

# Genfunlib Developer Documentation

---

## Ideas and notes

possible components:

- code in .m files

- data in .m files (if small enough)

- user documentation: tutorial, guide, help pages - only pointers to mathematical background, usage messages

- formal specification?

- tests

- developer documentation: this and code comments

- proofs of correctness?

The User Documentation doesn't talk about how the implementations compute; developer documentation does.

Extra, additional information will be found in Andrew MacFie's master's thesis.

Programmatic formatting for Mathematica code - possible?

Syntax highlighting for your own functions

Setting Up Mathematica Packages

Making Mathematica packages

User documentation method:

- Authoring Using DocumentationTools

- Mathematica Development User Guide > Tasks > Mathematica Documentation

mathematical background - point to references, we shouldn't write about that if it isn't necessary

Put Web links to the project on relevant Web pages

tell Wolfram|Alpha

Package pallettes?

CapitalCase and usage messages for public symbols, lowerCase for private symbols

Writing user documention last is OK as long as in-code documentation and this file are written diligently

private symbols are defined before the first public symbol downvalue they're used in

private symbols don't interfere with previously defined symbols in the *Mathematica* session (in "Global").

The obvious sequel to this project would be adding enumeration functionality for RegularLanguages, SymbolicMethod, and Species.

---

## Species

Sage, alldor-combinat, book

I (Andrew) don't really know a lot about species.

predefined species

- Empty

- Characteristic

- Cycle
- Partition
- Permutation
- Linear-order
- Set
- Subset
- weighted species
  - singletons may be weighted
- restrictions
  - restriction by main parameter value
- operations
  - product
  - sum
  - (partitional) composition
    - substitution into the first slot only (p. 85)
  - derivative
    - w.r.t. first slot only
  - pointing
    - w.r.t. first slot only
- toGF(eqn)s
  - generating series
  - isomorphism type generating series
  - cycle index series
- Bonus: implicit species

---

## GFeq2coefs

SV: differentiate eqn, set var to 0, solve

Note: for some ansatzes, there will be faster methods

e.g. repeatedly differentiating will take at least time exponential in  $\log(n)$ , but linear algorithms exist for rational series according to Jason

If derivatives are handled, initial values might also need to be handled.

MV: ? repeated SV?

Idea: use Series to compute derivatives

Note: **SeriesCoefficient** can be used for **Root** and **DifferentialRoot** expressions

---

## GFeq2asymptoticCoef(gdev's *equivalent*)

Active research area: Bruno and <http://www.cs.auckland.ac.nz/~mcw/Research/mvGF/asymultseq/index.html#software>

Until research is done, just handle systems of equations that can be Solve'd.

## SymbolicMethod

Specification: **Spec** [ { **lhs==rhs**, ... }, **labeled?** ]

the left hand sides are symbols representing classes, the right hand sides are expressions built with constructions, specification classes, and atomic and neutral classes

Labeled constructions: sum, product, seq, cycle, set, pointing, substitution

**SMPlus**, **SMTimes**, **SMSeq**, **SMCyc**, **SMSet**, **SMPointing**, **SMSub**

Unlabeled constructions: sum, product, seq, cycle, multiset, pointing, substitution

**SMPlus**, **SMTimes**, **SMSeq**, **SMCyc**, **SMSet**, **SMMultiset**, **SMPointing**, **SMSub**

Syntax for **SMPointing**: **SMPointing** [ **class**, **paramNumber** ]

Syntax for **SMSub**: **SMSub** [ **baseClass**, **substitutedClass**, **paramNumber** ]

Restrictions:

Number of components in final set/multiset/sequence/cycle object

Option for those heads: **Cardinality** → **predicateOnIntegers**

Parameter values of final objects

**Restricted** [ **class**, { **atomicClassNum** → **func**, ... } ], where **func** is a predicate on the integers specifying the allowed set of values for parameter **atomicClassNum**

predicates must be symbolic-friendly (not PrimeQ) -- like in GeneratingFunction

Atomic class: **ZClass** [ 1 ], Neutral class: **EClass**

Additional params:

additional atomic classes

**ZClass** [ 2 ], **ZClass** [ 3 ], ...

marked by **indeterminate** [ 2 ], **indeterminate** [ 3 ], ...

