

Closing star-free closure

THOMAS PLACE and MARC ZEITOUN, LaBRI, Université de Bordeaux, France

We introduce an operator on classes of regular languages, the star-free closure. Our motivation is to generalize standard results of automata theory within a unified framework. Given an arbitrary input class \mathcal{C} , the star-free closure operator outputs the least class closed under Boolean operations and language concatenation, and containing all languages of \mathcal{C} as well as all finite languages. We establish several equivalent characterizations of star-free closure: in terms of regular expressions, first-order logic, pure future and future-past temporal logic, and recognition by finite monoids. A key ingredient is that star-free closure coincides with another closure operator, defined in terms of regular operations where Kleene stars are allowed in restricted contexts.

A consequence of this first result is that we can decide membership of a regular language in the star-free closure of a class whose separation problem is decidable. Moreover, we prove that separation itself is decidable for the star-free closure of any finite class, and of any class of group languages having itself decidable separation (plus mild additional properties). We actually show decidability of a stronger property, called covering.

CCS Concepts: • **Theory of computation** → **Regular languages; Modal and temporal logics; Finite Model Theory.**

Additional Key Words and Phrases: Words, regular languages, star-free closure, first-order logic, linear temporal logic, aperiodicity, membership, separation, covering

ACM Reference Format:

Thomas Place and Marc Zeitoun. 2023. Closing star-free closure. 1, 1 (July 2023), 60 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/nmnnnnn>

1 INTRODUCTION

Context. The starting point of this paper is a major result from the theory of regular languages. It states that it is equivalent for a language of finite words to be defined by:

- (1) a star-free regular expression, *i.e.*, which forbids Kleene star but allows complement,
- (2) a regular expression restricting Kleene stars to prefix codes of bounded synchronization delay,
- (3) a first-order logic sentence using the linear order and the alphabetic predicates,
- (4) a pure future temporal logic formula,
- (5) a future-past temporal logic formula,
- (6) a morphism into a finite aperiodic monoid.

This statement compiles a series of theorems by Schützenberger [40, 41] for (1) \Leftrightarrow (2) \Leftrightarrow (6), McNaughton and Papert [23] for (3) \Leftrightarrow (1) and Kamp [17] for (3) \Leftrightarrow (4) \Leftrightarrow (5). It attests to the robustness of a class of languages defined by seemingly unrelated formalisms: various types of regular expressions, of logics and of machine-based devices. Moreover, Property (6) can be decided on a

Authors' address: Thomas Place, tplace@labri.fr; Marc Zeitoun, mz@labri.fr, LaBRI, Université de Bordeaux, 351 cours de la Libération, Talence, F-33405, France.

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than ACM must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.

© 2023 Association for Computing Machinery.

XXXX-XXXX/2023/7-ART \$15.00

<https://doi.org/10.1145/nmnnnnn.nmnnnnn>

specific canonical morphism, which can be computed from the language. This yields an algorithm for checking whether a given regular language has any of the aforementioned properties. In other words, the *membership problem* of a regular language to this class of languages is decidable.

This result had a profound influence on automata theory: its impact went far beyond the class of star-free languages. By highlighting the correspondence between specific regular expressions, fragments of second-order monadic logic, variants of temporal logic and classes of finite monoids, it initiated a line of research whose aim is to capture the expressive power of natural classes of regular languages—see [25, Part B] or [46] for overviews. As in the theorem above, these classes are defined by restricting the syntax of the aforementioned formalisms. Historically, the way to study such a class was inspired by Schützenberger’s contribution to the above result: the aim was to design *membership algorithms*. There is an abundant literature on the subject, due to the number of interesting classes of regular languages. See for example [42, 19, 6, 26] (for variations on the quantifier alternation free fragment of first-order logic), [29, 14, 21] (for variations on a more expressive fragment) or [48, 7, 20] (for variations on two-variable first-order logic).

Operators. However, the number of publications in the field can also be explained by the fact that the classes that were investigated do not have a unique flavor. Indeed, logic and regular expressions come in a multitude of variants. For example, other versions of first-order logic can be envisaged by extending its signature, *i.e.*, by allowing more predicates, thus increasing the expressive power. This leads to two classic variants: we can add predicates that test the value of a position modulo a certain integer, and more generally predicates that count the number of occurrences of a particular letter modulo an integer. Similarly, star-free expressions can be extended in a natural way: instead of starting with singleton languages, we can start with languages of a certain fixed class. Finally, there are several extensions of temporal logic, usually obtained by adding more expressive temporal modalities (see for example [13]).

Naturally, the historical approach has been to treat each of these variations individually. This means that the proofs have to be recast for each variation, which is often technical and sometimes nontrivial. To avoid such adaptations, it is desirable to develop a generic approach, which would encompass several variations of a given class at once. This is where the notion of operator comes in. An *operator* Op associates with any class \mathcal{C} of regular languages a larger class $Op(\mathcal{C})$. For example, the star-free closure operator SF takes as input a class \mathcal{C} and outputs $SF(\mathcal{C})$, which is the least class containing \mathcal{C} and all finite languages, and which is closed under union, complement and concatenation. Notice that we recover the class of star-free languages as the star-free closure of the class consisting of two languages: the empty and the full languages.

Focusing on operators rather than on individual classes meets our main objective (understanding classes of regular languages). Indeed, most interesting classes are obtained from simpler ones by applying operators from a small set. The main operators are Boolean and polynomial closure [29] (they appear in concatenation hierarchies, see for example [27]), unambiguous polynomial closure [31] and star-free closure, which is the subject of this paper. Actually, it is more rewarding to concentrate on operators, as this allows multiple variants of the same class to be handled at once, leading to *generic* results. Not only this avoids reproducing proofs for classes that are variations of each other, but also and more importantly, this simplifies the proofs and emphasizes the characteristics of the operator Op and the assumptions needed on the class \mathcal{C} to decide $Op(\mathcal{C})$ -membership.

Ideally, for an operator Op , we would like to reduce $Op(\mathcal{C})$ -membership to \mathcal{C} -membership, *i.e.*, to obtain a statement like: “If \mathcal{C} has decidable membership, then so does $Op(\mathcal{C})$ ”. Unfortunately, although this situation may occur [31], it is uncommon: decidability of membership is rarely

preserved by operators (see [1], which provides negative examples in the context of classes of monoids). This observation leads to the following question:

“What properties should \mathcal{C} satisfy for the $Op(\mathcal{C})$ -membership problem to be decidable?”

This question, in turn, motivates us to consider a new problem: \mathcal{C} -separation. It asks whether two regular input languages can be separated by a language from the class \mathcal{C} , *i.e.*, whether there exists a language from \mathcal{C} containing the first input language while being disjoint from the second. There is an easy algorithmic reduction from \mathcal{C} -membership to \mathcal{C} -separation: a language belongs to \mathcal{C} if and only if it can be \mathcal{C} -separated from its complement. Note that separation is more demanding than membership: it requires to exhibit a separating language, if possible, even when none of the input languages belong to the class under study. In contrast, solving membership only requires to prove that the input language does or does not belong to the class. For this reason separation is also more rewarding than membership: although more difficult, it brings more information, which can later be exploited to tackle classes of languages built on top of the one being investigated.

In particular, looking at separation provides a partial answer to the above question (“what properties should \mathcal{C} satisfy for the $Op(\mathcal{C})$ -membership problem to be decidable?”). Indeed, for some operators Op , being able to decide \mathcal{C} -separation is sufficient to decide $Op(\mathcal{C})$ -membership. This is the case when Op is the polynomial closure operator [32] (assuming mild properties on \mathcal{C}). If in addition, the class \mathcal{C} consists of group languages (see Section 3.5), this is also the case for the Boolean closure of the polynomial closure [37] (which, in fact, has then decidable separation). For this reason, separation has replaced membership as the standard problem to understand a class of regular languages. It turns out that in order to tackle \mathcal{C} -separation, it is convenient to study an even more general problem called \mathcal{C} -covering. Intuitively, it generalizes separation to an arbitrary number of input languages. The state of the art regarding the class of star-free languages is that it has decidable covering, hence also decidable separation (this follows from [35] and indirectly from [15, 2]).

Contributions. We investigate the star-free closure operator. With any class of languages \mathcal{C} , it associates the least class $SF(\mathcal{C})$ containing \mathcal{C} , all finite languages, and which is closed under Boolean operations and language concatenation. Note that these operations preserve regularity and that Kleene star is explicitly forbidden. We generalize the known results in two orthogonal directions:

- First, we generalize the Kamp-McNaughton-Papert-Schützenberger theorem. This means finding appropriate generalizations for each of the properties appearing in this theorem, and showing that they all characterize star-free closure. In other words, we need to find suitable operators generalizing the definition of the classes that appear in this result: languages of bounded synchronization delay, first-order definable languages, languages definable in pure future and future-past temporal logic, and languages recognized by finite aperiodic monoids. An important consequence of the algebraic characterization, is that $SF(\mathcal{C})$ -membership reduces to \mathcal{C} -separation.
- Secondly, we prove that under certain (strong) assumptions on the input class \mathcal{C} , which we detail below, the covering problem for the star-free closure $SF(\mathcal{C})$ is decidable.

Let us comment on these two contributions. Concerning the first, one of the operators we have to define already exists: with each class \mathcal{C} , one can associate a variant $FO(\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{C}})$ of first-order logic whose predicates depend on \mathcal{C} [32]. It defines exactly the languages in the star-free closure of \mathcal{C} . Its definition is simple: each language L in \mathcal{C} yields a binary predicate that selects pairs of positions such that the infix between them belongs to L . On the other hand, all other operators are new.

The main one is the SD operator. It generalizes a class defined by Schützenberger [41] (see also [10, 11]). Roughly speaking, $SD(\mathcal{C})$ is the least class containing all finite languages which is

closed under intersection with languages of \mathcal{C} , disjoint union, unambiguous concatenation, and Kleene star applied to prefix codes of bounded synchronization delay. Unlike SF , the SD operator prohibits complement. In fact, the definitions of these operators are of a different nature: the restrictions for SF are syntactic (they constrain legal regular expressions), whereas being a disjoint union, an unambiguous concatenation or a prefix code with bounded synchronization delay are semantic notions: they depend on the languages themselves, not just on expressions used to describe them.

The SD operator is a key ingredient in the generalization of the Kamp-McNaughton-Papert-Schützenberger theorem: the first step, establishing the inclusion $SD(\mathcal{C}) \subseteq SF(\mathcal{C})$, is particularly helpful. Indeed, proving inclusion in $SF(\mathcal{C})$ is generally difficult, since this requires the construction of expressions that involve alternating complement and concatenation operations, which are hard to understand. On the other hand, proving inclusion in $SD(\mathcal{C})$ is easier, as we may use Kleene stars. In fact, several of the article’s proofs are based on this capability.

The proof of the converse inclusion $SF(\mathcal{C}) \subseteq SD(\mathcal{C})$ is intertwined with the algebraic characterization. Here, we have to generalize Property (6), which involves finite aperiodic monoids (*i.e.*, which are such that the sequence of powers of any element eventually stabilizes). Given a monoid morphism into a finite monoid M , we define monoids in M called \mathcal{C} -orbits for this morphism. They are computable as soon as \mathcal{C} -separation is decidable. The generalized algebraic characterization states that a language is in $SD(\mathcal{C}) = SF(\mathcal{C})$ if and only if all the \mathcal{C} -orbits of its syntactic morphism are aperiodic. In particular, if \mathcal{C} has decidable separation, membership in $SF(\mathcal{C})$ is decidable. This is the way we generalize Schützenberger’s membership theorem.

At last, we generalize the correspondences with temporal logic. We first define an operator that associates a variant of pure future temporal logic with each class. This simply amounts to generalizing the “Until” temporal modality to take into account the input class \mathcal{C} . More precisely, each language L of \mathcal{C} produces a new “Until” modality U_L . Intuitively, this modality adds a constraint to the semantic of the standard Until: a formula $\phi U_L \psi$ holds at position i in a word when there exists a position $j > i$ where ψ holds, such that ϕ holds on all the intermediate positions, and such that the infix between i and j belongs to L . Adapting this construction to future-past temporal logic is straightforward. Again, we show that both temporal logic operators obtained in this way correspond to the star-free closure operator, thus generalizing Properties 4 and 5 of the Kamp-McNaughton-Papert-Schützenberger theorem.

