

UNIVERSITY OF BAYREUTH

BACHELOR SEMINAR TREE AUTOMATA

---

# Introduction to Ranked Tree Automata

---

*Author:*  
Martin BRAUN


*Supervisor:*  
Prof. Dr. Wim MARTENS

# Introduction to Tree Languages

A good example for a tree language is the one consisting of all binary boolean expressions evaluating to true, for which an instance - if formatted in the right way - could look like this:

$and(or(false, true), or(true, true))$

To simplify, the elements of the language are often represented as a tree in a graphical way:



Just like for regular word languages, it is of interest to know whether a given word (in this case a tree) is part of the (tree-)language. In order to describe an automaton that recognizes tree-languages we have to define what  $\Sigma$ -trees and (regular) tree-languages are, first.

**Definition 1.**  $\Sigma$ -tree [1]

The set of  $\Sigma$ -trees  $T_\Sigma$  over the **alphabet**  $\Sigma$  is inductively defined as follows:

1. every  $\sigma \in \Sigma$  is a  $\Sigma$ -tree
2.  $\sigma \in \Sigma$  and  $t_1, \dots, t_n \in T_\Sigma, n \geq 1 \iff \sigma(t_1, \dots, t_n) \in T_\Sigma$

*Note: In general, there is no bound for the number of children in a tree (these trees are called unranked), but in this paper we will only take a look at **ranked trees**, which have such a bound.*

**Definition 2.** tree-language [1]

A tree language  $L_{t\Sigma}$  over the alphabet  $\Sigma$  is defined as a subset of  $T_\Sigma$ :

$$L_{t\Sigma} \subseteq T_\Sigma$$

From that definition, we can see that  $T_\Sigma$  is already a tree-language. Next, we have to declare some terminology in the context of  $\Sigma$  - trees.

We can now define (Non-Deterministic) Finite Tree Automata for tree languages.

**Definition 3.** *NFTA [2]*

*A (Non-Deterministic) Finite Tree Automaton (NFTA) over the alphabet  $\Sigma$  is a tuple  $A = (Q, \Sigma, Q_f, \Delta)$  where  $Q$  is a **finite set of states**,  $Q_f \subseteq Q$  is a **finite set of final states**, and  $\Delta$  is a **finite set of transition rules** of the type:*

$$f(q_1, \dots, q_n) \rightarrow q_x$$

where  $n \geq 0, f \in \Sigma, q_x, q_1, \dots, q_n \in Q$

For  $n = 0$ , we write:

$$a \rightarrow q(a)$$

where  $a \in \Sigma, q \in Q$

*Note: These rules transition into the initial states of a NFTA (that's why we call them initial rules rather informally)*

*An automaton starts at the leaves and moves upward, inductively associating along a **run** each subterm to a state while reducing the tree via the transition rules.*

*For a tree  $t' \in T_{\Sigma \cup Q}$  that is the result of applying a transition rule on a tree  $t \in T_{\Sigma \cup Q}$  we write:*

$$t \rightarrow_A t'$$

*If zero or more transition rules are applied, we write:*

$$t \rightarrow_A^* t'$$

Our binary-boolean-expression NFTA can now be written as:

*Example 1.* binary-boolean-statement NFTA

$$A = (Q, \Sigma, Q_f, \Delta)$$

$$\Sigma = \{or, and, not, true, false\}$$


$$Q = \{q_f, q_t\}$$

$$Q_f = \{q_t\}$$


$$\Delta = \{false \rightarrow q_f, true \rightarrow q_t, \\ and(q_t, q_t) \rightarrow q_t, and(q_t, q_f) \rightarrow q_f, and(q_f, q_t) \rightarrow q_f, and(q_f, q_f) \rightarrow q_f, \\ or(q_t, q_t) \rightarrow q_t, or(q_t, q_f) \rightarrow q_t, or(q_f, q_t) \rightarrow q_t, or(q_f, q_f) \rightarrow q_f, \\ not(q_f) \rightarrow q_t, not(q_t) \rightarrow q_f\}$$

Running a tree automaton can be represented by a series of stages the tree is in. We will show this now by running the above automaton on the tree from the beginning of this chapter.