To GF eqns: **GFEqns** [ **Spec** [ ... ], **indeterminate** ]

Todo: package

**ToGenfunlibSpec**

takes Comstruct grammar as a String and whether it's labeled and returns spec

for use with <http://algo.inria.fr/ecs/>

converts upper case symbols to doubled lower case symbols

Bonus: implicit specs

Bonus: attribute grammars

ref: [Mishna]

Bonus: semantic spec validity testing, a.k.a. checking for well definedness of a spec

Areas for **restrictedSum** improvement:

**#≤a&&#≥b&**

## RegularLanguages

This subpackage allows regular languages to be represented by any of the following regular language representations (RLRs): NFA, DFA, regular expression, right regular grammar, or directed graph with labeled vertices. Any RLR can

be converted to any other. The following operations on RLRs are supported: union, intersection, complement, reverse, concatenation, star. Generating functions for regular expressions can be computed by specifying a weight/-marker for each letter in the alphabet.

Re messages, from the Guidebook: “As a rule of thumb, messages are not generated for “symbolic” input if the function they appear in is used in classical mathematics. A scalar product is used in classical mathematics, so no message was produced in the last case. A table (a list) is not, so *Mathematica* produced a message.”

-The FiniteFields package largely doesn’t do input validation. It sometimes performs weakish syntactic validity checks, sometimes performs total semantic validity checks and sometimes sends error messages (on failure all checks result in an expression returning unevaluated).

-The Splines package does only weak syntactic input validation.

-*Mathematica* built-in downvalues validate **any** sequence of arguments and send messages on errors.

How to do efficient and simple input validation remains a mystery. The result of a successful RegUnion command, for example, is guaranteed to be valid RLR, but when it’s passed to another function, it’s checked for validity anyway. One option is for all functions to store the validity of their results right before they return them, by setting a down-value of the “validate” symbol (validate[ret] = True; ret). This system could be altered by making the validate symbol only remember the last *n* such expressions. A somewhat-relevant reference is this.

If a public function calls another public function, it always passes valid input. One way to avoid unnecessary computation of the validity is to pass an option saying “validation not required”; another is for public functions never to call public functions.

Current validation scheme: Public downvalues call validation directly (right in their definition) unless told not to by the validationRequired option; private downvalues don’t do validation. Using validationRequired saves some computation at the expense of more complicated code.

Data representations like DFA[\_, \_, \_, \_] don’t do validation themselves, like RegularExpression and Graph in *Mathematica* built-in rules.

Validity-checking rules that return more information than True/False (i.e. return conditions) can have their extra info captured in a Module variable like this:

```
f[]:=Module[{valid,b=3},
(
Print[valid];
)/;(valid=validity[b])
];
```

The authors of *Combinatorica* say, “Our aim in introducing permutation groups into Combinatorica is primarily for solving combinatorial enumeration problems. We make no attempt to efficiently represent permutation groups or to solve many of the standard computational problems in group theory.” The situation for this package and automata/-grammar algorithm performance is similar.

Letters are represented by nonempty **Strings**, words are represented by **Lists** of letters.

An alternative approach to providing RL functionality would have been to make a *J/Link* interface to brics.