We now turn to the second contribution: covering algorithms for specific input classes. First, we show that the star-free closure of a *finite class* has decidable covering (and therefore, decidable separation). We then use this result to establish our main theorem: the star-free closure of a class of *group languages* with decidable *separation* has decidable *covering* (and therefore again, decidable separation). Let us mention some important features of this work.

A first point is that the case of a finite class is important by itself. Foremost, it is a crucial step for the main result on the star-free closure of classes of group languages (this is due to the fact that a language in the star-free closure of a class is built using a finite number of languages of the class). Second, it provides a new proof that covering is decidable for the original class of star-free languages (this is shown in [36] or can be derived from [15, 2]). This new proof is simpler and generic. While the original underlying technique goes back to Wilke [50], the proof has been simplified at several levels. The main simplification is obtained thanks to an abstract framework, introduced in [39]. It is based on the central notion of rating map, which is meant to measure the quality of a separator. For the framework to be relevant, we actually need to generalize separation to multiple input languages, which leads to the covering problem. Another key difference is that existing proofs (specific to star-free languages) involve abstracting words by new letters at some

point, which requires the working alphabet to be a parameter of the induction. Here, we cannot use this approach as the classes we build with star-free closure are less robust in general. We work with a fixed alphabet, which also makes the proof simpler. In fact, several proofs should look similar to the reader. This is not surprising, since in order to establish membership or covering, we have to build languages from the classes we are interested in.

Applications. Finally, let us present important applications of the result about covering for classes made of group languages. First, one may look at the input class containing all group languages. Straubing [44] described an algebraic counterpart of the star-free closure of this class, whose membership was then shown to be decidable by Rhodes and Karnofsky [18]. Altogether, this implies that membership is decidable for the star-free closure of group languages, as noted by Margolis and Pin [22]. Here, we are able to generalize this result to separation and covering, as separation is known to be decidable for the class of all group languages [3, 33].

Another important application is the class of languages definable by first-order logic with modular predicates $FO(<, MOD)$. This class is known to have decidable membership [4]. Moreover, it is the star-free closure of the class consisting of the languages counting the length of words modulo some number. Since this input class is easily shown to have decidable separation (see [37] for example), our main theorem applies.

The third application concerns first-order logic endowed with predicates counting the number of occurrences of a letter before a position, modulo some integer. Indeed, the class of languages definable in this logic is exactly the star-free closure of the class of languages recognized by Abelian groups (this follows from a generic correspondence theorem between star-free closure of a class and variants of first-order logic [37, 24], as well as from the description of languages recognized by Abelian groups [12]). Again, our main theorem applies, since the class of Abelian groups is known to have decidable separation: this follows from [8] and [2] (see also [33]).

Organization. The paper is structured as follows. We set up the notation and recall the background in Section 2. We introduce the star-free closure operator and present some of its basic properties in Section 3. In the same section, we introduce classes of group languages, for which this operator produces relevant classes. We define prefix codes of bounded synchronization delay in Section 4 and the associated operator SD , which allows Kleene star to be applied only to these languages. We also show that this new operator can be simulated by the star-free closure. We then develop in Section 5 the material needed to establish, for a class \mathcal{C} with mild properties, a common algebraic characterization of $SF(\mathcal{C})$ and $SD(\mathcal{C})$ (thus proving the missing inclusion $SF(\mathcal{C}) \subseteq SD(\mathcal{C})$). As explained above, this characterization is decidable as soon as separation is decidable for the underlying class \mathcal{C} . We establish the correspondences of star-free closure with first-order logic in Section 6 and with temporal logic in Section 7. Finally, we consider the covering problem. In Section 8, we recall the framework of rating maps, which is convenient for handling covering. We then prove that the star-free closure operator outputs a class whose covering is decidable in two cases: in Section 9, when the input class is finite and in Section 10, when it is composed of group languages (plus lightweight additional properties).

Related paper. This paper completes results from [34] and extend them.

2 PRELIMINARIES

In this section, we introduce the terminology used in the paper. We also present the membership, separation and covering problems, as well as key mathematical tools designed to handle them.

2.1 Classes of regular languages

For the whole paper, we fix a finite alphabet A . We denote by A^* the set of all *finite* words over A , including the empty word ε . We let $A^+ = A^* \setminus \{\varepsilon\}$. For $u, v \in A^*$, we write uv the word obtained by concatenating u and v . Moreover, for every $w \in A^*$, we write $|w| \in \mathbb{N}$ for its length. We shall also consider *positions*. A word $w = a_1 \cdots a_{|w|} \in A^*$ is viewed as an *ordered set* $\text{Pos}(w) = \{0, 1, \dots, |w|, |w| + 1\}$ of $|w| + 2$ positions. A position i such that $1 \leq i \leq |w|$ carries label $a_i \in A$. We write $\text{Pos}_\varepsilon(w) = \{1, \dots, |w|\}$ for this set of labeled positions. On the other hand, positions 0 and $|w| + 1$ are *artificial* leftmost and rightmost positions, which carry *no label*. Finally, given a word $w = a_1 \cdots a_{|w|} \in A^*$ and $i, j \in \text{Pos}(w)$ such that $i < j$, we write $w(i, j) = a_{i+1} \cdots a_{j-1} \in A^*$ (i.e., the infix obtained by keeping the letters carried by the positions that are *strictly* between i and j). Note that $w(0, |w| + 1) = w$.

A *language* is a subset of A^* . It is standard to extend concatenation to languages: given $K, L \subseteq A^*$, we write $KL = \{uv \mid u \in K \text{ and } v \in L\}$. Finally, we use the Kleene star: if $K \subseteq A^*$, then K^+ denotes the union of all languages K^n for $n \geq 1$ and K^* denotes the language $K^+ \cup \{\varepsilon\}$.

Classes. A class of languages \mathcal{C} is a set of languages. Such a class \mathcal{C} is a *lattice* when $\emptyset \in \mathcal{C}$, $A^* \in \mathcal{C}$ and \mathcal{C} is closed under union and intersection: for every $K, L \in \mathcal{C}$, we have $K \cup L \in \mathcal{C}$ and $K \cap L \in \mathcal{C}$. A *Boolean algebra* is a lattice which is closed under complement: if $K \in \mathcal{C}$, then $A^* \setminus K \in \mathcal{C}$. Finally, a class \mathcal{C} is *quotient-closed* if for every $L \in \mathcal{C}$ and $u \in A^*$, the following properties hold:

$$u^{-1}L \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{w \in A^* \mid uw \in L\} \quad \text{and} \quad Lu^{-1} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{w \in A^* \mid wu \in L\} \quad \text{both belong to } \mathcal{C}.$$

A *prevariety* is a quotient-closed Boolean algebra containing only *regular languages*. The regular languages are those which can be equivalently defined by nondeterministic finite automata, finite monoids or monadic second-order logic. We work with the definition by monoids, which we recall now.

Finite monoids and regular languages. A *semigroup* is a set S endowed with an associative multiplication $(s, t) \mapsto s \cdot t$ (also denoted by st). A *monoid* is a semigroup M whose multiplication has an identity element 1_M , i.e., such that $1_M \cdot s = s \cdot 1_M = s$ for every $s \in M$.

An *idempotent* of a semigroup S is an element $e \in S$ such that $ee = e$. We write $E(S) \subseteq S$ for the set of all idempotents in S . It is folklore that for every *finite* semigroup S , there exists a natural number $\omega(S)$ (denoted by ω when S is understood) such that for every $s \in S$, the element s^ω is an idempotent.

Clearly, A^* is a monoid whose multiplication is concatenation (the identity element is ε). Thus, we may consider morphisms $\alpha : A^* \rightarrow M$ where M is an arbitrary monoid. That is, $\alpha : A^* \rightarrow M$ is a map satisfying $\alpha(\varepsilon) = 1_M$ and $\alpha(uv) = \alpha(u)\alpha(v)$ for all $u, v \in A^*$. Given such a morphism and some language $L \subseteq A^*$, we say that L is *recognized* by α when there exists a subset F of M such that $L = \alpha^{-1}(F)$. It is standard and well known that the regular languages are those which can be recognized by a morphism into a *finite* monoid.

Syntactic morphism. Every language L is recognized by a canonical morphism. Let us briefly recall its definition. One may associate to L an equivalence relation \equiv_L over A^* : the *syntactic congruence* of L . Given $u, v \in A^*$, we let,

$$u \equiv_L v \text{ if and only if } xuy \in L \Leftrightarrow xvy \in L \text{ for every } x, y \in A^*.$$

As the name suggests, it is known and simple to verify that “ \equiv_L ” is a congruence on A^* : it is reflexive, symmetric and transitive, and for every $u, u', v, v' \in A^*$ such that $u \equiv_L v$ and $u' \equiv_L v'$, we have $uu' \equiv_L vv'$. Thus, the set of equivalence classes $M_L = A^*/\equiv_L$ is a monoid. It is called the *syntactic monoid* of L . Moreover, the map $\alpha_L : A^* \rightarrow M_L$ sending every word to its equivalence class is a morphism recognizing L , called the *syntactic morphism* of L . Another characterization

of regular languages is that L is regular if and only if M_L is finite (i.e., \equiv_L has finite index): this is Myhill-Nerode's theorem. In this case, one may compute the syntactic morphism $\alpha_L : A^* \rightarrow M_L$ from any representation of L (such as a finite automaton or an arbitrary monoid morphism).

2.2 Decision problems

We look at three decision problems. They all depend on an arbitrary class of languages \mathcal{C} . We use them as mathematical tools for analyzing \mathcal{C} . Indeed, obtaining an algorithm for one of these three problems requires a solid understanding of \mathcal{C} .

The \mathcal{C} -membership problem is the simplest one. It takes as input a single regular language L and asks whether $L \in \mathcal{C}$. The second problem, \mathcal{C} -separation, is more general. Given three languages K, L_1, L_2 , we say that K separates L_1 from L_2 if we have $L_1 \subseteq K$ and $L_2 \cap K = \emptyset$. Given a class of languages \mathcal{C} , we say that L_1 is \mathcal{C} -separable from L_2 if some language in \mathcal{C} separates L_1 from L_2 . Observe that when \mathcal{C} is not closed under complement, the definition is not symmetrical: it is possible for L_1 to be \mathcal{C} -separable from L_2 while L_2 is not \mathcal{C} -separable from L_1 . The separation problem associated to a given class \mathcal{C} , also called \mathcal{C} -separation problem, takes two regular languages L_1 and L_2 as input and asks whether L_1 is \mathcal{C} -separable from L_2 .

Remark 2.1. *The \mathcal{C} -separation problem generalizes the \mathcal{C} -membership problem. Indeed, a regular language belongs to \mathcal{C} if and only if it is \mathcal{C} -separable from its complement, which is also regular.*

In the paper, we do not consider separation directly. Instead, we work with a third, even more general problem: \mathcal{C} -covering. It was introduced in [39] and takes as input a single regular language L_1 and a finite set of regular languages L_2 . It asks whether there exists a " \mathcal{C} -cover of L_1 which is separating for L_2 ".

Given a language L , a cover of L is a finite set of languages \mathbf{K} such that $L \subseteq \bigcup_{K \in \mathbf{K}} K$. A cover \mathbf{K} is a \mathcal{C} -cover if all languages $K \in \mathbf{K}$ belong to \mathcal{C} . Moreover, given two finite sets of languages \mathbf{K} and \mathbf{L} , we say that \mathbf{K} is separating for \mathbf{L} if for every $K \in \mathbf{K}$, there exists $L \in \mathbf{L}$ such that $K \cap L = \emptyset$. Finally, given a language L_1 and a finite set of languages L_2 , we say that the pair (L_1, L_2) is \mathcal{C} -coverable if there exists a \mathcal{C} -cover of L_1 which is separating for L_2 .

The \mathcal{C} -covering problem is now defined as follows. Given as input a regular language L_1 and a finite set of regular languages L_2 , it asks whether the pair (L_1, L_2) is \mathcal{C} -coverable. It is straightforward to prove that covering generalizes separation if the class \mathcal{C} is a lattice, as stated in the following lemma (see [39, Theorem 3.5] for the proof).