*Example 2.* running a NFTA




*The start.*




*false and true, according to our initial rules, are reduced to  $q_f$  and  $q_t$ .*



*or( $q_f, q_t$ ) and or( $q_t, q_t$ ) are reduced to  $q_t$  each.*



*and( $q_t, q_t$ ) is reduced to  $q_t$ .*



*The final stage.*

In this graphical representation we kept the states after reducing them. However, this is not needed for running an automaton like the formal version of this

run shows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{and}(\text{or}(\text{false}, \text{true}), \text{or}(\text{true}, \text{true})) \rightarrow_A^* \text{and}(\text{or}(q_f, q_t), \text{or}(q_t, q_t)) \\ & \rightarrow_A^* \text{and}(q_t, q_t) \rightarrow_A^* q_t \end{aligned}$$

Since the tree could be reduced to the accepting state  $q_t \in Q_f$ , we can say that  $A$  accepts  $w$  and therefore the tree  $w$  is in the language  $L_A$  recognized by the automaton.

## Determinization

Non Deterministic Finite Tree Automata (NFTA) can be determinized just like Non Deterministic Automata (NFA) in the word case. By knowing that there exists a DFTA for every NFTA, definitions, proofs and algorithms become much easier, since we don't have to take special care of the properties of NFTAs. We will now take a look at how this is done. But first we have to define formally, what being deterministic means in the context of FTAs.

**Definition 4.** *Deterministic Finite Tree Automaton*

*A tree automaton with no two rules of the type:*

$$\begin{aligned} f(q_1, \dots, q_n) &\rightarrow q_x \\ f(q_1, \dots, q_n) &\rightarrow q_y \\ &\text{with } q_x \neq q_y \end{aligned}$$

or

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon(q_1, \dots, q_n) &\rightarrow q_x \\ &\text{(state changes, even though no actual symbol is read)} \end{aligned}$$

with  $n \geq 0, q_x, q_y, q_1, \dots, q_n \in Q, q_x \neq q_y, f \in \Sigma$  is called a **Deterministic Finite Tree Automaton (DFTA)**.

Similar to the algorithm for Determinization in the word case, there exists a power set construction algorithm for determinizing Tree Automata.

**Definition 5.** *Algorithm DET for Tree Automata [2]*

*Note: statesOf( $x$ ) returns the set of states that contributed to the creation of the state  $x$ , while state( $X$ ) returns a state representing all states in the set  $X$ .*

**Data:** NFTA  $A = (Q, \Sigma, Q_f, \Delta)$

$Q_d := \emptyset$

$\Delta_d := \emptyset$

**while**  $\Delta_d$  grew last cycle **do**

$f(q_1, \dots, q_n) \in \Delta$

$s_1, \dots, s_n \in Q_d$

    /\* meta-state representing the set of reachable states \*/

$s := \text{state}(\{q \in Q \mid q_1 \in \text{statesOf}(s_1), \dots, q_n \in \text{statesOf}(s_n), f(q_1, \dots, q_n) \rightarrow q \in \Delta\})$

$Q_d := Q_d \cup \{s\}$

$\Delta_d := \Delta_d \cup f(s_1, \dots, s_n) \rightarrow s$

**end**

$Q_{f_d} := \{s \in Q_d \mid \{s\} \cap Q_d \neq \emptyset\}$

**Result:** DFTA  $A_d = (Q_d, \Sigma, Q_{f_d}, \Delta_d)$

It is easy to see that the algorithm produces a deterministic automaton  $A_d$  as we are automatically constructing meta-states for all reachable states and therefore eliminating all possible non-deterministic behaviour. However, we still have to prove  $L(A) = L(A_d)$ . For this, we have to show that the meta-states  $s \in Q_d$  are "built correctly", or in formal terms:

$$\text{For any tree } t : t \rightarrow_{A_d}^* s \iff s = \text{state}(\{q \in Q \mid t \rightarrow_A^* q\})$$

*Proof.*  $L(A) = L(A_d)$  (Correctness of DET) [2]

This proof is done via an induction over the structure of the symbols in  $\Sigma$ .

