non-equivalent  $k$ -OREs over  $\Sigma_k$ .  $Dk$ -OREs, which is the class of deterministic  $k$ -OREs, are subclass of  $k$ -OREs, the number of non-equivalent  $Dk$ -OREs over  $\Sigma_k$  is also finite.

Let  $\mathcal{D} \in \{k\text{-OREs}, Dk\text{-OREs}\}$ . Assume that there is a language  $L \subseteq \Sigma_k^*$  such that no expression  $\alpha \in \mathcal{D}$  is  $\mathcal{D}$ -descriptive of  $L$ . If an expression  $\alpha_1 \in \mathcal{D} : \mathcal{L}(\alpha_1) \supseteq L$ , then there is an expression  $\alpha_2 \in \mathcal{D} : \mathcal{L}(\alpha_1) \supset \mathcal{L}(\alpha_2) \supseteq L$ . There are infinite expressions  $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_i, \dots \in \mathcal{D}$  such that  $\mathcal{L}(\alpha_1) \supset \mathcal{L}(\alpha_2) \supset \dots \supset \mathcal{L}(\alpha_i) \supset \dots \supseteq L$ . This contradicts the fact that there is only a finite number of non-equivalent  $k$ -OREs (and, hence,  $Dk$ -OREs) over  $\Sigma_k$ . Hence, for every language  $L$ , a  $k$ -ORE-descriptive  $k$ -ORE and a  $Dk$ -ORE-descriptive  $Dk$ -ORE must exist.  $\square$

#### A.2 Proof of Theorem 1

PROOF. We first present some conclusions for the obtained SORE  $r$ , then the SORE  $r$  is proved to be a descriptive SORE by the derived conclusions. There are three conclusions for the  $r$  derived from  $MinSore$ . (1)  $r$  is a SORE. (2)  $\mathcal{L}(r) \supseteq S$ . (3)  $\mathcal{L}(r)$  includes the minimum number of the strings, which are not recognized by the SOA  $A$  (SOA  $A_1$  is referred to as SOA  $A$  for simplification).

For (1), an SOA as the input of the algorithm  $MinSore$ , contains distinct alphabet symbols as the label of the nodes. In algorithm  $MinSore$ , a regular expression is derived by modifying the SOA. And for every step, there are no duplicate alphabet symbols introducing into the label of a node in the SOA. Thus, a regular expression finally obtained from  $MinSore$  is a SORE.

We distinguish a number of different cases, depending on which clause was used for  $MinSore(A)$ . Then, we conclude (2) and (3) by induction hypothesis. Since the labels of the nodes in an SOA are distinct, a node labelled with symbol  $a$ , is referred as node  $a$ . For a given finite language  $S$ , an SOA  $A := 2T\text{-INF}(S)$  and  $r := MinSore(A)$ , let  $M(r, S, A) = 1$  denote the corresponding conclusions (2) and (3) are both hold.

**Case 1:** The clause in line 1 or the clause in line 2 was used. The case for (2) and (3) is trivial.

**Case 2:** The clause in line 3 was used.  $U$  is a strongly connected looped component of  $A$ , it indicates that, for a node  $a$  in  $U$ , there exist substrings  $s_1 = a \dots$  and  $s_2 = \dots a \dots$  in  $S$ .  $B_0$  is the SOA that  $U$  is extracted and processed by  $bend()$ , forbids the substrings such as  $s_1$  and  $s_2$  are both recognized. Let  $r_0 := MinSore(B_0)$  and  $r = r_0^+$ , there exists the set  $S_{r_0}$  of the substrings extracted from  $S$  such that  $B_0 = 2T\text{-INF}(S_{r_0})$ . Let SOA  $A_u = A.extract(U)$ , and  $S_u$  be the set of

the substrings extracted from  $S$  such that  $A_u = 2T\text{-INF}(S_u)$ . For  $r_0$ ,  $S_{r_0}$  and  $B_0$ ,  $M(r_0, S_{r_0}, B_0) = 1$  hold by induction, then, for  $r$ ,  $S_u$  and  $A_u$ ,  $\mathcal{L}(r) = \mathcal{L}(r_0^+) = \mathcal{L}(r_0)^+ \supseteq S_{r_0}^+ \supseteq S_u$ . Because  $r_0$  is a SORE, to ensure the expression derived from  $A_u$  is also a SORE, let  $r = r_0^+$ , then, the substrings such as  $s_1$  and  $s_2$  can be generated by  $r$ . The SORE  $r$  guarantees the minimum number of the strings, which are accepted by  $r$  but not recognized by the SOA  $A_u$ . Thus,  $M(r, S_u, A_u) = 1$ .