Lemma 2.2. *Let \mathcal{C} be a lattice and L_1, L_2 be two languages. Then L_1 is \mathcal{C} -separable from L_2 if and only if $(L_1, \{L_2\})$ is \mathcal{C} -coverable.*

2.3 \mathcal{C} -morphisms

We now present a central mathematical tool. Consider an arbitrary prevariety \mathcal{C} . A \mathcal{C} -morphism is a surjective morphism $\eta : A^* \rightarrow N$ into a finite monoid N such that every language recognized by η belongs to \mathcal{C} . While basic, the notion of \mathcal{C} -morphism is a central tool in the paper. First, it is connected to the membership problem via the following simple, yet crucial proposition.

Proposition 2.3. *Let \mathcal{C} be a prevariety. A regular language L belongs to \mathcal{C} if and only if its syntactic morphism $\alpha_L : A^* \rightarrow M_L$ is a \mathcal{C} -morphism.*

PROOF. The "if" implication is immediate since L is recognized by its syntactic morphism. We prove the converse one: assuming that $L \in \mathcal{C}$, we prove that every language recognized by $\alpha_L : A^* \rightarrow M_L$ belongs to \mathcal{C} (recall that syntactic morphisms are surjective by definition). Clearly, every such language is a union of \equiv_L -classes. Hence, as \mathcal{C} is a prevariety, it suffices to prove that all \equiv_L -classes belongs to \mathcal{C} . For every $s \in M_L$, we fix a word $x_s \in A^*$ such that $\alpha_L(x_s) = s$. Consider the

following equivalence \sim on A^* :

$$u \sim v \text{ if and only if } x_s u x_t \in L \Leftrightarrow x_s v x_t \in L \text{ for every } s, t \in M_L.$$

We first show that \sim and \equiv_L are the same relation. It is immediate by definition that $\equiv_L \subseteq \sim$. For the converse inclusion, let $u, v \in A^*$ be such that $u \sim v$. We prove that $u \equiv_L v$. Given $x, y \in A^*$, we need to prove that $xuy \in L \Leftrightarrow xvy \in L$. Let $s = \alpha_L(x)$ and $t = \alpha_L(y)$. By definition, we have $\alpha_L(xuy) = \alpha_L(x_s u x_t)$ and $\alpha_L(xvy) = \alpha_L(x_s v x_t)$. Consequently, $xuy \in L \Leftrightarrow x_s u x_t \in L$ and $xvy \in L \Leftrightarrow x_s v x_t \in L$. Finally, since $u \sim v$, we know that $x_s u x_t \in L \Leftrightarrow x_s v x_t \in L$. Altogether, this yields $xuy \in L \Leftrightarrow xvy \in L$, as desired.

It remains to prove that every \sim -class belongs to \mathcal{C} . Let $w \in A^*$. We define the following subset P_w and N_w of M_L^2 :

$$P_w = \left\{ (s, t) \in M_L^2 \mid x_s w x_t \in L \right\} \quad \text{and} \quad N_w = \left\{ (s, t) \in M_L^2 \mid x_s w x_t \notin L \right\}.$$

One may now verify from the definition of \sim that the \sim -class of w is the following language:

$$\left(\bigcap_{(s,t) \in P_w} (x_s^{-1} L x_t^{-1}) \right) \setminus \left(\bigcup_{(s,t) \in N_w} (x_s^{-1} L x_t^{-1}) \right).$$

Since $L \in \mathcal{C}$ and \mathcal{C} is a prevariety, it follows that the \sim -class of w belongs to \mathcal{C} , which completes the proof. \square

In view of Proposition 2.3, getting an algorithm for \mathcal{C} -membership boils down to finding a procedure to decide whether an input morphism $\alpha : A^* \rightarrow M$ is a \mathcal{C} -morphism. This is how we approach the question in the paper.

Additionally, we shall use \mathcal{C} -morphisms as mathematical tools in proof arguments. They are convenient when manipulating arbitrary classes. We present a few properties that we shall need in this context. First, we have the following simple corollary of Proposition 2.3.

Proposition 2.4. *Let \mathcal{C} be a prevariety and consider finitely many languages L_1, \dots, L_k of \mathcal{C} . There exists a \mathcal{C} -morphism $\eta : A^* \rightarrow N$ such that L_1, \dots, L_k are all recognized by η .*

PROOF. For every $i \leq k$, let $\alpha_i : A^* \rightarrow M_i$ be the syntactic morphism of L_i . We know from Proposition 2.3 that α_i is a \mathcal{C} -morphism. Let $M = M_1 \times \dots \times M_k$ be the monoid equipped with the componentwise multiplication. Moreover, let $\alpha : A^* \rightarrow M$ be the morphism defined by $\alpha(w) = (\alpha_1(w_1), \dots, \alpha_k(w_k))$ for every $w \in A^*$. One may verify from the definition of α that all languages recognized by α are finite intersections of languages recognized by $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k$ (in particular, α recognizes each L_i). Hence, all languages recognized by α belong to \mathcal{C} . It now suffices to let $\eta : A^* \rightarrow N$ be the surjective restriction of α to complete the proof. \square

Finally, we consider the special case when \mathcal{C} is a *finite* prevariety (i.e., \mathcal{C} contains finitely many languages). In this case, Proposition 2.4 yields a \mathcal{C} -morphism recognizing *all* languages in \mathcal{C} . The following lemma implies that it is unique (up to renaming).

Lemma 2.5. *Let \mathcal{C} be a finite prevariety and let $\alpha : A^* \rightarrow M$ and $\eta : A^* \rightarrow N$ be two \mathcal{C} -morphisms. If α recognizes all languages in \mathcal{C} , then there exists a morphism $\gamma : M \rightarrow N$ such that $\eta = \gamma \circ \alpha$.*

PROOF. Assume that α recognizes all languages in \mathcal{C} . We define $\gamma : M \rightarrow N$. For every $s \in M$, we fix a word $w_s \in \alpha^{-1}(s)$ (recall that \mathcal{C} -morphisms are surjective by definition) and define $\gamma(s) = \eta(w_s)$. It remains to prove that γ is a morphism and that $\eta = \gamma \circ \alpha$. It suffices to prove the latter: since α is surjective, the former is an immediate consequence. Let $v \in A^*$. We show that $\eta(v) = \gamma(\alpha(v))$. Let $s = \alpha(v)$. By definition, $\gamma(s) = \eta(w_s)$. Hence, we need to prove that $\eta(v) = \eta(w_s)$. Since η is a \mathcal{C} -morphism, we have $\eta^{-1}(\eta(w_s)) \in \mathcal{C}$. Hence, our hypothesis implies

that $\eta^{-1}(\eta(w_s))$ is recognized by α . Since it is clear that $w_s \in \eta^{-1}(\eta(w_s))$ and $\alpha(v) = \alpha(w_s) = s$, it follows that $v \in \eta^{-1}(\eta(w_s))$ which exactly says that $\eta(v) = \eta(w_s)$, completing the proof. \square

By Lemma 2.5, if \mathcal{C} is a finite prevariety and $\alpha : A^* \rightarrow M$ and $\eta : A^* \rightarrow N$ are two \mathcal{C} -morphisms which both recognize *all* languages in \mathcal{C} , there exist two morphisms $\gamma : M \rightarrow N$ and $\beta : N \rightarrow M$ such that $\eta = \gamma \circ \alpha$ and $\alpha = \beta \circ \eta$. This yields $\beta \circ \gamma \circ \alpha = \alpha$. Since α is surjective, it follows that $\beta \circ \gamma : M \rightarrow M$ is the identity morphism. Hence, both β and γ are isomorphisms, meaning that α and η are the same object up to renaming. We call it the *canonical \mathcal{C} -morphism* and denote it by $\eta_{\mathcal{C}} : A^* \rightarrow N_{\mathcal{C}}$. Let us emphasize that this object is only defined when \mathcal{C} is a *finite prevariety*.

3 STAR-FREE CLOSURE

In this section, we introduce the classes investigated in the paper. Each of them is built from a simpler input class using a single operator: the *star-free closure*, which we first define. Then, we present classes that we use as key inputs for this operator: those containing only *group languages*.

3.1 Definition

Consider a class \mathcal{C} . The *star-free closure* of \mathcal{C} , denoted by $SF(\mathcal{C})$, is the least class of languages containing \mathcal{C} and all singletons $\{a\}$ for $a \in A$, and which is closed under union, complement and concatenation (that is, if $K, L \in SF(\mathcal{C})$, then $K \cup L$, $A^* \setminus K$ and KL belong to $SF(\mathcal{C})$ as well).

Remark 3.1. *Star-free closure is the generalization of a prominent single class: the class SF of star-free languages. It contains exactly the languages that can be defined by a star-free expression, i.e., a regular expression that cannot use the Kleene star but can use complement instead. One may verify that SF is exactly the star-free closure of the class $\{\emptyset, A^*\}$, i.e., $SF = SF(\{\emptyset, A^*\})$. Naturally, SF is also the star-free closure of itself. Therefore, $SF(\mathcal{C}) = SF$ for every class \mathcal{C} included in SF and containing $\{\emptyset, A^*\}$. It follows that investigating the star-free closure is worthwhile only when applied to a class which is **not** included in SF . As we explain below, typical such classes are made of group languages.*

In practice, we only apply star-free closure to input classes \mathcal{C} that are prevarieties. In this case, $SF(\mathcal{C})$ is a prevariety as well. We prove this in the following proposition.

Proposition 3.2. *If \mathcal{C} is a prevariety, then $SF(\mathcal{C})$ is a prevariety closed under concatenation.*

PROOF. It is immediate by definition that $SF(\mathcal{C})$ is a Boolean algebra closed under concatenation and containing only regular languages (indeed, it is well-known that regular languages are closed under Boolean operations and concatenation). Hence, it suffices to prove that $SF(\mathcal{C})$ is quotient-closed. By symmetry, we only present a proof for left quotients. Let $w \in A^*$. We use induction on the length of w to prove that for every $L \in SF(\mathcal{C})$, we have $w^{-1}L \in SF(\mathcal{C})$. When $w = \varepsilon$, we have $w^{-1}L = L$ for every $L \subseteq A^*$. Hence, the result is trivial. Assume now that $w \in A^+$ and consider $L \in SF(\mathcal{C})$. By hypothesis, there exist $u \in A^*$ and $a \in A$ such that $w = ua$. Hence, $w^{-1}L = u^{-1}(a^{-1}L)$. We use a sub-induction on the construction of L to prove that $a^{-1}L \in SF(\mathcal{C})$. It will then be immediate by induction on the length of w that $w^{-1}L = u^{-1}(a^{-1}L) \in SF(\mathcal{C})$.

Since $L \in SF(\mathcal{C})$, it is built from languages in \mathcal{C} and the singletons $\{b\}$ for $b \in A$ using only union, complement and concatenation. We use induction on this construction to prove that $a^{-1}L \in SF(\mathcal{C})$. Assume first that $L \in \mathcal{C}$. In this case, $a^{-1}L \in \mathcal{C} \subseteq SF(\mathcal{C})$ since \mathcal{C} is a prevariety. Assume now that $L = \{b\}$ for some $b \in A$. Then, either $b \neq a$ and $L = \emptyset \in \mathcal{C} \subseteq SF(\mathcal{C})$, or $b = a$ and $L = \{\varepsilon\}$, which also belongs to $SF(\mathcal{C})$ since it is the complement of the union of all languages A^*cA^* for $c \in A$.

We turn to the inductive cases. First, assume that $L = L_1 \cup L_2$ for languages $L_1, L_2 \in SF(\mathcal{C})$ for which, by induction, we have $a^{-1}L_1 \in SF(\mathcal{C})$ and $a^{-1}L_2 \in SF(\mathcal{C})$. Since $a^{-1}L = a^{-1}L_1 \cup a^{-1}L_2$, we get $a^{-1}L \in SF(\mathcal{C})$, as desired. Assume now that $L = A^* \setminus H$ for $H \in SF(\mathcal{C})$ such that, by

induction, $a^{-1}H \in SF(\mathcal{C})$. One may verify that $a^{-1}L = A^* \setminus (a^{-1}H)$. Hence, we get $a^{-1}L \in SF(\mathcal{C})$, as desired. Finally, assume that $L = L_1L_2$ for languages $L_1, L_2 \in SF(\mathcal{C})$ for which, by induction, we have $a^{-1}L_1 \in SF(\mathcal{C})$ and $a^{-1}L_2 \in SF(\mathcal{C})$. One may verify that,

$$a^{-1}L = \begin{cases} (a^{-1}L_1)L_2 & \text{if } \varepsilon \notin L_1, \\ (a^{-1}L_1)L_2 \cup a^{-1}L_2 & \text{if } \varepsilon \in L_1. \end{cases}$$

Since $a^{-1}L_1 \in SF(\mathcal{C})$ and $a^{-1}L_2 \in SF(\mathcal{C})$ by induction, we get $a^{-1}L \in SF(\mathcal{C})$, which concludes the proof. \square

We complete the presentation with a characteristic property of star-free closure (for input classes that are prevarieties). We present it as a property of the $SF(\mathcal{C})$ -morphisms.

