# **Polyblind functions**

<u>Cécilia Pradic</u> j.w.w. Lê Thành Dũng (Tito) Nguyễn 15/05/25 Swansea theory seminar Talk based on a 2021 ICALP paper, but

#### **Actual goals**

- Introduce you to some very restricted models of computations  $\{0,1\}^* \to \{0,1\}^*.$
- Motivate those **somewhat** by theoretical results.

Some practical applications: think verification of extended regexps/sed programs

• Give you an idea of what hard problems people look at in this space.

If you have questions, please interrupt and ask!

(I don't care if I don't cover pet result #n)

Introduction: string-to-string transducers

### Automata-theoretic classes of string-to-string functions

In contrast with languages (string to booleans), many sensible notions:

- Arrows are strict inclusions, no path = incomparable
- I can make this picture worse if you desire



# Automata-theoretic classes of string-to-string functions

In contrast with languages (string to booleans), many sensible notions:

- Arrows are strict inclusions, no path = incomparable
- I can make this picture worse if you desire



Today: regular, polyregular and polyblind

#### Two-way transducers: executive summary

Finite set of states + bidirectional reading head + output produced from left to right

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \texttt{mapPalin}: & \{a, b, c, \#\}^* & \longrightarrow & \{a, b, c, \#\}^* \\ & w_1 \# \dots \# w_n & \longmapsto & w_1 \cdot \texttt{reverse}(w_1) \# \dots \# w_n \cdot \texttt{reverse}(w_n) \end{array}$$





#### Two-way transducers: executive summary

Finite set of states + bidirectional reading head + output produced from left to right



#### Two-way transducers: executive summary

Finite set of states + bidirectional reading head + output produced from left to right



#### Two-way transducers: executive summary

Finite set of states + bidirectional reading head + output produced from left to right



#### Two-way transducers: executive summary

Finite set of states + bidirectional reading head + output produced from left to right



d

### Two-way transducers: executive summary

Finite set of states + bidirectional reading head + output produced from left to right

Example:

d

#### Two-way transducers: executive summary

Finite set of states + bidirectional reading head + output produced from left to right



#### Two-way transducers: executive summary

Finite set of states + bidirectional reading head + output produced from left to right



#### Two-way transducers: executive summary

Finite set of states + bidirectional reading head + output produced from left to right



#### Two-way transducers: executive summary

Finite set of states + bidirectional reading head + output produced from left to right



#### Two-way transducers: executive summary

Finite set of states + bidirectional reading head + output produced from left to right



#### Two-way transducers: executive summary

Finite set of states + bidirectional reading head + output produced from left to right

#### Two-way transducers: executive summary

Finite set of states + bidirectional reading head + output produced from left to right



#### Two-way transducers: executive summary

Finite set of states + bidirectional reading head + output produced from left to right



#### Two-way transducers: executive summary

Finite set of states + bidirectional reading head + output produced from left to right



#### Two-way transducers: executive summary

Finite set of states + bidirectional reading head + output produced from left to right



#### Two-way transducers: executive summary

Finite set of states + bidirectional reading head + output produced from left to right



#### Two-way transducers: executive summary

Finite set of states + bidirectional reading head + output produced from left to right



#### Two-way transducers: executive summary

Finite set of states + bidirectional reading head + output produced from left to right



#### Two-way transducers: executive summary

Finite set of states + bidirectional reading head + output produced from left to right



#### Two-way transducers: executive summary

Finite set of states + bidirectional reading head + output produced from left to right



#### Two-way transducers: executive summary

Finite set of states + bidirectional reading head + output produced from left to right



#### Two-way transducers: executive summary

Finite set of states + bidirectional reading head + output produced from left to right



#### Two-way transducers: executive summary

Finite set of states + bidirectional reading head + output produced from left to right



#### Two-way transducers: executive summary

Finite set of states + bidirectional reading head + output produced from left to right



#### Two-way transducers: executive summary

Finite set of states + bidirectional reading head + output produced from left to right



#### Two-way transducers: executive summary

Finite set of states + bidirectional reading head + output produced from left to right