**Case 3:** The clause in line 8 was used. Let  $a = v.label()$  and  $U = A.exclusive(v)$ ,  $U$  is the set of the nodes, which can only be reached by passing node  $v$  from the source of  $A$ .  $U$  includes node  $v$ . Let  $B_0 = A.extract(U)$  and  $r_0 = MinSore(B_0)$ , there exists the set  $S_0$  of the substrings which are extracted from  $S$  such that  $B_0 = 2T\text{-INF}(S_0)$ . Let  $v'$  be the node formed by  $A.contract(U, r_0)$ .  $v'$  represents the identification of the set of the substrings, which occur in  $S$  if and only if they begin with the symbol  $a$  or  $a'$  ( $a' \in fst(a)$  if  $a$  is an expression.). This implies  $\mathcal{L}(r_0)$  does not contain the additional strings, which do not begin with the symbol  $a$  or  $a'$  and are not recognized by  $B_0$ . For  $r_0$ ,  $S_0$  and  $B_0$ ,  $M(r_0, S_0, B_0) = 1$  holds by induction.

**Case 4:** The clause in line 12 was used. This case is mainly to add a node labeled  $\varepsilon$  by  $addEpsilon()$ . However, in the current SOA  $A$ , we first identify the pairs of edges  $(v_1, v_2) \in A.E$ , where  $v_1 \in A.first()$ ,  $v_2 \in A.\succ(q_0) \setminus A.first()$ , and  $v_1$  can reach the nodes which are not the successors of  $A.q_0$ . In addition,  $v_1$  and  $v_2$  are in the same strongly connected looped component ( $sclc$ )  $U$ . Let  $V_s = \{v | v \in (A.\succ(v_1) \cup A.\succ(v_2)) \setminus (A.\succ(q_0) \cup \{A.q_f\})\}$ .  $V_s$  is the set of the successors of the nodes  $v_1$  and  $v_2$ , but not including  $A.q_f$  and the successors of  $A.q_0$ . We remove edges  $(v_1, v_2)$ . Otherwise, the clause in line 22 or 19 will be used, and then the clause in line 29 will be used, the expression  $v_1.label()v_2.label()?$  will be produced. Then, for nodes  $v \in V_s$ ,  $v_1$  and  $v_2$ , they are processed by  $MinSore$  to form a new node  $v'$ , the corresponding label  $v'.label()$  (i.e., an expression) will generate the strings not recognized by SOA  $A$  that each of them begins the symbol  $l \in fst(v.label())$  instead of  $l \in fst(v_1.label())$  or  $l \in fst(v_2.label())$ .

The edges  $(v_1, v_2)$  are removed<sup>10</sup>. Because  $v_1, v_2 \in A.first()$  and their successors  $v \in V_s$  are in the same  $sclc$   $U$ , according to the clause in line 3, the subexpression  $v_1.label()|v_2.label$  under the iteration  $^+$  will be computed if the clause in line 29 is used. And each successor  $v \in V_s$  of the nodes  $v_1$  and  $v_2$  is processed by  $MinSore$ , according to the clause in 16, the edge  $(v_1, A.q_f)$  is added, the node labeled  $\varepsilon$  will be introduced by  $addEpsilon()$  for the clause in 22. This implies that, for each successor  $v \in V_s$  and its label,  $v.label()?$  will be produced when the clause in line 29 is used. Then the concatenation  $v_1.label()v_2.label()$  can be formed by the iteration  $^+$ , and can recognize any substrings in  $S$  generated by them. That the edges  $(v_1, v_2)$  are removed not only ensures the finally derived SORE from  $U$  accepts a minimum number of the strings not recognized by the SOA  $A$ , but also guarantees the strings occurring in  $S$  can be derived by  $v_1.label()v_2.label()$ . Let  $A' = A.extract(U)$ .  $S'$  is the set of the strings extracted from  $S$  such that  $A' = 2T\text{-INF}(S')$ . By induction, the generated expression  $v'.label()$