- **Base case:** For any tree  $t = a \in \Sigma$  we take a look at the rule  $a \rightarrow q(a)$ . Because of the way we defined  $s$  as the meta-state representing the set of all reachable states in a given situation this is inherently correct.
- **induction step:**  $t = f(q_1, \dots, q_n)$

- 1.:  $t \rightarrow_{A_d}^* s \Rightarrow (s = \text{state}(\{q \in Q \mid t \rightarrow_A^* q\}))$

Supposing  $t \rightarrow_{A_d}^* f(s_1, \dots, s_n) \rightarrow_{A_d} s$ , by induction hypothesis, for each  $i \in 1, \dots, n$ , we can see  $s_i = \text{state}(\{q \in Q \mid q_i \rightarrow_A^* q\})$ .

Because states  $s_i \in Q_d$ , rules  $f(s_1, \dots, s_n) \rightarrow s \in \Delta_d$  are added by the determinization algorithm and  $s := \text{state}(\{q \in Q \mid q_1 \in \text{statesOf}(s_1), \dots, q_n \in \text{statesOf}(s_n), f(q_1, \dots, q_n) \rightarrow q \in \Delta\})$ , we learn  $s = \text{state}(\{q \in Q \mid t \rightarrow_A^* q\})$ .

- 2.:  $s = \text{state}(\{q \in Q \mid t \rightarrow_A^* q\}) \Rightarrow t \rightarrow_{A_d}^* s$

Considering  $s = \text{state}(\{q \in Q \mid f(q_1, \dots, q_n) \rightarrow_A^* q\})$  with state sets  $S_i$  defined as  $S_i := \{q \in Q \mid q_i \rightarrow_A^* q\}$ , by induction hypothesis for each  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$  we know  $q_i \rightarrow_{A_d}^* s_i, s_i = \text{state}(S_i)$ . Thus  $s = \text{state}(\{q \in Q \mid q_1 \in S_1, \dots, q_n \in S_n, f(q_1, \dots, q_n) \rightarrow q \in \Delta\})$ .

By the definition of  $\Delta_d$  in the determinization algorithm,  $f(s_1, \dots, s_n) \in \Delta_d$  and thus  $t \rightarrow_{A_d}^* s$ .

□

Following is an example of how a NFTA can be determinized with this algorithm.

*Example 3.* Running the DET algorithm consider a non deterministic FTA given like this:

$$\begin{aligned}
A &= (Q, \Sigma, Q_f, \Delta) \\
\Sigma &= \{ul, li, text, empty\} \\
Q &= \{q_{ul}, q_{li1}, q_{li2}, q_{text}, q_{empty}\} \\
Q_f &= \{q_{ul}\} \\
\Delta &= \{ul(q_{li1}, q_{li2}) \rightarrow q_{ul}, ul(q_{li2}, q_{li1}) \rightarrow q_{ul}, \\
&\quad li(q_{text}) \rightarrow q_{li1}, li(q_{empty}) \rightarrow q_{li2}, \\
&\quad text \rightarrow q_{text}, empty \rightarrow q_{empty}, \\
&\quad \epsilon(q_{empty}) \rightarrow q_{text}\}
\end{aligned}$$


This recognizes all trees that represent unordered lists (ul) in HTML notation, which contain 2 list items (li):

```

<ul>
  <li>text</li>
  <li>empty</li>
</ul>

```

Or as a tree input:



If we start determinizing with the rules containing no state and then go "up in the hierarchy" and generate all the states on-the-fly, we get these new rules:

$$\begin{aligned}
text &\rightarrow state(\{q_{text}\}) \\
empty &\rightarrow state(\{q_{text}, q_{empty}\}) \\
li(state(\{q_{text}\})) &\rightarrow state(\{q_{li1}, q_{li2}\}) \\
li(state(\{q_{text}, q_{empty}\})) &\rightarrow state(\{q_{li1}, q_{li2}\}) \\
ul(state(\{q_{li1}, q_{li2}\}), state(\{q_{li1}, q_{li2}\})) &\rightarrow state(\{q_{ul}\})
\end{aligned}$$

And the set of final states is  $Q_{f_d} = \{state(\{q_{ul}\})\}$ .

As we can see, there is no  $\epsilon$ -rule left and we don't have to choose which rule to apply when reading



# Minimization

Now that we can obtain a DFTA for each NFTA, we can take a look at how we can minimize these newly determinized automata.

Just like in the word case there exists a Myhill-Nerode theorem for Finite Tree Automata. But before we can use it, we have to define **Contexts**, **Congruence** and  $\equiv_L$ .

For the definition of a **Context** it is convenient to define a **Slot** first.