#### Two-way transducers: executive summary

Finite set of states + bidirectional reading head + output produced from left to right



#### Two-way transducers: executive summary

Finite set of states + bidirectional reading head + output produced from left to right



#### Two-way transducers: executive summary

Finite set of states + bidirectional reading head + output produced from left to right



#### Two-way transducers: executive summary

Finite set of states + bidirectional reading head + output produced from left to right


# Deterministic two-way transducers (2DFT)

### Two-way transducers: executive summary

Finite set of states + bidirectional reading head + output produced from left to right

Example:



# Deterministic two-way transducers (2DFT)

### Two-way transducers: executive summary

Finite set of states + bidirectional reading head + output produced from left to right

Example:



# Deterministic two-way transducers (2DFT)

### Two-way transducers: executive summary

Finite set of states + bidirectional reading head + output produced from left to right

Example:



# **Regular functions**

Functions  $\Sigma^* \to \Gamma^*$  definable by 2DFTs are called regular functions

### **Properties of regular functions**

- Linear growth: |f(w)| = O(|w|)
- Closed under composition
- L regular  $\implies f^{-1}(L)$  regular

#### Alternative characterizations

- Via Monadic Second-Order logic (MSO transductions)
- Copyless streaming string transducers
- Various functional programming or regexp-like (declarative) formalisms
- Minimal linear  $\lambda$ -calculus and Church encodings

[Nguyễn, Noûs, P. 2020]

(if  $f: \Gamma^* \to \Sigma^*$  and  $g: \Sigma^* \to \Pi^*$  are regular then so is  $g \circ f$ )

# **Polyregular functions**

Polyregular functions:

- A larger class of string-to-string transductions
- Garnered significant attention recently, starting with [Bojańczyk 2018]

### Properties

- Polynomial growth:  $|f(w)| = O(|w|^k)$
- L regular  $\implies f^{-1}(L)$  regular
- Closed under composition

### Characterizations [Bojańczyk 2018; Bojańczyk, Kiefer & Lhote 2019]

- Multidimensional MSO interpretations
- Imperative nested loop programs
- Simply typed  $\lambda$ -calculus augmented with a list type and some list manipulation primitives
- Composition closure of [regular functions ∪ "squaring with underlining"]

# **Polyregular functions**

Polyregular functions:

- A larger class of string-to-string transductions
- Garnered significant attention recently, starting with [Bojańczyk 2018]

### Properties

- Polynomial growth:  $|f(w)| = O(|w|^k)$
- L regular  $\implies f^{-1}(L)$  regular
- Closed under composition

### Characterizations [Bojańczyk 2018; Bojańczyk, Kiefer & Lhote 2019]

- Multidimensional MSO interpretations
- Imperative nested loop programs
- Simply typed  $\lambda$ -calculus augmented with a list type and some list manipulation primitives
- Composition closure of [regular functions ∪ "squaring with underlining"]
- k-pebble string-to-string transducers

#### *k*-pebble transducers: executive summary

Finite set of states + a stack of two-way reading heads of height  $\leq k$ 

- Heads can be moved, pushed, popped
- Arbitrary comparisons between heads in the stack
- 1-pebble transducers  $\cong$  2DFTs



#### *k*-pebble transducers: executive summary

Finite set of states + a stack of two-way reading heads of height  $\leq k$ 

- Heads can be moved, pushed, popped
- Arbitrary comparisons between heads in the stack
- 1-pebble transducers  $\cong$  2DFTs



#### *k*-pebble transducers: executive summary

Finite set of states + a stack of two-way reading heads of height  $\leq k$ 

- Heads can be moved, pushed, popped
- Arbitrary comparisons between heads in the stack
- 1-pebble transducers  $\cong$  2DFTs



#### *k*-pebble transducers: executive summary

Finite set of states + a stack of two-way reading heads of height  $\leq k$ 

- Heads can be moved, pushed, popped
- Arbitrary comparisons between heads in the stack
- 1-pebble transducers  $\cong$  2DFTs