<sup>10</sup>The edges  $(v_1, v_2)$  are removed such that the SOA  $A$  does not derive the expression of form  $v_1.label()v_2.label()?$ , which generates the strings that begin with symbol  $a \in fst(v.label())$  ( $v \in V_s$ ) and are not recognized by the SOA  $A$ .

supports the corresponding conclusions (2) and (3), i.e.,  $M(v'.label(), S', A') = 1$ .

**Case 5:** The clause in line 23 was used. Let  $v$  be the only successor of  $A.q_0$ , and  $a = v.label()$ . Let SOA  $A_a$  be the input of *MinSore* to generate  $a$ . Let SOA  $B_0$  be the SOA which is obtained by  $A.contract(\{A.q_0, v\}, q_0)$ , and  $r_0 = MinSore(B_0)$ . There exists the set  $S_0$  (resp.  $S_a$ ) of the substrings, which can be extracted from  $S$  such that  $B_0 = \mathbf{2T-INF}(S_0)$  (resp.  $A_a = \mathbf{2T-INF}(S_a)$ ). For  $\mathcal{L}(r_0)$  (resp.  $\mathcal{L}(a)$ ),  $S_0$  (resp.  $S_a$ ) and  $B_0$  (resp.  $A_a$ ), the correspond conclusions (2) and (3) hold by induction. i.e.,  $M(r_0, S_0, B_0) = 1$  and  $M(a, S_a, A_a) = 1$ . Then, let  $r = concatenate(a, r_0) = ar_0$ , for the language  $S \subseteq S_a S_0$ ,  $\mathcal{L}(r) = \mathcal{L}(ar_0) = \mathcal{L}(a)\mathcal{L}(r_0) \supseteq S_a S_0 \supseteq S$  for  $\mathcal{L}(a) \supseteq S_a$  and  $\mathcal{L}(r_0) \supseteq S_0$ . This implies  $\mathcal{L}(r)$  and  $S$  support conclusion (2). And the SOA  $A$  can be obtained by concatenating  $A_a$  with  $B_0$ . For the SOA  $A_a$  (resp. SOA  $B_0$ ),  $\mathcal{L}(a)$  (resp.  $\mathcal{L}(r_0)$ ) supports conclusion (3). Then, for the SOA  $A$ ,  $\mathcal{L}(r)$  supports conclusion (3). i.e.,  $M(r, S, A) = 1$ .

**Case 6:** The clause in line 29 was used. Let  $u$  and  $v$  be chosen in line 29, and let  $a = u.label()$  and  $b = v.label()$ . There exist corresponding samples  $S_a, S_b$  and SOAs  $A_a, A_b$  such that  $\mathcal{L}(a)$  and  $\mathcal{L}(b)$  both support conclusions (2) and (3) by induction. i.e.,  $M(a, S_a, A_a) = 1$  and  $M(b, S_b, A_b) = 1$ .  $u, v \in A.first()$ , this implies the strings accepted by the current SOA  $A$  begin with the substrings, which are either generated by  $a$  or generated by  $b$ . Let  $r = or(u.label(), v.label()) = or(a, b) = a|b$ . Then,  $\mathcal{L}(r) = \mathcal{L}(a) \cup \mathcal{L}(b) \supseteq S$ .  $\mathcal{L}(a)$  with respect to the SOA  $A_a$  and  $\mathcal{L}(b)$  with respect to the SOA  $A_b$  support conclusion (3), respectively, then for  $\mathcal{L}(r)$  and the SOA  $A$ , the corresponding conclusion (3) holds. i.e.,  $M(r, S, A) = 1$ .