**Definition 6.** Slot *(is this definition sufficient?)*

A **Slot**  $s \in S, S \cap \Sigma = \emptyset$  is a special token, that, if found in a tree  $t_1 \in T_{\Sigma \cup S}$ , can be replaced by any tree  $t_2 \in T_{\Sigma \cup S}$  ( $t_2$  can contains **slots** as well).

As an abstract representation, a tree with a slot is often drawn as a triangle with a marker for every slot:




Fig. 1: Tree with the slot  $x$  [3]




Fig. 2: Tree with the slots  $x$  and  $y$  [3]

Defining a Context is straightforward now.

**Definition 7.** Context [2][3]

A tree with slots is called a **Context**. Furthermore, if  $C$  is a context with slots  $s_1, \dots, s_n \in S$ , then  $C[t_1, \dots, t_n], t_1, \dots, t_n \in T_\Omega$  is known as a **context application**, with the slots  $s_i$  being replaced by (sub-)trees  $t_i \in T_\Omega, T_\Omega \supseteq T_{\Sigma \cup S}$ .

Note:  $T_\Omega$  **can** contain new slots.



Fig. 3: Context application [3]




Fig. 4: Context application with a new context [3]

**Definition 8.** *Congruence* [2]

An equivalence relation  $\equiv$  on  $T_\Sigma$  is a **congruence** on  $T_\Sigma$  if for every  $f \in \Sigma$  with  $n$  arguments applies:

$$T_\Sigma \ni u_i \equiv w_i \in T_\Sigma, 1 \leq i \leq n \Rightarrow f(u_1, \dots, u_n) \equiv f(w_1, \dots, w_n)$$

# of  $\equiv$ -classes is finite  $\Rightarrow \equiv$  is of **finite index**.

Additionally a congruence is an equivalence relation closed under context. This means that for any  $C \in T_{\Sigma \cup V}$ , if  $u \equiv w \Rightarrow C[u] \equiv C[w]$ .

**Definition 9.**  $\equiv_L$  [2]

For any given tree language  $L \in T_\Sigma$ , we define the congruence  $\equiv_L$  on  $T_\Sigma$  by:  $T_\Sigma \ni u \equiv_L w \in T_\Sigma$ , if for all Contexts  $C \in T_{\Sigma \cup V}$  applies:

$$C[u] \in L \iff C[w] \in L$$

For the sake of easier proofs, we consider all following DFTAs to be **complete** and **reduced**.

**Definition 10.** *Completeness and reduction* [5]

A FTA  $A$  is **complete** if there is at least one transition rule available for every possible symbol-states combination. A state  $q$  is **accessible** if there exists a tree  $t$  such that  $t \rightarrow_A^* q$ . A NFTA is **reduced** if all its states are accessible.

*Note: All examples for Finite Tree Automata given in this paper are supposed to be complete and reduced. However, we do not add a capturing state for all impossible symbol-state combinations for the sake of simplicity. Let  $q_c \in Q$  be the capturing state, then every transition rule that contained it state on the left side look like  $f(\dots, q_c, \dots) \rightarrow q_c$ . This means, that once the capturing state is reached, there is no way of getting to a different state anymore.*

We can now give the Myhill-Nerode theorem.

**Theorem 1.** *Myhill-Nerode [2]*  
*These statements are equivalent:*

- (i)  *$L$  is a regular tree language*
- (ii)  *$L$  is the union of some congruence classes of finite index*
- (iii) *the relation  $\equiv_L$  is a congruence of finite index*