Proposition 3.3. *Let \mathcal{C} be a prevariety and let $\alpha : A^* \rightarrow M$ be an $SF(\mathcal{C})$ -morphism. There exists a \mathcal{C} -morphism $\eta : A^* \rightarrow N$ such that:*

$$\text{for every } u \in A^*, \text{ if } \eta(u) \text{ is idempotent, then } (\alpha(u))^{\omega+1} = (\alpha(u))^\omega.$$

PROOF. Since α is an $SF(\mathcal{C})$ -morphism, we have $\alpha^{-1}(s) \in SF(\mathcal{C})$ for every $s \in M$. This means that $\alpha^{-1}(s)$ is built from finitely many languages of \mathcal{C} and from the singletons $\{a\}$ (for $a \in A$) using union, complement and concatenation. Since \mathcal{C} is a prevariety of regular languages, Proposition 2.4 yields a \mathcal{C} -morphism $\eta : A^* \rightarrow N$ recognizing all the languages in \mathcal{C} used in the construction of the languages $\alpha^{-1}(s)$ for $s \in M$. Let $\mathcal{C}_\eta = SF(\{\eta^{-1}(t) \mid t \in N\})$. By definition of η , we know that $\alpha^{-1}(s) \in SF(\mathcal{C}_\eta)$ for every $s \in M$. We prove that for every language $L \in SF(\mathcal{C}_\eta)$, there exists an integer $k \geq 1$ such that the following property holds (recall that \equiv_L denotes the syntactic congruence of L):

$$\text{for every } u \in A^*, \text{ if } \eta(u) \text{ is idempotent, then } u^{k+1} \equiv_L u^k. \quad (1)$$

Let us first explain why this implies the statement of the proposition: $(\alpha(u))^{\omega+1} = (\alpha(u))^\omega$ for any $u \in A^*$ such that $\eta(u)$ is idempotent. Let u be such a word and let $s = (\alpha(u))^\omega$. Since $\alpha^{-1}(s) \in SF(\mathcal{C}_\eta)$, there exists $k \geq 1$ such that (1) holds for $L = \alpha^{-1}(s)$. Let $p = \omega(M)$. Note that $\alpha(u^{pk}) = s$. This yields $u^{(p-1)k} \cdot u^k \cdot \varepsilon = u^{pk} \in \alpha^{-1}(s)$, whence by (1), $u^{pk+1} = u^{(p-1)k} \cdot u^{k+1} \cdot \varepsilon \in \alpha^{-1}(s)$. We get $(\alpha(u))^{\omega+1} = \alpha(u^{pk+1}) = s = (\alpha(u))^\omega$, as desired.

It remains to prove that for every language $L \in SF(\mathcal{C}_\eta)$, there exists $k \geq 1$ such that (1) holds. We argue by induction on the construction of L . The base cases are when $L = \eta^{-1}(t)$ for $t \in N$ and when L is a singleton $\{a\}$. If $L = \eta^{-1}(t)$ for $t \in N$, then, (1) holds for $k = 1$. Indeed, given $u, x, y \in A^*$ such that $\eta(u)$ is idempotent, we have $\eta(xuuy) = \eta(xuy)$. Since L is recognized by η , this yields $xuuy \in L \Leftrightarrow xuy \in L$, i.e., $u^2 \equiv_L u$. Assume next that $L = \{a\}$ for $a \in A$. In this case, (1) holds for $k = 2$. Indeed, let $u, x, y \in A^*$ such that $\eta(u)$ is idempotent. If $u = \varepsilon$, then $xu^{2+1}y = xy = xu^2y$ hence we get $xu^{2+1}y \in L \Leftrightarrow xu^2y \in L$. Otherwise, $u \in A^+$ and we have $|xu^2y| > 1$ and $|xu^{2+1}y| > 1$. Therefore, since $L = \{a\}$, we have $xu^2y \notin L$ and $xu^{2+1}y \notin L$. In all cases, $u^3 \equiv_L u^2$, concluding the proof of (1) in the base cases.

We turn to the inductive cases. Assume first that the last operation used to build L is union. We have $L = L_1 \cup L_2$ where L_1, L_2 are simpler languages of $SF(\mathcal{C}_\eta)$. By induction, this yields $k_1, k_2 \geq 1$ such that for $i = 1, 2$, if $u \in A^*$ is such that $\eta(u)$ is idempotent, we have $u^{k_i+1} \equiv_{L_i} u^{k_i}$. Hence, (1) holds for L with $k = \max(k_1, k_2)$. We turn to complement. Assume that $L = A^* \setminus H$ where H is a simpler language of $SF(\mathcal{C}_\eta)$. By induction, we get $k \geq 1$ such that if $u \in A^*$ is such that $\eta(u)$ is idempotent, we have $u^{k+1} \equiv_H u^k$, i.e., $xu^k y \in H \Leftrightarrow xu^{k+1} y \in H$ for all $x, y \in A^*$. Since $L = A^* \setminus H$, the contrapositive states that $xu^k y \in L \Leftrightarrow xu^{k+1} y \in L$, and (1) holds for L with the same integer k as for H .

Finally, assume that the last operation used to construct L is concatenation. We have $L = L_1L_2$ where L_1, L_2 are simpler languages of $SF(\mathcal{C}_\eta)$. By induction, this yields $k_1, k_2 \geq 1$ such that for $i = 1, 2$, if $u \in A^*$ is such that $\eta(u)$ is idempotent, we have $u^{k_i+1} \equiv_{L_i} u^{k_i}$. Let $m = \max(k_1, k_2)$. We prove that (1) holds for $k = 2m + 1$. Let $u, x, y \in A^*$ with $\eta(u)$ idempotent. We have to show that $xu^{k+1}y \in L \Leftrightarrow xu^ky \in L$. We concentrate on the left to right implication (the converse one is symmetrical): assuming that $xu^{k+1}y \in L$, we show that $xu^ky \in L$. Since $L = L_1L_2$, we get $w_1 \in L_1$ and $w_2 \in L_2$ such that $xu^{k+1}y = w_1w_2$. Since $k \geq 2m + 1$, it follows that either xu^{m+1} is a prefix of w_1 or $u^{m+1}y$ is a suffix of w_2 . By symmetry, we assume that the former property holds: we have $w_1 = xu^{m+1}z$ for some $z \in A^*$. Observe that since $xu^{k+1}y = w_1w_2$, it follows that $zw_2 = u^{k-m}y$. Moreover, we have $m \geq k_1$ by definition of m . Since $xu^{m+1}z = w_1 \in L_1$, we know therefore that $xu^mz \in L_1$ by definition of k_1 . Thus, $xu^mzw_2 \in L_1L_2 = L$. Since $zw_2 = u^{k-m}y$, this yields $xu^ky \in L$, concluding the proof. \square

3.2 Group languages

We now present a central kind of class. As we explained in the introduction, all classes investigated in the paper are built from basic ones using the star-free closure operator. Here, we introduce the basic classes used in this construction: the *classes of group languages*.

A *group* is a monoid G such that every element $g \in G$ has an inverse $g^{-1} \in G$, i.e., $gg^{-1} = g^{-1}g = 1_G$. A language L is a *group language* if it is recognized by a morphism $\alpha : A^* \rightarrow G$ into a finite group G (i.e., there exists $F \subseteq G$ such that $L = \alpha^{-1}(F)$). We write GR for the class of all group languages. One can verify that GR is a prevariety.

Remark 3.4. *No language theoretic definition of GR is known. There is however a definition based on automata: the group languages are those recognized by a permutation automaton [49] (i.e., which is simultaneously deterministic, co-deterministic and complete).*

A *class of group languages* is a class consisting of group languages only, i.e., a subclass of GR. The results of this paper apply to arbitrary *prevarieties of group languages*.

While our results apply in a generic way to all prevarieties of group languages, there are *four* main classes of this kind that we shall use for providing examples. One of them is GR itself. Let us present the other three. First, we write $ST = \{\emptyset, A^*\}$, which is clearly a prevariety of group languages (the notation from the fact that this class is the base level of the *Straubing-Thérien* hierarchy [43, 47]). While trivial, we shall see that this class has important applications. Moreover, we look at the class MOD of *modulo languages*. For every $q, r \in \mathbb{N}$ with $r < q$, we write $L_{q,r} = \{w \in A^* \mid |w| \equiv r \pmod{q}\}$. The class MOD consists of all *finite unions* of languages $L_{q,r}$. One may verify that MOD is a prevariety of group languages. Finally, we shall consider the class AMT of *alphabet modulo testable languages*. For all $q, r \in \mathbb{N}$ with $r < q$ and all $a \in A$, let $L_{q,r}^a = \{w \in A^* \mid |w|_a \equiv r \pmod{q}\}$. We define AMT as the least class consisting of all languages $L_{q,r}^a$ and closed under union and intersection. It is again straightforward to verify that AMT is a prevariety of group languages.

We do not investigate classes of group languages themselves in the paper: we only use them as input classes for our operators. In particular, we shall use ST, MOD, AMT and GR in order to illustrate our results. In this context, it will be important that *separation* is decidable for these four classes. The techniques involved for proving this are independent from what we do in the paper. Actually, this can be difficult. On one hand, the decidability of ST-separation is immediate (two languages are ST-separable if and only if one of them is empty). On the other hand, the decidability of GR-separation is equivalent to a difficult algebraic question [16], which remained open for several years before it was solved by Ash [3]. Recent automata-based proofs that separation is decidable for MOD, AMT and GR are available in [33].

We conclude this section with a useful result, which states a simple property of the \mathcal{G} -morphisms when \mathcal{G} is a group prevariety.

Lemma 3.5. *Let \mathcal{G} be a group prevariety and let $\alpha : A^* \rightarrow G$ be a \mathcal{G} -morphism. Then, G is a group.*

PROOF. Let $g \in G$, we exhibit an inverse $g^{-1} \in G$ for g (i.e., such that $gg^{-1} = g^{-1}g = 1_G$). By hypothesis, $\alpha^{-1}(1_G) \in \mathcal{G}$. Since \mathcal{G} is a group prevariety, there exists a morphism $\eta : A^* \rightarrow H$ into a finite group H recognizing $\alpha^{-1}(1_G)$. Let $n = \omega(H)$. We define $g^{-1} = g^{n-1}$. Since $gg^{-1} = g^{-1}g = g^n$, it remains to prove that $g^n = 1_G$. Let $w \in \alpha^{-1}(g)$ (recall that \mathcal{G} -morphisms are surjective). Clearly, $\eta(w^n) = (\eta(w))^n$ is an idempotent of H since $n = \omega(H)$. Hence, $\eta(w^n) = 1_H$ since H is a group. Hence, $\eta(w^n) = \eta(\varepsilon)$. Since $\varepsilon \in \alpha^{-1}(1_G)$ and since $\alpha^{-1}(1_G)$ is recognized by η , we get $w^n \in \alpha^{-1}(1_G)$, i.e., $\alpha(w^n) = g^n = 1_G$, as desired. \square

4 BOUNDED SYNCHRONIZATION DELAY

We now present an alternate definition of star-free closure. More precisely, we introduce a second operator $\mathcal{C} \mapsto SD(\mathcal{C})$ whose definition is independent from that of star-free closure. We then prove that $SD(\mathcal{C}) = SF(\mathcal{C})$ if \mathcal{C} is a prevariety. This definition is less prominent than the main one and than the logical characterizations that we shall present below. Yet, it is a key ingredient of the paper. Whenever we have to construct languages in $SF(\mathcal{C})$ in proof arguments, we actually build them as languages of $SD(\mathcal{C})$. For example, this is how we obtain the algebraic characterization of $SF(\mathcal{C})$ (in fact, this argument is intertwined with the proof of the inclusion $SF(\mathcal{C}) \subseteq SD(\mathcal{C})$ that we present in this section).