The all cases have been analyzed. By induction, for the given finite language  $S$  and the corresponding SOA  $A$ , the final SORE  $r$  is obtained from *MinSore*,  $\mathcal{L}(r)$  with respect to  $S$  (resp. with respect to SOA  $A$ ) supports the conclusion (2) (resp. conclusion (3)). i.e.,  $M(r, S, A) = 1$ . Assume  $r$  is not a descriptive SORE for  $S$ , then there exists a SORE  $\delta$  such that  $\mathcal{L}(r) \supset \mathcal{L}(\delta) \supseteq S$ . Because of  $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{2T-INF}(\mathcal{L}(r))) = \mathcal{L}(r)$  and  $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{2T-INF}(\mathcal{L}(\delta))) = \mathcal{L}(\delta)$  (see Lemma 9 in [15]). And  $\mathbf{2T-INF}(S)$  is SOA-descriptive of  $S$  [15],  $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{2T-INF}(S))$  contains the all strings, which are recognized by the SOA  $A$ . Then,  $|\mathcal{L}(r) \setminus \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{2T-INF}(S))| > |\mathcal{L}(\delta) \setminus \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{2T-INF}(S))|$ , this implies  $\mathcal{L}(r)$  does not include the minimum number of the strings, which is not recognized by the SOA  $A$ . This is a contradiction for the SORE  $r$  that  $\mathcal{L}(r)$  with respect to the SOA  $A$  supports the conclusion (3). Thus, the above assumption does not hold, then the SORE  $r$  is a descriptive SORE for  $S$ .  $\square$

### A.3 Proof of Theorem 2

**PROOF.** The initial constructed  $k_0$ -OA  $A_{k_0}$  for a given finite sample  $S$  exactly recognizes  $S$ , i.e.,  $\mathcal{L}(A_{k_0}) = S$  which holds if only if  $S \subseteq \mathcal{L}(A_{k_0})$  and  $\mathcal{L}(A_{k_0}) \subseteq S$ .

(1)  $S \subseteq \mathcal{L}(A_{k_0})$ . For a string  $s \in S$ , first, the suffix  $s_{ls}$  of  $s$  is computed, and then  $s!s_{ls}$  is obtained.  $s$  is decomposed into the substrings  $s_1$  and  $s_2$ , where  $s_1 = s!s_{ls}$ ,  $s_2 = s_{ls}$  and  $s = s_1 s_2$ . Let  $\hat{S} = \{s!s_{ls} | s \in S\}$ , the PTA  $G_p$  (resp. PTA  $G'_p$ ) is constructed for  $\hat{S}$  (resp.  $s_{ls}$ ). According to the definition of PTA,  $s_1 \in \mathcal{L}(G_p)$  and  $s_{ls} \in \mathcal{L}(G'_p)$ . In Algorithm 3, PTAs  $G_p$  and  $G'_p$  are connected to a graph  $G$ , then  $s = s_1 s_2 \in \mathcal{L}(G)$ . Some equivalent states in  $G$  are merged in lines 18~22,  $G$  is transformed to a  $k_0$ -OA  $A_{k_0}$ ,

then  $\mathcal{L}(G) = \mathcal{L}(A_{k_0})$ . Therefore,  $s = s_1 s_2 \in \mathcal{L}(A_{k_0})$ . This implies that  $\forall s \in S : s \in \mathcal{L}(A_{k_0})$ . Thus,  $S \subseteq \mathcal{L}(A_{k_0})$ .

(2)  $\mathcal{L}(A_{k_0}) \subseteq S$ . Consider a path (string)  $p \in A_{k_0}$ , in Algorithm 3, before some equivalent states are merged in lines 18~22, the constructed PTAs  $G_p$  and  $G'_p$  are connected to a graph  $G$ . For the graph  $G$ , a path in graph  $A_{k_0}$  also exists in the graph  $G$ , then the path  $p \in \mathcal{L}(G)$ . For graphs  $G_p$  and  $G'_p$ , there exist paths  $p_1$  and  $p_2$  such that  $p_1 \in \mathcal{L}(G_p)$ ,  $p_2 \in \mathcal{L}(G'_p)$  and  $p = p_1 p_2$ . For  $p_1 \in \mathcal{L}(G_p)$  (resp.  $p_2 \in \mathcal{L}(G'_p)$ ), there exists  $s_1 \in \hat{S} : s_1 = p_1$  (resp.  $s_2 = s_{ls}$ ). For a string  $\hat{s} \in \hat{S}$ ,  $\hat{s}s_{ls} \in S$ . Then,  $p = p_1 p_2 = s_1 s_2 \in S$ . This implies that  $\forall p \in \mathcal{L}(A_{k_0}) : p \in S$ . Thus,  $\mathcal{L}(A_{k_0}) \subseteq S$ .