#### *k*-pebble transducers: executive summary

Finite set of states + a stack of two-way reading heads of height  $\leq k$ 

- Heads can be moved, pushed, popped
- Arbitrary comparisons between heads in the stack
- 1-pebble transducers  $\cong$  2DFTs



#### *k*-pebble transducers: executive summary

Finite set of states + a stack of two-way reading heads of height  $\leq k$ 

- Heads can be moved, pushed, popped
- Arbitrary comparisons between heads in the stack
- 1-pebble transducers  $\cong$  2DFTs



#### *k*-pebble transducers: executive summary

Finite set of states + a stack of two-way reading heads of height  $\leq k$ 

- Heads can be moved, pushed, popped
- Arbitrary comparisons between heads in the stack
- 1-pebble transducers  $\cong$  2DFTs



#### *k*-pebble transducers: executive summary

Finite set of states + a stack of two-way reading heads of height  $\leq k$ 

- Heads can be moved, pushed, popped
- Arbitrary comparisons between heads in the stack
- 1-pebble transducers  $\cong$  2DFTs



#### *k*-pebble transducers: executive summary

Finite set of states + a stack of two-way reading heads of height  $\leq k$ 

- Heads can be moved, pushed, popped
- Arbitrary comparisons between heads in the stack
- 1-pebble transducers  $\cong$  2DFTs



#### *k*-pebble transducers: executive summary

Finite set of states + a stack of two-way reading heads of height  $\leq k$ 

- Heads can be moved, pushed, popped
- Arbitrary comparisons between heads in the stack
- 1-pebble transducers  $\cong$  2DFTs



#### *k*-pebble transducers: executive summary

Finite set of states + a stack of two-way reading heads of height  $\leq k$ 

- Heads can be moved, pushed, popped
- Arbitrary comparisons between heads in the stack
- 1-pebble transducers  $\cong$  2DFTs



#### *k*-pebble transducers: executive summary

Finite set of states + a stack of two-way reading heads of height  $\leq k$ 

- Heads can be moved, pushed, popped
- Arbitrary comparisons between heads in the stack
- 1-pebble transducers  $\cong$  2DFTs



#### *k*-pebble transducers: executive summary

Finite set of states + a stack of two-way reading heads of height  $\leq k$ 

- Heads can be moved, pushed, popped
- Arbitrary comparisons between heads in the stack
- 1-pebble transducers  $\cong$  2DFTs



#### *k*-pebble transducers: executive summary

Finite set of states + a stack of two-way reading heads of height  $\leq k$ 

- Heads can be moved, pushed, popped
- Arbitrary comparisons between heads in the stack
- 1-pebble transducers  $\cong$  2DFTs



#### *k*-pebble transducers: executive summary

Finite set of states + a stack of two-way reading heads of height  $\leq k$ 

- Heads can be moved, pushed, popped
- Arbitrary comparisons between heads in the stack
- 1-pebble transducers  $\cong$  2DFTs



#### *k*-pebble transducers: executive summary

Finite set of states + a stack of two-way reading heads of height  $\leq k$ 

- Heads can be moved, pushed, popped
- Arbitrary comparisons between heads in the stack
- 1-pebble transducers  $\cong$  2DFTs



#### *k*-pebble transducers: executive summary

Finite set of states + a stack of two-way reading heads of height  $\leq k$ 

- Heads can be moved, pushed, popped
- Arbitrary comparisons between heads in the stack
- 1-pebble transducers  $\cong$  2DFTs



#### *k*-pebble transducers: executive summary

Finite set of states + a stack of two-way reading heads of height  $\leq k$ 

- Heads can be moved, pushed, popped
- Arbitrary comparisons between heads in the stack
- 1-pebble transducers  $\cong$  2DFTs



#### *k*-pebble transducers: executive summary

Finite set of states + a stack of two-way reading heads of height  $\leq k$ 

- Heads can be moved, pushed, popped
- Arbitrary comparisons between heads in the stack
- 1-pebble transducers  $\cong$  2DFTs



#### *k*-pebble transducers: executive summary

Finite set of states + a stack of two-way reading heads of height  $\leq k$ 

- Heads can be moved, pushed, popped
- Arbitrary comparisons between heads in the stack
- 1-pebble transducers  $\cong$  2DFTs



### Main question

What happens if we disallow comparisons between reading heads?