## ■ Public (Exported) Symbols with Downvalues

Conversions

**ToNFA**

from **DFA**: via Regex

from **Regex**

uses nfa \*, concat, union

from **RRGrammar**: direct

from **Digraph**: direct

## LineGraph construction

### ToDFA

from **NFA**: powerset construction, minimize  
 Todo: too slow  
 Remove states from which no end state is accessible, from NFA  
 Create only elements of the powerset that are possible  
 Optimize code

from **Regex**: via NFA  
 from **RRGrammar**: via NFA  
 from **Digraph**: via NFA

### ToRegex

from **NFA**: via DFA  
 from **DFA**: state elimination algorithm  
 from **RRGrammar**: via DFA  
 from **Digraph**: via DFA

### ToRRGrammar

from **NFA**: direct  
 from **DFA**: via NFA  
 from **Regex**: via NFA  
 from **Digraph**: via NFA

### ToDigraph

from **NFA**: via DFA  
 from **DFA**: direct  
     LineGraph construction  
 from **Regex**: via DFA  
 from **RRGrammar**: via DFA

Regex <-> RegularExpression conversion:

**ToRegex**[**RegularExpress**[...]]

**ToRegularExpression**[**Regex**[...]]

usage string for RegularExpression is joined to built-in one

## Operations

The following take one of **DFA**, **NFA**, **Regex**, **RRGrammar**, **Digraph**

### RegStar

via NFA

### RegComplement

via DFA

takes alphabet as second parameter

equals alphabet\* \ L(dfa)

### RegReverse

via Regex

The following take two (of the same kind) of **DFA**, **NFA**, **Regex**, **RRGrammar**, **Digraph**  
**RegUnion**

via NFA

**RegConcat**

via NFA

**RegIntersection**

via DFA

Todo: replace RegStar, RegUnion, RegConcat with grammar versions from contextFree.m, then delete contextFree.m

GFs

**GeneratingFunction[regex, rules]**

allow the user to provide a function mapping each letter to a symbol/"weight" in the form of Rules

Todo: SE: Can disambiguation be done in subexponential time?

Bonus

**Disambiguate**

takes {**Regex**, **RRGrammar**, **Digraph**}

Digraph disambiguation is converting to a DFA and back

**AmbiguousQ**

takes {**Regex**, **RRGrammar?**, **NFA?**, **Digraph**}

ask on SE for "?" cases

ambiguity test via NFA test (see Book and Even papers -- is Book necessary, would ordinary construction work?) or recursive test (see Brabrand and Thomsen)

"a\*" is not considered ambiguous in Book, neither is "a\* | b\*". *our* definition of ambiguity must include  $\epsilon$ .

## ■ Representation Descriptions

**NFA**

**NFA[numStates\_Integer, alphabet\_, transitionMatrix\_,  
 acceptStates\_?VectorQ, initialState\_]**

number of states: integer  $\geq 0$ , where 0 states means null language

alphabet: sorted list of distinct strings, not containing "". A value of {} means the empty language or  $\{\epsilon\}$ .

transition matrix: numStates by alphabet size+1 matrix where entry  $i,j$  is a list of (valid) states accessible from state  $i$  and letter  $j = \text{alphabet}[j]$ . The (alphabet size+1) "letter" is  $\epsilon$ .

if numStates = 0, transitionMatrix = {}

if alphabet = {}, transitionMatrix has one column (if there are any rows)

accept states: list of integers between 1 and number of states

initial state: integer between 1 and number of states, or Null iff numStates = 0

**DFA**

**DFA[numStates\_Integer, alphabet\_, transitionMatrix\_,  
 acceptStates\_?VectorQ, initialState\_]**

number of states: integer  $\geq 0$ , where 0 states means null language

alphabet: sorted list of distinct strings, not containing "". A value of {} means the empty language or  $\{\epsilon\}$ .

transition matrix: numStates by alphabet size matrix where entry  $i,j$  is the (valid) state accessible from state  $i$  and letter  $j$ .

if numStates = 0, transitionMatrix = {}

if alphabet = {}, transitionMatrix = {{}}, {{}}, ...}

accept states: list of integers between 1 and number of states

initial state: integer between 1 and number of states or Null if numStates = 0

### String Regular Expression

string, with wrapping head **RegularExpression**, containing [a-z,A-Z,0-9,\*,(,),|,] and is a valid *Mathematica* regular expression (POSIX ERE I think)