$A_{k_0}$  is a deterministic  $k_0$ -OA. For the PTAs  $G_p$  and  $G'_p$ , they are deterministic by definition. In line 4 of Algorithm 3,  $S_1$  is obtained such that  $G_p$  and  $G'_p$  are connected to form a deterministic  $k$ -OA ( $k \geq k_0$ )  $G$ . The final  $k_0$ -OA  $A_{k_0}$  is obtained by merging some equivalent states in  $G$  in lines 18~22. The obtained  $k_0$ -OA  $A_{k_0}$  is also deterministic.  $\square$

### A.4 Proof of Theorem 3

**PROOF.** For any given finite sample  $S$  and value of  $k$ , according to the algorithm *ConsK-OA*( $S, k$ ), proofs are provided by distinguishing a number of different subroutines, which were used in *ConsK-OA*. Each subroutine has a minimal generalization for processing the current MA such that a descriptive  $k$ -OA (w.r.t. the class of deterministic  $k$ -OA) can be finally obtained.

*ConsK<sub>0</sub>-OA*. Initially, the deterministic  $k_0$ -OA  $A_{k_0}$  is constructed for  $S$ , according to Theorem 2,  $\mathcal{L}(A_{k_0}) = S$ . If  $k \geq k_0$ , then  $A_{k_0}$  is returned as the constructed deterministic  $k$ -OA.  $A_{k_0}$  is descriptive of  $S$  (w.r.t. the class of deterministic  $k$ -OA).

If  $k < k_0$ , then to obtain the deterministic  $k$ -OA  $A_k$ , some states in  $A_{k_0}$  will be merged by calling subroutines *Determine*, *mergeMA*, *minMerge*, *MergeSym* and *MergeEq*.

*Determine*. If an MA  $M$  is a non-deterministic MA, then *Determine* returns a deterministic MA. Otherwise, *Determine* returns  $M$  directly. Some states are compulsory to be merged for deterministic MA. The produced generalization for the current MA is inevitable.

*mergeMA*. *mergeMA* merges the specified set  $V$  of states in an MA  $\mathcal{A}$ . Assume that, the states in  $V$  are merged such that the finally returned MA has a minimal generalization, or the states in  $V$  are compulsory to be merged for deterministic MA.

*minMerge*. First, the specified pair of states  $(v_1, v_2)$  ( $(v_1, v_2) \in D_a$ ) is searched. Condition (1) ensures that  $v_1$  and  $v_2$  are merged by *mergeMA* such that the returned MA has a minimal generalization. Condition (2) ensures that more states, whose labels use the symbols in  $\mathcal{A}.S$ , can be merged such that the number of the states in the finally returned MA  $\mathcal{A}$  is as small as possible. Condition (3) ensures that  $v_1$  and  $v_2$  ( $[v_1 v_2]_a^{\mathcal{A}}$ ) are chosen such that more states (whose labels use symbol  $a$ ) can be merged. Then,  $v_1$  and  $v_2$  are merged by calling *mergeMA*.

For condition (1),  $gdn(v_1, v_2)$  measures the generalization degree of the new formed MA after  $v_1$  and  $v_2$  were merged. More states can be merged according to conditions (2) and (3). If it is just states  $v_1$  and  $v_2$  merged to state  $v$ , then

$v.m = v_1.m \cup v_2.m$ , and

$$gdn(v_1, v_2) = \sum_{u \in v.m} in(u) \left( \sum_{u \in v.m} out(u) - \sum_{a \in \Sigma} \left( \sum_{u \in Succ(v.m)} in_a(u) - 1 \right) \right) - \sum_{u \in v.m} in(u)out(u). \quad (1)$$

Otherwise,

$$gdn(v_1, v_2) = gdn(v_1, v_2) + \sum_{(w_1, w_2) \in W} gdn(w_1, w_2). \quad (2)$$

where  $W$  is set of the pairs of states specified to be merged. According to Equation 1, it is easy to prove that Equation 2 holds. *minGdn* returns the set of pairs of states, where each pair of states  $(v_1, v_2)$  such that  $gdn(v_1, v_2)$  has the minimum value for the pairs of states in specified set  $D_a$ . Thus, the searched states  $v_1, v_2$  are merged by *mergeMA* has a minimal generalization for the current obtained MA, and *Determine* is possibly called, such that the finally returned MA has a minimal generalization by induction.

