

A robust class of languages of 2-nested words

Séverine Fratani

LIS, Aix-Marseille Univ, CNRS, Marseille, France

Guillaume Maurras

LIS, Aix-Marseille Univ, CNRS, Marseille, France

Pierre-Alain Reynier

LIS, Aix-Marseille Univ, CNRS, Marseille, France

Abstract

Regular nested word languages (a.k.a. visibly pushdown languages) strictly extend regular word languages, while preserving their main closure and decidability properties. Previous works have shown that considering languages of 2-nested words, *i.e.* words enriched with two matchings (a.k.a. 2-visibly pushdown languages), is not as successful: the corresponding model of automata is not closed under determinization. In this work, inspired by homomorphic representations of indexed languages, we identify a subclass of 2-nested words, which we call 2-wave words. This class strictly extends the class of nested words, while preserving its main properties. More precisely, we prove closure under determinization of the corresponding automaton model, we provide a logical characterization of the recognized languages, and show that the corresponding graphs have bounded treewidth. As a consequence, we derive important closure and decidability properties. Last, we show that the word projections of the languages we define belong to the class of linear indexed languages.

2012 ACM Subject Classification Theory of computation → Models of computation; Theory of computation → Formal languages and automata theory

Keywords and phrases Nested word, Determinization, Indexed languages

Digital Object Identifier 10.4230/LIPIcs.CVIT.2016.23

1 Introduction

The class of regular languages constitutes a cornerstone of theoretical computer science, thanks to its numerous closure and decidability properties. A long line of research studied extensions of this class, while preserving its robustness. Context free languages (CFL for short) constitute a very important class: they admit multiple presentations, by means of pushdown automata, context-free grammars and more, and have led to numerous applications. Unfortunately, CFL do not satisfy several important properties enjoyed by regular languages. More precisely, the corresponding automaton model, namely pushdown automata, does not admit determinization. In addition, the class of CFL is not closed under intersection nor complement, and universality, inclusion and equivalence are undecidable properties.

A simple way to patch this is by considering as input the word together with the inherent matching relation, resulting in what is known as a *nested word* [3]. Indeed, as soon as a word belongs to a CFL, one can identify a matching relation on (some of) the positions of the word, whatever the presentation of the CFL. For instance, if the CFL is given as a pushdown automaton, then this relation associates push/pop positions. Another way to define the matching relation is to use an alternative presentation of CFL given in [17], which refines the Chomsky-Schützenberger theorem. Following this work, one can show that a language L is a CFL iff there exists a regular language R , a Dyck language D_2 over two pairs of brackets, and two homomorphisms h (h is non-erasing), g such that $L = h(g^{-1}(D_2) \cap R)$. This alternative presentation also leads to a natural matching relation, induced by D_2 . The model of *nested word automata* naturally extends finite-state automata by allowing to label edges of the matching relation with states (often called hierarchical). This model accepts the so-called



© Jane Open Access and Joan R. Public; licensed under Creative Commons License CC-BY 4.0

42nd Conference on Very Important Topics (CVIT 2016).

Editors: John Q. Open and Joan R. Access; Article No. 23; pp. 23:1–23:29

Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics



LIPICs Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, Dagstuhl Publishing, Germany


class of *regular nested word languages*, allowing to recover most of the nice properties of regular languages. More precisely, nested word automata can always be determinized. The class of regular nested word languages is closed under all the boolean operations, admits an equivalent presentation by means of logic (monadic-second order logic with a binary predicate corresponding to the matching relation), and expected decidability properties (emptiness, universality, inclusion and equivalence). It is worth noticing that another way to present this class is by splitting the alphabet into call/return/internal symbols. This leads to so-called *visibly pushdown languages* [2], and the associated model of visibly pushdown automata.

Several works tried to extend the class of regular nested word languages while preserving its closure and decidability properties. In particular, a focus has been put on words with multiple matching relations. In [21], the authors consider multiple stacks with a semantical restriction of push/pop operations known as k phases. That way, they obtain decidability of the emptiness problem. However, their model of automata cannot be determinized. In [6], the authors consider visibly pushdown automata with multiple stacks, with an ordering on stacks, and prove the closure under complement of their model. Their proof does not rely on the determinization of the model: indeed, as shown in [21], this class cannot be determinized in general. This corrects a previous result published in [5], which states that the general class of 2-stack visibly pushdown automata is closed under complementation, which does not hold, as shown in [4]. The crux in their proof was the use of determinization of 2-stack visibly pushdown automata. In [4], Bollig studies 2-stack visibly pushdown automata in their unrestricted form. He proves the equivalence with the existential fragment of monadic second-order logic, but that quantifier alternation leads to an infinite hierarchy in this setting. As a corollary, the resulting class of languages is not closed under complementation. Another restriction, known as scope-bounded pushdown languages, has been introduced in [22, 23], for which the authors manage to prove that the automaton model can be determinized.

The previous survey of related works shows the difficulty in identifying a class of 2-nested words for which the corresponding automaton model can be determinized. As a consequence, the decidability results presented in these papers require ad-hoc involved proofs. Graphs of bounded treewidth constitute an alternative approach for obtaining decidability properties. Indeed, in [14], the authors show that most of the previous classes with good decidability properties actually correspond to graphs of bounded treewidth, for which MSO decidability follows from [7, 18]. Yet, determinization of nested word automata is the keystone of the nice properties of this model, and thus constitutes a highly desirable feature. In the present work, taking inspiration in indexed languages, we identify a class of 2-nested words for which automata can be determinized. Our class is incomparable with those of [21], [6] and [22, 23]. Intuitively, between two matched positions of the first matching, they bound the number of switches between matchings, while we do not. In addition, the proof of determinizability of [22, 23] is different from ours, as their proof is a kind of supervisor that uses determinization of [3] as a subroutine, while ours generalizes the construction of [3] to two nestings.

Indexed languages [1] correspond to the level 2 of the infinite hierarchy of higher-order languages [15]. With numerous applications in computational linguistics, they have been much studied during the seventies and the eighties [16, 8, 10]. Homomorphic characterizations of CFL that we presented before have been extended to (linear) indexed languages in several works, including [24, 11]. One of them (see [11]) shows that L is an indexed language iff there exists a regular language R , two Dyck languages D_2 and D_k over two and k pairs of brackets respectively, and two homomorphisms h, g such that $L = h(g^{-1}(D_2) \cap R \cap D_k)$, with some additional conditions on g . This presentation allows to associate with a word $w \in L$ two matchings, induced by D_2 and D_k , which interact in a very particular way. Graphically

speaking, this interaction yields kinds of *waves* (see Figure 1). When restricted to linear indexed languages, the length of these waves is upper bounded by 2, yielding the structure of 2-waves that will be of interest to us in this paper. All these notions will be formally presented in the paper. We also refer the reader to Section 7, in which we explore the relationship between our work and (linear) indexed languages.



■ **Figure 1** A 4-wave (left), a 2-wave (middle), and a combination of 2-waves (right).

In this paper, we consider 2-nested words whose matchings satisfy the structural restriction of 2-waves; we call them 2-wave words. The main result of this paper is to show that 2-nested word automata are closed under determinization on the class of 2-wave words. While determinization of nested word automata extends the well-known powerset construction with a reference state, our construction is more involved in order to be able to reconcile the labels of the different arches, and we give a detailed proof of correction. This allows us to prove the equivalence of automata with monadic-second order logic on 2-wave words, as well as with its existential fragment. This contrasts with results of [4] which show that on 2-nested words, quantifier alternation yields an infinite hierarchy. We also prove that the graphs associated with 2-wave words are MSO-definable, and have bounded treewidth. As a consequence, we obtain the following decidability results for the class of 2-wave words: satisfiability of MSO, emptiness of automata (in polynomial time), universality, inclusion and equivalence of automata (in exponential time).

In Section 2, we introduce the definitions of matchings and nested words, and provide a grammar for 2-wave words. In Section 3, we introduce the automaton model, and present in Section 4 the main result of the paper: the closure under determinization over 2-wave words. Applications to logic and decidability are presented in Sections 5 and 6. Last, a discussion on relations with (linear) indexed languages is given in Section 7. Omitted proofs can be found in Appendix.

2 Words and matchings

Words and relations

For any positive integer n , $[n] = \{1, \dots, n\}$ is the set of all positive integers ranging from 1 to n . When referencing a position in a word, integers might be called *positions* or *index*. Σ denotes a finite alphabet. The empty word is denoted ϵ , and the set of finite words on Σ is denoted Σ^* . The length of $w \in \Sigma^*$ is denoted $|w|$. Given a non-empty word $w \in \Sigma^*$, its positions are numbered from 1 to $|w|$. We say that u is a *factor* of w if there exist two words x, y such that $w = xuy$. Given an interval $I \subseteq [|w|]$, we denote by $w|_I$ the factor of w corresponding to positions in I . Unless specified otherwise, words and automata introduced in this paper are defined on Σ .

► **Definition 1.** A matching relation of length $n \geq 0$ is a binary relation M on $[n]$ such that:

1. if $M(i, j)$ then $i < j$, i.e. M is compatible with the natural order on integers
2. if $M(i, j)$ and $M(k, l)$ then $\{i, j\} \cap \{k, l\} \neq \emptyset \implies i = k \wedge j = l$, i.e. any integer is related at most once by the matching

23:4 A robust class of languages of 2-nested words

3. if $M(i, j)$ and $M(k, l)$ then $i < k < j \implies l < j$ i.e. a matching is non-crossing.

Since a matching is an injective functional relation, we will often use functional notations: $M(i) = j$ or $M^{-1}(j) = i$ rather than $M(i, j)$. If $M(i, j)$, we call i a *call* position, j a *return* position and if $k \in [n]$ is neither a call nor a return position we call it an *internal* position.

If I is a subset of $[n]$ we denote by I^c the subset of call positions of I , and by I^r the subset of return positions and I^{int} the subset of internal position. We say that I is *without pending arch* (wpa) if it has no pending call nor pending return, i.e. $M(I^c) \cup M^{-1}(I^r) \subseteq I$. Note that this definition holds when I is an interval, but even for an arbitrary subset of $[n]$. In particular, we say a pair (I_1, I_2) of intervals is without pending arch if $I_1 \cup I_2$ is. In this case, we may also say that (I_1, I_2) is a pair of *matched intervals*.

(2-)Nested Words

We first recall the classical definition of nested words:


► **Definition 2.** A nested word on Σ is a pair $\omega = (w, M)$ where $w \in \Sigma^*$ and M is a matching of length $|w|$. We write $\text{NW}(\Sigma)$ the set of nested words on Σ , and $\text{NWL}(\Sigma)$ the set of languages of nested words.

Words equipped with two matchings are called 2-nested words:

► **Definition 3.** A 2-nested word on Σ is a triple $\omega = (w, M_1, M_2)$ where $w \in \Sigma^*$ and M_1, M_2 are matchings of length $|w|$. We write $\text{2NW}(\Sigma)$ for the set of 2-nested words on Σ , and $\text{2NWL}(\Sigma)$ for the set of languages of 2-nested words.

► **Example 4.** An example of a nested word (resp. two examples of 2-nested words) is depicted on the left (resp. on the middle and right) of Figure 2. For 2-nested words, the matching M_1 is depicted above, while matching M_2 is depicted below.

Given a 2-nested word $\omega = (w, M_1, M_2)$ and an interval $I \subseteq [|w|]$ which is wpa w.r.t. both M_1 and M_2 , we denote by $\omega|_I$ the 2-nested word consisting of $w|_I$ and of the two matchings M'_1 and M'_2 obtained from M_1 and M_2 by restricting them to I , and then shifting them to the interval $[|I|]$. It is routine to verify that if ω is a 2-nested word, then so is $\omega|_I$.



■ **Figure 2** A nested word (left) and two 2-nested words (middle and right).

Waves and wave words

In the sequel, we introduce the restriction of 2-nested words on which we will focus. Intuitively, wave structures are graphs obtained from the two matchings consisting of cycles alternating M_1 -arches and M_2 -arches whose shape evokes waves.

► **Definition 5.** Let n be an integer, and (M_1, M_2) be a pair of matching relations of length n . A sequence of 4 integers $1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < i_3 < i_4 \leq n$ is a 2-wave if the following holds:

- $M_1(i_1, i_2)$ and $M_1(i_3, i_4)$ (top arches),
- $M_2(i_2, i_3)$ (bottom arch), and $M_2(i_1, i_4)$ (support arch)

A pair (M_1, M_2) is a 2-wave structure if any arch in $M_1 \cup M_2$ belongs to a 2-wave.

► **Remark 6.** One could allow 2-wave structures to admit 1-waves, *i.e.* pairs of indices (i_1, i_2) with $i_1 < i_2$, $M_1(i_1, i_2)$ and $M_2(i_1, i_2)$. All our results would also hold for this generalization. However, in order to simplify the presentation of the paper, we do not consider them in this extended abstract.

► **Definition 7.** A 2-wave word is a 2-nested word $\omega = (w, M_1, M_2)$ such that (M_1, M_2) is a 2-wave structure. We denote by $\text{WW}_2(\Sigma)$ the set of 2-wave words over the alphabet Σ .

► **Example 8.** Examples of waves are given on Figure 1. Let us consider the 2-nested words depicted on Figure 2. The one on the middle is not a 2-wave word (the upper arch (5, 6) does not belong to a 2-wave), while the one on the right is.

Grammar

In order to proceed with structural induction, we present an inductive presentation of 2-wave words based on multiple context-free grammars (MCFG for short [19]). To this end, we turn to 2-visibly pushdown languages: the alphabet Σ is duplicated into five copies $\Sigma_c^c, \Sigma_r^c, \Sigma_c^r, \Sigma_r^r$ and $\Sigma_{\text{int}}^{\text{int}}$, whose disjoint is denoted $\tilde{\Sigma}$. This way, the two matchings are encoded in the types of the symbols: the upper index is for the first and the lower index for the second matching relation. More formally, given $\omega \in \text{WW}_2(\Sigma)$, we denote by $\tilde{\omega} \in \tilde{\Sigma}^*$ its visibly pushdown version.

In MCFG, non-terminals allow to express tuples of words. We present a grammar with two non-terminals W and H which represent respectively words (denoted $w \in \tilde{\Sigma}^*$), and pairs of words (denoted $(x, y) \in \tilde{\Sigma}^* \times \tilde{\Sigma}^*$). The grammar is defined by the following rules:

$$\begin{aligned} W \ni w & ::= \epsilon \mid i \mid w_1 w_2 \mid x w y \\ H \ni (x, y) & ::= (\epsilon, \epsilon) \mid (x_1 x_2, y_2 y_1) \mid (w_1 x w'_1, w_2 y w'_2) \mid (a x b, c y d) \end{aligned}$$

where $i \in \Sigma_{\text{int}}^{\text{int}}$ and $(a, b, c, d) \in \Sigma_c^c \times \Sigma_r^c \times \Sigma_c^r \times \Sigma_r^r$.

► **Lemma 9.** $L(W) = \{\tilde{\omega} \in \tilde{\Sigma}^* \mid \omega \in \text{WW}_2(\Sigma)\}$

Proof sketch. We give some hints on how to show the right to left implication. Let $\omega = (w, M_1, M_2) \in \text{WW}_2(\Sigma)$. We show, by induction on $n \leq |w|$, the following properties:


- Let $I \subseteq [|w|]$ such that $|I| = n$ and I is wpa, then $\tilde{\omega}_{|I} \in L(W)$.
- Let $I_1, I_2 \subseteq [|w|]$ such that $|I_1| + |I_2| = n$ and (I_1, I_2) is wpa, then $(\tilde{\omega}_{|I_1}, \tilde{\omega}_{|I_2}) \in L(H)$.

