Assignment 2

1. Prove with induction that $|w^n| = n \cdot |w|$.

```
Proof. Base case: |w^0| = |\epsilon| = 0 = 0 \cdot |w|

Inductive Hypothesis: \forall k < n

|w^k| = k \cdot |w|

Inductive Step:

|w^(k+1)| = |w^k| + |w| = k \cdot |w| + |w| (according to Inductive Hypothesis) k \cdot |w| + |w| = (k+1) \cdot |w|

Therefore, |w^n| = n \cdot |w|, \forall n
```

2. Prove $w^i = w$ if and only if $w = \epsilon$.

```
Proof. We need to prove 2 parts \star \text{ If } w^i = w \text{ then } w = \epsilon We prove this by contradiction. Suppose w is a word and i \in N Suppose w^i = w and suppose that w \neq \epsilon. Since w \neq \epsilon, \exists x \in w If x \in w, x \in w^0 since w = w^i. We also have: w^0 = \epsilon Therefore, x = \epsilon. This contradicts our assumption. Therefore, w = \epsilon \star \text{ If } w = \epsilon \text{ then } w^i = w Since w = \epsilon, then w^1 = \epsilon. Because we concatenate \epsilon to w. Then w^2 = \epsilon since we concatenate \epsilon to w^1... Therefore, w^i = \epsilon \forall i
```

3. Suppose you have two languages L_1 and L_2 over the alphabet $\{a,b\}$. Give an example of L_1 and L_2 such that $|L_1 \cdot L_2| < |L_1| \cdot |L_2|$. For all possible choices of L_1, L_2 , what is the smallest value of $|L_1| + |L_2|$ such that $|L_1 \cdot L_2| < |L_1| \cdot |L_2|$? Show why this is true.

```
Example: Let L_1 = \{a, \epsilon\}, L_2 = \{a, \epsilon\}
Then: L_1 \cdot L_2 = \{\epsilon, a, aa\}
|L_1 \cdot L_2| = 3
|L_1| \cdot |L_2| = 2 \cdot 2 = 4
Therefore, |L_1 \cdot L_2| < |L_1| \cdot |L_2|
```

that $w^i = w$ if and only if $w = \epsilon$

The smallest value of $|L_1| + |L_2|$ such that $|L_1 \cdot L_2| < |L_1| \cdot |L_2|$ is 4.

```
Proof. We prove this by Case Analysis Technique.
Case 1: |L_1| + |L_2| = 0
This implies that |L_1| = 0 and |L_2| = 0.
We have |L_1 \cdot L_2| = 0 and |L_1| \cdot |L_2| = 0 \cdot 0 = 0
Then the condition |L_1 \cdot L_2| < |L_1| \cdot |L_2| does not hold since 0 = 0
Case 2: |L_1| + |L_2| = 1
This implies that (|L_1| = 1 \text{ and } L_2 = 0) \text{ or } (L_1 = 0 \text{ and } |L_2| = 1).
The only word we concatenate is word from L_1 or L_2.
We have only 1 word concatenated from L_1 \cdot L_2, then |L_1 \cdot L_2| = 1 and
|L_1| \cdot |L_2| = 1 \cdot 0 = 0
Then the condition |L_1 \cdot L_2| < |L_1| \cdot |L_2| does not hold since 1 > 0
Case 3: |L_1| + |L_2| = 2
3a) Let |L_1| = 1 and |L_2| = 1
We have 1 word concatenated from L_1 \cdot L_2, then |L_1 \cdot L_2| = 1 and
|L_1| \cdot |L_2| = 1 \cdot 1 = 1
Then the condition |L_1 \cdot L_2| < |L_1| \cdot |L_2| does not hold since 1 = 1
3b) Let (|L_1| = 0 \text{ and } |L_2| = 2) \text{ or } (|L_1| = 2 \text{ and } |L_2| = 0)
Since |L_1| = 0 and |L_2| = 2, |L_2| has 2 distinct words, we still have 2
words after concatenating.
Therefore, we have 2 words concatenated from L_1 \cdot L_2, then |L_1 \cdot L_2| = 2
and |L_1| \cdot |L_2| = 2 \cdot 0 = 0 (similar to the case |L_1| = 2 and |L_2| = 0)
Then the condition |L_1 \cdot L_2| < |L_1| \cdot |L_2| does not hold since 2 > 0
Case 4: |L_1| + |L_2| = 3
4a) Let (|L_1| = 0 \text{ and } |L_2| = 3) \text{ or } (|L_1| = 3 \text{ and } |L_2| = 0)
We will have 3 words from L_1 or L_2 that does not change. Then |L_1 \cdot L_2| =
3 and |L_1| \cdot |L_2| = 3 \cdot 0 = 0
Then the condition |L_1 \cdot L_2| < |L_1| \cdot |L_2| does not hold since 0 = 0
4b) Let (|L_1| = 1 \text{ and } |L_2| = 2) or (|L_1| = 2 \text{ and } |L_2| = 1)
Since |L_1| = 1 and |L_2| = 2, |L_2| has 2 distinct words, we concatenate 2
words with 1 word from L_1, we will still have 2 different words.
Therefore, we have 2 words concatenated from L_1 \cdot L_2, then |L_1 \cdot L_2| = 2
and |L_1| \cdot |L_2| = 2 \cdot 1 = 2. (similar to the case |L_1| = 2 and |L_2| = 1)
Then the condition |L_1 \cdot L_2| < |L_1| \cdot |L_2| does not hold since 2 = 2
Case 5: |L_1| + |L_2| = 4
5a) Let (|L_1| = 0 \text{ and } |L_2| = 4) \text{ or } (|L_1| = 4 \text{ and } |L_2| = 0)
Since |L_1| = 0 and |L_2| = 4, |L_2| has 4 distinct words, we concatenate 4
words from L_1 or L_2.
Therefore, we have |L_1 \cdot L_2| = 4 and |L_1| \cdot |L_2| = 4 \cdot 0 = 0
Then the condition |L_1 \cdot L_2| < |L_1| \cdot |L_2| does not hold since 4 > 0
5b) Let (|L_1| = 1 \text{ and } |L_2| = 3) \text{ or } (|L_1| = 3 \text{ and } |L_2| = 1)
Since |L_1| = 1 and |L_2| = 3, |L_2| has 3 distinct words, we concatenate 3
```

words with 1 word from L_1 , we will still have 3 different words.

Therefore, we have 3 words concatenated from from $L_1 \cdot L_2$, then $|L_1 \cdot L_2| =$ 3 and $|L_1| \cdot |L_2| = 3 \cdot 1 = 3$. (similar to the case $|L_1| = 3$ and $|L_2| = 1$)

Then the condition $|L_1 \cdot L_2| < |L_1| \cdot |L_2|$ does not hold since 3 = 3 5c) Let $|L_1| = 2$ and $|L_2| = 2$

Since we could have repetition from this case, we can have 3 words concatenated from $L_1 and L_2$

Therefore, $|L_1 \cdot L_2| = 3$ and $|L_1| \cdot |L_2| = 2 \cdot 2 = 4$

Then the condition $|L_1 \cdot L_2| < |L_1| \cdot |L_2|$ holds since 3 < 4

Therefore, the smallest value of $|L_1| + |L_2|$ is 4 such that $|L_1 \cdot L_2|$ $|L_1|\cdot |L_2|$.