*MergeSym*. In *MergeSym*,  $P_l$  is the set of pairs of states. Each pair of states  $(v_1, v_2)$  in  $P_l$  is a direct edge in the current MA. While,  $P'_l$  is the set of pairs of states, for each pair of states  $(v_1, v_2)$  in  $P'_l$ ,  $v_2$  is reachable from  $v_1$ , but  $(v_1, v_2)$  is not a direct edge in the current MA.

Let the current MA be  $\mathcal{A}$ . If Step (1) is chosen, then the pair of states  $(v_1, v_2)$  is selected from  $P_l$  that there is a longest path from  $\mathcal{A}.q_0$  to  $v_2$ .  $v_1$  and  $v_2$  are merged to a new node  $v_1$  such that a self loop is produced. Compared with the possibly produced the strongly connected loop component, self loop has a minimal generalization for MA  $\mathcal{A}$ .

If Step (2) is chosen, then subroutine *minMerge* is called, the returned MA has a minimal generalization by induction.

If Step (3) is chosen, then the pair of states  $(v_1, v_2)$  is selected from  $P'_l$  that there is a longest path from  $\mathcal{A}.q_0$  to  $v_2$ .  $v_1$  and  $v_2$  are merged to a new node  $v_1$  such that a strongly connected loop component is produced. Here, there does not exist any pairs of states that can be merged in step (1) and Step (2). i.e.,  $v_1$  and  $v_2$  are required to be merged for deterministic  $k$ -OA. Note that, there is a longest path from  $\mathcal{A}.q_0$  to  $v_2$ . The produced strongly connected loop component has a minimal generalization for MA  $\mathcal{A}$ .

*MergeEq*. Let the current MA be  $\mathcal{A}$ . *MergeEq* returns an MA by recursively merging the two equivalent states in the MA  $\mathcal{A}$ . The two equivalent states are merged such that there is no generalization for MA  $\mathcal{A}$ .

Therefore, we prove all subroutines processing the current MA has a minimal generalization except the compulsory generalization for constructed deterministic  $k$ -OA. Since the initial constructed  $k_0$ -OA is equivalent to the given finite sample  $S$ , and the labels of the states in MA are converted to the corresponding labels in a  $k$ -OA, thus, the constructed deterministic  $k$ -OA has a minimal generalization for the given finite sample  $S$ , i.e., the constructed deterministic  $k$ -OA  $A_k$  is descriptive of  $S$  (w.r.t. the class of deterministic  $k$ -OA).  $\square$

## A.5 Proof of Corollary 1

PROOF. For any given finite sample  $S$  and value of  $k$ , a  $k$ -OA  $A_k := ConsK\text{-}OA(S, k)$ , according to Theorem 3, the deterministic  $k$ -OA  $A_k$  is descriptive of  $S$  (w.r.t. the class of deterministic  $k$ -OAs), then  $\mathcal{L}(A_k) \supseteq S$ . A  $k$ -ORE

$r_k$  is descriptive of  $S$ , then  $\mathcal{L}(r_k) \supseteq S$ . Consider  $\overline{A_k} = marking(A_k)$ , for a string  $s = a_1 \cdots a_{|s|} \in S$ , where  $a_i \in \Sigma$  ( $1 \leq i \leq |s|$ ), there is an accepting run  $q_0 a_1 \cdots a_{|s|} q_f$  in the  $k$ -OA  $A_k$ , the corresponding accepting run in  $\overline{A_k}$  is  $q_0 \overline{a_1} \cdots \overline{a_{|s|}} q_f$ . Let  $\overline{s} = \overline{a_1} \cdots \overline{a_{|s|}}$ , then each  $s \in S$ , there exists a  $\overline{s} = marking(s)$ . Let  $\overline{S} = \{\overline{s} | \overline{s} \in \mathcal{L}(\overline{A_k}), s \in S\}$ , then  $\overline{S} \subseteq \mathcal{L}(\overline{A_k})$ . Similarly, there exists a mark for  $r_k$  such that  $\overline{S} \subseteq \mathcal{L}(\overline{r_k})$ .