Non-example: "squaring with underlining"

Example: "polyblind squaring"



 $cfsquaring(abb) = \underline{a}abb\underline{b}abb\underline{b}abb$ 





### Main question

What happens if we disallow comparisons between reading heads?

Non-example: "squaring with underlining"

Example: "polyblind squaring"



 $cfsquaring(abb) = \underline{a}abb\underline{b}abb\underline{b}abb$ 





### Main question

What happens if we disallow comparisons between reading heads?

Non-example: "squaring with underlining"

Example: "polyblind squaring"



 $cfsquaring(abb) = \underline{a}abb\underline{b}abb\underline{b}abb$ 



 $output = \underline{a}$ 

### Main question

What happens if we disallow comparisons between reading heads?

Non-example: "squaring with underlining"

Example: "polyblind squaring"







output = <u>a</u>a

### Main question

What happens if we disallow comparisons between reading heads?

Non-example: "squaring with underlining"

Example: "polyblind squaring"







 $output = \underline{a}ab$ 

### Main question

What happens if we disallow comparisons between reading heads?

Non-example: "squaring with underlining"

Example: "polyblind squaring"







output =  $\underline{a}abc$ 

### Main question

What happens if we disallow comparisons between reading heads?

Non-example: "squaring with underlining"

Example: "polyblind squaring"



 $cfsquaring(abb) = \underline{a}abb\underline{b}abb\underline{b}abb$ 



output =  $\underline{a}abc$ 

### Main question

What happens if we disallow comparisons between reading heads?

Non-example: "squaring with underlining"

Example: "polyblind squaring"



 $cfsquaring(abb) = \underline{a}abb\underline{b}abb\underline{b}abb$ 



output =  $\underline{a}abc$ 

### Main question

What happens if we disallow comparisons between reading heads?

Non-example: "squaring with underlining"

Example: "polyblind squaring"



 $cfsquaring(abb) = \underline{a}abb\underline{b}abb\underline{b}abb$ 



 $output = \underline{a}abc\underline{b}$ 

### Main question

What happens if we disallow comparisons between reading heads?

Non-example: "squaring with underlining"

Example: "polyblind squaring"



 $cfsquaring(abb) = \underline{a}abb\underline{b}abb\underline{b}abb$ 



 $output = \underline{a}abc\underline{b}a$
### Main question

What happens if we disallow comparisons between reading heads?

Non-example: "squaring with underlining"

Example: "polyblind squaring"







 $output = \underline{a}abc\underline{b}ab$ 

### Main question

What happens if we disallow comparisons between reading heads?

Non-example: "squaring with underlining"

Example: "polyblind squaring"







 $output = \underline{a}abc\underline{b}abc$ 

### Main question

What happens if we disallow comparisons between reading heads?

Non-example: "squaring with underlining"

Example: "polyblind squaring"



 $cfsquaring(abb) = \underline{a}abb\underline{b}abb\underline{b}abb$ 



 $output = \underline{a}abc\underline{b}abc$ 

### Main question

What happens if we disallow comparisons between reading heads?

Non-example: "squaring with underlining"

Example: "polyblind squaring"



 $cfsquaring(abb) = \underline{a}abb\underline{b}abb\underline{b}abb$ 



 $output = \underline{a}abc\underline{b}abc$ 

### Main question

What happens if we disallow comparisons between reading heads?

Non-example: "squaring with underlining"

Example: "polyblind squaring"



 $cfsquaring(abb) = \underline{a}abb\underline{b}abb\underline{b}abb$ 



 $output = \underline{a}abc\underline{b}abc\underline{c}$ 

### Main question

What happens if we disallow comparisons between reading heads?

Non-example: "squaring with underlining"

Example: "polyblind squaring"



 $cfsquaring(abb) = \underline{a}abb\underline{b}abb\underline{b}abb$ 



 $output = \underline{a}abc\underline{b}abc\underline{c}a$ 

### Main question

What happens if we disallow comparisons between reading heads?