The proof decomposes the 2-wave, by distinguishing cases according to the structure of the two matchings. One can then verify that in all cases, one can produce the words using one of the rules of the grammar. ◀

3 2-Nested Word Automata

Nested word automata have been introduced in [3] as an extension of finite-state automata intended to recognize nested words. They label arches of the matching relation with so-called *hierarchical* states: if the position corresponds to a call (resp. a return), then the automaton "outputs" (resp. "receives") the hierarchical state used to label the arch, hence we place it after the input letter (resp. before). This corresponds to push/pop operations performed by a (visibly) pushdown automaton. The extension of this model to multiple matchings is natural, and has already been considered in [4, 6]: with two matchings, automata label edges of both matchings with hierarchical states.

We first introduce some notations. Let us assume that two matching relations M_1, M_2 of length n are given. Then, each index $i \in [n]$ can be labelled in 9 different ways depending on



■ **Figure 3** Examples of transition steps.

it's call, return and internal status with regard to matchings M_1 and M_2 . We say that a position i is a *call-return* if it is a call w.r.t. M_1 , and a return w.r.t. M_2 . We extend this convention to other possible types of positions (*call-call*, *return-call*, *call-internal*...). Let $I \subseteq [n]$ and $x, y \in \{c, r, \text{int}\}$. Following our graphical representation of 2-nested words, in which M_1 is depicted above the word, and M_2 is depicted below, we denote by I_y^x the subset of I with x status on M_1 , and y status on M_2 . For instance, given a position $i \in I$, we have $i \in I_r^c$ if i is a call w.r.t. M_1 and a return w.r.t. M_2 . We also introduce the following shortcuts: for $x \in \{c, r\}$, $I^x = I_c^x \cup I_r^x \cup I_{\text{int}}^x$ and $I_x = I_x^c \cup I_x^r \cup I_x^{\text{int}}$. For instance, I_c (resp. I_r) denotes the set of positions in I which are a call w.r.t. M_1 (resp. M_2).

- **Definition 10.** A 2-nested word automaton is a tuple $A = (Q, Q_0, Q_f, P, \Sigma, \Delta)$ where :
- Q is a finite set of states and $Q_0, Q_f \subseteq Q$ are respectively the initial and final states
 - P is a set of hierarchical states
 - $\Delta = (\Delta_y^x)_{x,y \in \{c,r,\text{int}\}}$ is a set of transitions : $\Delta_y^x \subseteq Q \times P^{\text{in}_{x,y}} \times \Sigma \times P^{\text{out}_{x,y}} \times Q$, where $\text{in}_{x,y}$ (resp. $\text{out}_{x,y}$) is the number of r (resp. c) in $\{x,y\}$. For instance, $\text{in}_{c,r} = \text{in}_{r,c} = 1$ and $\text{out}_{c,c} = 2$.

► **Remark 11.** In the previous definition, elements in $P^{\text{in}_{x,y}}$ correspond to hierarchical states that label closing arches, which can be interpreted as popped symbols, while elements in $P^{\text{out}_{x,y}}$ correspond to hierarchical states that label opening arches, which can be interpreted as pushed symbols. Elements of Q are called *linear* states, as they follow the edges of the linear order, in contrast to hierarchical states.

► **Definition 12 (Run/Language of a 2NWA).** Let $\omega = (a_1 \dots a_n, M_1, M_2) \in 2\text{NW}$ and A be a 2NWA. Let $\ell = (\ell_i)_{i \in [0,n]}$ be a sequence of states, $h^1 = (h_i^1)_{i \in [n]^c}$ and $h^2 = (h_i^2)_{i \in [n]^c}$ be two sequences of elements of P . For all $i \in [n]$, we write $\text{run}_i^A(\omega, \ell, h^1, h^2)$ if one of the following cases holds: (the first four cases are illustrated on Figure 3)

- call-call:** $i \in [n]_c^c$, and $(\ell_{i-1}, a_i, h_i^1, h_i^2, \ell_i) \in \Delta_c^c$
- return-call:** $i \in [n]_c^r$, and $(\ell_{i-1}, h_{M_1^{-1}(i)}^1, a_i, h_i^2, \ell_i) \in \Delta_c^r$
- call-return:** $i \in [n]_r^c$, and $(\ell_{i-1}, h_{M_2^{-1}(i)}^2, a_i, h_i^1, \ell_i) \in \Delta_r^c$
- return-return:** $i \in [n]_r^r$, and $(\ell_{i-1}, h_{M_1^{-1}(i)}^1, h_{M_2^{-1}(i)}^2, a_i, \ell_i) \in \Delta_r^r$
- call-internal:** $i \in [n]_{\text{int}}^c$, and $(\ell_{i-1}, a_i, h_i^1, \ell_i) \in \Delta_{\text{int}}^c$
- internal-call:** $i \in [n]_c^{\text{int}}$, and $(\ell_{i-1}, a_i, h_i^2, \ell_i) \in \Delta_c^{\text{int}}$
- return-internal:** $i \in [n]_{\text{int}}^r$, and $(\ell_{i-1}, h_{M_1^{-1}(i)}^1, a_i, \ell_i) \in \Delta_{\text{int}}^r$
- internal-return:** $i \in [n]_r^{\text{int}}$, and $(\ell_{i-1}, h_{M_2^{-1}(i)}^2, a_i, \ell_i) \in \Delta_r^{\text{int}}$
- internal-internal:** $i \in [n]_{\text{int}}^{\text{int}}$, and $(\ell_{i-1}, a_i, \ell_i) \in \Delta_{\text{int}}^{\text{int}}$

If for all $i \in [n]$, $\text{run}_i^A(\omega, \ell, h^1, h^2)$ holds, the triple (ℓ, h^1, h^2) is said to be a run of A over ω ; it is an accepting run if $\ell_0 \in Q_0$ and $\ell_n \in Q_f$.


We will write $q \xrightarrow[A]{\omega} q'$ when there exists a triple (ℓ, h^1, h^2) which is a run of A on ω , and whose first (resp. last) element of ℓ is equal to q (resp. q'). If we denote by n the length of ω , and if $I \subseteq [n]$ is an interval wpa, then we write $q \xrightarrow[A]{\omega|_I} q'$ as a shortcut for $q \xrightarrow[A]{\omega} q'$.

A 2-nested word is accepted by A if it admits an accepting run. The set of all 2-nested words accepted by A is denoted $L(A)$, and a language of 2-nested words is called regular if it is accepted by a 2-nested word automaton. In the sequel, we will also be interested in restricting the language of a 2NWA to 2-wave words. Hence, we denote by $L_{\text{WW}_2}(A)$ the set of 2-wave words accepted by A , i.e. $L(A) \cap \text{WW}_2(\Sigma)$.

► **Example 13.** Let $A_{ex} = (Q, Q_0, Q_f, P, \{a, b, c, d\}, \Delta)$, with $Q = \{q_a, q_b, q_c, q_d\}$, $Q_0 = \{q_a\}$, $Q_f = \{q_d\}$, $P = Q$ and Δ defined as follows (we only give non-empty transition sets):

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_c^c &= \{(q_a, a, q_a, q_a, q_a)\} \\ \Delta_c^r &= \{(q_x, q_a, b, q_b, q_b) \mid x \in \{a, b\}\} \\ \Delta_r^c &= \{(q_x, q_b, c, q_c, q_c) \mid x \in \{b, c\}\} \\ \Delta_r^r &= \{(q_x, q_c, q_a, d, q_d) \mid x \in \{c, d\}\} \end{aligned}$$

We illustrate the semantics of 2NWA by giving on Figure 4 a graphical representation of a run of A_{ex} on the 2NW $\omega_2 = (a^2b^2c^2d^2, M_1, M_2)$, with M_1, M_2 depicted on Figure 4. We let the reader check that the projection of $L(A_{ex})$ on Σ^* is equal to $\{a^n b^n c^n d^n \mid n \geq 1\}$, hence not context-free.



► **Figure 4** A run of A_{ex} over ω_2 .

► **Definition 14** (deterministic 2NWA). A 2NWA is deterministic iff $Q_0 = \{q_0\}$ and for all $x, y \in \{c, r, \text{int}\}$, Δ_y^x induces a function $Q \times P^{\text{in}_{x,y}} \times \Sigma \rightarrow P^{\text{out}_{x,y}} \times Q$.

► **Example 15.** The automaton A_{ex} considered in Example 13 is deterministic.

Normal form

To ease further constructions, we present a normal form for 2NWA that requires the hierarchical state of an arch to be equal to the target linear state of its call index. More formally, we say that a 2NWA is in weakly-hierarchical post form (post form for short) if $P = Q$ and for all $x, y \in \{c, r, \text{int}\}$, $\Delta_y^x \subseteq \bigcup_{q \in Q} Q \times Q^{\text{in}_{x,y}} \times \Sigma \times \{q\}^{\text{out}_{x,y}} \times \{q\}$. As a consequence, transitions of an automaton in post form can be simplified: $\Delta_y^x \subseteq Q \times Q^{\text{in}_{x,y}} \times \Sigma \times Q$.

It is worth observing that in a 2NWA in post form, a run is completely characterized by the linear states. Hence, we can omit the hierarchical states in the formula run_i^A , and we can say that a sequence of (linear) states ℓ is a run of A on a 2-nested word ω .

► **Example 16.** The automaton A_{ex} considered in Example 13 is in post form.

► **Lemma 17.** Given a 2NWA $A = (Q, Q_0, Q_f, \Sigma, P, \Delta)$, we can build a 2NWA $A' = (Q', q'_0, Q'_f, \Sigma, Q', \Delta')$ which is in weakly-hierarchical post form and such that $L(A) = L(A')$.

Closure properties

Applying classical automata constructions to 2NWA, one can prove the following closure properties of regular 2NWL. Detailed proofs can be found in Appendix B.

► **Proposition 18.** [See also [4]] Regular 2NWL are closed under union, intersection, and direct and reciprocal image by a non erasing alphabetic morphism.

4 Determinization of 2NWA over 2-wave words

► **Theorem 19.** *2NWA are determinizable on the subclass of 2-wave words, i.e., given a 2NWA A , we can build a deterministic 2NWA A' such that $L_{\text{WW}_2}(A) = L_{\text{WW}_2}(A')$.*

Thanks to Lemma 17, we start from a 2NWA in post normal form $A = (Q, Q_0, Q_f, \Delta)$. This normal form will allow to lighten the presentation, as less arguments are needed to write the transitions and the runs. We will describe the construction of a deterministic 2NWA A' (not in post normal form), which accepts the same language of 2-wave words.

Introduction to the construction

The determinization of finite-state automata, known as the powerset construction, registers all the states reachable by a run of A , which in the sequel are named *current* states. The determinization procedure of [3] for nested word automata requires the recording of two states. In addition to the current state, they also store the state labelling the call of the arch covering the current position. This state is named *reference* state. Intuitively, it stores where we come from, and will be used when closing the arch to reconcile the global run with what happened below this arch.

In our setting, as we consider a pair of matchings (M_1, M_2) instead of a single one, we need to store triples of states, composed of two reference states (one for M_1 and one for M_2), and one current state. Hence, states of A' will be sets of such triples of states.

The very particular shape of 2-wave words, and in particular the fact that the support arch and the top arches do end up at the same return-return position, ensure that we can gather the information collected along these two paths to compute, in a deterministic fashion, the set of possible current states.

However, when trying to address the setting of 2-wave words, we face another difficulty related to reference states. Indeed, the computations we will perform on each arch of the 2-wave word are somehow disconnected. In order to be sure that they can be reconciled, we will enrich the reference state of the second top arch of the 2-wave with the state of the bottom arch and that of the first top arch. This allows us to check whether the reference associated with the second top arch is *compatible* with that chosen for the first top arch.

Construction


We will define the deterministic 2NWA $A' = (Q', \{q'_0\}, Q'_f, P', \delta)$ in the following way. We first introduce the reference states for M_1 and M_2 :¹

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\mathcal{R}}^1 &:= Q && \text{the reference for positions at the surface of the first top arch} \\ \overline{\mathcal{R}}^2 &:= Q^3 && \text{the reference for positions at the surface of the second top arch} \\ \underline{\mathcal{R}} &:= Q && \text{the reference for } M_2 \end{aligned}$$

We denote by $\overline{\mathcal{R}}$ the union $\overline{\mathcal{R}}^1 \cup \overline{\mathcal{R}}^2$. This allows us to define:

$$\begin{aligned} Q' &:= 2^{\overline{\mathcal{R}}^1 \times \underline{\mathcal{R}} \times Q} \cup 2^{\overline{\mathcal{R}}^2 \times \underline{\mathcal{R}} \times Q} && q'_0 &:= \{(q_0, q_0, q_0); q_0 \in Q_0\} \\ Q'_f &:= \{S \in Q'; S \cap Q \times Q \times Q_f \neq \emptyset\} && P' &:= (Q' \times \Sigma) \cup (Q' \times \Sigma)^2 \end{aligned}$$

¹ Observe that the reference state for the second top arch is a triple of states, as explained before.



■ **Figure 5** Illustration of the determinization. The (original) run in A is depicted in red, while the (new) one in A' is in blue. Elements of states of A' are illustrated by triples depicted below them.

The transition function δ for A' is defined as follows, by distinguishing cases according to the nature of the symbol. The construction is illustrated on Figure 5. In order to ease the writing, the arguments of the formula are not explicitly written.

- $\delta_{\text{int}}(S, \alpha) := \{(\bar{r}, r, q'); \exists q (\bar{r}, r, q) \in S \wedge (q, \alpha, q') \in \Delta_{\text{int}}\}$
- $\delta_c^c(S_1, \alpha_1) := (S'_1, (S_1, \alpha_1), (S_1, \alpha_1))$ where

$$S'_1 := \{(q'_1, q'_1, q'_1); \exists \bar{r}_1, r_0, q_1 \phi_1\}$$

$$\phi_1 := (\bar{r}_1, r_0, q_1) \in S_1 \wedge (q_1, \alpha_1, q'_1) \in \Delta_c^c.$$

- $\delta_c^r(S_2, (S_1, \alpha_1), \alpha_2) := (S'_2, (S_1, \alpha_1, S_2, \alpha_2))$ where

$$S'_2 := \{(\bar{r}_1, q'_2, q'_2); \exists r_0, r_2, q_1, q'_1, q_2 \phi_2\}$$

$$\phi_2 := \phi_1 \wedge (q'_1, r_2, q_2) \in S_2 \wedge (q_2, q'_1, \alpha_2, q'_2) \in \Delta_c^r$$

- $\delta_c^c(S_3, (S_1, \alpha_1, S_2, \alpha_2), \alpha_3) := (S'_3, (S_2, \alpha_2, S_3, \alpha_3))$ where ²

$$S'_3 := \{(q'_1 q'_2 q'_3, r_2, q'_3); \exists \bar{r}_1, \bar{r}_3, r_0, q_1, q_2, q_3 \phi_3\}$$

$$\phi_3 := \phi_2 \wedge \bar{r}_1 \preceq \bar{r}_3 \wedge (\bar{r}_3, q'_2, q_3) \in S_3 \wedge (q_3, q'_2, \alpha_3, q'_3) \in \Delta_c^c$$

- $\delta_c^r(S_4, (S_2, \alpha_2, S_3, \alpha_3), (S_1, \alpha_1), \alpha_4) := S'_4$ where

$$S'_4 := \{(\bar{r}_3, r_0, q'_4); \exists \bar{r}_1, r_2, q_1, q'_1, q_2, q'_2, q_3, q'_3, q_4 \phi_4\}$$

$$\phi_4 := \phi_3 \wedge (q'_1 q'_2 q'_3, q'_1, q_4) \in S_4 \wedge (q_4, q'_3, q'_1, \alpha_4, q'_4) \in \Delta_c^r$$

► **Remark 20.** Formulas $(\phi_j)_{j \in [4]}$ are not quantified at all, hence all their variables are free. Their objective is to link parameters extracted from the triplets of states of A' .