This second definition was discovered by Schützenberger [41]. He defined a single class SD (in our terminology, this is the class $SD(ST)$) and he proved that it coincides with the class SF of star-free languages (see also the work of Diekert and Kufleitner [9] for a recent proof). This is a surprising result since SD seems antithetic to SF at first glance. Its definition is based on the operations available in classical regular expressions: union, concatenation and Kleene star. However, these operations are restricted to languages satisfying specific *semantic conditions*. The main restriction concerns the Kleene star, which can only be applied to *prefix codes of bounded synchronization delay* (this is a notion from code theory, which we recall below). Here, we generalize the definition of SD as an operator $\mathcal{C} \mapsto SD(\mathcal{C})$.

We first present preliminary notions from code theory that we shall need for the definition. Then, we define $\mathcal{C} \mapsto SD(\mathcal{C})$ properly and state the correspondence with star-free closure.

4.1 Prefix codes of bounded synchronization delay

The objects introduced in this section are based on a notion taken from code theory: *prefix codes*. We briefly present them here and prove a few basic properties that we shall need. For a detailed presentation of code theory, we refer the reader to the book of Berstel, Perrin and Reutenauer [5].

Prefix codes. A language $K \subseteq A^*$ is a *prefix code* when $\varepsilon \notin K$ (i.e., $K \subseteq A^+$) and $K \cap KA^+ = \emptyset$ (i.e., no word in K admits a strict prefix which is also a word in K).

Example 4.1. *If $A = \{a, b\}$, then the language A is a prefix code. Any singleton language $\{u\}$ with $u \neq \varepsilon$ is also a prefix code. Finally, a^*b is a prefix code as well. On the other hand, $L = \{a, aa\}$ is not a prefix code, since $aa \in L \cap LA^+$.*

We now state the key property of prefix codes, which we verify directly using the definition.

Fact 4.2. *Let K be a prefix code. Consider $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$, $u_1, \dots, u_m \in K$ and $v_1 \cdots v_n \in K$. The two following properties hold:*

- *If $u_1 \cdots u_m$ is a prefix of $v_1 \cdots v_n$, then $m \leq n$ and $u_i = v_i$ for every $i \leq m$.*

- If $u_1 \cdots u_m = v_1 \cdots v_n$, then $m = n$ and $u_i = v_i$ for every $i \leq m$.

PROOF. The second property is an immediate corollary of the first one. Hence, it suffices to show that if $u_1 \cdots u_m$ is a prefix of $v_1 \cdots v_n$, then $m \leq n$ and $u_i = v_i$ for every $i \leq m$. We proceed by induction on $m \in \mathbb{N}$. If $m = 0$, then the property is immediate. Otherwise, $m \geq 1$. Clearly, $u_1 \cdots u_{m-1}$ is a prefix of $v_1 \cdots v_n$. Hence, induction yields that $m - 1 \leq n$ and $u_i = v_i$ for every $i \leq m - 1$. Now, since $u_1 \cdots u_m$ is a prefix of $v_1 \cdots v_n$, it follows that u_m is a prefix of $v_m \cdots v_n$. Since $u_m \in K$ and K is a prefix code, we have $u_m \neq \varepsilon$, which implies that $v_m \cdots v_n \neq \varepsilon$, i.e., $m \leq n$. Moreover, since K is a prefix code and $u_m, v_m \in K$ we know that u_m is *not* a strict prefix of v_m and v_m is *not* a strict prefix of u_m . Together with the hypothesis that u_m is a prefix of $v_m \cdots v_n$, this yields $u_m = v_m$, concluding the proof. \square

The second assertion in Fact 4.2 implies that when K is a prefix code, every word $w \in K^*$ admits a *unique* decomposition witnessing this membership. This property is exactly the definition of a *code*, which is therefore a notion more general than that of prefix code.

Bounded synchronization delay. We turn to a more restrictive notion. Consider an integer $d \geq 1$. We say that a prefix code $K \subseteq A^+$ has *synchronization delay* d when the following property holds:

$$\text{for every } u, v, w \in A^*, \quad uw \in K^+ \text{ and } v \in K^d \quad \Rightarrow \quad uv \in K^+. \quad (2)$$

Furthermore, we say that a prefix code $K \subseteq A^+$ has *bounded synchronization delay* when there exists some $d \geq 1$ such that K has synchronization delay d .

Remark 4.3. *It follows from the definition that if a prefix code has synchronization delay d , then it has also synchronization delay d' for all $d' \geq d$.*

Remark 4.4. *If K is a prefix code with synchronization delay d , then whenever u, v, w are words such that $uw \in K^+$ and $v \in K^d$, we have $w \in K^*$. Indeed, Condition (2) states that $uv \in K^+$. This means that there exist words $u_1, \dots, u_n, v_1, \dots, v_m$ in K such that $uw = u_1 \cdots u_n$ and $uv = v_1 \cdots v_m$. From Fact 4.2, we deduce that $m \leq n$ and $w = u_{m+1} \cdots u_n$, which belongs to K^* . This explains the terminology: any infix v in K^d of a word $uw \in K^+$ determines a decomposition $uv \cdot w$ of uw whose factors (uv and w) both belong to K^* .*

Example 4.5. Assume that $A = \{a, b\}$.

- Clearly, for any $B \subseteq A$, the language B is a prefix code of synchronization delay 1.
- It is also immediate that any language $L \subseteq a^*b$ is a prefix code of synchronization delay 1. Indeed, if $uw \in L^*$ and $v \in L$, then v ends with a “b”, whence $uv \in L^*$.
- Similarly, one may verify that $(aab)^*ab$ is a prefix code of synchronization delay 2 (this follows from Fact 4.7 below applied to $K = \{ab, abb\}$ and $H = \{ab\}$, where K is a prefix code of synchronization delay 1). However, it does not have synchronization delay 1. Indeed, consider the decomposition $aabab = a \cdot ab \cdot ab$. We have $aabab, ab \in ((aab)^*(ab))^1$ but $aab \notin ((aab)^*ab)^+$.
- Finally, $\{aa\}$ (which is a prefix code) does not have bounded synchronization delay. Indeed, given $d \geq 1$, we have $a(aa)^d a \in (aa)^+$ and $(aa)^d \in \{aa\}^d$ but $a(aa)^d \notin (aa)^*$.

We complete the definition with two properties of prefix codes of bounded synchronization delay. First, we show that every language included in a such a code retains the property to be a prefix code of bounded synchronization delay.

Fact 4.6. *Let $d \geq 1$ and let $K \subseteq A^+$ be a prefix code with synchronization delay d . Then, every language $H \subseteq K$ is also a prefix code with synchronization delay d .*

PROOF. It is immediate from the definitions that H is itself a prefix code. It remains to prove that H has synchronization delay d . Consider $u, v, w \in A^*$ such that $uvw \in H^+$ and $v \in H^d$. We show that $uv \in H^+$. Since $H \subseteq K$, we have $uvw \in K^+$ and $v \in K^d$. Since K has synchronization delay d , we obtain $uv \in K^+$. Moreover, since K is a prefix code and $uvw \in K^+$, it follows from the second property in Fact 4.2 that uvw admits a unique decomposition into factors of K . Additionally, since $uvw \in H^+$ with $H \subseteq K$, all factors in this unique decomposition belong to H . Finally, since $uv \in K^+$, the first property in Fact 4.2 yields that uv is a concatenation of factors in this unique decomposition. Hence, we have $uv \in H^+$, which concludes the proof. \square

Let us now present a construction to build a new prefix code of bounded synchronization delay from another one.

Fact 4.7. *Let $d \geq 1$ and let $K \subseteq A^+$ be a prefix code with synchronization delay d . Let $H \subseteq K$. Then, the language $(K \setminus H)^*H$ is a prefix code with synchronization delay $d + 1$.*

PROOF. We first verify that $(K \setminus H)^*H$ is a prefix code. Clearly, $(K \setminus H)^*H \subseteq A^+$ since $H \subseteq K \subseteq A^+$. Hence, we have to show that $(K \setminus H)^*H \cap (K \setminus H)^*HA^+ = \emptyset$. Assume by contradiction that there exists $w \in (K \setminus H)^*H \cap (K \setminus H)^*HA^+$. In particular, we have $w \in (K \setminus H)^*H \subseteq K^*$. Since K is a prefix code, w admits a *unique* decomposition $w = w_1 \cdots w_n$ with $w_1, \dots, w_n \in K$. Since $w \in (K \setminus H)^*H$, the factor w_n is the only one to be in H among all the w_i 's. However, since $w \in (K \setminus H)^*HA^+$, the first property in Fact 4.2 implies that one of the factors w_i for $i \leq n - 1$ must belong to H . This is a contradiction. Therefore, $(K \setminus H)^*H$ is a prefix code.

It remains to show that $(K \setminus H)^*H$ has synchronization delay $d + 1$. Let $u, v, w \in A^*$ such that $uvw \in ((K \setminus H)^*H)^+$ and $v \in ((K \setminus H)^*H)^{d+1}$. We prove that $uv \in ((K \setminus H)^*H)^+$. Clearly $v = xy$ with $x \in ((K \setminus H)^*H)^d$ and $y \in (K \setminus H)^*H$. Observe that $x \in K^n$ for some $n \geq d$. Hence, since $uxyw = uvw \in K^+$ and K has synchronization delay d , it follows that $ux \in K^+$. Consequently $uv = uxy \in K^+(K \setminus H)^*H$, whence $uv \in K^*H \subseteq ((K \setminus H)^*H)^+$. This concludes the proof. \square

4.2 Definition

We now define the operator $\mathcal{C} \mapsto SD(\mathcal{C})$. The definition involves two additional notions. First, we consider *disjoint union*. Two languages $K, L \subseteq A^*$ are *disjoint* if $K \cap L = \emptyset$. In this case, we write $K \uplus L$ for $K \cup L$ in order to emphasize disjointedness. Additionally, we consider *unambiguous concatenation*. Given two languages $K, L \subseteq A^*$, their concatenation KL is *unambiguous* when every word $w \in KL$ admits a *unique* decomposition witnessing this membership: if $u, u' \in K$, $v, v' \in L$ and $uv = u'v'$, then $u = u'$ and $v = v'$.

Let \mathcal{C} be some class of languages. We write $SD(\mathcal{C})$ for the least class containing \emptyset and $\{a\}$ for every $a \in A$, and which is closed under the following properties:

- **Intersection with \mathcal{C} :** if $K \in SD(\mathcal{C})$ and $L \in \mathcal{C}$, then $K \cap L \in SD(\mathcal{C})$.
- **Disjoint union:** if $K, L \in SD(\mathcal{C})$ are disjoint then $K \uplus L \in SD(\mathcal{C})$.
- **Unambiguous concatenation:** if $K, L \in SD(\mathcal{C})$ and KL is unambiguous, then $KL \in SD(\mathcal{C})$.
- **Kleene star for prefix codes of bounded synchronization delay:** if $K \in SD(\mathcal{C})$ is a prefix code of bounded synchronization delay, then $K^* \in SD(\mathcal{C})$.

An important special case is when the input class \mathcal{C} is the trivial prevariety $ST = \{\emptyset, A^*\}$. In this case, $SD(ST)$ is the original class SD of Schützenberger [41]. His definition is slightly different, as it does not require unions to be disjoint, nor concatenations to be unambiguous. Yet, the two definitions are equivalent.