Non-example: "squaring with underlining"

Example: "polyblind squaring"



cfsquaring(*abb*) = <u>a</u>abb<u>b</u>abb<u>b</u>abb



 $output = \underline{a}abc\underline{b}abc\underline{c}ab$ 

### Main question

What happens if we disallow comparisons between reading heads?

Non-example: "squaring with underlining"

Example: "polyblind squaring"







 $output = \underline{a}abc\underline{b}abc\underline{c}abc$ 

### Main question

What happens if we disallow comparisons between reading heads?

Non-example: "squaring with underlining"

Example: "polyblind squaring"



 $cfsquaring(abb) = \underline{a}abb\underline{b}abb\underline{b}abb$ 



 $output = \underline{a}abc\underline{b}abc\underline{c}abc$ 

### Main question

What happens if we disallow comparisons between reading heads?

Non-example: "squaring with underlining"

Example: "polyblind squaring"



 $cfsquaring(abb) = \underline{a}abb\underline{b}abb\underline{b}abb$ 



 $output = \underline{a}abc\underline{b}abc\underline{c}abc$ 

### Main question

What happens if we disallow comparisons between reading heads?

Non-example: "squaring with underlining"

Example: "polyblind squaring"





$\triangleright$	а	b	С	$\bigtriangledown$
------------------	---	---	---	--------------------

 $output = \underline{a}abc\underline{b}abc\underline{c}abc$ 

## Contributions

- Alternative characterizations
- Separation results
- Along the way: closure by composition, pebble minimization

Some alternative characterizations

## Alternative characterization (1/2): composition by substitutions

#### Definition (Composition by substitutions)

Let  $\Gamma$ ,  $\Sigma$  and I be finite alphabets and  $f : \Gamma^* \to I^*$ ,  $g_i : \Gamma^* \to \Sigma^*$  and  $w \in \Gamma^*$ . Define  $\operatorname{CbS}(f, (g_i)_{i \in I})(w)$  so that, if  $f(w) = i_1 \dots i_k$ , then

 $\operatorname{CbS}(f,(g_i)_{i\in I})(w) = g_{i_1}(w) \dots g_{i_k}(w)$ 

E.g. for cfsquaring, we take  $f : \Sigma^* \to (\Sigma \cup \{X\})^*$ ,  $g_X, g_a : \Sigma^* \to (\Sigma \cup \underline{\Sigma})^*$  (for  $a \in \Sigma$ ) so that  $f(abc) = aXbXcX \qquad g_a(w) = \underline{a} \text{ and } g_X(w) = w$ 

 $\bullet\,$  Note: both polyblind and polyregular functions are closed under  ${\rm CbS}$ 

## Alternative characterization (1/2): composition by substitutions

#### Definition (Composition by substitutions)

Let  $\Gamma$ ,  $\Sigma$  and I be finite alphabets and  $f : \Gamma^* \to I^*$ ,  $g_i : \Gamma^* \to \Sigma^*$  and  $w \in \Gamma^*$ . Define  $\operatorname{CbS}(f, (g_i)_{i \in I})(w)$  so that, if  $f(w) = i_1 \dots i_k$ , then

 $\operatorname{CbS}(f,(g_i)_{i\in I})(w) = g_{i_1}(w) \dots g_{i_k}(w)$ 

E.g. for cfsquaring, we take  $f : \Sigma^* \to (\Sigma \cup \{X\})^*$ ,  $g_X, g_a : \Sigma^* \to (\Sigma \cup \underline{\Sigma})^*$  (for  $a \in \Sigma$ ) so that  $f(abc) = aXbXcX \qquad g_a(w) = \underline{a}$  and  $g_X(w) = w$ 

 $\bullet\,$  Note: both polyblind and polyregular functions are closed under  ${\rm CbS}$ 

### Alternative definition of polyblind functions

Smallest class such that

- Every regular function is polyblind
- If f is regular and  $g_i$  is polyblind for every  $i \in I$  then  $CbS(f, (g_i)_{i \in I})$  is polyblind

