

**The 3 most challenging cases we came up with:**

	1- <u>Long end</u>
description of the languages	1. $a[1-9]b[1-9]c[1-9]d[1-9]\{20\}$ 2. $a[1-9]c[1-9]b[1-9]d[1-9]\{20\}$
Why did you think the language will be hard to distinguish?	The distinguishing is done according to the last output, and because of the vanishing gradients problem, distant changes have less of an effect. For a higher number of epok (we tried 100) the network will be able to identify the our languages with the addition of the 20/21 numbers at the end, but for an addition which is sufficiently long, the network will certainly fail.

	2- <u>Length</u>
description of the languages	1. $[1-9]\{20\}$ 2. $[1-9]\{21\}$
Why did you think the language will be hard to distinguish?	A normal RNN network is unable to distinguish between different lengths, so the difference between languages can't be identified.

	3- <u>Order</u>
description of the languages	1. $a[a+b+]\{4\}$ 2. $b[b+a+]\{4\}$
Why did you think the language will be hard to distinguish?	The network consists of a matrix that preserves the locale changes all along the way. For both languages there are the same changes (ab / ba) and probably therefore it is difficult to distinguish.

**For all 3 languages:**

train and test set sizes	Train-800 Set-200
Number of iterations we trained	100
did it manage to learn the train but did not generalize well to the test, or did it fail also on train?	We have not encountered such case.
Did you manage to fail the LSTM acceptor?	Yes.