² \preceq denotes the prefix partial order on strings.

Proof of correctness

We fix a 2-wave word $\omega = (w, M_1, M_2)$, with $w = a_1 \dots a_n$. The following proposition states that on an interval without pending arch, runs of A' exactly capture possible runs of A , while keeping track of the reference states, as explained before.

► **Proposition 21.** *Let $\llbracket s, f \rrbracket \subseteq [n]$ be wpa, and $S, S' \in Q'$ such that $S \xrightarrow[A']{\omega, \llbracket s, f \rrbracket} S'$, then:*

$$\forall \bar{r} \in \bar{\mathcal{R}}, \underline{r} \in \underline{\mathcal{R}}, q' \in Q, \left((\bar{r}, \underline{r}, q') \in S' \iff \exists q \in Q (\bar{r}, \underline{r}, q) \in S \wedge q \xrightarrow[A]{\omega, \llbracket s, f \rrbracket} q' \right)$$

Before sketching the proof of this proposition, we fix some notations. Let $\llbracket s, f \rrbracket \subseteq [n]$ be an interval wpa, and $S, S' \in Q'$ such that $S \xrightarrow[A']{\omega, \llbracket s, f \rrbracket} S'$. Observe that as A' is deterministic, it has a unique run on the 2-wave word ω restricted to $\llbracket s, f \rrbracket$. We let $(L_i)_{i \in \llbracket s-1, f \rrbracket}$ denote the (linear) states of this run. In particular, we have $L_{s-1} = S$ and $L_f = S'$. As A' is deterministic, hierarchical states are completely determined from linear ones.

In order to prove Proposition 21, we separate the direct from the indirect case. For the indirect case, it is easy to show by induction that any run of A on ω (restricted to $\llbracket s, f \rrbracket$) will appear in the run of A' on ω (restricted to $\llbracket s, f \rrbracket$). This only requires to define carefully the corresponding reference states.

► **Lemma 22.** *Let $\ell = (\ell_i)_{i \in \llbracket s-1, f \rrbracket}$ be a run of A on ω (restricted to $\llbracket s, f \rrbracket$) such that $\ell_{s-1} = q$, $\ell_f = q'$ and $(\bar{r}, \underline{r}, q) \in S = L_{s-1}$. Then we can define reference mappings \bar{R} and \underline{R} from $\llbracket s-1, f \rrbracket$ to $\bar{\mathcal{R}}$ and $\underline{\mathcal{R}}$ respectively, such that $\bar{R}(f) = \bar{r}$, $\underline{R}(f) = \underline{r}$, and for all $i \in \llbracket s-1, f \rrbracket$, $(\bar{R}(i), \underline{R}(i), \ell_i) \in L_i$.*

The direct implication will be proven by induction on $\llbracket s, f \rrbracket$. More precisely, we rely on the grammar allowing to describe all 2-wave words given in Section 2. We use a slight abuse of notation here, as the grammar is based on the visibly pushdown presentation, while we work here with 2-nested words, but we believe the correspondence is without ambiguity. The three first cases of the grammar (internal, empty word, and concatenation of 2-wave words) are easy. The last case decomposes the 2-wave word ω as $\omega = x\omega'y$, with (x, y) being a pair of "matched" words, *i.e.* given by the non-terminal H. Intuitively, the grammar gives a decomposition of the wpa interval associated with ω into a wpa interval corresponding to ω' , and a pair of matched intervals corresponding to (x, y) . Hence, this requires to study pairs of matched intervals, *i.e.* a pair of intervals which is without pending arch. To this end, we introduce a notation for a "partial" run on a pair of matched intervals:

► **Definition 23.** *Let $(I_1 = \llbracket i_1, j_1 \rrbracket, I_2 = \llbracket i_2, j_2 \rrbracket)$ be a pair of matched intervals w.r.t. ω . Let q_1, q_2, q'_1, q'_2 be four states. We let $J = I_1 \cup I_2 \cup \{i_1 - 1, i_2 - 1\}$. We write $q_1, q_2 \xrightarrow[A]{\omega, I_1, I_2} q'_1, q'_2$ if there exists $(\ell_i)_{i \in J}$ such that $\forall i \in J$, $\text{run}_i^A(\omega, \ell)$ and $\forall k \in [2]$, $q_k = \ell_{i_k-1}$ and $q'_k = \ell_{j_k}$.*

We are now ready to state the following lemma:

► **Lemma 24.** *Let (i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4) be a 2-wave such that $i_1 \in \llbracket s, f \rrbracket$ and $(\bar{r}_3, \underline{r}_0, q'_4) \in L_{i_4}$. For any $\bar{r}_1, \underline{r}_2, q_1, q'_1, q_2, q'_2, q_3, q'_3, q_4$ satisfying ψ_4 we have $q_1, q_3 \xrightarrow[A]{\omega, \llbracket i_1, i_2 \rrbracket, \llbracket i_3, i_4 \rrbracket} q'_2, q'_4$.*

Lemma 24 confirms the intuition that a 2-wave is an encapsulation in its sort: any q_1, q'_2 and q_3 yielded by $(\bar{r}_3, \underline{r}_0, q'_4) \in L_{i_4}$ via the construction of L_{i_4} (e.g. via ψ_4) define with q'_4 a run of A on ω on the subset of positions given by $\llbracket i_1, i_2 \rrbracket$ and $\llbracket i_3, i_4 \rrbracket$.

We explain how to conclude the proof of Proposition 21. Starting from the 2-wave word ω , we obtained a decomposition $\omega = x\omega'y$, with (x, y) being a pair of "matched" words produced by H. We can show in addition that extremal positions of x and y exactly correspond to a 2-wave, in the sense of the premises of Lemma 24. Combining it with the induction hypothesis (direct implication of Proposition 21) applied on ω' , we can exhibit the expected run in A .

Proof of Theorem 19. First, observe that by construction, A' is deterministic and complete. Let $\omega \in \text{WW}_2(\Sigma)$. As A' is deterministic and complete, it has a unique run on ω starting from q'_0 . Let $(L_i)_{i \in \llbracket 0, n \rrbracket}$ be this run, with $L_0 = q'_0$. We proceed by equivalence:

$$\begin{aligned} \omega \in L(A') &\iff L_n \in Q'_f \iff L_n \cap Q \times Q \times Q_f \neq \emptyset \iff \exists(\bar{r}, \underline{r}, q_f) \in L_n \ q_f \in Q_f \\ &\iff \exists q_0, q_f \in Q_f \ (\bar{r}, \underline{r}, q_0) \in q'_0 \text{ and } q_0 \xrightarrow[A]{\omega} q_f \iff \omega \in L(A). \quad \blacktriangleleft \end{aligned}$$

Closure under complementation

It is proved in [21] that regular 2NWL are not closed under complementation, since they are not determinizable. The definition of 2NWL they use is slightly different from ours because the two matchings do not share positions, but the same negative result can be shown for our definition. For example, there is no deterministic automaton recognizing the language $\{(a^{n+m}b^m a^n b^m a^n, \{(i, i + 2(n + m)) \mid 1 \leq i \leq n + m\}, \{(i, i + n + m) \mid 1 \leq i \leq n + m\}) \mid n, m \geq 0\}$. However, thanks to our determinization result for regular WW_2 languages, we get:

► **Proposition 25.** *Regular languages of 2-wave words are closed under complementation.*

5 Logical characterization

We show that languages of 2-wave words definable in monadic second order logic (MSO) are exactly regular languages of 2-wave words. Let us fix $\mathcal{V} = \mathcal{V}_1 \cup \mathcal{V}_2$, \mathcal{V}_1 is the set of first order variables (whose elements will be written using lower-cases) and \mathcal{V}_2 is the set of second order variables (whose elements will be written using upper-cases).

The monadic second-order logic of 2-nested words ($\text{MSO}(\Sigma, <, M_1, M_2)$) is given by

$$\phi := Q_a(x) \mid x < y \mid X(x) \mid M_i(x, y) \mid \neg\phi \mid \phi \wedge \phi \mid \exists x \phi \mid \exists X \phi$$

where $a \in \Sigma$, $x, y \in \mathcal{V}_1$, $X \in \mathcal{V}_2$, $i \in \{1, 2\}$.

The semantics is defined over 2-nested words in a natural way. The first-order variables are interpreted over positions of the nested word, while set variables are interpreted over sets of positions; $Q_a(x)$ holds if the symbol at the position interpreted for x is a , $x < y$ holds if the position interpreted for x is lesser than the position interpreted for y , and $M_i(x, y)$ holds if the positions interpreted for x and y are related by a nesting edge of matching M_i .

Let us define some fragments of $\text{MSO}(\Sigma, <, M_1, M_2)$. The set $\text{FO}(\Sigma, <, M_1, M_2)$ of first order (FO) formulas is the set of all formulas in $\text{MSO}(\Sigma, <, M_1, M_2)$ that do not contain any second-order quantifier. Furthermore, the set $\text{EMSO}(\Sigma, <, M_1, M_2)$ of existential MSO (EMSO) formulas consists of all formulas of the form $\exists X_1 \dots \exists X_n \phi$, with $\phi \in \text{FO}(\Sigma, <, M_1, M_2)$. If \mathcal{L} is a logic (MSO, EMSO or FO), and ϕ is a closed formula in $\mathcal{L}(\Sigma, <, M_1, M_2)$, the *language defined by ϕ* , denoted $L(\phi)$ is the set of all 2-nested words that are a model for ϕ , and $L_{\text{WW}_2}(\phi)$ is the set of all 2-wave words that are a model for ϕ , that is, $L_{\text{WW}_2}(\phi) = L(\phi) \cap \text{WW}_2(\Sigma)$.

23:12 A robust class of languages of 2-nested words

In [4], Bollig shows the equivalence between automata and EMSO for the whole class of 2-nested words. However, he shows that quantifier alternation yields an infinite hierarchy. In our setting, this hierarchy collapses, and we obtain the equivalence between MSO and EMSO. The following characterization extends that given in [3] for regular nested word languages. Its proof follows classical lines, and relies on Propositions 18 and 25.

► **Theorem 26.** *A language of 2-wave words is definable in EMSO iff it is definable in MSO iff it is regular.*

6 Decision problems

The analysis we did so far of 2NWA over 2-wave words allows to establish the following decidability results:

- **Theorem 27.** *Let A and B be two 2NWA over Σ . The following holds:*
- *Determining whether $L_{\text{WW}_2}(A) = \emptyset$ can be decided in polynomial time.*
 - *Determining whether $L_{\text{WW}_2}(A) = \text{WW}_2(\Sigma)$ can be decided in exponential time.*
 - *Determining whether $L_{\text{WW}_2}(A) \subseteq L_{\text{WW}_2}(B)$ (resp. $L_{\text{WW}_2}(A) = L_{\text{WW}_2}(B)$) can both be decided in exponential time.*

Proof sketch. The first result follows from the grammar presented in Section 2 that produces all 2-wave words. More precisely, we maintain a set W of pairs of states (for non-terminal W) and a set H of quadruplets of states (for non-terminal H). Intuitively, $(p, q) \in W$ means that there exists a 2-wave word ω and a run $p \xrightarrow[A]{\omega} q$. We initialize them with identity relations and saturate them using the rules of the grammar, and corresponding transitions of A . The other results are direct consequences from closure under complement using the determinization procedure, with the observation that the latter has exponential complexity. ◀

On the treewidth of 2-wave words

Any 2NW $\omega = (w, M_1, M_2)$ of length n can be seen as a graph whose set of vertices is $[n]$ and set of edges is $M_1 \cup M_2 \cup \{(i, i+1)\}_{i \in [n-1]}$, then an alternative approach to decidability is by using Courcelle's Theorem on graphs of bounded treewidth. Indeed, using the grammar presented in Section 2 for 2-wave words (Lemma 9), we show:

► **Lemma 28.** *For all $\omega \in \text{WW}_2(\Sigma)$, ω has treewidth at most 11.*

In addition, it is easy to verify that the class of 2-wave words can be expressed in MSO. As a consequence, we obtain using [7, 18]:

► **Proposition 29.** *Given a formula $\phi \in \text{MSO}(<, M_1, M_2)$, checking whether there exists $\omega \in \text{WW}_2(\Sigma)$ that satisfies ϕ is decidable.*

7 Relation to indexed languages

Let \mathcal{L} be a logic (FO, EMO, or MSO), we denote by $\exists \text{Match} \mathcal{L}(\Sigma, <, M)$ the class of all word languages $L = \{u \in \Sigma^* \mid \exists M(u, M) \in L_M\}$ such that L_M is definable in $\mathcal{L}(\Sigma, <, M)$. Similarly, we denote by $\exists \text{WW}_2 \mathcal{L}(\Sigma, <, M_1, M_2)$ the class of languages $L = \{u \in \Sigma^* \mid \exists (u, M_1, M_2) \in L_{\text{WW}_2}(\phi)\}$ for $\phi \in \mathcal{L}(\Sigma, <, M_1, M_2)$.

It is proved in [13] that $\text{CFL} = \exists \text{Match FO}(\Sigma, <, M) = \exists \text{Match MSO}(\Sigma, <, M)$. A key of the proof is the fact that CF grammars can be put in Greibach double normal form. Then

each production has the form $X \rightarrow aub$, and the derivation tree of a word can be encoded by matching letters delimiting each production.

Consider now indexed grammars that generate Indexed Languages (IL). They are CF grammars where each non-terminal symbol carries a pushdown stack (often denoted X^ω where X is the non terminal and ω the stack). Grammars contain *push productions* of the form $X \rightarrow Y^p$ saying that any X^ω can be rewritten $Y^{p\omega}$; *pop productions* of the form $X^p \rightarrow Y$ saying that any $X^{p\omega}$ can be rewritten Y^ω and *copy productions* of the form $X \rightarrow YZ$ saying that any X^ω can be rewritten $Y^\omega Z^\omega$.


The derivation tree of a word can be encoded using two matching relations: one delimiting productions (corresponding to M_2), and one for the stack moves (corresponding to M_1). The nested structure thus obtained is a wave structure, where each wave follows a pushed symbol amongst the different copies. In particular, a 2-wave corresponds to a symbol which has been popped but has never been copied. Indexed grammars which never process copies are called *linear indexed grammars* and generate *linear indexed languages* (LIL). In such grammars, copy productions have the form $X \rightarrow X^\bullet Y$ or $X \rightarrow XY^\bullet$ where \bullet marks the symbol on which the stack is transmitted.

The next Proposition establishes a formal connection between regular languages of 2-wave words and linear indexed languages:

► **Proposition 30.** *Languages in $\exists WW_2MSO(\Sigma, <, M_1, M_2)$ are linear indexed languages.*

However, we don't know if the equality holds, mainly because we don't know if linear indexed languages can be put in a Greibach double normal like form.

We can also ask whether the logical characterization of CFL extends to indexed languages. The appropriate structure seems to be 2NW whose edges form *waves* of unbounded length. Intuitively, a k -wave generalizes a 2-wave as follows: it consists of $2k$ indices in increasing order, with k top arches, $k - 1$ bottom arches, and an additional support arch. An example of a 4-wave is depicted on Figure 1. This yields the notion of k -wave word (WW_k), and that of wave word (WW), which is simply the union of WW_k over k . As an example, the 2-nested word depicted on Figure 6 is in WW_4 . So, the question is: does $IL = \exists WWFO(\Sigma, <, M_1, M_2) = \exists WWMSO(\Sigma, <, M_1, M_2)$ hold? Proposition 31 provides an element of response, and we think that $IL \neq \exists WWFO(\Sigma, <, M_1, M_2)$.



■ **Figure 6** Example of a word in L and its associated wave structure.