Therefore,  $\overline{r_k}$  (resp.  $\overline{A_k}$ ) can be regarded as a SORE (resp. SOA), the  $k$ -ORE  $r_k$  is descriptive of  $S$ , then, the SORE  $\overline{r_k}$  is descriptive of  $\overline{S}$ . The deterministic  $k$ -OA  $A_k$  is descriptive of  $S$ , then, the SOA  $\overline{A_k}$  is descriptive of  $\overline{S}$ . According to Corollary 17 in [15], if the SORE  $\overline{r_k}$  is descriptive of  $\overline{S}$ , then  $\mathcal{L}(\overline{r_k}) \supseteq \mathcal{L}(\overline{A_k})$ . Thus,  $\mathcal{L}(r_k) \supseteq \mathcal{L}(A_k)$ .  $\square$

## A.6 Proof of Theorem 4

PROOF. For any given finite sample  $S$  and value of  $k$ ,  $k$ -OA  $A_k := ConsK\text{-}OA(S, k)$ , then, according to Theorem 3, the deterministic  $k$ -OA  $A_k$  is descriptive of  $S$  (w.r.t. the class of deterministic  $k$ -OAs), then  $\mathcal{L}(A_k) \supseteq S$ . Let  $r_k := Koa2Kore(A_k)$ .

(1)  $\mathcal{L}(r_k) \supseteq S$ .  $\overline{A_k} = marking(A_k)$ , for  $s \in S$ ,  $s \in \mathcal{L}(A_k)$ . For  $\overline{A_k}$ , there exist marks  $\overline{s} = marking(s)$  such that  $\overline{s} \in \mathcal{L}(\overline{A_k})$ . Let  $\overline{S} = \{\overline{s} | \overline{s} \in \mathcal{L}(\overline{A_k}), s \in S\}$ , then for a string  $\overline{s} \in \overline{S}$ ,  $\overline{s} \in \mathcal{L}(\overline{A_k})$ . Therefore  $\overline{S} \subseteq \mathcal{L}(\overline{A_k})$ . Since deterministic  $k$ -OA  $A_k$  is descriptive of  $S$ , for sample  $\overline{S}$ ,  $\overline{A_k}$  is an SOA-descriptive SOA.

In algorithm *Koa2Kore*, the SORE  $r$  is derived from the SOA  $\overline{A_k}$  by using algorithm *MinSore*. According to Theorem 1, for the sample  $\overline{S}$ ,  $r$  is a SORE-descriptive SORE. Then, according to Corollary 17 in [15],  $\mathcal{L}(r) \supseteq \mathcal{L}(\overline{A_k})$ . The  $k$ -ORE  $r_k = \overline{r}$ , and  $\mathcal{L}(r) \supseteq \mathcal{L}(A_k) \supseteq S$ . Therefore,  $\mathcal{L}(r_k) \supseteq \mathcal{L}(A_k) \supseteq S$ .

(2)  $r_k$  is  $k$ -ORE-descriptive of  $S$ . Assume the  $k$ -ORE  $r_k$  is not descriptive of  $S$ , there exists a  $k$ -ORE  $\delta_k$  such that  $\mathcal{L}(r_k) \supset \mathcal{L}(\delta_k) \supset S$ . For sample  $S' = \overline{S}$ ,  $\mathcal{L}(\overline{r_k}) \supseteq S'$ , then there exist unified marks such that  $\mathcal{L}(\overline{r_k}) \supset \mathcal{L}(\overline{\delta_k}) \supset S'$ .  $\overline{\delta_k}$  is a SORE. With respect to the class of SORES,  $\overline{r_k}$  is not a descriptive SORE for  $S'$ . There is a contradiction to the above conclusion that  $\overline{r_k}$  is SORE-descriptive of  $S'$  (i.e.  $\overline{S}$ ). Thus, the  $k$ -ORE  $r_k$  is descriptive of  $S$ .