*Proof.*

- (i)  $\Rightarrow$  (ii): Assume that the tree language  $L$  is recognized by some complete DFTA  $A = (Q, \Sigma, Q_f, \delta)$  with  $\delta$  being a transition function (i). Let us consider the relation  $\equiv_A$  defined on  $T_\Sigma$  by:  $T_\Sigma \ni u \equiv v \in T_\Sigma$ , if  $\delta(u) = \delta(v)$ . Since we know that  $Q$  only has a finite amount of states in it and the number of equivalence classes may at most be equal to the size of  $Q$ , we can deduce that  $\equiv_A$  is a congruence of finite index (ii).
- (ii)  $\Rightarrow$  (iii): By denoting the congruence of finite index as  $\cong$  and assuming that  $T_\Sigma \ni u \cong v \in T_\Sigma$ , it can be proven that  $C[u] \cong C[v]$  for all contexts  $C \in T_{\Sigma \cup V}$  by an easy induction on the structure of terms. Since  $L$  is the union of some equivalence classes of the congruence of finite index  $\cong$  (ii), we have  $C[u] \in L \iff C[v] \in L$ . Therefore we know that  $u \equiv_L v$  and that  $\equiv_L$  contains the equivalence class of  $u$  in  $\cong$ . Furthermore we now know that  $index(\equiv_L) \leq index(\cong) \Rightarrow index(\equiv_L)$  is finite (iii).
- (iii)  $\Rightarrow$  (i): By representing the set of equivalence classes of  $\equiv_L$  (iii) as the finite set of states  $Q_{min}$  with  $|Q_{min}| = |\equiv_L|$ , we know that every equivalence class has its own state. By denoting the equivalence class of a term  $u \in T_\Sigma$  as  $[u]$  we define the transition function  $\delta_{min}$  for every  $f \in \Sigma$  with  $n$  arguments as:

$$\delta_{min}(f, [u_1], \dots, [u_n]) = [f(u_1, \dots, u_n)]$$

The definition of  $\delta$  is consistent because  $\equiv_L$  is a congruence. With  $Q_{min_f} := \{[u] | u \in L\}$  the resulting DFTA  $A_{min} := (Q_{min}, \Sigma, Q_{min_f}, \delta_{min})$  recognizes the tree language  $L$  (i).  $\square$

As a consequence of this theorem we can deduce the following:

**Corollary 1.** [2]

*The minimum DFTA recognizing a tree language  $L$  is unique up to renaming the states and is given by  $A_{min}$  in the proof of the Myhill-Nerode Theorem.*

This means that we can minimize a tree automaton by computing the congruence classes of the language it recognizes. But before we can put this to use, we have to prove the corollary first.

*Proof.* [2]

Assume that  $L$  is recognized by some DFTA  $A = (Q, \Sigma, Q_f, \delta)$ . Then the relation  $\equiv_A$  is a refinement of  $\equiv_L$  with  $index(\equiv_A) \geq index(\equiv_L)$ , thus  $|Q| \geq |Q_{min}|$ . We know that  $A$  is reduced (all states are accesible), because otherwise a state could be removed contradicting to the definition of  $\equiv_A$ . Let  $q \in Q$  and  $u \in T_\Sigma$ , such that  $\delta(u) = q$ . Then the state  $q$  can be consistently identified with the state  $\delta_{min}(u)$ , since  $\delta$  is a refinement of  $\delta_{min}$  and we can see that every state  $q \in Q$  has a corresponding state  $q_{min} \in Q_{min}$ .  $\square$

By using this Corollary and the construction given in the Myhill-Nerode theorem we can deduce an algorithm to minimize Deterministic Finite Tree Automata:

**Definition 11.** *Algorithm MIN for Tree Automata* [4]

**Data:** complete and reduced DFTA  $A = (Q, \Sigma, Q_f, \Delta)$

Set  $P = \{(q_f, q) \mid q_f \in Q_f, q \in Q \setminus Q_f\}$

Set  $P' = P$

**while**  $P' \neq P$  **do**

$P = P'$

$\forall p_1, p_2, p_3 \in Q, p_1 \neq p_2, p_1 \neq p_3, p_2 \neq p_3,$

define  $\neg(p_1 P' p_2) \iff$

/\* couldn't distinguish to anything in the last cycle \*/

*ist das hier  $p_3$ ? Weil sonst bricht das ja sofort ab...*

1.  $\neg(p_1 P p_3)$  or

/\* can't distinguish  $p_1$  from  $p_2$ , yet \*/

2.  $\exists f \in \Sigma$  with  $n$  arguments,  $\exists q_1, \dots, q_{i-1}, q_{i+1}, \dots, q_n \in Q,$

$\neg(r_1 P r_2), r_1, r_2 \in Q,$  where:

$f(q_1, \dots, q_{i-1}, p_1, q_{i+1}, \dots, q_n) \rightarrow r_1$  and

$f(q_1, \dots, q_{i-1}, p_2, q_{i+1}, \dots, q_n) \rightarrow r_2$

(Note: this works for multiple occurences of  $p_1$  and  $p_2$  as well,  
see the example on the next page)