► **Proposition 31.** *There exists a language which is not an indexed language but being $\exists WWMSO(\Sigma, <, M_1, M_2)$ -definable.*

Proof sketch. Consider $\Sigma = A \cup \{\#\}$ for any alphabet A , and the set L of all words of the form $\#u_1\#u_2\#\dots u_n\#$, for $n \geq 1$, such that for all $i \in [1, n - 1]$, $u_i \in A^n$, and if $u_i = a_1 \dots a_n$, then $u_{i+1} = a_n a_1 \dots a_{n-1}$. Using the Shrinking Lemma given in [12] for indexed languages, it can easily be proved that L is not an indexed language. In addition, one can write an EMSO-formula defining 2-wave words $(\#u_1\#u_2\#\dots u_n\#, M_1, M_2)$ such that (M_1, M_2) forms $n/2$ embedded n -waves (see an example on Figure 6). ◀

8 Conclusion

A natural perspective of this work consists in studying its extension to k -wave words. We believe that the determinization property should hold for this class too. This will require to improve our arguments, as the present proof seems intricate to be adapted to k -waves.

For unbounded waves, automata are not determinizable: Bollig proved in [4] that regular 2NWL are not closed under complementation, and are then not determinizable. His proof uses the encoding of grids in 2NWL, and can thus be adapted to (unbounded) wave words.

Another perspective consists in characterizing the subclass of indexed languages capturing languages $\exists WWL$, when L is a regular WW_2 language, and determine if $\exists WWL$ is still indexed when L is a regular WW_k language, for $k > 2$.

References

- 1 Alfred V. Aho. Indexed grammars - an extension of context-free grammars. *J. ACM*, 15(4):647–671, 1968. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1145/321479.321488>, doi:10.1145/321479.321488.
- 2 Rajeev Alur and P. Madhusudan. Visibly pushdown languages. In László Babai, editor, *Proceedings of the 36th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, Chicago, IL, USA, June 13-16, 2004*, pages 202–211. ACM, 2004. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1145/1007352.1007390>, doi:10.1145/1007352.1007390.
- 3 Rajeev Alur and P. Madhusudan. Adding nesting structure to words. *J. ACM*, 56(3):16:1–16:43, 2009. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1145/1516512.1516518>, doi:10.1145/1516512.1516518.
- 4 Benedikt Bollig. On the expressive power of 2-stack visibly pushdown automata. *Log. Methods Comput. Sci.*, 4(4), 2008. URL: [https://doi.org/10.2168/LMCS-4\(4:16\)2008](https://doi.org/10.2168/LMCS-4(4:16)2008), doi:10.2168/LMCS-4(4:16)2008.
- 5 Dario Carotenuto, Aniello Murano, and Adriano Peron. 2-visibly pushdown automata. In Tero Harju, Juhani Karhumäki, and Arto Lepistö, editors, *Developments in Language Theory, 11th International Conference, DLT 2007, Turku, Finland, July 3-6, 2007, Proceedings*, volume 4588 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 132–144. Springer, 2007. URL: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-73208-2_15, doi:10.1007/978-3-540-73208-2_15.
- 6 Dario Carotenuto, Aniello Murano, and Adriano Peron. Ordered multi-stack visibly pushdown automata. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 656:1–26, 2016. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tcs.2016.08.012>, doi:10.1016/j.tcs.2016.08.012.
- 7 Bruno Courcelle. The expression of graph properties and graph transformations in monadic second-order logic. In Grzegorz Rozenberg, editor, *Handbook of Graph Grammars and Computing by Graph Transformations, Volume 1: Foundations*, pages 313–400. World Scientific, 1997.
- 8 W. Damm. The IO- and OI-hierarchies. *Theoret. Comput. Sci.*, 20(2):95–207, 1982.
- 9 Jürgen Duske and Rainer Parchmann. Linear indexed languages. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 32:47–60, 1984. URL: [https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-3975\(84\)90023-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-3975(84)90023-9), doi:10.1016/0304-3975(84)90023-9.
- 10 J. Engelfriet. Iterated pushdown automata and complexity classes. In *Proceedings of the 14th Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 365–373. Association for Computing Machinery, 1983.
- 11 Séverine Fratani and El Makki Voundy. Epsilon-reducible context-free languages and characterizations of indexed languages. *Inf. Comput.*, 269, 2019. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ic.2019.104444>, doi:10.1016/j.ic.2019.104444.
- 12 Robert H. Gilman. A shrinking lemma for indexed languages. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 163(1&2):277–281, 1996.
- 13 Clemens Lautemann, Thomas Schwentick, and Denis Thérien. Logics for context-free languages. In Leszek Pacholski and Jerzy Tiuryn, editors, *Computer Science Logic, 8th International Workshop, CSL '94, Kazimierz, Poland, September 25-30, 1994, Selected Papers*, volume

- 933 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 205–216. Springer, 1994. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/BFb0022257>, doi:10.1007/BFb0022257.
- 14 P. Madhusudan and Gennaro Parlato. The tree width of auxiliary storage. In Thomas Ball and Mooly Sagiv, editors, *Proceedings of the 38th ACM SIGPLAN-SIGACT Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages, POPL 2011, Austin, TX, USA, January 26-28, 2011*, pages 283–294. ACM, 2011. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1145/1926385.1926419>, doi:10.1145/1926385.1926419.
 - 15 A. N. Maslov. The hierarchy of index languages of arbitrary level. *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR*, 217:1013–1016, 1974.
 - 16 A. N. Maslov. Multilevel pushdown automata. *Problemy Peredači Informacii*, 12(1):55–62, 1976.
 - 17 A. Okhotin. Non-erasing variants of the chomsky-schützenberger theorem. In *Developments in Language Theory*, volume 7410 of *Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci.*, pages 121–129. Springer, 2012.
 - 18 Detlef Seese. The structure of models of decidable monadic theories of graphs. *Ann. Pure Appl. Log.*, 53(2):169–195, 1991. URL: [https://doi.org/10.1016/0168-0072\(91\)90054-P](https://doi.org/10.1016/0168-0072(91)90054-P), doi:10.1016/0168-0072(91)90054-P.
 - 19 Hiroyuki Seki, Takashi Matsumura, Mamoru Fujii, and Tadao Kasami. On multiple context-free grammars. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 88(2):191–229, 1991. URL: [https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-3975\(91\)90374-B](https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-3975(91)90374-B), doi:10.1016/0304-3975(91)90374-B.
 - 20 Wolfgang Thomas. Languages, automata, and logic. In Grzegorz Rozenberg and Arto Salomaa, editors, *Handbook of Formal Languages, Volume 3: Beyond Words*, pages 389–455. Springer, 1997. URL: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-59126-6_7, doi:10.1007/978-3-642-59126-6_7.
 - 21 Salvatore La Torre, Parthasarathy Madhusudan, and Gennaro Parlato. A robust class of context-sensitive languages. In *22nd IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (LICS 2007), 10-12 July 2007, Wrocław, Poland, Proceedings*, pages 161–170. IEEE Computer Society, 2007. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1109/LICS.2007.9>, doi:10.1109/LICS.2007.9.
 - 22 Salvatore La Torre, Parthasarathy Madhusudan, and Gennaro Parlato. The language theory of bounded context-switching. In Alejandro López-Ortiz, editor, *LATIN 2010: Theoretical Informatics, 9th Latin American Symposium, Oaxaca, Mexico, April 19-23, 2010. Proceedings*, volume 6034 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 96–107. Springer, 2010. URL: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-12200-2_10, doi:10.1007/978-3-642-12200-2_10.
 - 23 Salvatore La Torre, Margherita Napoli, and Gennaro Parlato. Scope-bounded pushdown languages. *Int. J. Found. Comput. Sci.*, 27(2):215–234, 2016. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1142/S0129054116400074>, doi:10.1142/S0129054116400074.
 - 24 D. Weir. *Characterizing Mildly Context-Sensitive Grammar Formalisms*. PhD thesis, University of Pennsylvania, 1988. Available as Technical Report MS-CIS-88-74.

A Proof of Lemma 9

► **Lemma 9.** $L(W) = \{\tilde{\omega} \in \tilde{\Sigma}^* \mid \omega \in WW_2(\Sigma)\}$

Proof. The right to left implication is easy.

We show the left to right implication. Let $\omega = (w, M_1, M_2)$ be a 2-wave. We show, by induction on $n \leq |w|$, the following property:

1. let $I \subseteq [|w|]$ such that $|I| = n$ and I is wpa, then $\tilde{\omega}_I$ belongs to $L(W)$,
2. let $(I_1, I_2) \subseteq [|w|]$ such that $|I_1| + |I_2| = n$, and (I_1, I_2) is wpa, then $(\tilde{\omega}_{|I_1}, \tilde{\omega}_{|I_2})$ belongs to $L(H)$.

For $n = 0$ the property follows from the cases ϵ and (ϵ, ϵ) respectively.

Assume the property holds for n , and let us show it holds for $n + 1$.

We start with the first statement. We consider a wpa interval I of size $n + 1$ and study the letter at the first position (denoted i):

- if it is an internal position, the result easily follows.
- otherwise, it must be a call-call. Then we consider the matching return-return, say at position j . Again several cases need to be considered:
 - if j is strictly before the last position of I , then the subinterval of I with positions $> j$ is wpa. Hence, induction property can be applied.
 - otherwise, j is at the last position. We can also identify the matching return call (position k) and call return (position ℓ). We define (I_1, I_2) corresponding to the four positions i, k and ℓ, j respectively, which is wpa. Again, there are two cases:
 - * If the two positions are not consecutive ($k < \ell - 1$), then (I_1, I_2) is strictly smaller, so the other property can be applied. In addition, the interval $[k + 1, \ell - 1]$ is also wpa. Again, induction property can be applied. We conclude using the last case of grammar of W .
 - * If the two positions are consecutive. We define (I'_1, I'_2) with I'_1 starting at $i + 1$, ending at $k - 1$, and I'_2 starting at $\ell + 1$, ending at $j - 1$. It is wpa, strictly smaller, induction case 2 can be applied. Last case of H can be applied to deduce that $(\tilde{\omega}_{|I'_1}, \tilde{\omega}_{|I'_2})$ belongs to $L(H)$. We easily conclude for I using that ϵ belongs to $L(W)$, and the last case of W .

We turn to the second property. We consider a pair (I, J) , wpa, of length $n + 1$. If $I = \emptyset$, then J is wpa and $(\tilde{\omega}_I, \tilde{\omega}_J)$ is obtained by applying the third case of grammar of H with $(x, y) = (\epsilon, \epsilon)$, $w_1 = w_2 = w_3 = \epsilon$ and $w_4 = \tilde{\omega}_{|J}$.

Otherwise, we study the letter at first position of I , that we denote by i . If it's an internal, again it's easy using the third case of grammar of H . So we suppose it's a call-call. Let us denote by j the matching return-return. We consider two cases:

- If j belongs to I , then we can split I into I' and I'' , obtained by restricting I to positions less than, or equal to (resp. strictly greater than) j . Then, I' is wpa, and (I'', J) is too, and of size at most n . We easily conclude, using induction hypothesis on both, and combining them using third case of H .
- Otherwise, j belongs to J . We distinguish several cases:
 - if j is not the last position of J , then we can split J as we split I before, and conclude similarly.
 - otherwise, j is at the last position of J , and we identify the two other matching positions, namely the return call k , and the call return ℓ . We distinguish two cases:
 - * if k is at the last position of I , and ℓ is at the first position of J , then we can apply last case of H to conclude.

- * otherwise, we will be able to split I (resp. J) into I', I'' (resp. J'', J') such (I', J') and (I'', J'') are both wpa, and non-empty, hence of size at most n . Using induction hypothesis, we conclude using second case of H. ◀

B

 Proofs of Section 3

► **Lemma 17.** *Given a 2NWA $A = (Q, Q_0, Q_f, \Sigma, P, \Delta)$, we can build a 2NWA $A' = (Q', q'_0, Q'_f, \Sigma, Q', \Delta')$ which is in weakly-hierarchical post form and such that $L(A) = L(A')$.*

Sketch. We define $Q' = Q(\{\epsilon\} \cup P \cup PP)$, $Q'_0 = Q_0$, $Q'_f = Q_f(\{\epsilon\} \cup P \cup PP)$. We construct Δ' from Δ such that there is a one to one correspondence between runs of A and runs of A' . More precisely, for all $\omega = (w, M_1, M_2)$, (ℓ, h^1, h^2) is a run of A over ω iff $\forall 1 \leq i \leq |w|$, the sequence $\ell'_i = \ell_i h_i^1 h_i^2$ is run of A' over ω (if h_i^1 or h_i^2 is undefined, it is replaced by ϵ). Formally, for all production $(q_1, p_1, \dots, p_{\text{in}_{x,y}}, a, p'_1, \dots, p'_{\text{out}_{x,y}}, q_2) \in \Delta_y^x$,

$$\{(q'_1, qp_1 \cdots p_{\text{in}_{x,y}}, a, q_2 p'_1 \cdots p'_{\text{out}_{x,y}}) \mid q'_1 \in q_1(\{\epsilon\} \cup P \cup PP), q \in Q\} \in \Delta_y^x.$$
◀

► **Proposition 18.** *[See also [4]] Regular 2NWL are closed under union, intersection, and direct and reciprocal image by a non erasing alphabetic morphism.*

Proof. Suppose L' and L'' to be recognized respectively by 2NWA $A' = (Q', Q'_0, Q'_f, \Sigma, \Delta')$ and $A'' = (Q'', Q''_0, Q''_f, \Sigma, \Delta'')$ in post form.

We define the *product* of A' and A'' to be the 2NWA $A = (Q' \times Q'', Q'_0 \times Q''_0, Q'_f \times Q''_f, \Sigma, \Delta)$ where for all $x, y \in \{c, r, \text{int}\}$, Δ_y^x is the set of transitions

$$((q'_1 q''_1), (p'_1 p''_1), \dots, (p'_{\text{in}_{x,y}} p''_{\text{in}_{x,y}}), a, (r'_1 r''_1), \dots, (r'_{\text{in}_{x,y}} r''_{\text{in}_{x,y}}), (q'_2 q''_2))$$

such that

- $(q'_1, p'_1, \dots, p'_{\text{in}_{x,y}}, a, r'_1, \dots, r'_{\text{in}_{x,y}}, q'_2) \in \Delta_y^x$, and
- $(q''_1, p''_1, \dots, p''_{\text{in}_{x,y}}, a, r''_1, \dots, r''_{\text{in}_{x,y}}, q''_2) \in \Delta_y^x$.

Given a 2-nested word w of length n , a Q' -sequence $(\ell'_i)_{i \in [0, n]}$, a Q'' -sequence $(\ell''_i)_{i \in [0, n]}$: ℓ' is a run of A' over w and ℓ'' is a run of A'' over w iff $(\ell'_i, \ell''_i)_{i \in [0, n]}$ is a run of A over w .

For the union of languages, we suppose that $Q' \cap Q'' \neq \emptyset$ and define the *sum* of A' and A'' to be the 2NWA $A = (Q' \cup Q'', Q'_0 \cup Q''_0, Q'_f \cup Q''_f, \Sigma, \Delta' \cup \Delta'')$. Given a 2-nested word w of length n , a Q' -sequence $(\ell'_i)_{i \in [0, n]}$, a Q'' -sequence $(\ell''_i)_{i \in [0, n]}$: ℓ' is a run of A' over w and ℓ'' is a run of A'' over w iff $(\ell'_i, \ell''_i)_{i \in [0, n]}$ is a run of A over w .

For the direct image by non erasing alphabetic morphism h , it suffices to replace in transitions each letter a by $h(a)$. For the inverse image, we proceed similarly but by duplicating transitions: one for each letter b such that $h(b) = a$. ◀

C

 Proof of Determinization

C.1 Notations

We start with additional definitions.