Empty string accepts just  $\epsilon$

**RegularExpression[Null]** for empty language

### Symbolic Regular Expression

expression with head **Regex** built up from nonempty strings, **EmptyWord** and **RegexStar**, **RegexConcat**, **RegexOr**

**Regex[Null]** is empty language

see **simplifyRawRegex** for more info

### Right Regular Grammar

**RRGrammar**-wrapped list of rules in the form **sym\_Symbol**  $\rightarrow$  RHS or **sym\_Symbol[n\_Integer]**  $\rightarrow$  RHS,

where RHS is either **EmptyWord**, a string, **sym\_Symbol**, where **sym** is in a LHS, **sym\_Symbol[n\_Integer]**, where **sym[n]** is in a LHS,

**RRGrammarConcat[str\_String, sym\_Symbol]** ,

**RRGrammarConcat[str\_String, sym\_Symbol[n\_Integer]]**, or **RRGrammarOr[args\_\_]**, where **args** is a sequence of those things. Strings cannot be empty.

An empty list corresponds to the null language.

Todo: the phrases underlined and bold are not uniformly adhered to

### Digraph

**Digraph[graph\_, startVertices\_, endVertices\_, eAccepted\_]**

graph: a directed graph, with vertices labeled with nonempty strings

startVertices: list of vertices of graph; if empty: null language ( $\epsilon$  may still be accepted). empty list means empty language ( $\epsilon$  may still be accepted)

endVertices: list of vertices of graph; if empty: null language ( $\epsilon$  may still be accepted). empty list means empty language ( $\epsilon$  may still be accepted)

eAccepted: True if  $\epsilon$  is accepted, False otherwise

Graph with 0 vertices means empty language ( $\epsilon$  may still be accepted).

Bonus: words with occurrences of patterns

Bonus: accept more regex syntax

Bonus: extended symbolic regexes with symbolic parameters ("a"  $k$  times, etc.)

SE question

---

## Util

egf2ogf, ogf2egf

method: Laplace transform

could also try manual method

---

## rec2GFeq

see also `GeneratingFunctions`

"override" `GeneratingFunction`

Areas for improvement:

```
GeneratingFunction[n^k f[n], n, x]
GeneratingFunction[Sum[c[i]*f[n], {i, 0, k}], n, x]
GeneratingFunction[f[n+i], n, x]
GeneratingFunction[Sum[f[n+i], {i, 0, k}], n, x]
GeneratingFunction[ $\frac{1}{n+1}$  f[n], n, x]
GeneratingFunction[Boole[Divisible[n, 2]], n, x]
GeneratingFunction[Boole[Mod[n, 2] == 0] f[n], n, x]
GeneratingFunction[Boole[n ≥ 1] f[n], n, x]
GeneratingFunction[UnitStep[n-k] f[n], n, x]
```

---

## GFeq2rec

see also `SeriesCoefficient[DifferentialRoot[lde]]`, `SeriesCoefficient[Root[ae]]` and `GeneratingFunctions`

"override" `SeriesCoefficient`

No way to represent known(unknown(z)) compositions (can't do "symbolic lists")

unknown(known(z), ...) compositions can only be done (for the same reason) for fixed expressions like unknown(k z) or unknown(k z, j z)

ref/Series: "Series by default assumes symbolic functions to be analytic"

For singular functions, `SeriesCoefficient` can do rational-power expansions. In that case, the Cauchy product rule for series multiplication doesn't hold. To use a simplification rule for products of series, we have to determine whether the factors are analytic. Doing that automatically would be an interesting challenge, however, for simplicity, we merely allow the user to specify when the factors should simply be assumed to be analytic. But... built-in functions cannot have new options added.

Also, negative-power expansions can be done, so sometimes that possibility should be ignored.

Current system: global variable called `$FullAnalytic`, which, if true, means that the Cauchy product rule is assumed always applicable.

Todo: recurse over second-argument lists (MV support)

Areas for improvement:

```
SeriesCoefficient[Sum[f[k[i]*x], {i, 1, m}], {x, 0, n}]
```