**end**

$Q_{min}$  = set of equivalence classes of  $P$

$\Delta_{min} = \{f([q_1], \dots, [q_n]) \rightarrow [q] \mid f(q_1, \dots, q_n) \rightarrow q \in \Delta\}$

$Q_{f_{min}} = \{[q] \mid q \in Q_f\}$

**Result:** complete, reduced and minimal DFTA

$A_{min} = (Q_{min}, \Sigma, Q_{f_{min}}, \Delta_{min})$

While we are not giving a complete proof for this algorithm, we can at least go over why it is correct for a given language  $L = L(A)$  and the automaton  $A = (Q, \Sigma, Q_f, \Delta)$  [2]:

- In the while loop we are marking all tuples  $p_1, p_2$  as distinguishable when they are added to the relation
- In order to get the equivalence classes for  $Q_{min}$ , we are merging all pairs of indistinguishable states to a new one representing both. After having done this incrementally for all not marked combinations, these "artificial" states have to be distinguishable to all other states and  $Q_{min}$  must therefore be minimal. This can easily be proven correct by contradiction.
- It isn't hard to see that the construction of  $Q_{f_{min}}$  and  $\Delta_{min}$  is correct.

*Example 4.* Running the MIN algorithm

After cleaning up the Automaton of our previous unordered list example, one might already see that it isn't minimal yet:

$$\begin{aligned}
A &= (Q, \Sigma, Q_f, \Delta) \quad \Sigma = \{ul, li, text, empty\} \\
Q &= \{q_{ul}, \mathbf{q}_{text}, \mathbf{q}_{text2}, q_{li}\} \\
Q_f &= \{q_{ul}\} \\
\Delta &= \{text \rightarrow q_{text}, \\
&\quad empty \rightarrow q_{text2}, \\
&\quad \mathbf{li}(\mathbf{q}_{text}) \rightarrow \mathbf{q}_{li}, \\
&\quad \mathbf{li}(\mathbf{q}_{text2}) \rightarrow \mathbf{q}_{li}, \\
&\quad ul(q_{li}, q_{li}) \rightarrow q_{ul}\}
\end{aligned}$$

While we should be able to fix this by hand, we are now using the MIN algorithm to minimize this automaton. In the following table, we are marking all tuples  $p_1, p_2$  that are distinguishable in that cycle by the index of that cycle, so we can see the process in action.

	$q_{text}$	$q_{text2}$	$q_{li}$	$q_{ul}$
$q_{text}$	-	-	-	-
$q_{text2}$	(merge)	-	-	-
$q_{li}$	1	1	-	-
$q_{ul}$	0	0	0	-

As predicted  $q_{text}$  and  $q_{text2}$  have to be merged in order to minimize  $A$ . The resulting automaton is:

$$\begin{aligned}
A &= (Q, \Sigma, Q_f, \Delta) \quad \Sigma = \{ul, li, text, empty\} \\
Q &= \{q_{ul}, \mathbf{q_{text_{1\&2}}}, q_{li}\} \\
Q_f &= \{q_{ul}\} \\
\Delta &= \{text \rightarrow \mathbf{q_{text_{1\&2}}}, \\
&\quad empty \rightarrow \mathbf{q_{text_{1\&2}}}, \\
&\quad \mathbf{li(q_{text_{1\&2}})} \rightarrow \mathbf{qli}, \\
&\quad ul(q_{li}, q_{li}) \rightarrow q_{ul}\}
\end{aligned}$$

## References

1. Automata theory for XML researchers, Frank Neven, University of Limburg, frank.neven@luc.ac.be, <http://homepages.inf.ed.ac.uk/libkin/dbtheory/frank.pdf>, 03/11/2015
2. Tree Automata and Techniques, Hubert Comon et. al, Pages 19-39
3. Automata and Logic on Trees, Wim Martens, Stijn Vansummeren, <http://lrb.cs.uni-dortmund.de/~martens/data/essli07/lecture01.pdf>, 03/17/2015
4. Automata and Logic on Trees, Wim Martens, Stijn Vansummeren, <http://lrb.cs.uni-dortmund.de/~martens/data/essli07/lecture02.pdf>, 03/21/2015
5. [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tree\\_automaton](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tree_automaton), 03/20/2015