23:18 A robust class of languages of 2-nested words

► **Definition 32.** Let M be a matching relation, $(i, j) \in M$ and $k \in [n]$:

■ k is on the surface of arch (i, j) (or (i, j) covers k) iff

$$k \in \llbracket i, j \rrbracket \text{ and } \forall i', j' (M(i', j') \wedge i < i' \leq k) \implies j' \leq k$$

■ if $M(k, l)$, arch (k, l) is on the surface of (i, j) iff l is on the surface of (i, j)

► **Definition 33.** The surface function s_M yields from any position k (including 0) the call position of the arch that covers k , or 0 if k is not covered by any arch. In particular, $s_M(0) = 0$.

► **Definition 34.** The surface call-call s_c^c yields from any position k (including 0) the call-call position of the arch that covers k , or 0 if k is not covered by any arch. In particular, $s_c^c(0) = 0$.

► **Remark 35.** the reader can check the following properties:

- if $k > 0$ is internal then $s_M(k) = s_M(k - 1)$
- if $k > 0$ is a call then $s_M(k) = k$
- if $k > 0$ is a return and $M(i, k)$ then $s_M(k) = s_M(i - 1)$
- if $i := s_{M_1}(k) > 0$ then i is in $[n]_c^c$ and $s_c^c(k) = i$ or i is in $[n]_r^c$ and $s_c^c(k) = (M_2 \circ M_1)^{-1}(i)$

C.2 Main proof

► **Proposition 21.** Let $\llbracket s, f \rrbracket \subseteq [n]$ be wpa, and $S, S' \in Q'$ such that $S \xrightarrow[A']{\omega, \llbracket s, f \rrbracket} S'$, then:

$$\forall \bar{r} \in \bar{\mathcal{R}}, \underline{r} \in \underline{\mathcal{R}}, q' \in Q, \left((\bar{r}, \underline{r}, q') \in S' \iff \exists q \in Q (\bar{r}, \underline{r}, q) \in S \wedge q \xrightarrow[A']{\omega, \llbracket s, f \rrbracket} q' \right)$$

Proof. Let $\llbracket s, f \rrbracket \subseteq [n]$ be an interval wpa, and $S, S' \in Q'$ such that $S \xrightarrow[A']{\omega, \llbracket s, f \rrbracket} S'$. Observe that as A' is deterministic, it has a unique run on the 2-wave word $\omega_{\llbracket s, f \rrbracket}$. We let $(L_i)_{i \in \llbracket s-1, f \rrbracket}$ denote the (linear) states of this run. In particular, we have $L_{s-1} = S$ and $L_f = S'$. As A' is deterministic, hierarchical states are completely determined from linear ones.

We start with the proof of the reverse implication:

► **Lemma 22.** Let $\ell = (\ell_i)_{i \in \llbracket s-1, f \rrbracket}$ be a run of A on ω (restricted to $\llbracket s, f \rrbracket$) such that $\ell_{s-1} = q$, $\ell_f = q'$ and $(\bar{r}, \underline{r}, q) \in S = L_{s-1}$. Then we can define reference mappings \bar{R} and \underline{R} from $\llbracket s-1, f \rrbracket$ to $\bar{\mathcal{R}}$ and $\underline{\mathcal{R}}$ respectively, such that $\bar{R}(f) = \bar{r}$, $\underline{R}(f) = \underline{r}$, and for all $i \in \llbracket s-1, f \rrbracket$, $(\bar{R}(i), \underline{R}(i), \ell_i) \in L_i$.

Proof. We define:

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{R} : \llbracket s-1, f \rrbracket &\rightarrow \bar{\mathcal{R}}^1 \cup \bar{\mathcal{R}}^2 \\ i &\mapsto \begin{cases} \bar{r} & \text{if } s_{M_1}(i) < s \\ \ell_{s_{M_1}(i)} & \text{if } s_{M_1}(i) \in \llbracket s, f \rrbracket_c^c \\ \ell_{s_c^c(i)} \ell_{m_{M_2}^{-1}(s_{M_1}(i))} \ell_{s_{M_1}(i)} & \text{if } s_{M_1}(i) \in \llbracket s, f \rrbracket_r^c \end{cases} \\ \\ \underline{R} : \llbracket s-1, f \rrbracket &\rightarrow \underline{\mathcal{R}} \\ i &\mapsto \begin{cases} \underline{r} & \text{if } s_{M_2}(i) < s \\ \ell_{s_{M_2}(i)} & \text{if } s_{M_2}(i) \in \llbracket s, f \rrbracket_c^2 \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

First, using these definitions, and the fact that $\llbracket s, f \rrbracket$ is wpa, it is easy to verify that $\bar{R}(f) = \bar{r}$ and $\underline{R}(f) = \underline{r}$.

Second, we observe that if (i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4) is a 2-wave within $\llbracket s, f \rrbracket$ then $\bar{R}(i_2) \preceq \bar{R}(i_3 - 1)$:

- if $s_{M_1}(i_2) = s_{M_1}(i_3 - 1)$ e.g. i_2 and $i_3 - 1$ are covered by the same M_1 -arch then $\overline{R}(i_2) = \overline{R}(i_3 - 1)$
- if $s_{M_1}(i_2) < s_{M_1}(i_3 - 1)$ then $s_{M_1}(i_2) = s_c^c(i_3 - 1)$ e.g. i_2 and $i_3 - 1$ are covered by the same wave (but not the same arch) then:

$$\overline{R}(i_2) = \ell_{s_{M_1}(i_2)} = \ell_{s_c^c(i_3-1)} \preceq \ell_{s_c^c(i_3-1)} \ell_{m_{M_2}^{-1}(s_{M_1}(i_3-1))} \ell_{s_{M_1}(i_3-1)} = \overline{R}(i_3 - 1)$$

We prove by induction over $k \in \llbracket s-1, f \rrbracket$ that (H_k) : $\forall s-1 \leq i \leq k, (\overline{R}(i), \underline{R}(i), \ell_i) \in L_i$. For $k = s-1$, the property follows from the hypothesis $(\overline{r}, \underline{r}, q) \in L_{s-1}$.

Suppose $k \geq s$, and $(\overline{R}(i), \underline{R}(i), \ell_i) \in L_i$, for all $s-1 \leq i \leq k-1$.

We consider the following cases:

- if k is an internal position then from construction of δ_{int} and (H_{k-1}) : L_k contains $(\overline{R}(k-1), \underline{R}(k-1), \ell_k)$. In addition, $\overline{R}(k) = \overline{R}(k-1)$ and $\underline{R}(k) = \underline{R}(k-1)$.
- if $k \in \llbracket s, f \rrbracket_c^c$, then from the construction of δ_c^c and (H_{k-1}) , $(\ell_k, \ell_k, \ell_k) \in L_k$. In addition, $s_{M_1}(k) = s_{M_2}(k) = k$ hence $\overline{R}(k) = \underline{R}(k) = \ell_k$.
- if $k \in \llbracket s, f \rrbracket_c^r$, then $k = i_2$ in a wave (i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4) included in $\llbracket s, f \rrbracket$ as it is wpa. Since ℓ is a run and (H_{k-1}) holds, $(\ell_{k-1}, \ell_{i_1}, a_k, \ell_k) \in \Delta_c^r$, and

$$(\ell_{i_1-1}, a_{i_1}, \ell_i) \in \Delta_c^c, (\overline{R}(i_1-1), \underline{R}(i_1-1), \ell_{i_1-1}) \in L_{i_1-1}, (\ell_{i_1}, \ell_{i_1}, \ell_{i_1}) \in L_{i_1} \quad (1)$$

From construction of δ_c^r , L_k contains $(\overline{R}(i_1-1), \ell_k, \ell_k)$. In addition, $s_{M_1}(k) = s_{M_1}(i_1-1)$ hence $\overline{R}(k) = \overline{R}(i_1-1)$ and $s_{M_2}(k) = k$. It follows that $\underline{R}(k) = \ell_k$.

- if $k \in \llbracket s, f \rrbracket_r^c$, then $k = i_3$ in a wave (i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4) included in $\llbracket s, f \rrbracket$ as it is wpa. Since ℓ is a run and (H_{k-1}) holds, $(\ell_{k-1}, \ell_{i_2}, a_k, \ell_k) \in \Delta_r^c$, (1), and

$$(\ell_{i_2-1}, \ell_{i_1}, a_{i_2}, \ell_{i_2}) \in \Delta_r^c, (\overline{R}(i_2), \underline{R}(i_2-1), \ell_{i_2-1}) \in L_{i_2-1}, (\overline{R}(i_2), \underline{R}(i_2), \ell_{i_2}) \in L_{i_2} \quad (2)$$

From construction of δ_r^c , $(\ell_k, \underline{R}(i_2-1), \ell_k) \in L_k$. In addition, $s_{M_1}(i_3) = i_3$ hence $\overline{R}(i_3) = \ell_{i_1} \ell_{i_2} \ell_{i_3}$ and $s_{M_2}(i_3) = s_{M_2}(i_2-1)$. It follows that $\underline{R}(i_3) = \underline{R}(i_2-1)$.

- if $k \in \llbracket s, f \rrbracket_r^r$, then $k = i_4$ in a wave (i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4) included in $\llbracket s, f \rrbracket$ as it is wpa. Since ℓ is a run and (H_{k-1}) holds, $(\ell_{k-1}, \ell_{i_3}, \ell_{i_1} n a_k, \ell_k) \in \Delta_r^r$, $(\ell_k, \ell_k, \ell_{k-1}) \in L_{k-1}$, (1), (2) and

$$(\ell_{i_3-1}, \ell_{i_2}, a_{i_3}, \ell_{i_3}) \in \Delta_r^r, (\overline{R}(i_1-1), \ell_k, \ell_{i_3-1}) \in L_{i_3-1}, (\ell_k, \overline{R}(i_2-1), \ell_k) \in L_{i_3}$$

From construction of δ_r^r , $(\overline{R}(i_1-1), \underline{R}(i_1-1), \ell_k) \in L_k$. In addition, $s_{M_1}(i_4) = s_{M_1}(i_3-1)$ hence $\overline{R}(i_4) = \overline{R}(i_3-1)$ and $s_{M_2}(i_4) = s_{M_2}(i_1-1)$ hence $\underline{R}(i_4) = \underline{R}(i_1-1)$. ◀

We turn to the direct implication, and consider $\overline{r} \in \overline{\mathcal{R}}$, $\underline{r} \in \underline{\mathcal{R}}$ and $q' \in Q$.

We proceed by structural induction on wpa interval $\llbracket s, f \rrbracket$ (IH₁).

If $s = f$, since $\llbracket s, f \rrbracket$ is a wpa interval, f is an internal position,

$$\begin{aligned} (\overline{r}, \underline{r}, q') \in S' &\iff \exists q (\overline{r}, \underline{r}, q) \in S \wedge (q, a_f, q') \in \Delta_{\text{int}} \\ &\iff \exists q (\overline{r}, \underline{r}, q) \in S \wedge q \xrightarrow[A]{\omega, \llbracket s, f \rrbracket} q' \end{aligned}$$

Else, if there exists $i \in \llbracket s, f \rrbracket$ such that $\llbracket s, i \rrbracket$ and $\llbracket i, f \rrbracket$ are wpa, then (IH₁) can be applied to both interval. Formally, by calling $S'' := L_{i-1}$ it follows :

$$\begin{aligned} (\overline{r}, \underline{r}, q') \in S' &\iff \exists q'' (\overline{r}, \underline{r}, q'') \in S'' \wedge q'' \xrightarrow[A]{\omega, \llbracket i, f \rrbracket} q' \\ &\iff \exists q, q'' (\overline{r}, \underline{r}, q) \in S \wedge q \xrightarrow[A]{\omega, \llbracket s, i \rrbracket} q'' \wedge q'' \xrightarrow[A]{\omega, \llbracket i, f \rrbracket} q' \\ &\iff \exists q (\overline{r}, \underline{r}, q) \in S \wedge q \xrightarrow[A]{\omega, \llbracket s, f \rrbracket} q' \end{aligned}$$

23:20 A robust class of languages of 2-nested words

Else, since neither s nor f can be internals (previous case), and since s (resp. f) cannot be a return (resp. call) of any kind, $s \in \llbracket s, f \rrbracket_c^c$, $f \in \llbracket s, f \rrbracket_r^r$ and $M_2(s) = f$ (if not then $\llbracket s, f \rrbracket$ can be split in 2 non-empty wpa intervals thus falling - again - under the previous case). Then, there exist s', f' such that (s, s', f', f) is a 2-wave thus defining the limit case for which the induction hypothesis has to be proven. To conclude this case, we will prove the following property of 2-waves:

► **Lemma 24.** *Let (i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4) be a 2-wave such that $i_1 \in \llbracket s, f \rrbracket$ and $(\bar{r}_3, \underline{r}_0, q'_4) \in L_{i_4}$. For any $\bar{r}_1, \underline{r}_2, q_1, q'_1, q_2, q'_2, q_3, q'_3, q_4$ satisfying ψ_4 we have $q_1, q_3 \xrightarrow[A]{\omega, \llbracket i_1, i_2 \rrbracket, \llbracket i_3, i_4 \rrbracket} q'_2, q'_4$.*

We defer the proof of this Lemma, and conclude that of Proposition 21 in the limit case. We have $(\bar{r}, \underline{r}, q') \in L_f$ with $\llbracket s, f \rrbracket$ a wpa interval and (s, s', f', f) a 2-wave. Let us rename s, s', f', f by i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4 then by construction of δ_r^r , $(\bar{r}, \underline{r}, q') \in L_f$ implies the existence of $\bar{r}_1, \underline{r}_2, q, q'_1, q_2, q'_2, q_3, q'_3, q_4$ such that :

$$\psi_4[\bar{r}, \underline{r}, q, q' \mid \bar{r}_3, \underline{r}_0, q_1, q'_4]$$

is satisfied. We apply lemma 24 giving us :

$$(\bar{r}_1, \underline{r}, q) \in L_s, \bar{r}_1 \preceq \bar{r}, (\bar{r}, q'_2, q_3) \in L_{i_3-1} \text{ and } q, q_3 \xrightarrow[A]{\omega, \llbracket i_1, i_2 \rrbracket, \llbracket i_3, i_4 \rrbracket} q'_2, q'$$

Since $\llbracket i_2, i_3 \rrbracket$ is wpa and $(\bar{r}, q'_2, q_3) \in L_{i_3-1}$ we apply (IH₁), there exist q''_2 such that $(\bar{r}, q'_2, q''_2) \in L_{i_2}$ and $q''_2 \xrightarrow[A]{\omega, \llbracket i_2, i_3 \rrbracket} q_3$. By construction of δ_c^r , we have $q''_2 = q'_2$ and altogether,

$$q, q_3 \xrightarrow[A]{\omega, \llbracket i_1, i_2 \rrbracket, \llbracket i_3, i_4 \rrbracket} q'_2, q' \text{ and } q'_2 \xrightarrow[A]{\omega, \llbracket i_2, i_3 \rrbracket} q_3$$

yields :

$$q \xrightarrow[A]{\omega, \llbracket s, f \rrbracket} q'$$

By contradiction, if $\bar{r}_1 \prec \bar{r}$ then $\bar{r}_1 \in \bar{\mathcal{R}}^1$ and $\bar{r} \in \bar{\mathcal{R}}^2$ implying that $i_1 - 1$ and $i_3 - 1$ are not at the surface of the same M_1 -arch this would involve from the M_1 -arch covering $i_1 - 1$ to be returned in $\llbracket i_2, i_3 \rrbracket$ and called at a position strictly before i_1 contradicting the wpa nature of $\llbracket s, f \rrbracket$. Hence as $\bar{r}_1 \preceq \bar{r}$ we have $\bar{r}_1 = \bar{r}$ and therefore $(\bar{r}, \underline{r}, q) \in L_s$. ◀

We return to the proof of Lemma 24. To this end, we introduce some notations. When defining the construction of the deterministic 2NWA, we introduced formula $(\phi_j)_{j \in [4]}$ with abstract names $(S_j, S'_j, \alpha_j, \dots)$. In order to prove Lemma 24, we will need to introduce notations that allow us to link the construction more closely to the run $(L_i)_{i \in \llbracket s-1, f \rrbracket}$ and a 2-wave within $\llbracket s, f \rrbracket$.