Example 4.8. *Let us present two examples. Let $A = \{a, b\}$.*

- We have $(ab)^* \in SD(ST)$. Indeed, $\{a\}, \{b\} \in SD(ST)$ which implies that $\{ab\} \in SD(ST)$ by closure under unambiguous concatenation. Since $\{ab\}$ is a prefix code of bounded synchronization delay (the delay is 1), we get $(ab)^* \in SD(ST)$.
- We have $(aa + bb)^* \in SD(MOD)$ (on the other hand, $(aa + bb)^* \notin SD(ST)$, which can be verified using Theorem 5.11). Clearly, $\{a\}$ and $\{b\}$ are prefix codes of bounded synchronization delay. Hence, $a^*, b^* \in SD(MOD)$. Moreover, since $(AA)^* \in MOD$, we get $(aa)^*, (bb)^* \in SD(MOD)$ by closure under intersection with MOD. We then use unambiguous concatenation to get $(aa)^+(bb)^+ = aa(aa)^*bb(bb)^* \in SD(MOD)$. This is a prefix code of bounded synchronization delay. Hence, $((aa)^+(bb)^+)^* \in SD(MOD)$. Using unambiguous concatenation again, this yields $(bb)^*((aa)^+(bb)^+)^*(aa)^* \in SD(MOD)$. One may now verify that $(aa + bb)^* = (bb)^*((aa)^+(bb)^+)^*(aa)^* \in SD(MOD)$.

Remark 4.9. We do not explicitly require in the definition that $SD(\mathcal{C})$ contains \mathcal{C} . Yet, this is a simple consequence of the definition. Clearly, $A^* \in SD(\mathcal{C})$ since $A \in SD(\mathcal{C})$ is a prefix code of bounded synchronization delay. Hence, $L = A^* \cap L \in SD(\mathcal{C})$ for every $L \in \mathcal{C}$.

On the other hand, it is crucial to allow intersection with languages in \mathcal{C} . If we only require the inclusion $\mathcal{C} \subseteq SD(\mathcal{C})$ in the definition, we would end up with a weaker operator (which, therefore, does not correspond to star-free closure in general). For example, consider the class MOD of modulo languages. Assume that $A = \{a, b\}$. As observed in Example 4.8, $(aa)^* \in SD(MOD)$. On the other hand, one may verify that $(aa)^*$ cannot be built from the languages of MOD using only union, concatenation and Kleene star for prefix codes of bounded synchronization delay.

It is not immediate that the classes $SD(\mathcal{C})$ have robust closure properties, even when this is the case for the input class \mathcal{C} . Actually, it is not even clear whether $SD(\mathcal{C})$ is a lattice, since closure under intersection is not required in the definition, and closure under union is restricted. However, $SD(\mathcal{C})$ does have robust properties: if \mathcal{C} is a prevariety, then $SD(\mathcal{C})$ is a prevariety closed under concatenation. This follows from Proposition 3.2 and the following theorem, which states the correspondence with star-free closure.

Theorem 4.10. Let \mathcal{C} be a prevariety. Then, $SD(\mathcal{C}) = SF(\mathcal{C})$.

The difficult direction in Theorem 4.10 is the inclusion $SF(\mathcal{C}) \subseteq SD(\mathcal{C})$. We rely on an indirect approach based on the generic algebraic characterization of star-free closure, which we use as an intermediary result to prove this implication. In fact, the proof of the difficult inclusion is intertwined with the one of the characterization itself. Hence, we postpone it to the next section. On the other hand, we prove the easier inclusion $SD(\mathcal{C}) \subseteq SF(\mathcal{C})$ now.

INCLUSION $SD(\mathcal{C}) \subseteq SF(\mathcal{C})$ IN THEOREM 4.10. We fix a prevariety \mathcal{C} and prove the inclusion $SD(\mathcal{C}) \subseteq SF(\mathcal{C})$. This amounts to proving that $SF(\mathcal{C})$ satisfies all properties in the definition of $SD(\mathcal{C})$. In all cases but one, this is immediate by definition of $SF(\mathcal{C})$. Indeed, we have $\emptyset \in SF(\mathcal{C})$ and $\{a\} \in SF(\mathcal{C})$ for every $a \in A$. Moreover, $SF(\mathcal{C})$ is closed under union, intersection and concatenation by definition (this includes intersection with languages of \mathcal{C} since $\mathcal{C} \subseteq SF(\mathcal{C})$). It remains to show that $SF(\mathcal{C})$ is closed under Kleene star applied to a prefix code of bounded synchronization delay.

We let $K \in SF(\mathcal{C})$ be such a prefix code, and we let $d \geq 1$ be its synchronization delay. We have to show that $K^* \in SF(\mathcal{C})$. Consider the following languages:

$$H = \left(A^* K^d \cap \left(A^* \setminus \left(A^* K^{d+1} \cup \bigcup_{0 \leq h \leq d} K^h \right) \right) \right) A^*.$$

$$G = \left(\bigcup_{0 \leq h \leq d-1} K^h \right) \cup \left(A^* K^d \cap (A^* \setminus H) \right).$$

Clearly, $H \in SF(\mathcal{C})$ since both K and A^* belong to $SF(\mathcal{C})$, which is closed under Boolean operations and concatenation. Therefore $G \in SF(\mathcal{C})$ as well. We show that $K^* = G$, which will entail that $K^* \in SF(\mathcal{C})$, concluding the proof of $SD(\mathcal{C}) \subseteq SF(\mathcal{C})$ in Theorem 4.10.

We first show that $K^* \cap H = \emptyset$. Note that this is the only part of the proof where we use the hypothesis that K has synchronization delay d .

Fact 4.11. *We have $K^* \subseteq A^* \setminus H$.*

PROOF. We have to show that $K^* \cap H = \emptyset$. Since $K^* \subseteq A^*K^{d+1} \cup \bigcup_{0 \leq h \leq d} K^h$, we have,

$$A^* \setminus (A^*K^{d+1} \cup \bigcup_{0 \leq h \leq d} K^h) \subseteq A^* \setminus K^*.$$

By definition of H , this yields $H \subseteq (A^*K^d \cap (A^* \setminus K^*))A^*$. Therefore, it suffices to show that $K^* \cap (A^*K^d \cap (A^* \setminus K^*))A^* = \emptyset$, which follows immediately from the hypothesis that K has synchronization delay d . \square

It remains to show that $K^* = G$. We start with the left to right inclusion. Recall that $G = (\bigcup_{0 \leq h \leq d-1} K^h) \cup (A^*K^d \cap (A^* \setminus H))$. Consider $x \in K^*$. If $x \in K^h$ for $h \leq d-1$, it is immediate that $x \in G$. Otherwise, we have $x \in A^*K^d$ and since $x \in K^*$, we know that $x \in A^* \setminus H$ by Fact 4.11. This implies that $x \in A^*K^d \cap (A^* \setminus H) \subseteq G$, finishing the proof for this inclusion.

For the right to left inclusion, consider $x \in G$. We show that $x \in K^*$. If $x \in \bigcup_{0 \leq h \leq d-1} K^h$, this is immediate. Otherwise, $x \in A^*K^d \cap (A^* \setminus H)$. We proceed by induction on the length of x . By hypothesis, $x \in A^*K^d$ and $x \notin H$. By definition of H , this implies that,

$$x \in A^*K^{d+1} \cup \bigcup_{0 \leq h \leq d} K^h.$$

If $x \in \bigcup_{0 \leq h \leq d} K^h$, it is immediate that $x \in K^*$, which finishes the proof. Otherwise, $x \in A^*K^{d+1}$ which means that $x = x'y$ with $x' \in A^*K^d$ and $y \in K$. Since $\varepsilon \notin K$ (as K is a prefix code), we have $y \neq \varepsilon$ which implies that $|x'| < |x|$. Moreover, since $x \in A^* \setminus H$ and x' is a prefix of x , one may verify from the definition of H that $x' \in A^* \setminus H$ as well. Altogether, we have $x' \in A^*K^d \cap (A^* \setminus H)$ and $|x'| < |x|$. Therefore by induction, $x' \in K^*$. Finally, since $y \in K$, we get $x = x'y \in K^*K \subseteq K^*$, which concludes the proof. \square

Remark 4.12. *In the above proof, we used Fact 4.11 only to establish that $K^* \subseteq G$. This inclusion relies on the assumption that K has bounded synchronization delay (clearly, relying on this hypothesis to show that K^* belongs to $SF(\mathcal{C})$ is mandatory). On the other hand, the inclusion $G \subseteq K^*$ is independent from this hypothesis.*

5 ALGEBRAIC CHARACTERIZATION

We present a generic algebraic characterization of the classes $SF(\mathcal{C})$ built with star-free closure from a prevariety \mathcal{C} . It yields an effective reduction from $SF(\mathcal{C})$ -membership to \mathcal{C} -separation (here, we mean reduction in the Turing sense: we get a generic algorithm for $SF(\mathcal{C})$ -membership that uses an oracle for \mathcal{C} -separation). Moreover, we use this characterization to prove the missing inclusion $SF(\mathcal{C}) \subseteq SD(\mathcal{C})$ in Theorem 4.10.

We characterize the languages in $SF(\mathcal{C})$ by a property of their syntactic morphisms. It generalizes Schützenberger's characterization of star-free languages as those whose syntactic monoid is *a*periodic [40]. First, with every class \mathcal{C} and every morphism $\alpha : A^* \rightarrow M$, we associate a relation on M : the *\mathcal{C} -pair relation for α* (it was defined in [32]). Then, we use this relation to identify special subsets of M , which happen to be monoids when \mathcal{C} is a prevariety: *the \mathcal{C} -orbits of α* . Finally, the

characterization states that for every prevariety \mathcal{C} , a language belongs to $SF(\mathcal{C})$ if and only if all \mathcal{C} -orbits of its syntactic morphism are aperiodic monoids. Let us now define \mathcal{C} -pairs.

5.1 \mathcal{C} -Pairs

Consider a class \mathcal{C} and a morphism $\alpha : A^* \rightarrow M$ into a finite monoid. We define the \mathcal{C} -pair relation for α on M as follows. Let $(s, t) \in M^2$. We say that,

$$(s, t) \text{ is a } \mathcal{C}\text{-pair (for } \alpha) \text{ if and only if } \alpha^{-1}(s) \text{ is not } \mathcal{C}\text{-separable from } \alpha^{-1}(t). \quad (3)$$

Remark 5.1. *While we often make this implicit, being a \mathcal{C} -pair depends on α .*

By definition, the set of \mathcal{C} -pairs for α is finite: it is a subset of M^2 . Moreover, having a \mathcal{C} -separation algorithm in hand is clearly enough to compute all \mathcal{C} -pairs associated to an input morphism α . We complete the definition with some properties of \mathcal{C} -pairs. A simple and useful one is that the \mathcal{C} -pair relation is reflexive when the morphism α is surjective (which is always the case in practice). Moreover, it is symmetric when \mathcal{C} is closed under complement (this is the case for all classes considered in the paper). On the other hand, the \mathcal{C} -pair relation is *not* transitive in general, as the following example shows.

Example 5.2. *Let $A = \{a, b\}$ and $\mathcal{C} = AT$ be the least Boolean algebra containing A^*aA^* and A^*bA^* . Let M be the monoid $\{1, a, b, 0\}$ where 1 acts as an identity element, 0 as an absorbing element, and the rest of the multiplication is given by $aa = ab = ba = bb = 0$. Let $\alpha : A^* \rightarrow M$ be the morphism defined by $\alpha(a) = a$ and $\alpha(b) = b$. We have $\alpha^{-1}(a) = \{a\}$. Therefore, one may verify that any language of AT containing $\alpha^{-1}(a)$ also contains a^+ , and therefore intersects $\alpha^{-1}(0)$ (which is the set of words of length at least 2). Hence, $(a, 0)$ is an AT -pair. Likewise, $(0, b)$ is an AT -pair. However, (a, b) is not an AT -pair, since the language $a^+ \in AT$ separates $\alpha^{-1}(a) = \{a\}$ from $\alpha^{-1}(b) = \{b\}$. This example shows that the \mathcal{C} -pair relation is not transitive in general.*

We now provide a useful characterization of \mathcal{C} -pairs via \mathcal{C} -morphisms in the special case when \mathcal{C} is a prevariety, which, again, is the only case that we consider here.