(3) If  $A_k = A_{k_0}$ , then  $\mathcal{L}(r_k) = S$ . According to Theorem 2,  $\mathcal{L}(A_k) = S$ , the  $k$ -ORE  $r_k$  is descriptive of  $S$ , then  $\mathcal{L}(r_k) \supseteq \mathcal{L}(A_k) = S$ . The  $k$ -ORE  $r_k$  is also descriptive of  $\mathcal{L}(A_k)$ . However, the  $k$ -ORE  $r_k$  is transformed from the  $k$ -OA  $A_k$  by using algorithm *MinSore*. Since  $A_k = A_{k_0}$ , the  $k$ -OA is constructed by connecting two PTAs built for  $S$  and merging some equivalent states. Then, the graph  $A_k$  does not include strongly connected looped components, and each node  $v$  in  $A_k$ , which satisfies that  $v_1 \rightarrow v$ ,  $v \rightarrow v_2$  and  $(v_1, v_2) \in A_k.E$ , is not associated with any income edges. According to the procedures in algorithm *MinSore*, the operator  $+$  does not be introduced into a  $k$ -ORE, and the operator  $?$  does not be introduced into the subexpressions of a  $k$ -ORE, which should have been exactly matched by the substrings occurring in  $S$ . This implies that there are no generalizations in converting the  $k$ -OA to a  $k$ -ORE. Thus,  $\mathcal{L}(r_k) = \mathcal{L}(A_k) = S$ .  $\square$

## A.7 Proof of Corollary 2

PROOF. For any given finite sample  $S$  and value of  $k$ ,  $A_k := ConsK\text{-}OA(S, k)$ , let  $r_k := Koa2Kore(A_k)$ , according

to Theorem 3, the deterministic  $k$ -OA  $A_k$  is descriptive of  $S$  (w.r.t. the class of deterministic  $k$ -OAs). According to Theorem 4,  $r_k$  is a  $k$ -ORE-descriptive  $k$ -ORE for  $S$ . Then, Corollary 1 shows that there is  $\mathcal{L}(r_k) \supseteq \mathcal{L}(A_k) \supseteq S$ .

If the  $k$ -OA  $A_k$  is a Glushkov representation of a target  $k$ -ORE  $r$ , i.e.,  $\mathcal{L}(A_k) = \mathcal{L}(r)$ . Then,  $\mathcal{L}(r_k) \supseteq \mathcal{L}(r) \supseteq S$ . If  $\mathcal{L}(r_k) \supset \mathcal{L}(r) \supseteq S$ , then  $r$  is also a  $k$ -ORE such that  $r_k$  is not a descriptive  $k$ -ORE for  $S$ . A contradiction to Theorem 4. Thus,  $\mathcal{L}(r_k) = \mathcal{L}(r)$ ,  $Koa2Kore(A_k)$  is equivalent to  $r$   $\square$

## A.8 Proof of Theorem 5

PROOF. For any given finite language  $S$ ,  $r_k := InfKore(S)$ , the subroutine *Select*, which is required to select a deterministic expression, guarantees that the finally returned  $r_k$  is a deterministic  $k$ -ORE. Then, assume that  $r_k$  is not descriptive of  $S$  (w.r.t. the class of deterministic  $k$ -OREs). There exists a deterministic  $k$ -ORE  $\delta_k$  such that  $\mathcal{L}(r_k) \supset \mathcal{L}(\delta_k) \supseteq S$ . However, in algorithm *InfKore(S)*, a  $k$ -ORE  $r_k = Koa2Kore(A_k)$ , where  $A_k = ConsK-OA(S, k)$ . According to Theorem 4, the  $k$ -ORE  $r_k$  is descriptive of  $S$ .  $\delta_k$  is also a  $k$ -ORE. Then, with respect to the class of  $k$ -OREs,  $\mathcal{L}(r_k) \supset \mathcal{L}(\delta_k) \supseteq S$  indicates that  $r_k$  is not  $k$ -ORE-descriptive of  $S$ . This is an obvious contradiction. Thus, a deterministic  $k$ -ORE derived by *InfKore* is descriptive of  $S$  (w.r.t. the class of deterministic  $k$ -OREs).  $\square$