Let $(i_{xj})_{j \in [4]}$ be a 2-wave, where $x \in \{\varepsilon, \bullet, \circ\}$ is a tag (ε for no tag). We derive formula $(\psi_{xm})_{m \in [4]}$ from $(\phi_m)_{m \in [4]}$ by replacing S_j, α_j by their counterpart $(L_{i_{xj-1}}, a_{i_{xj}})$ ($j \in [m]$) and tagging the remaining variables with x . Formally:

$$\psi_{xm} := \phi_m \left[\begin{array}{l} L_{i_{xj-1}}, a_{i_{xj}}, q_{xj}, q'_{xj} \mid S_j, \alpha_j, q_j, q'_j; j \in [m] \\ \bar{r}_{x1} \bar{r}_{x3} \underline{r}_{x0} \underline{r}_{x2} \mid \bar{r}_1, \bar{r}_3, \underline{r}_0, \underline{r}_2 \end{array} \right]$$

► **Example 36.** Considering 2-waves $(i_j)_{j \in [4]}$ and $(i_{\bullet j})_{j \in [4]}$:

$$\psi_3 = \phi_3[L_{i_{j-1}}, a_{i_j} \mid S_j, \alpha_j; j \in [3]]$$

$$\psi_{\bullet 4} = \phi_4 \left[\begin{array}{l} L_{i_{\bullet j-1}}, a_{i_{\bullet j}}, q_{\bullet j}, q'_{\bullet j} \mid S_j, \alpha_j, q_j, q'_j; j \in [4] \\ \bar{r}_{\bullet 1}, \bar{r}_{\bullet 3}, \underline{r}_{\bullet 0}, \underline{r}_{\bullet 2} \mid \bar{r}_1, \bar{r}_3, \underline{r}_0, \underline{r}_2 \end{array} \right]$$

Proof of Lemma 24. We proceed by induction on $i_4 - i_1$ (IH₂). Let $k \in \llbracket i_1, i_2 \llbracket$, $K \in \llbracket i_3, i_4 \llbracket$ and $p, q \in Q$ we define:


$$H(k, K, p, q) := \bigwedge \begin{cases} k = i_1 \wedge K = i_4 \text{ or } K \in \llbracket i_3, i_4 \llbracket^c \\ (k, K) \in M_2 \wedge s_{M_1}(K - 1) = i_3 \wedge (q'_1 q'_2 q'_3, p, q) \in L_{K-1} \\ \llbracket i_1, k \llbracket \cup \llbracket K, i_4 \llbracket \text{ is wpa and } q'_1, q \xrightarrow[A]{\omega, \llbracket i_1, k \llbracket, \llbracket K, i_4 \llbracket} p, q_4 \end{cases}$$

In particular $H(i_1, i_4, q'_1, q_4)$ Holds.

We state an additional technical Lemma:

► **Lemma 37.** *If $H(k, K, p, q)$ then $\llbracket i_3, K \llbracket$ is wpa or there exist $k' \in \llbracket i_1, i_2 \llbracket$, $K' \in \llbracket i_3, K \llbracket$ and $p', q' \in Q$ such that $H(k', K', p', q')$*

The purpose here is to encapsulate in one go, the way we are going to build a run on A inside the 2-wave inductively. Since we are depending on (IH₁) to extract run on intervals wpa, we start from the last known linear state $K - 1$, we extract the longest wpa interval finishing on $K - 1$ and find $\llbracket i_{\bullet 4}, K \llbracket$ (resp. $\llbracket i_3, K \llbracket$) if $i_{\bullet 4}$ is the return-return position of a 2-wave whose call-call position was covered by i_1 (resp. if $\llbracket i_3, K \llbracket$ is wpa.) then (IH₂) gives us the run for the matched $\llbracket i_1, i_2 \llbracket$, $\llbracket i_3, i_4 \llbracket$, and we finish applying (IH₁) to $\llbracket i_1, i_{\bullet 1} \llbracket$.



■ **Figure 7** 2-wave (i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4) and notations for Lemma 37.

Proof of Lemma 37. If $i_3 = K - 1$ then $\llbracket i_3, K \llbracket$ is empty, hence wpa and the lemma is true. Let us suppose now that $i_3 < K - 1$:

$K'' = \min\{m \in \llbracket i_3, K \llbracket; \llbracket m, K \llbracket \text{ is wpa}\}$ is well define since $\llbracket K - 1, K \llbracket = \emptyset$ hence wpa, therefore $K'' \leq K - 1$.

The set $\llbracket i_1, k \llbracket \cup \llbracket K, i_4 \llbracket$ is wpa by $H(k, K, p, q)$ and $\llbracket K'', K \llbracket$ is wpa by construction, then their reunion $\llbracket i_1, k \llbracket \cup \llbracket K'', i_4 \llbracket$ is wpa. If K'' is a call (on any matching) it has to be returned in $\llbracket K'', i_4 \llbracket \subseteq \llbracket i_1, k \llbracket \cup \llbracket K'', i_4 \llbracket$ that is wpa, implying $K'' \in \llbracket i_1, k \llbracket \cup \llbracket K'', i_4 \llbracket$ which is absurd. Since K'' being an internal would contradict its own minimality, K'' is a return-return position. Let k'' such that $(k'', K'') \in M_2$ we have $k'' < i_2$ (otherwise $i_3 < k''$ and $\llbracket k'', K'' \llbracket$ being wpa contradict minimality of K'').

Finally there exist a 2-wave $(i_{\bullet j})_{j \in [4]}$ such that $(i_{\bullet 1}, i_{\bullet 4}) = (k'', K'')$.

As $(q'_1 q'_2 q'_3, p, q) \in L_{K-1}$ and $\llbracket K'', K \llbracket$ wpa, (IH₁) yields $q'_{\bullet 4}$ such that $(q'_1 q'_2 q'_3, p, q'_{\bullet 4}) \in L_{K''}$ and $q'_{\bullet 4} \xrightarrow[A]{\omega, \llbracket K'', K \llbracket} q$. Since $(q'_1 q'_2 q'_3, p, q'_{\bullet 4}) \in L_{i_{\bullet 4}}$ by construction of δ_r^r , we can exhibit $\bar{r}_{\bullet 1}$,

23:22 A robust class of languages of 2-nested words

$r_{\bullet 2}, q_{\bullet 1}, q'_{\bullet 1}, q_{\bullet 2}, q'_{\bullet 2}, q_{\bullet 3}, q'_{\bullet 3}, q_{\bullet 4}$ such that $\psi_{\bullet 4}[q'_1 q'_2 q'_3, q'_1 | \bar{r}_{\bullet 3}, r_{\bullet 0}]$ is satisfied. By virtue of (IH₂), lemma 24 applies so we also have :

$$q_{\bullet 1}, q_{\bullet 3} \xrightarrow[A]{\omega, \llbracket i_{\bullet 1}, i_{\bullet 2} \rrbracket, \llbracket i_{\bullet 3}, i_{\bullet 4} \rrbracket} q'_{\bullet 2}, q'_{\bullet 4}$$

Since $r_{\bullet 1} \preceq q'_1 q'_2 q'_3$ and $r_{\bullet 1} \in \bar{\mathcal{R}}^1$ (i_1 is a call-call), we have $r_{\bullet 1} = q'_1$ and $(q'_1, p, q_{\bullet 1}) \in L_{i_{\bullet 1}-1}$. Since $M_2(k, K), M_2(k'', K'')$ and $\llbracket K'', K \rrbracket$ is wpa, $\llbracket k, k'' \rrbracket$ is wpa. Applying (IH₁) yields p'' such that $(q'_1, p, p'') \in L_k, p'' \xrightarrow[A]{\omega, \llbracket k, k'' \rrbracket} q_{\bullet 1}$ and by construction of $\delta_c^c, p = p''$. Altogether, we have shown:

$$p \xrightarrow[A]{\omega, \llbracket k, i_{\bullet 1} \rrbracket} q_{\bullet 1} ; q_{\bullet 1}, q_{\bullet 3} \xrightarrow[A]{\omega, \llbracket i_{\bullet 1}, i_{\bullet 2} \rrbracket, \llbracket i_{\bullet 3}, i_{\bullet 4} \rrbracket} q'_{\bullet 2}, q'_{\bullet 4} ; q'_{\bullet 4} \xrightarrow[A]{\omega, \llbracket \bullet 4, K \rrbracket} q$$

And therefore:

$$p, q_{\bullet 3} \xrightarrow[A]{\omega, \llbracket k, i_{\bullet 2} \rrbracket, \llbracket i_{\bullet 3}, K \rrbracket} q'_{\bullet 2}, q$$

Which combined with:

$$q'_1, q \xrightarrow[A]{\omega, \llbracket i_1, k \rrbracket, \llbracket K, i_4 \rrbracket} p, q_4$$

Yields:

$$q'_1, q_{\bullet 3} \xrightarrow[A]{\omega, \llbracket i_1, i_{\bullet 2} \rrbracket, \llbracket i_{\bullet 3}, i_4 \rrbracket} q'_{\bullet 2}, q_4$$

and $H(i_{\bullet 2}, i_{\bullet 3}, q'_{\bullet 2}, q_{\bullet 3})$ closes the proof of Lemma 37. \blacktriangleleft

We are now ready to conclude the proof of Lemma 24. Starting from $(k, K) = (i_1, i_4)$ and applying Lemma 37 until its hypothesis ceases to hold we exhibit $k \in \llbracket i_1, i_2 \rrbracket, K \in \llbracket i_3, i_4 \rrbracket$ and $p, q \in Q$ such that $H(k, K, p, q)$ holds and $\llbracket i_3, K \rrbracket$ is wpa. Since $(q'_1 q'_2 q'_3, p, q) \in L_{K-1}$ applying (IH₁) yields $q''_3 \in Q$ such that $(q'_1 q'_2 q'_3, p, q''_3) \in L_{i_3}$ and $q''_3 \xrightarrow[A]{\omega, \llbracket i_3, K \rrbracket} q$. By construction of δ_r^c , we have $q''_3 = q'_3$.

As $(q'_1 q'_2 q'_3, p, q'_3) \in L_{i_3}$ there exists : $\bar{r}_1, \bar{r}_3, \bar{r}_0, \tilde{q}_1, \tilde{q}_2, \tilde{q}_3$ satisfying :

$$\psi_3 \left[\begin{array}{c} \tilde{q}_1, \tilde{q}_2, \tilde{q}_3 \mid q_1, q_2, q_3 \\ \bar{r}_1, \bar{r}_3, \bar{r}_0, p \mid \bar{r}_1, \bar{r}_3, \bar{r}_0, r_2 \end{array} \right]$$

Granting us with : $(q'_1, p, \tilde{q}_2) \in L_{i_2-1}$ and $(\tilde{q}_2, q'_1, a_{i_2}, q'_2) \in \Delta_c^r$.

Since $\llbracket k, i_2 \rrbracket$ is wpa and $(q'_1, p, \tilde{q}_2) \in L_{i_2-1}$ we apply (IH₁), there exists p' such that $(q'_1, p, p') \in L_k$ and $p' \xrightarrow[A]{\omega, \llbracket k, i_2 \rrbracket} \tilde{q}_2$. By construction of δ_c^r , we have $p = p'$, and altogether:

$$q'_3 \xrightarrow[A]{\omega, \llbracket i_3, K \rrbracket} q ; q'_1, q \xrightarrow[A]{\omega, \llbracket i_1, k \rrbracket, \llbracket K, i_4 \rrbracket} p, q_4 ; p \xrightarrow[A]{\omega, \llbracket k, i_2 \rrbracket} \tilde{q}_2$$

Yields:

$$q'_1, q'_3 \xrightarrow[A]{\omega, \llbracket i_1, i_2 \rrbracket, \llbracket i_3, i_4 \rrbracket} \tilde{q}_2, q_4$$

Since ψ_4 gave us : $(q_1, a_{i_1}, q'_1) \in \Delta_c^c, (q_3, q'_2, a_{i_3}, q'_3) \in \Delta_c^c, (q_4, q'_3, q'_1, a_{i_4}, q'_4) \in \Delta_r^r$ and since $(\tilde{q}_2, q'_1, a_{i_2}, q'_2) \in \Delta_c^r$ those transitions combined with the afore mentioned ‘‘inner’’ run allows us to conclude the proof of Lemma 24. \blacktriangleleft

D MSO-definability of regular languages of 2-wave words

► **Theorem 38.** *For all MSO-sentence ϕ over $(\Sigma, <, M_1, M_2)$, the set $L(\phi)$ of all 2-wave words (u, M_1, M_2) such that $(u, M_1, M_2) \models \phi$ is regular.*

Proof. We follow the proofs of [20] and [3] for MSO over words and nested words. In order to simplify the proof, we consider only the restricted but equivalent MSO₀-logic in where first-order variables are cancelled: we add the atomic formula $\text{Sing}(X)$ meaning X is a singleton and replace each atomic formula $A(x_1, \dots, x_n, Y_1, \dots, Y_m)$ by $A(X_1, \dots, X_n, Y_1, \dots, Y_m)$ meaning that each X_i is a singleton $\{x_i\}$ and $A(x_1, \dots, x_n, Y_1, \dots, Y_m)$ holds.

A model of a formula $\phi(X_1, \dots, X_n)$ (that is, whose free variables are X_1, \dots, X_n) is given by a pair consisting of:

- a 2-wave word over the alphabet $\Sigma : (a_1 \cdots a_k, M_1, M_2)$,
- a valuation function, associating each X_i to a subset $I_i \subseteq [k]$, for $i = 1, \dots, n$.

We encode a such a model by the 2-wave word (v, M_1, M_2) over the alphabet $\Sigma \times \{0, 1\}^n$: $v = (a_1, \beta_1) \cdots (a_k, \beta_k)$ where for all $i \in [1, k]$, $\beta_i = b_1 \cdots b_n$ and for all $j \in [1, n]$, $b_j = 1$ iff $i \in I_j$.

We denote by $L(\phi)$ the set of all 2-wave words satisfying ϕ , and show by structural induction that for all ϕ , $L(\phi)$ is regular. For atomic formulas $X \subseteq Y, \text{Sing}(X), X < Y, Q_a(X), M_1(X, Y), M_2(X, Y)$ we proceed as for finite automata (see [20]). For example, for $M_\epsilon(X, Y)$, $\epsilon = 1, 2$, it suffices to construct an automaton recognizing every 2-nested words (v, M_1, M_2) , $v \in \Sigma \times \{0, 1\}^2$ such that there are exactly two positions i and j such that $\pi_2(v[i]) = 1$ and $\pi_3(v[j]) = 1$, and $(i, j) \in M_\epsilon$ (here π_i denoted the projection on the i -th component, then for a letter $\alpha = (a, b_0 b_1)$, $\pi_2(\alpha)$ is b_0 and $\pi_3(\alpha)$ is b_1).