# Alternative characterization (1/2): composition by substitutions

#### Definition (Composition by substitutions)

Let  $\Gamma$ ,  $\Sigma$  and I be finite alphabets and  $f : \Gamma^* \to I^*$ ,  $g_i : \Gamma^* \to \Sigma^*$  and  $w \in \Gamma^*$ . Define  $\operatorname{CbS}(f, (g_i)_{i \in I})(w)$  so that, if  $f(w) = i_1 \dots i_k$ , then

 $\operatorname{CbS}(f,(g_i)_{i\in I})(w) = g_{i_1}(w) \dots g_{i_k}(w)$ 

E.g. for cfsquaring, we take  $f : \Sigma^* \to (\Sigma \cup \{X\})^*$ ,  $g_X, g_a : \Sigma^* \to (\Sigma \cup \underline{\Sigma})^*$  (for  $a \in \Sigma$ ) so that  $f(abc) = aXbXcX \qquad g_a(w) = \underline{a}$  and  $g_X(w) = w$ 

 $\bullet\,$  Note: both polyblind and polyregular functions are closed under  ${\rm CbS}$ 

Alternative definition of polyblind functions

Smallest class such that

- Every regular function is polyblind
- If f is regular and  $g_i$  is polyblind for every  $i \in I$  then  $CbS(f, (g_i)_{i \in I})$  is polyblind
- More convenient to manipulate formally
- $\bullet\,$  Tight link between the number of pebbles and the nesting of the  ${\rm CbS}$  operator

We have an alternative characterization based on linear the  $\lambda\text{-calculus}$ 

- Not presented in the paper, mostly based on [Nguyễn,Noûs,P. 2020]
- Hints at the following non-trivial theorem

(reproven with automata-theoretic tools in the paper with no references to the  $\lambda$ -calculus)

**Closure under composition** 

If  $f: \Sigma^* \to \Gamma^*$  and  $g: \Gamma^* \to \Delta^*$  are both polyblind, so is  $g \circ f$ .

We have an alternative characterization based on linear the  $\lambda\text{-calculus}$ 

- Not presented in the paper, mostly based on [Nguyễn,Noûs,P. 2020]
- Hints at the following non-trivial theorem

(reproven with automata-theoretic tools in the paper with no references to the  $\lambda$ -calculus)

**Closure under composition** 

If  $f: \Sigma^* \to \Gamma^*$  and  $g: \Gamma^* \to \Delta^*$  are both polyblind, so is  $g \circ f$ .

Leads to a combinator-based definition.

Alternative definition of polyblind functions

Least class containing the regular functions, cfsquaring and closed under composition.

• Analogous to the case of general polyregular functions

<code>cfsquaring</code> replaced by "squaring with underlining" in the above  $\rightarrow$  all polyregular functions

• Regular functions can also themselves be decomposed

Not all polyregular functions are polyblind

The function  $f : a^n \in \{a\}^* \mapsto a \# aa \# \dots \# a^n$  is polyregular but not polyblind.

Corollary: "squaring with underlining" is not CF.

The function  $f : a^n \in \{a\}^* \mapsto a \# aa \# \dots \# a^n$  is polyregular but not polyblind.

Corollary: "squaring with underlining" is not CF.

Observation:  $f(a^n)$  has the *n* maximal *a*-factors

a aa ... a<sup>n</sup>

The function  $f : a^n \in \{a\}^* \mapsto a \# aa \# \dots \# a^n$  is polyregular but not polyblind.

Corollary: "squaring with underlining" is not CF.

Observation:  $f(a^n)$  has the *n* maximal *a*-factors

a aa ... a<sup>n</sup>

#### Lemma

For any polyblind  $g : \{a\}^* \to \Sigma^*$ , there are O(1) possible lengths for maximal a-factors in  $g(a^n)$ .

The function  $f : a^n \in \{a\}^* \mapsto a \# aa \# \dots \# a^n$  is polyregular but not polyblind.

Corollary: "squaring with underlining" is not CF.

Observation:  $f(a^n)$  has the *n* maximal *a*-factors

a aa ... a<sup>n</sup>

#### Lemma

For any polyblind  $g : \{a\}^* \to \Sigma^*$ , there are O(1) possible lengths for maximal a-factors in  $g(a^n)$ .

