Automata, Games, and Verification

1. **Semi-deterministic automata** (tutorial A: group G05, tutorial B: group G16)

Let $\Sigma = \{a, b, c\}$ be an alphabet and \mathcal{A} be the following Büchi automaton over Σ having the states $\{p, q, r\}$:



Construct an equivalent semi-deterministic automaton using the construction from the proof of Lemma 1 in Section 7 of the lecture (McNaughton's Theorem).

2. More Acceptance Conditions (tutorial A: group G09, tutorial B: group G12)

Besides Büchi and Muller automata, there are three further important types of ω -automata.

- A parity automaton is a tuple (S, I, T, c : S → N).
 A run r of a parity automaton is accepting iff max{c(s) | s ∈ In(r)} is even.
- A Rabin automaton is a tuple (S, I, T, {(A_i, R_i) | i ∈ J}).
 A run r of a Rabin automaton is accepting iff, for some i ∈ J, In(r) ∩ A_i ≠ Ø and In(r) ∩ R_i = Ø.
- A Streett automaton is a tuple $(S, I, T, \{(A_i, R_i) \mid i \in J\})$. A run r of a Streett automaton is accepting iff, for all $i \in J$, $In(r) \cap A_i \neq \emptyset$ or $In(r) \cap R_i = \emptyset$.

Compare the expressive power of Büchi, Muller, Rabin, Streett and parity automata. Which ones are equi-expressive? Which are less expressive than others? Provide proofs for all your claims.

3. Deterministic Parity Automata (challenge question)

Show that deterministic parity automata are closed under

- negation,
- union, and
- intersection.
- 4. Deterministic Automata (tutorial A: group G13, tutorial B: group G06)

Compare the expressive power of *deterministic* Muller, Rabin, Streett and parity automata (again, prove your claims).

<u>Hint:</u> In the literature you will find methods based on appearance records. Do *not* use them. It is much simpler to use the results of the previous tasks.