Disjunction, negation, and conjunction follow for the closure properties of regular 2NWL. Also, if $\phi = \exists X_i \psi(X_1, \dots, X_n)$, models of ϕ are obtained by deleting the $i + 1$ -th component, that is, by applying a non erasing alphabetic morphism. ◀

E Proofs of Section 6

► **Lemma 28.** *For all $\omega \in \text{WW}_2(\Sigma)$, ω has treewidth at most 11.*

Proof. (sketch) Following rules of grammar introduced for visibly 2-wave words (Lemma 9), we show by induction the following property:

- if $I = \llbracket x_1, y_1 \rrbracket$ is wpa, $\omega|_I$ admits a tree decomposition of width ≤ 11 containing a node $\{x_1, y_1\}$.
- if $(I_1 = \llbracket x_1, y_1 \rrbracket, I_2 = \llbracket x_2, y_2 \rrbracket)$ are matched intervals, then the graph corresponding to $(\omega|_{I_1}, \omega|_{I_2})$ admits a tree decomposition of width ≤ 11 containing a node $\{x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2\}$.

Here $\omega|_I$ refers to the graph induced by ω restricted to nodes in I . From rules of the grammars:

- either $I = (\llbracket x_1, y_1 \rrbracket, \llbracket x_2, y_2 \rrbracket)$ is wpa because $I' = (\llbracket x_1 + 1, y_1 - 1 \rrbracket, \llbracket x_2 + 1, y_2 - 1 \rrbracket)$ is wpa and x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2 is a 2-wave. Then, let $t' = (V', E')$ be the tree decomposition of $\omega|_{I'}$ given by induction hypothesis, $t = (V' \cup \{v_1, v_2\}, E' \cup \{(v_1, v_2), (v_2, v')\})$ is a tree decomposition of $\omega|_I$ of width less than (or equal to) 11, where:
 - $v_1 = \{x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2\}$
 - $v_2 = \{x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2, x_1 + 1, y_1 - 1, x_2 + 1, y_2 - 1\}$ (we deal here with the case where I' is a pair of non-empty intervals)
 - v' is the node $\{x_1 + 1, y_1 - 1, x_2 + 1, y_2 - 1\} \in V'$.

23:24 A robust class of languages of 2-nested words

- Otherwise, every non trivial I is constructed from I_1, \dots, I_m , where each I_i denotes a wpa interval or a pair of matched intervals. From induction hypothesis each $\omega|_{I_i}$ admits a tree decomposition $t_i = (V_i, E_i)$ of width ≤ 11 . Then $t = (V' \cup \{v, v'\}, E' \cup \{(v, v')\} \cup \{(v', v_i)\}_{i \in [m]})$ is a tree decomposition of $\omega|_I$ of width less than (or equal to) 11, where:
 - v is the set of all bounds of I
 - $v_i \in V_i$ is the set of all bounds of V_i , for $i \in [m]$
 - v' is the union of all v_i , for $i \in [m]$ (it necessarily also contains v).
 Let us check that in all cases, $|v|, |v'| \leq 12$:
 - (rule w_1w_2) $I = \llbracket x_1, y_1 \rrbracket$, $I_1 = \llbracket x_1, y'_1 \rrbracket$ and $I_2 = \llbracket y'_1 + 1, y_1 \rrbracket$, then $v = \{x_1, y_1\}$ and $v' = \{x_1, y_1, y'_1, y'_1 + 1\}$;
 - (rule xwy) $I = \llbracket x_1, y_1 \rrbracket$, $I_1 = (\llbracket x_1, y'_1 \rrbracket, \llbracket x'_1, y_1 \rrbracket)$ and $I_2 = \llbracket y'_1 + 1, x'_1 - 1 \rrbracket$, then $v = \{x_1, y_1\}$ and $v' = \{x_1, y_1, y'_1, x'_1, y'_1 + 1, x'_1 - 1\}$;
 - rule (x_1x_2, y_1y_2) I is composed from two pairs of intervals, then $|v| = 4$ and $|v'| = 8$;
 - rule $(w_1xw'_1, w_2yw'_2)$ I is composed of a pair of intervals and of four single intervals, then $|v| = 4$ and $|v'| = 12$.

◀

F Proofs of Section 7

Proof of Proposition 30

We prove here that removing matching relations to regular 2-wave word languages yields linear indexed languages (LIL).

Let us recall basic notions on Dyck words, and fix notations:

Given an alphabet Γ , we denote by $\bar{\Gamma}$ the disjoint copy $\bar{\Gamma} = \{\bar{a} \mid a \in \Gamma\}$. We adopt the following conventions: $\bar{\bar{a}} = a$ for all $a \in \Gamma$, $\bar{\varepsilon} = \varepsilon$ and for any word $u = \alpha_1 \cdots \alpha_n \in (\Gamma \cup \bar{\Gamma})^*$, $\bar{\bar{u}} = \bar{\alpha}_n \cdots \bar{\alpha}_1$.

► **Definition 39.** (Dyck words) Given an alphabet Γ , the set \mathcal{D}_Γ of Dyck words over Γ is the set of all words $u \in (\Gamma \cup \bar{\Gamma})^*$ such that $u \in \mathcal{D}_\Gamma$

- either $u = \epsilon$,
- or there exists $u_1, u_2 \in \mathcal{D}_\Gamma$ and $a \in \Gamma$ such that $u = au_1\bar{a}u_2$.

Note that this inductive definition is non-ambiguous: if $u = au_1\bar{a}u_2$ and $u = au'_1\bar{a}u'_2$ and $u, u_1u_2, u'_1, u'_2 \in \mathcal{D}_\Gamma$, then $u_1 = u'_1$ and $u_2 = u'_2$.

Dyck words are closely related to nested words:

► **Lemma 40.** Let $u = a_1 \cdots a_n \in \mathcal{D}_\Gamma$, and M be the relation defined for all $i < j$ by $M(i, j) \Leftrightarrow (a_i = \bar{a}_j \text{ and } a_{i+1} \cdots a_{j-1} \in \mathcal{D}_\Gamma)$. Then (u, M) is a nested word whose each position is a call or a return.

Rather than considering linear indexed grammars, we will use an homomorphic characterization of linear indexed languages. Such characterizations of languages are very common, for example, the Chomsky-Schützenberger theorem states that context-free languages are exactly languages $h(R \cap \mathcal{D}_\Gamma)$ where h is a morphism, R a regular set, and Γ an alphabet. Similarly, it is proved in [11] that indexed languages are exactly languages $h(R \cap \mathcal{D}_\Gamma \cap g^{-1}(\mathcal{D}_{\Gamma'}))$, where R, h as above, and g is a *symmetric* morphism, that is, g is alphabetic, and $g(\bar{a}) = \bar{g(a)}$.

Remark that from a given a word u in $\mathcal{D}_\Gamma \cap g^{-1}(\mathcal{D}_{\Gamma'})$, we can construct a 2NW (u, M_1, M_2) where arches in M_2 correspond to $\mathcal{D}_{\Gamma'}$, and M_1 to $g^{-1}(\mathcal{D}_{\Gamma'})$.


A 2NW such constructed is in fact a WW. Regarding linear indexed languages, there exists also a homomorphic characterization of the form $h(R \cap \mathcal{D}_\Gamma \cap g^{-1}(\mathcal{D}_\Gamma))$. The morphism

g is not exactly symmetric since a counter is added to letters in order to constrain the length of waves:

► **Theorem 41.** [24] *A language L is linear indexed iff there exists an alphabet A , a regular language R and a morphism h such that*

$$L = h(R \cap \mathcal{D}_{\Gamma_A} \cap g_A^{-1}(\mathcal{D}_{\Gamma_A})),$$

where $\Gamma_A = A_1 \cup A_2$, $A_i = \{(a, i) \mid a \in A\}$, for $i = 1, 2$ and g_A is the morphism defined by

$$g_A : \begin{array}{l} (a, 1) \mapsto (a, 1) \quad \overline{(a, 1)} \mapsto \overline{(a, 2)} \\ (a, 2) \mapsto \overline{(a, 1)} \quad \overline{(a, 2)} \mapsto (a, 2) \end{array}$$


To ease the proof of Proposition 30, we will use a slightly different morphism that erases some letters.

► **Definition 42.** *Let A, B be two disjoint alphabets, we fix $A_i = \{(a, i) \mid a \in A\}$, for $i = 1, 2$, and $\Gamma_{A,B} = A_1 \cup A_2 \cup B$. Then $g_{A,B} : \Gamma_{A,B}^* \rightarrow (A_1 \cup A_2 \cup \overline{A_1} \cup \overline{A_2})^*$ is the morphism defined for all $a \in A$, $b \in B$ by:*

$$g_{A,B} : \begin{array}{l} (a, 1) \mapsto (a, 1) \quad \overline{(a, 1)} \mapsto \overline{(a, 2)} \\ (a, 2) \mapsto (a, 1) \quad \overline{(a, 2)} \mapsto (a, 2) \\ b \mapsto \varepsilon \quad \overline{b} \mapsto \varepsilon \end{array}$$

► **Lemma 43.** *If a language L can be written*

$$L = h(R \cap \mathcal{D}_{\Gamma_{A,B}} \cap g_{A,B}^{-1}(\mathcal{D}_{\Gamma_{A,B}})),$$

for some disjoint alphabets A, B , regular language R and morphism h , then L is a linear indexed language.

Proof. (Sketch) One can prove that

$$g_{A,B}^{-1}(\mathcal{D}_{\Gamma_{A,B}}) \cap \mathcal{D}_{\Gamma_{A,B}} = h_{A,B}(R_{A,B} \cap g_{A \cup B}^{-1}(\mathcal{D}_{\Gamma_{A \cup B}}) \cap \mathcal{D}_{\Gamma_{A \cup B}}),$$

where $R_{A,B} = (A_1 \cup A_2 \cup \overline{A_1} \cup \overline{A_2} \cup \{(b, 1)(b, 2), \overline{(b, 2)}\overline{(b, 1)}\}_{b \in B})^*$, and

$$h_{A,B} : \begin{array}{l} (a, i) \mapsto (a, i) \quad \overline{(a, i)} \mapsto \overline{(a, i)} \quad \text{for } a \in A, i = 1, 2 \\ (b, 1) \mapsto b \quad \overline{(b, 1)} \mapsto \overline{b} \quad \text{for } b \in B \\ (b, 2) \mapsto \varepsilon \quad \overline{(b, 2)} \mapsto \varepsilon \quad \text{for } b \in B \end{array}$$

Then $g_{A,B}^{-1}(\mathcal{D}_{\Gamma_{A,B}}) \cap \mathcal{D}_{\Gamma_{A,B}}$ is a LIL, and using closure properties of LIL [9], so is L . ◀

In the following we need a restricted version of 2NWA such that in any run, all hierarchical states occurring in a cycle are equal.

► **Definition 44.** *A 2NWA $A = (Q, Q_0, Q_f, \Sigma, P, \Delta)$ is nice if transitions satisfies:*

$$\Delta_y^x \subseteq \bigcup_{p \in P} Q \times \{p\}^{\text{in}_{x,y}} \times \Sigma \times \{p\}^{\text{out}_{x,y}} \times Q, \quad \text{for all } x, y \in \{c, r\}.$$

23:26 A robust class of languages of 2-nested words

► **Lemma 45.** *For every 2NWA A , there exists a nice 2NWA A' such that $L_{\text{WW}_2}(A) = L_{\text{WW}_2}(A')$.*

Proof. (Sketch) From $A = (Q, Q_0, Q_f, \Sigma, P, \Delta)$, we construct a nice 2NWA A' whose hierarchical states belongs to P^4 , and encode all four hierarchical states labelling a 2-wave in a run of A . Thus, these states has to be "guessed" from the call-call transition. Formally, we replace each transition :

- $(q, a, p_1, p_4, q') \in \Delta_c^c$ by $\{(q, a, (p_1, p_2, p_3, p_4), (p_1, p_2, p_3, p_4), q') \mid p_2, p_3 \in P\}$
- $(q, p_1, a, p_2, q') \in \Delta_c^r$ by $\{(q, (p_1, p_2, p_3, p_4), a, (p_1, p_2, p_3, p_4), q') \mid p_3, p_4 \in P\}$
- $(q, p_2, a, p_3, q') \in \Delta_r^c$ by $\{(q, (p_1, p_2, p_3, p_4), a, (p_1, p_2, p_3, p_4), q') \mid p_1, p_4 \in P\}$
- $(q, a, p_3, p_4, q') \in \Delta_r^r$ by $\{(q, (p_1, p_2, p_3, p_4), (p_1, p_2, p_3, p_4), a, q') \mid p_1, p_2 \in P\}$.

◀

Associated with Theorem 26, the following property proves Proposition 30

► **Proposition 46.** *Let L be a regular set of WW_2 , the language $\exists\text{W}(L) = \{u \mid (u, M_1, M_2) \in L, \text{ for some } M_1, M_2\}$ is a LIL.*

Proof. Let $A = (Q, Q_0, Q_f, \Sigma, P, \Delta)$ be a nice NWA. Let $\omega = (u, M_1, M_2)$ to be a 2-wave word of length n . Remark that because A is nice, in a given run (ℓ, h^1, h^2) of A over ω , h^2 is fully determined by h^1 , because states labelling two arches having a common extremity are equal. Then a such a run will be simply given by (ℓ, h) , where $h = (h_i)_{i \in [n]^c \cup [n]_c}$ is defined by $h_i = h_i^1$ if $i \in [n]^c$ and $h_i = h_i^2$ if $i \in [n]_c$. This definition is consistent since $h_i^1 = h_i^2$ if $i \in [n]^c$.

Using notation introduced Definition 42, we set $A = P$, $B = Q \cup \Sigma$, and $\Gamma_{A,B} = A_1 \cup A_2 \cup B$. We define a morphism $\tau : \Delta^* \rightarrow (\Gamma_{A,B} \cup \overline{\Gamma_{A,B}})^*$:

- if $\delta = (q, a, q') \in \Delta_{\text{int}}^{\text{int}}$ then $\tau(\delta) = \overline{q}a\overline{a}q'$
- if $\delta = (q, a, p, p, q') \in \Delta_c^c$ then $\tau(\delta) = \overline{q}a\overline{a}(p, 1)q'$
- if $\delta = (q, p, a, p, q') \in \Delta_c^r$ then $\tau(\delta) = \overline{q}a\overline{a}(p, 2)q'$
- if $\delta = (q, p, a, p, q') \in \Delta_r^c$ then $\tau(\delta) = \overline{q}a\overline{a}(\overline{p}, 2)q'$
- if $\delta = (q, p, p, a, q') \in \Delta_r^r$ then $\tau(\delta) = \overline{q}a\overline{a}(p, 1)q'$.

For $q \in Q$, let R_q be the set words in $Q_0\tau(\Delta^*)$ whose last letter is q . Clearly R_q and $R = \bigcup_{q \in Q_f} R_q$ are regular languages and we consider the following two morphisms:

- $f : (\Gamma_{A,B} \cup \overline{\Gamma_{A,B}})^* \rightarrow \Sigma^*$ mapping every $a \in \Sigma$ to a and all the other letters to ε
- $g_{A,B}$ is the morphism given Definition 42.

The rest of the proof is dedicated to the the following result:

$$\exists\text{W}(L_{\text{WW}_2}(A)) = f(R \cap \mathcal{D}_{\Gamma_{A,B}} \cap g_{A,B}^{-1}(\mathcal{D}_{\Gamma_{A,B}})).$$

According to Lemma 43, this will prove that $\exists\text{W}(L_{\text{WW}_2}(A))$ is a LIL. We split the proof in two subproofs: Lemma 47 shows that $\exists\text{W}(L_{\text{WW}_2}(A)) \subseteq f(R \cap \mathcal{D}_{\Gamma_{A,B}} \cap g_{A,B}^{-1}(\mathcal{D}_{\Gamma_{A,B}}))$, and the converse inclusion follows from Lemma 48.