In fact,  $\exists S \subseteq \mathbb{Q}[X]$  finite such that  $\{P(n) \mid P \in S\}$  contains {lengths of maximal *a*-factors of  $g(a^n)$ }. Why?  $\rightarrow$  characterization on the next slide

### Definition (Poly-pumping sequence of words)

Smallest subclass of  $(\Sigma^*)^{\mathbb{N}}$ 

- Containing the constant sequences  $\alpha_n = w$
- Closed under concatenation  $\alpha_n = \beta_n \cdot \gamma_n$
- Closed under "iteration"  $\alpha_n = (\beta_n)^n$

#### Theorem (polyblind with unary input)

 $f: \{a\}^* \to \Sigma^*$  is polyblind iff  $\exists p \in \mathbb{N} \forall m \in \mathbb{N}$ .  $(f(a^{(n+1)p+m}))_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is poly-pumping

(meaning of the  $\exists \forall$ : "ultimately periodic combinations")

 $g: a^{n_1} \# \dots \# a^{n_k} \in \{a, \#\}^* \mapsto a^{n_1 \times n_1} \# \dots \# a^{n_k \times n_k}$  is polyregular but not polyblind.

([Douéneau-Tabot 2021] proves a stronger result)

 $g: a^{n_1} \# \dots \# a^{n_k} \in \{a, \#\}^* \mapsto a^{n_1 \times n_1} \# \dots \# a^{n_k \times n_k}$  is polyregular but not polyblind.

([Douéneau-Tabot 2021] proves a stronger result)

 $g: a^{n_1} \# \dots \# a^{n_k} \in \{a, \#\}^* \mapsto a^{n_1 \times n_1} \# \dots \# a^{n_k \times n_k}$  is polyregular but not polyblind.

([Douéneau-Tabot 2021] proves a stronger result)

### Definition

For 
$$h: \Gamma^* \to \Sigma^*$$
,  $w_1, \ldots, w_n \in \Gamma^*$  with  $\# \notin \Gamma$ ,  
map $(h)(w_1 \# \ldots \# w_n) = f(w_1) \# \ldots \# f(w_n)$ .

 $g = \max(w \mapsto w^{|w|})$  therefore polyblind functions are *not* closed under map, unlike regular and polyreg functions

- $\rightarrow$  obstruction to characterizing polyblind fn
  - by list-processing functional programs
  - (à la [Bojańczyk, Daviaud & Krishna 2018])

### **Pebble minimization**

If f is polyblind and  $|f(w)| = O(|w|^k)$  then some polyblind k-pebble transducer computes f.

Technical proof adapted from a false result for pebble transducers [Lhote 2020].

Theorem  $g(a^{n_1} \# \dots \# a^{n_k}) = a^{n_1 \times n_1} \# \dots \# a^{n_k \times n_k} \text{ is not polyblind.}$ 

Proof by contradiction: assume g is polyblind.

First,  $|g(w)| = O(|w|^2)$  therefore g is computed by some 2-cf-pebble transducer. Equivalently, for some *finite I* and *regular* functions f and  $h_i$ ,

$$g = \operatorname{CbS}(f, (h_i)_{i \in I})$$
 i.e.  $f(w) = i_1 \dots i_m \implies g(w) = h_{i_1}(w) \dots h_{i_m}(w)$ 

To conclude:

pumping argument + pigeonhole principle, exploiting the linear asymptotic growth

Might be doable without pebble minimization, but convenient and of independent interest

**Further topics** 

### First-order (FO)-regular functions

Robust subclass of regular functions; several characterizations:

- Logic: replace MSO by first-order logic
- 2DFT with aperiodic monoid of behaviors
- Functional programming or regexp-like e.g. [Dartois, Gastin & Krishna 2021]

 $\rightsquigarrow$  Analogous class of FO-polyregular.

### First-order (FO)-regular functions

Robust subclass of regular functions; several characterizations:

- Logic: replace MSO by first-order logic
- 2DFT with aperiodic monoid of behaviors
- Functional programming or regexp-like e.g. [Dartois, Gastin & Krishna 2021]

 $\rightsquigarrow$  Analogous class of FO-polyregular. What about polyblind functions?