Lemma 5.3. *Let \mathcal{C} be a prevariety and let $\alpha : A^* \rightarrow M$ be a morphism into a finite monoid. The two following properties hold:*

- (1) *For every \mathcal{C} -morphism $\eta : A^* \rightarrow N$ and every \mathcal{C} -pair $(s, t) \in M^2$ for α , there exist $u, v \in A^*$ such that $\eta(u) = \eta(v)$, $\alpha(u) = s$ and $\alpha(v) = t$.*
- (2) *There exists a \mathcal{C} -morphism $\eta : A^* \rightarrow N$ such that for all $u, v \in A^*$, if $\eta(u) = \eta(v)$, then $(\alpha(u), \alpha(v))$ is a \mathcal{C} -pair for α .*

PROOF. Let us start with the first assertion. Let $\eta : A^* \rightarrow N$ be a \mathcal{C} -morphism and let $(s, t) \in M^2$ be a \mathcal{C} -pair for α . Let $F = \eta(\alpha^{-1}(s)) \subseteq N$. We have $\eta^{-1}(F) \in \mathcal{C}$ since η is a \mathcal{C} -morphism. Moreover, it is immediate from the definition of F that $\alpha^{-1}(s) \subseteq \eta^{-1}(F)$. Since (s, t) is a \mathcal{C} -pair (meaning that $\alpha^{-1}(s)$ cannot be separated from $\alpha^{-1}(t)$ by a language in \mathcal{C}), it follows that $\eta^{-1}(F) \cap \alpha^{-1}(t) \neq \emptyset$. This yields $v \in A^*$ such that $\eta(v) \in F$ and $\alpha(v) = t$. Finally, since $\eta(v) \in F = \eta(\alpha^{-1}(s))$, we get $u \in A^*$ such that $\eta(u) = \eta(v)$ and $\alpha(u) = s$. This concludes the proof of the first assertion.

Let us turn to the second assertion. Let $P \subseteq M^2$ be the set of all pairs $(s, t) \in M^2$ which are *not* \mathcal{C} -pairs. For every $(s, t) \in P$, there exists $K_{s,t} \in \mathcal{C}$ separating $\alpha^{-1}(s)$ from $\alpha^{-1}(t)$. Proposition 2.4 yields a \mathcal{C} -morphism $\eta : A^* \rightarrow N$ such that every language $K_{s,t}$ for $(s, t) \in P$ is recognized by η . It remains to prove that for every $u, v \in A^*$, if $\eta(u) = \eta(v)$, then $(\alpha(u), \alpha(v))$ is a \mathcal{C} -pair. We prove the contrapositive. Assuming that $(\alpha(u), \alpha(v))$ is a *not* a \mathcal{C} -pair, we show that $\eta(u) \neq \eta(v)$. By hypothesis, $(\alpha(u), \alpha(v)) \in P$, which means that $K_{\alpha(u), \alpha(v)} \in \mathcal{C}$ is defined and separates $\alpha^{-1}(\alpha(u))$ from $\alpha^{-1}(\alpha(v))$. In particular, $u \in K_{\alpha(u), \alpha(v)}$ and $v \notin K_{\alpha(u), \alpha(v)}$. Since $K_{\alpha(u), \alpha(v)}$ is recognized by η , this implies that $\eta(u) \neq \eta(v)$. \square

Finally, we prove that when \mathcal{C} is a prevariety of regular languages, the \mathcal{C} -pair relation is compatible with multiplication.

Lemma 5.4. *Let \mathcal{C} be a prevariety and let $\alpha : A^* \rightarrow M$ be a morphism into a finite monoid. If $(s_1, t_1), (s_2, t_2) \in M^2$ are \mathcal{C} -pairs, then (s_1s_2, t_1t_2) is a \mathcal{C} -pair as well.*

PROOF. Item 2 of Lemma 5.3 yields a \mathcal{C} -morphism $\eta : A^* \rightarrow N$ such that for all $u, v \in A^*$, if $\eta(u) = \eta(v)$, then $(\alpha(u), \alpha(v))$ is a \mathcal{C} -pair. Let $(s_1, t_1), (s_2, t_2) \in M^2$ be \mathcal{C} -pairs. Since η is a \mathcal{C} -morphism, it follows from Item 1 of Lemma 5.3 that there exist $u_i, v_i \in A^*$ for $i = 1, 2$ such that $\eta(u_i) = \eta(v_i)$, $\alpha(u_i) = s_i$ and $\alpha(v_i) = t_i$. This yields $\eta(u_1u_2) = \eta(v_1v_2)$, $\alpha(u_1u_2) = s_1s_2$ and $\alpha(v_1v_2) = t_1t_2$. Hence, (s_1s_2, t_1t_2) is a \mathcal{C} -pair by definition of η . \square

5.2 \mathcal{C} -orbits and \mathcal{C} -kernels

Consider a class \mathcal{C} and a morphism $\alpha : A^* \rightarrow M$ into a finite monoid. For every idempotent $e \in E(M)$ we define the \mathcal{C} -orbit of e (for α) as the set consisting of all elements $ese \in M$ such that $(e, s) \in M^2$ is a \mathcal{C} -pair (for α). More generally, the \mathcal{C} -orbits for α are all the subsets of M which are the \mathcal{C} -orbit of some idempotent $e \in E(M)$. When \mathcal{C} is a prevariety, we have the following simple corollary of Lemma 5.4.

Lemma 5.5. *Let \mathcal{C} be a prevariety and let $\alpha : A^* \rightarrow M$ be a surjective morphism into a finite monoid. For every $e \in E(M)$, the \mathcal{C} -orbit of e for α is a subsemigroup of M . Moreover, it is a monoid whose neutral element is e .*

PROOF. We write $N_e \subseteq M$ for the \mathcal{C} -orbit of e . Observe that N_e is nonempty: $e = eee \in N_e$ since (e, e) is a \mathcal{C} -pair (note that here, we need the hypothesis that α is surjective, as it implies that $\alpha^{-1}(e) \neq \emptyset$). Moreover, since e is idempotent, it is clear that for every $q \in N_e$, we have $eq = qe = q$ since $q = ese$ for some $s \in M$. It remains to prove that N_e is a subsemigroup of M . Let $q, r \in N_e$. We show that $qr \in N_e$. By definition, we get $s, t \in M$ such that (e, s) and (e, t) are \mathcal{C} -pairs, $q = ese$ and $r = ete$. Since (e, e) is also a \mathcal{C} -pair and \mathcal{C} is a prevariety, Lemma 5.4 implies that (e, set) is a \mathcal{C} -pair. Hence, we have $qr = eseete = esete \in N_e$, as desired. \square

By definition, the \mathcal{C} -pairs associated to a morphism $\alpha : A^* \rightarrow M$ can be computed provided that \mathcal{C} -separation is decidable. Therefore, it is immediate that for each $e \in E(M)$, the \mathcal{C} -orbit of e can be computed as well in this case.

Lemma 5.6. *Let \mathcal{C} be a class of languages with decidable separation. Then, given as input a morphism $\alpha : A^* \rightarrow M$ into a finite monoid and an idempotent $e \in E(M)$, one can compute the \mathcal{C} -orbit of e for α .*

We complete the definition of \mathcal{C} -orbits by connecting it with another notion tailored to classes that are *group prevarieties* [31]. Given a class \mathcal{G} , we associate with any morphism $\alpha : A^* \rightarrow M$ (where M is a finite monoid) a subset of M . We call this subset of M the \mathcal{G} -kernel of α . It consists of all elements $s \in M$ such that $\{s\}$ is not \mathcal{G} -separable from $\alpha^{-1}(s)$.

Remark 5.7. *While the definition makes sense for an arbitrary class \mathcal{G} , it is meant to be used in the special case when \mathcal{G} is a group prevariety.*

Remark 5.8. *When \mathcal{G} is the class MOD of modulo languages, it can be shown that the MOD-kernel of a morphism corresponds to a standard notion: the stable monoid, defined in [45]. Given a morphism $\alpha : A^* \rightarrow M$ into a finite monoid, it can be verified that there exists a number $d \geq 1$ such that $\alpha(A^{2d}) = \alpha(A^d)$. The least such number $d \geq 1$ is called the stability index of α . The stable monoid of α is $N = \{1_M\} \cup \alpha(A^d)$. One may verify that N is the MOD-kernel of α (this follows from a simple analysis of MOD-separation).*

Clearly, having a \mathcal{G} -separation algorithm in hand suffices to compute the \mathcal{G} -kernel of an input morphism α . This yields the following lemma.

Lemma 5.9. *Let \mathcal{G} be a class with decidable separation. Given as input a morphism $\alpha : A^* \rightarrow M$ into a finite monoid, one may compute the \mathcal{G} -kernel of α .*

We now characterize \mathcal{G} -kernels in terms of \mathcal{G} -orbits when \mathcal{G} is a group prevariety.

Lemma 5.10. *Let \mathcal{G} be a group prevariety and let $\alpha : A^* \rightarrow M$ be a surjective morphism into a finite monoid. Let N be the \mathcal{G} -kernel of α . The two following properties hold:*

- *Every \mathcal{G} -orbit for α is a subset of N .*
- *N is exactly the \mathcal{G} -orbit of 1_M for α .*

PROOF. First, let $e \in E(M)$ and let N_e be the \mathcal{G} -orbit of e . We prove that $N_e \subseteq N$. Let $q \in N_e$. This yields $s \in M$ such that (e, s) is a \mathcal{G} -pair and $q = ese$. By contradiction, assume that $q \notin N$. By definition, we get a language $K \in \mathcal{G}$ separating $\{e\}$ from $\alpha^{-1}(q)$. That is, $e \in K$ and $K \cap \alpha^{-1}(q) = \emptyset$. We exhibit an element $x \in K \cap \alpha^{-1}(q)$, yielding a contradiction. Since $K \in \mathcal{G}$, Proposition 2.4 yields a \mathcal{G} -morphism $\eta : A^* \rightarrow G$ recognizing K . Moreover, Lemma 3.5 implies that G is a group since \mathcal{G} is a group prevariety. Since (e, s) is a \mathcal{G} -pair, Lemma 5.3 yields $u, v \in A^*$ such that $\eta(u) = \eta(v)$, $\alpha(u) = e$ and $\alpha(v) = s$. Let $k = \omega(G)$ and $x = u^k v u^{k-1}$. Since $\eta(u) = \eta(v)$ and G is a group, we have $\eta(x) = (\eta(u))^k = 1_G = \eta(e)$. Hence, since $e \in K$ and K is recognized by η , we have $x \in K$. This a contradiction since $\alpha(x) = e^k s e^{k-1} = ese = q$ and $K \cap \alpha^{-1}(q) = \emptyset$ by hypothesis.

It remains to prove that N is exactly the \mathcal{G} -orbit of 1_M for α . Since we already proved that the latter is included in the former, it suffices to show that every $s \in N$ belongs to the \mathcal{G} -orbit of 1_M . Since $s \in N$, we know that $\{e\}$ is not \mathcal{G} -separable from $\alpha^{-1}(s)$. Since $e \in \alpha^{-1}(1_M)$, it follows that $\alpha^{-1}(1_M)$ is not \mathcal{G} -separable from $\alpha^{-1}(s)$, i.e., $(1_M, s)$ is a \mathcal{G} -pair. Hence, $s = 1_M s 1_M$ belongs to the \mathcal{G} -orbit of 1_M , as desired. \square

5.3 Characterization

Let us first recall the definition of aperiodic monoids. We use an equational definition, specific to finite monoids. We say that a finite monoid M is *aperiodic* when every $s \in M$ satisfies $s^{\omega+1} = s^\omega$. We are ready to state the generic characterization of $SF(\mathcal{C})$. In fact, the statement also mentions the correspondence with $SD(\mathcal{C})$. This is important because we still have to prove the inclusion $SF(\mathcal{C}) \subseteq SD(\mathcal{C})$, and the argument is intertwined with the proof of the algebraic characterization.

Theorem 5.11. *Let \mathcal{C} be a prevariety and consider a regular language $L \subseteq A^*$. The following properties are equivalent:*

- (1) $L \in SF(\mathcal{C})$.
- (2) $L \in SD(\mathcal{C})$.
- (3) All \mathcal{C} -orbits for the syntactic morphism of L are aperiodic monoids.

Before we prove Theorem 5.11, let us discuss its consequences. First, it yields a transfer result concerning the decidability of $SF(\mathcal{C})$ -membership. It follows from Lemma 5.6 that the \mathcal{C} -orbits associated to a morphism into a finite monoid can be computed as soon as \mathcal{C} -separation is decidable. Hence, we obtain an algorithm for $SF(\mathcal{C})$ -membership in this case. Given an input language L , one first computes its syntactic morphism $\alpha : A^* \rightarrow M$. Then, one computes all elements $s \in M$ belonging to a \mathcal{C} -orbit for α (this is possible since \mathcal{C} -separation is decidable). Finally, it follows from Theorem 5.11 and the definition of aperiodicity that $L \in SF(\mathcal{C})$ if and only if every such element $s \in M$ satisfies $s^{\omega+1} = s^\omega$.

