#### NFA vs DFA

#### **Definitions:**

• NFA (Nondeterministic Finite Automaton): Allows for multiple transitions from a state for a given input symbol and ε-transitions (transitions without consuming an input symbol).

$$NFA = (Q, \Sigma, \Delta, q_0, F)$$

- Q: Set of states
- $\Sigma$ : Alphabet
- $\Delta$ : Transition function  $(\Delta: Q \times \Sigma_{\varepsilon} \to P(Q))$  where  $\Sigma_{\varepsilon} = \Sigma \cup \{\varepsilon\}$
- q<sub>0</sub>: Start state
- F: Set of final states
- DFA (Deterministic Finite Automaton): Allows only one transition from a state for each input symbol.

$$DFA = (Q, \Sigma, \delta, q_0, F)$$

- Q: Set of states
- $\Sigma$ : Alphabet
- $\delta$ : Transition function ( $\delta: Q{ imes}{\mathcal L} o Q$ )
- q<sub>0</sub>: Start state
- F: Set of final states

# **Comparisons:**

- Expressive Power: Both NFA and DFA recognize the same set of languages: the regular languages.
- Transition Mechanism: DFA has a unique transition for every symbol, while NFA can have multiple transitions or  $\varepsilon$ -transitions.
- Equivalence: Every NFA can be converted to an equivalent DFA using the

- powerset construction, recognizing the same language.
- Ease of Construction: NFAs can be simpler and more intuitive to design for certain regular languages, whereas DFAs can be more verbose.

# Regular and Non-Regular Languages:

- Regular Language: If a language can be recognized by some DFA or NFA, it is regular. Regular languages are described by regular expressions.
- Non-Regular Language: Languages that cannot be represented by any DFA or NFA. They require more computational power, such as a Pushdown Automaton (PDA) for context-free languages.

### **Examples:**

• For a language over  $\Sigma = \{0,1\}$  where the third position from the end is 1, a DFA can be designed with states to keep track of the last three symbols read, and it will have a unique transition for every symbol in each state.