### First-order (FO)-regular functions

Robust subclass of regular functions; several characterizations:

- Logic: replace MSO by first-order logic
- 2DFT with aperiodic monoid of behaviors
- Functional programming or regexp-like e.g. [Dartois, Gastin & Krishna 2021]

 $\rightsquigarrow$  Analogous class of FO-polyregular. What about polyblind functions?

Definition (First-order polyblind functions)

FO-polyblind = smallest class such that

- Every FO-regular function is FO-polyblind
- If f is FO-regular and  $g_i$  is FO-polyblind  $(\forall i \in I)$ , then  $CbS(f, (g_i)_{i \in I})$  is FO-polyblind

A few relevant directions:

• Extending this class to tree-to-tree functions and look for characterizations

A linear  $\lambda\text{-calculus characterization}$  matches an analogue of the  $\mathrm{CbS}$  definition

A few relevant directions:

• Extending this class to tree-to-tree functions and look for characterizations

A linear  $\lambda\text{-calculus}$  characterization matches an analogue of the  $\mathrm{CbS}$  definition

• Equivalence, separation and membership problems, in the spirit of:

### Theorem [Douéneau-Tabot 2021]

There is an algorithm with

- Input: a pebble transducer implementing a function f with quadratic growth
- Output: a polyblind transducer implementing f, or an error if there is none

A few relevant directions:

• Extending this class to tree-to-tree functions and look for characterizations

A linear  $\lambda\text{-calculus}$  characterization matches an analogue of the  $\mathrm{CbS}$  definition

• Equivalence, separation and membership problems, in the spirit of:

### Theorem [Douéneau-Tabot 2021]

There is an algorithm with

- Input: a pebble transducer implementing a function f with quadratic growth
- Output: a polyblind transducer implementing f, or an error if there is none
- Non-commutative linear  $\lambda$ -calculus characterization for the FO case

Conclusion

## Summary

A class of string-to-string functions: polyblind functions.

### **Equivalent definitions**

- By polyblind pebble transducers
- Inductively (composition by substitution)
- As the composition closure of regular functions + cfsquaring(*abc*) = <u>a</u>*abc*<u>b</u>*abc*<u>c</u>*abc*
- L regular language  $\implies f^{-1}(L)$  also regular
- Polynomial growth:  $|f(w)| = O(|w|^k)$ 
  - pebble minimization theorem: k = number of heads necessary to compute f
- Strictly included in polyregular functions
  - $a^n \mapsto a \# aa \# \dots \# a^n$  and "map unary square" are polyregular but not polyblind
  - for  $\{a\}^* \to \{a\}^*$  polyblind = polyreg
- Incomparable with polynomial HDT0L transductions
  - $a^n \mapsto a \# a a \# \dots \# a^n$  not polyblind but HDT0L
  - $w \mapsto w^{|w|}$  is polyblind but not HDT0L
- Well-behaved first-order counterpart
## Summary

A class of string-to-string functions: polyblind functions.

## **Equivalent definitions**

- By polyblind pebble transducers
- Inductively (composition by substitution)
- As the composition closure of regular functions + cfsquaring(*abc*) = <u>a</u>*abc*<u>b</u>*abc*<u>c</u>*abc*
- L regular language  $\implies f^{-1}(L)$  also regular
- Polynomial growth:  $|f(w)| = O(|w|^k)$ 
  - pebble minimization theorem: k = number of heads necessary to compute f
- Strictly included in polyregular functions
  - $a^n \mapsto a \# aa \# \dots \# a^n$  and "map unary square" are polyregular but not polyblind
  - for  $\{a\}^* \to \{a\}^*$  polyblind = polyreg
- Incomparable with polynomial HDT0L transductions
  - $a^n \mapsto a \# a a \# \dots \# a^n$  not polyblind but HDT0L
  - $w \mapsto w^{|w|}$  is polyblind but not HDT0L
- Well-behaved first-order counterpart

## Thanks for your attention! Questions?