► **Lemma 47.** *For all $\omega = (u, M_1, M_2) \in L_{\text{WW}_2}(A)$, there exists $w \in R \cap \mathcal{D}_{\Gamma} \cap g_{A,B}^{-1}(\mathcal{D}_{\Gamma})$ such that $f(w) = u$.*

Proof. Let $\omega = (u, M_1, M_2)$ to be a 2-wave word of length n and $s = (\ell, h)$ be an accepting run of A over ω . We associate s to the word $w = \ell_0\tau(\delta_1 \cdots \delta_n)\overline{\ell}_n$ where for all $i \in [n]$, δ_i is the transition applied wrt s . Obviously, $w \in R$ (more precisely, $w \in R_{\ell_n}$ and $\ell_n \in Q_f$ because s is accepting) and $f(w) = u$. Then, it remains to prove that $w \in \mathcal{D}_{\Gamma} \cap g_{A,B}^{-1}(\mathcal{D}_{\Gamma})$.

Let s, f be indexes satisfying $1 \leq s \leq f \leq n$, we consider the property $(H_{s,f})$:

1. if $\llbracket s, f \rrbracket$ does not contain pending M_2 arches, then $\ell_{s-1}\tau(\delta_s \cdots \delta_f)\bar{\ell}_f \in \mathcal{D}_\Gamma$,
 2. if $\llbracket s, f \rrbracket$ does not contain pending M_1 arches, then $g_{A,B}(\ell_{s-1}\tau(\delta_s \cdots \delta_f)\bar{\ell}_f) \in \mathcal{D}_\Gamma$.
- In the case $s = 1$, $f = n$, $\ell_{s-1}\tau(\delta_s \cdots \delta_f)\bar{\ell}_f = w$ and $\llbracket 1, n \rrbracket$ is without pending M_1 -arches and M_2 -arches. Then $(H_{1,n})$ implies that $w \in \mathcal{D}_\Gamma \cap g_{A,B}^{-1}(\mathcal{D}_\Gamma)$.

Let us prove $(H_{s,f})$ by induction over $f - s$. We suppose that $u = a_1 \cdots a_n$ and fix $v = \ell_{s-1}\tau(\delta_s \cdots \delta_f)\bar{\ell}_f$.

(Base) If $f = s$ and s is internal (otherwise there are pending M_1 -arches and M_2 -arches), $v = \ell_{s-1}\tau(\delta_s)\bar{\ell}_f = \ell_{s-1}\bar{\ell}_{s-1}a_s\bar{a}_s\ell_f\bar{\ell}_f \in \mathcal{D}_\Gamma$ and $g_{A,B}(v) = \varepsilon \in \mathcal{D}_\Gamma$.

(Induction) If $f > s$, we consider five cases according to s :

- if s is internal, then $v = \ell_{s-1}\bar{\ell}_{s-1}a_s\bar{a}_s v'$ with $v' = \ell_s\tau(\delta_{s+1} \cdots \delta_f)\bar{\ell}_f$:
 1. if $\llbracket s, f \rrbracket$ does not contain pending M_2 arches, then because s is internal, $\llbracket s+1, f \rrbracket$ does not contain pending M_2 arches. From hypothesis, $v' \in \mathcal{D}_\Gamma$ then so is v .
 2. if $\llbracket s, f \rrbracket$ does not contain pending M_1 arches, then because s is internal, $\llbracket s+1, f \rrbracket$ does not contain pending M_1 arches. From hypothesis, $g_{A,B}(v') \in \mathcal{D}_\Gamma$, then so is $g_{A,B}(v) = g_{A,B}(v')$.
- if $s \in [n]_c^c$, there exists i_2, i_3, i_4 such that s, i_2, i_3, i_4 is a 2-wave, then there exists $p \in P$ such that:
 1. if $\llbracket s, f \rrbracket$ does not contain pending M_2 arches, then $s < i_4 \leq f$, and $\llbracket s+1, i_4-1 \rrbracket, \llbracket i_4+1, f \rrbracket$ do not contain pending M_2 arches. In addition v can be decomposed in

$$v = \ell_s\bar{\ell}_s a\bar{a}(p, 1)v_1 a_{i_4} \bar{a}_{i_4}(p, 1)v_2,$$

where $v_1 = \ell_{s+1}\tau(\delta_{s+1} \cdots \delta_{i_4-1})$ and $v_2 = \ell_{i_4}\tau(\delta_{i_4+1} \cdots \delta_f)\bar{\ell}_f$.

From induction hypothesis, v_1 and v_2 belong to \mathcal{D}_Γ , then so is v

2. if $\llbracket s, f \rrbracket$ does not contain pending M_1 arches, then $s < i_2 \leq f$, and $\llbracket s+1, i_2-1 \rrbracket, \llbracket i_2+1, f \rrbracket$ do not contain pending M_1 arches. In addition v can be decomposed in

$$v = \ell_s\bar{\ell}_s a\bar{a}(p, 1)v_1 a_{i_2} \bar{a}_{i_2}(p, 2)v_2,$$

where $v_1 = \ell_{s+1}\tau(\delta_{s+1} \cdots \delta_{i_2-1})\bar{\ell}_{i_2-1}$ and $v_2 = \ell_{i_2}\tau(\delta_{i_2+1} \cdots \delta_f)\bar{\ell}_f$. From induction hypothesis, $g_{A,B}(v_1)$ and $g_{A,B}(v_2)$ belong to \mathcal{D}_Γ , then so is $g_{A,B}(v) = (p, 1)g_{A,B}(v_1)(p, 1)g_{A,B}(v_2)$.

- if $s \in [n]_r^c$, then $\llbracket s, f \rrbracket$ contains pending M_1 -arches. If it does not contain pending M_2 -arches, there exists $s < i_3 \leq f$ such that $M_2(s, i_3)$, $i_3 \in [n]_r^c$ and $\llbracket s+1, i_3-1 \rrbracket, \llbracket i_3+1, f \rrbracket$ do not contain pending M_2 arches. In addition v can be decomposed in

$$v = \ell_s\bar{\ell}_s a\bar{a}(p, 2)v_1 a_{i_3} \bar{a}_{i_3}(p, 2)v_2,$$

where $v_1 = \ell_{s+1}\tau(\delta_{s+1} \cdots \delta_{i_3-1})\bar{\ell}_{i_3-1}$ and $v_2 = \ell_{i_3}\tau(\delta_{i_3+1} \cdots \delta_f)\bar{\ell}_f$.

From induction hypothesis, v_1 and v_2 belong to \mathcal{D}_Γ , then so is v .

- if $s \in [n]_r^c$ then $\llbracket s, f \rrbracket$ contains pending M_2 -arches. If it does not contain pending M_1 -arches, there exists $s < i_4 \leq f$ such that $M_1(s, i_4)$, $i_4 \in [n]_r^c$ and $\llbracket s+1, i_4-1 \rrbracket, \llbracket i_4+1, f \rrbracket$ do not contain pending M_1 arches. In addition v can be decomposed in

$$v = \ell_s\bar{\ell}_s a\bar{a}(p, 2)v_1 a_{i_4} \bar{a}_{i_4}(p, 1)v_2,$$

where $v_1 = \ell_{s+1}\tau(\delta_{s+1} \cdots \delta_{i_4-1})\bar{\ell}_{i_4-1}$ and $v_2 = \ell_{i_4}\tau(\delta_{i_4+1} \cdots \delta_f)\bar{\ell}_f$.

From induction hypothesis, $g_{A,B}(v_1)$ and $g_{A,B}(v_2)$ belong to \mathcal{D}_Γ , then so is $g_{A,B}(v) = (p, 2)g_{A,B}(v_1)(p, 2)g_{A,B}(v_2)$.

- if $s \in [n]_r^c$, $\llbracket s, f \rrbracket$ contains pending M_1 -arches and M_2 -arches.

◀

► **Lemma 48.** *For all $w \in R \cap \mathcal{D}_\Gamma \cap g_{A,B}^{-1}(\mathcal{D}_\Gamma)$, there exists a WW₂ $\omega = (u, M_1, M_2)$ such that $f(w) = u$ and $u \in L(A)$.*

Proof. Let $w \in R \cap \mathcal{D}_\Gamma \cap g_{A,B}^{-1}(\mathcal{D}_\Gamma)$. From definition of R , there exists $n \geq 0$ and transitions $\delta_1, \dots, \delta_n$ such that $w = q_0 \tau(\delta_1 \cdots \delta_n) q_f$, with $q_0 \in Q_0$ and $q_f \in Q_F$.

For every non internal transition δ , we denote by $\pi_2(\delta)$ the projection of $\tau(\delta)$ in $P_1 \cup P_2 \cup \overline{P_1} \cup \overline{P_2}$, and by $\pi_1(\delta)$ the word $g_{A,B}(\tau(\delta))$ (it also belongs to $(P_1 \cup P_2 \cup \overline{P_1} \cup \overline{P_2})^*$). Note that because $w \in \mathcal{D}_\Gamma \cap g_{A,B}^{-1}(\mathcal{D}_\Gamma)$, $\pi_1(\delta_1 \cdots \delta_n)$ and $\pi_2(\delta_1 \cdots \delta_n)$ are Dyck words.

We define the 2NW $\omega = (u, M_1, M_2)$ by:

- $u = a_1 \cdots a_n = f(w)$
 - for all $i < j$, $M_1(i, j) \Leftrightarrow (\delta_i \text{ is not internal and } \pi_1(\delta_i) = \overline{\pi_1(\delta_j)} \text{ and } \pi_1(\delta_{i+1} \cdots \delta_{j-1}) \in \mathcal{D}_\Gamma)$.
 - for all $i < j$, $M_2(i, j) \Leftrightarrow (\delta_i \text{ is not internal and } \pi_2(\delta_i) = \overline{\pi_2(\delta_j)} \text{ and } \pi_2(\delta_{i+1} \cdots \delta_{j-1}) \in \mathcal{D}_\Gamma)$.
- Remark that from construction $i \in [n]_y^x$ iff $\delta_i \in [n]_y^x$.

Now let $s = (\ell, h)$ be sequences defined from ω and w by : $\ell_0 = q_0$, for all $i \in [n]$, ℓ_i is the last component of δ_i , and for all $i \in [n]^c$, $h_i = \pi_1(\delta_i)$, for all $i \in [n]_c$, $h_i = \pi_2(\delta_i)$.

We let the reader check that for all $i \in [n]$, $run_j^A(\omega, s)$, and s is an accepting run of A over ω . Now, it remains to prove that ω is a WW₂. From construction, for all $i \in [n]$

- if $i \in [n]_c^c$, there exists $p \in P$ such that $\pi_1(\delta_i) = \overline{(p, 1)}$ and $\pi_2(\delta_i) = \overline{(p, 1)}$
- if $i \in [n]_c^r$, there exists $p \in P$ such that $\pi_1(\delta_i) = \overline{(p, 1)}$ and $\pi_2(\delta_i) = \overline{(p, 2)}$
- if $i \in [n]_r^c$, there exists $p \in P$ such that $\pi_1(\delta_i) = \overline{(p, 2)}$ and $\pi_1(\delta_i) = \overline{(p, 2)}$
- if $i \in [n]_r^r$, there exists $p \in P$ such that $\pi_1(\delta_i) = \overline{(p, 2)}$ and $\pi_1(\delta_i) = \overline{(p, 1)}$

It follows that every arch (x, y) belongs to a 2-wave i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4 such that $\pi_1(\delta_{i_1} \delta_{i_2} \delta_{i_3} \delta_{i_4}) = \overline{(p, 1)(p, 1)(p, 2)(p, 2)}$ and $\pi_2(\delta_{i_1} \delta_{i_2} \delta_{i_3} \delta_{i_4}) = \overline{(p, 1)(p, 2)(p, 2)(p, 1)}$. ◀

◀

Proof of Proposition 31

► **Proposition 31.** *There exists a language which is not an indexed language but being $\exists \text{WWEMSO}(\Sigma, <, M_1, M_2)$ -definable.*

Proof. Consider $\Sigma = A \cup \{\#\}$ for any alphabet A , and the set L of all words of the form

$\#u_1\#u_2\#\dots\#u_n\#$, for $n \geq 1$, such that for all $i \in [1, n-1]$, $u_i \in A^n$, and if $u_i = a_1 \dots a_n$, then $u_{i+1} = a_n a_1 \dots a_{n-1}$.


Using the Shrinking Lemma given in [12] for indexed languages, it can easily prove that L is not an indexed language. Indeed, this Lemma ensures that for any indexed language L and any positive integer m , there exists $k > 0$, such that each word $w \in L$ with $|w| \geq k$ can be decomposed as a product of r nonempty factors (with $m < r \leq k$), and such that each choice of m factors among the r occurs in a proper subproduct which lies in L .

Then, choose $m = 1$, $w = \#u_1\#u_2\#\dots\#u_n\#$, with $n > k$, and consider a decomposition $w = w_1 \cdots w_r$. As, $r \leq k$, at least one factor w_i must contains two or more $\#$'s. Then w_i can be decomposed in $w_i = \#u_j\#v$ with $1 \leq j \leq n$. The length of any word in L containing the factor w_i being the same as that of u , w_i cannot occur in a proper subproduct of $w_1 \cdots w_r$.

Let us now check that L is $\exists \text{wavesMSO}$ -definable. We consider the wave-nested-word language L_{NW} whose word-projection is L , and consisting in all $(u = \#u_1\#u_2\#\dots\#u_n\#, M_1, M_2)$, where M_1 and M_2 are defined as follows (for sake of simplicity, we suppose that n is odd: $n = 2m$ and $m \geq 2$):

- for each u_i , consider the unique nested word (u_i, M_{u_i}) such that each node in $[1, m]$ is a push node, and each node in $[m + 1, 2m]$ is a pop node. Then M_1 is union of all the M_{u_i} (with the appropriate translation on node numbers);
- Now, for each $i \in [1, n - 1]$ let us consider the unique nested word $(u_i \# u_{i+1}, M'_{u_i})$ such that each node in $[m + 1, 2m]$ is a push node, and each node in $[2m + 2, 3m + 1]$ is a pop node. We define M_2 as union of all the M'_{u_i} (with the appropriate translation on node numbers) and of $\{(i, |u| - i), 2 \leq i \leq m + 1\}$.

Such a nested word is represented Figure 8.



■ **Figure 8** Example of a word in L

First we construct a formula FO formula defining the set of all wave-NW $(\#u_1\#\dots\#u_k\#, M_1, M_2)$ such that $k \geq 2$, there exists $m \geq 2$ such that $|u_i| = 2m$, for $1 \leq i \leq k$, and M_1, M_2 are defined as above. Now we can ensure the property that if $u_i = a_1 \dots a_n$, then $u_{i+1} = a_n a_1 \dots a_{n-1}$, since the labeling has to satisfy the following local properties: if $M_1(x, y) \wedge M_2(y, z) \wedge M_1(z, t)$ then

- $u(x) = u(z + 1)$ and $u(y - 1) = u(t)$
- if $u(y + 1) = \#$, then $u(y) = u(z)$

Until now, we have constructed a FO formula. Now, it remains to check that $k = 2m$. For this purpose, we follow the path of the first letter of the first factor, and check that it reaches the end of the word (then k is a multiple of $2m$), and it is the only one time it reaches the end of a factor (then $k < 4m$). To follows the path of this letter, we define the set X of all elements x satisfying one of the following property:

- x is the first position of u_1 ;
- there exist $y \in X$, and z such that $(y, z) \in M_1$ and $(z, x - 1) \in M_2$;
- there exist $y \in X$, and z such that $(y, z) \in M_2$ and $(z, x - 1) \in M_1$.

If X contains the last position of the factor u_k and it is the only one $x \in X$ indexing the last letter of a factor u_i , for $1 \leq i \leq k$, then $k = 2m$. Symbols indexed by elements of X are represented in bold in Figure 4. ◀