

## Notation

- For  $w \in \Sigma^*$  and  $X \subseteq \Sigma$ ,  $w \downarrow_X$  denotes the projection of  $w$  with respect to  $X$ —that is, the word obtained by erasing all letters not in  $X$  from  $w$ . Formally,

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon \downarrow_X &= \varepsilon \\ wa \downarrow_X &= w \downarrow_X \cdot a, \quad \text{if } a \in X \\ &= w \downarrow_X, \quad \text{otherwise} \end{aligned}$$

- Given a distributed alphabet  $(\Sigma_1, \Sigma_2, \dots, \Sigma_k)$ ,
  - $\Sigma = \bigcup_{i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}} \Sigma_i$ .
  - For  $a \in \Sigma$ ,  $\text{loc}(a) = \{i \mid a \in \Sigma_i\}$ .
  - $I_{\text{loc}} = \{(a, b) \mid \text{loc}(a) \cap \text{loc}(b) = \emptyset\}$  is the independence relation, usually denoted just  $I$ .
  - $D_{\text{loc}} = (\Sigma \times \Sigma) \setminus I$  is the dependence relation, usually denoted just  $D$ .
  - $w \dot{\sim} w'$  if  $w = uabv$  and  $w' = ubav$  for some  $(a, b) \in I$ .
  - $w \sim w'$  if there exists  $m \geq 0$  and words  $w_0, w_1, \dots, w_m$  such that  $w = w_0 \dot{\sim} w_1 \dot{\sim} \dots \dot{\sim} w_m = w'$ .

## Questions

1. Given a distributed alphabet  $(\Sigma_1, \Sigma_2, \dots, \Sigma_k)$  and a pair of words  $u, v$ , prove that  $u \sim v$  if and only if  $u \downarrow_{\{a, b\}} = v \downarrow_{\{a, b\}}$  for every pair of letters  $(a, b) \in D$ .
2. Suppose we have two distributed alphabets  $(\Sigma_1, \Sigma_2, \dots, \Sigma_k)$  and  $(\Sigma'_1, \Sigma'_2, \dots, \Sigma'_m)$  such that  $\Sigma = \bigcup_{i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}} \Sigma_i = \bigcup_{j \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\}} \Sigma'_j$  and both distributed alphabets induce the same independence relation on  $\Sigma$ .

We would like to check whether the two distributed alphabets are equivalent with respect to distributed implementations in the form of direct products and synchronized products.

Define  $(\Sigma_1, \Sigma_2, \dots, \Sigma_k) \preceq (\Sigma'_1, \Sigma'_2, \dots, \Sigma'_m)$  if for each  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$ , there exists  $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$  such that  $\Sigma_i \subseteq \Sigma'_j$ .

- (a) Suppose  $(\Sigma_1, \Sigma_2, \dots, \Sigma_k) \preceq (\Sigma'_1, \Sigma'_2, \dots, \Sigma'_m)$  and  $L$  is a direct product language over  $(\Sigma_1, \Sigma_2, \dots, \Sigma_k)$ . Show that  $L$  is also a direct product language over  $(\Sigma'_1, \Sigma'_2, \dots, \Sigma'_m)$ .

Is the converse true? If  $L$  is a direct product language over  $(\Sigma'_1, \Sigma'_2, \dots, \Sigma'_m)$ , is it always implementable as a direct product language over  $(\Sigma_1, \Sigma_2, \dots, \Sigma_k)$ ?

- (b) Suppose  $(\Sigma_1, \Sigma_2, \dots, \Sigma_k) \preceq (\Sigma'_1, \Sigma'_2, \dots, \Sigma'_m)$  and  $L$  is a synchronized product language over  $(\Sigma_1, \Sigma_2, \dots, \Sigma_k)$ . Show that  $L$  is also a synchronized product language over  $(\Sigma'_1, \Sigma'_2, \dots, \Sigma'_m)$ .

Is the converse true? If  $L$  is a synchronized product language over  $(\Sigma'_1, \Sigma'_2, \dots, \Sigma'_m)$ , is it always implementable as a synchronized product language over  $(\Sigma_1, \Sigma_2, \dots, \Sigma_k)$ ?

3. We can extend the notion of primary and secondary information to arbitrary depth: primary information consists of events of the form  $\text{latest}_{i \rightarrow j_1}(I)$ , secondary information consists of events of the form  $\text{latest}_{i \rightarrow j_1 \rightarrow j_2}(I)$ ,  $\dots$ ,  $m$ -ary information consists of events of the form  $\text{latest}_{i \rightarrow j_1 \rightarrow j_2 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow j_m}(I)$ .

The update algorithm for primary information uses secondary information to maintain a consistent labelling across all primary events, but does not guarantee that secondary events are themselves consistently labelled. Show that we can construct an asynchronous automaton that maintains a consistent labelling across all  $m$ -ary events, for any choice of  $m$ .