Corollary 5.12. *Let \mathcal{C} be a prevariety with decidable separation. Then, $SF(\mathcal{C})$ -membership is decidable.*

Theorem 5.11 can be simplified in the special case of classes $SF(\mathcal{G})$ where \mathcal{G} is a group prevariety. In this case, it is possible to characterize the languages in $SF(\mathcal{G})$ using only the \mathcal{G} -kernel of their syntactic morphisms. Indeed, we have the following statement as an immediate corollary of Theorem 5.11, Lemma 5.10 and the definition of aperiodic monoids.

Corollary 5.13. *Let \mathcal{G} be a group prevariety and consider a regular language L . The following properties are equivalent:*

- (1) $L \in SF(\mathcal{G})$.
- (2) $L \in SD(\mathcal{G})$.
- (3) *The \mathcal{G} -kernel of the syntactic morphism of L is an aperiodic monoid.*

Remark 5.14. *Schützenberger’s original characterization [40] of the class SF of star-free languages is an immediate consequence of Corollary 5.13. Indeed, consider a regular language L and let $\alpha : A^* \rightarrow M$ be its syntactic morphism. Since $SF = SF(ST)$, it follows from Corollary 5.13 that $L \in SF$ if and only if the ST -kernel of α is aperiodic. Moreover, since $ST = \{\emptyset, A^*\}$ and syntactic morphisms are surjective, it is immediate that the ST -kernel of α is the whole syntactic monoid M . Hence, $L \in SF$ if and only if its syntactic monoid M is aperiodic. This is exactly Schützenberger’s theorem.*

PROOF OF THEOREM 5.11. We fix a prevariety \mathcal{C} for the proof. Moreover, we let $L \subseteq A^*$ be a regular language and $\alpha : A^* \rightarrow M$ be its syntactic morphism. We already proved that (2) \Rightarrow (1) in Theorem 4.10. Hence, it suffices to prove that (1) \Rightarrow (3) and (3) \Rightarrow (2). The latter implication corresponds of the inclusion $SF(\mathcal{C}) \subseteq SD(\mathcal{C})$, which we omitted in the proof of Theorem 4.10.

Implication (1) \Rightarrow (3). Assume that $L \in SF(\mathcal{C})$. For every idempotent $e \in E(M)$, we prove that the \mathcal{C} -orbit of e for α is aperiodic. By definition, this boils down to proving that for all $s \in M$ such that $(e, s) \in M^2$ is a \mathcal{C} -pair for α , we have $(ese)^{\omega+1} = (ese)^\omega$. The argument is based on Proposition 3.3. By hypothesis on \mathcal{C} , it follows from Proposition 3.2 that $SF(\mathcal{C})$ is a prevariety. Hence, since $L \in SF(\mathcal{C})$, Proposition 2.3 implies that its syntactic morphism α is an $SF(\mathcal{C})$ -morphism. Consequently, Proposition 3.3 yields a \mathcal{C} -morphism $\eta : A^* \rightarrow N$ such that for every $u \in A^*$, if $\eta(u)$ is idempotent, then we have $(\alpha(u))^{\omega+1} = (\alpha(u))^\omega$.

Since η is a \mathcal{C} -morphism and (e, s) is a \mathcal{C} -pair for α , Lemma 5.3 yields $u, v \in A^*$ such that $\eta(u) = \eta(v)$, $\alpha(u) = e$ and $\alpha(v) = s$. Let $k = \omega(N)$. Clearly, $\eta(u^{k-1}vu^k) = \eta(u^k)$ is an idempotent of N . Hence, it follows from the definition of η that $(\alpha(u^{k-1}vu^k))^{\omega+1} = (\alpha(u^{k-1}vu^k))^\omega$. Finally, since $\alpha(u) = e$ and $\alpha(v) = s$, this exactly says that $(ese)^{\omega+1} = (ese)^\omega$, as desired.

Implication (3) \Rightarrow (2). We assume that all \mathcal{C} -orbits for α are aperiodic monoids and prove that $L \in SD(\mathcal{C})$. We first present a preliminary definition. Given a language $K \subseteq A^*$ and an element $s \in M$, we say that K is s -safe when $s\alpha(u) = s\alpha(v)$ for every $u, v \in K$. Additionally, given a language $P \subseteq A^*$, an $SD(\mathcal{C})$ -partition of P is a finite partition of P into languages which all belong to $SD(\mathcal{C})$. The argument is based on the following lemma.

Lemma 5.15. *Let $P \subseteq A^+$ be a prefix code with bounded synchronization delay such that there exists an $SD(\mathcal{C})$ -partition \mathbf{H} of P whose elements are all 1_M -safe. Then, for every $s \in M$, there exists an $SD(\mathcal{C})$ -partition \mathbf{K} of P^* whose elements are all s -safe.*

We first apply Lemma 5.15 to show that every language recognized by α (such as L) belongs to $SD(\mathcal{C})$ and conclude the main argument. By definition, $SD(\mathcal{C})$ is closed under disjoint union. Hence, it suffices to show that $\alpha^{-1}(t) \in SD(\mathcal{C})$ for every $t \in M$. We fix such an element $t \in M$.

Note that $A \subseteq A^+$ is a prefix code with bounded synchronization delay. Moreover, the set $\mathbf{H} = \{\{a\} \mid a \in A\}$ is an $SD(\mathcal{C})$ -partition of A such that every $H \in \mathbf{H}$ is 1_M -safe. Hence, we may apply Lemma 5.15 in the case when $P = A$ and $s = 1_M$. We get an $SD(\mathcal{C})$ -partition \mathbf{K} of A^* such that

every $K \in \mathbf{K}$ is 1_M -safe. Being 1_M -safe means that $\alpha(K)$ is a singleton for every $K \in \mathbf{K}$. Therefore, $\alpha^{-1}(t)$ is the disjoint union of all $K \in \mathbf{K}$ intersecting $\alpha^{-1}(t)$. Since $SD(\mathcal{C})$ is closed under disjoint union, we obtain that $\alpha^{-1}(t) \in SD(\mathcal{C})$, which concludes the main argument.

It remains to prove Lemma 5.15. Let $P \subseteq A^*$ be a prefix code with bounded synchronization delay and consider an $SD(\mathcal{C})$ -partition \mathbf{H} of P such that every $H \in \mathbf{H}$ is 1_M -safe. Moreover, fix $s \in M$. We need to build an $SD(\mathcal{C})$ -partition \mathbf{K} of P^* such that every $K \in \mathbf{K}$ is s -safe. We proceed by induction on the three following parameters listed by order of importance:

- (1) The size of $\alpha(P^+) \subseteq M$.
- (2) The size of \mathbf{H} .
- (3) The size of $s \cdot \alpha(P^*) \subseteq M$.

We distinguish two cases depending on whether the following property of s and \mathbf{H} holds. We say that s is \mathbf{H} -stable when:

$$\text{for every } H \in \mathbf{H}, \quad s \cdot \alpha(P^*) = s \cdot \alpha(P^*H). \quad (4)$$

The base case happens when s is \mathbf{H} -stable: we conclude directly without using induction. Otherwise, we use induction on our three parameters.

Base case: s is \mathbf{H} -stable. This is the only part of the proof where we need the hypothesis that all \mathcal{C} -orbits for α are aperiodic monoids. Lemma 5.3 yields a \mathcal{C} -morphism $\eta : A^* \rightarrow N$ such that for every $u, v \in A^*$, if $\eta(u) = \eta(v)$, then $(\alpha(u), \alpha(v))$ is a \mathcal{C} -pair for α . We define,

$$\mathbf{K} = \{P^* \cap \eta^{-1}(t) \mid t \in N\}.$$

Clearly, \mathbf{K} is a partition of P^* . Moreover, it only contains languages in $SD(\mathcal{C})$. Indeed, we have $P \in SD(\mathcal{C})$: it is the disjoint union of all languages in the $SD(\mathcal{C})$ -partition \mathbf{H} of P . Therefore, $P^* \in SD(\mathcal{C})$ since P is a prefix code with bounded synchronization delay. Hence, $P^* \cap \eta^{-1}(t) \in SD(\mathcal{C})$ for every $t \in N$ since $\eta^{-1}(t) \in \mathcal{C}$ (as η is a \mathcal{C} -morphism). It remains to show that every language $K \in \mathbf{K}$ is s -safe. The argument is based on the following fact, which is where we use the hypothesis that s is \mathbf{H} -stable.

Fact 5.16. *Let $q, f \in \alpha(P^*)$ such that f is idempotent. Then, we have $sqf = sq$.*

PROOF. The proof is based on the following preliminary result. For every $u, v \in P^*$, we show that,

$$\text{there exists } r \in \alpha(P^*) \text{ such that } sr\alpha(u) = s\alpha(v). \quad (5)$$

We fix $u, v \in P^*$ for the proof of (5). There exists a decomposition $u = u_1 \cdots u_n$ with $u_1, \dots, u_n \in P$. We use induction on the length n of this decomposition. If $n = 0$, then $u = \varepsilon$ and it suffices to choose $r = \alpha(v) \in \alpha(P^*)$. Otherwise, $u = wu'$ with $w \in P$ and $u' \in P^*$ admits a decomposition of length $n - 1$. Induction yields $r' \in \alpha(P^*)$ such that $sr'\alpha(u') = s\alpha(v)$. Moreover, since $w \in P$ and \mathbf{H} is a partition of P , there exists some $H \in \mathbf{H}$ such that $w \in H$. Since s is \mathbf{H} -stable and $r' \in \alpha(P^*)$, it follows from (4) that there exists $r \in \alpha(P^*)$ and $x \in \alpha(H)$ such that $sr' = sr x$. Additionally, recall that $H \in \mathbf{H}$ is 1_M -safe by hypothesis. Hence, since $x, \alpha(w) \in \alpha(H)$, we have $x = \alpha(w)$. Therefore, $sr' = sr\alpha(w)$. Altogether, this yields $sr\alpha(u) = sr\alpha(w)\alpha(u') = sr'\alpha(u') = s\alpha(v)$, which concludes the proof of (5).

It remains to prove the fact. Consider $q, f \in \alpha(P^*)$ such that f is idempotent. By definition, there exist $u, v \in P^*$ such that $q = \alpha(v)$ and $f = \alpha(u)$. Hence (5) yields $r \in \alpha(P^*)$ such that $sr f = sq$. Since f is idempotent, we obtain $sqf = sr f f = sr f = sq$, which completes the proof. \square

We are ready to show that every language $K \in \mathbf{K}$ is s -safe. By definition, $K = P^* \cap \eta^{-1}(t)$ for $t \in N$. Given $u, v \in K$, we have to show that $s\alpha(u) = s\alpha(v)$. Let $n = \omega(M)$ and $e = (\alpha(u))^n \in E(M)$. Since $u, v \in K$, we have $\eta(u) = \eta(v) = t$. Hence, $\eta(u^n) = \eta(vu^{n-1})$. By definition of η , it follows that

$(e, \alpha(vu^{n-1})) = (\alpha(u^n), \alpha(vu^{n-1}))$ is a \mathcal{C} -pair. Hence, $e\alpha(vu^{n-1})e$ belongs to the \mathcal{C} -orbit of e , which is aperiodic by hypothesis on α . This yields $(e\alpha(vu^{n-1})e)^n = (e\alpha(vu^{n-1})e)^{n+1}$. Multiplying by s on the left gives $s(e\alpha(vu^{n-1})e)^n = s(e\alpha(vu^{n-1})e)^{n+1}$. Since $n = \omega(M)$, we know that $(e\alpha(vu^{n-1})e)^n$ is an idempotent of M . Moreover, since $u, v \in K$, we have $(e\alpha(vu^{n-1})e)^n \in \alpha(P^*)$. Therefore, Fact 5.16 yields $s(e\alpha(vu^{n-1})e)^n = s$. Together with $s(e\alpha(vu^{n-1})e)^n = s(e\alpha(vu^{n-1})e)^{n+1}$, this yields $s = se\alpha(vu^{n-1})e$. We now multiply by $\alpha(u)$ on the right to get $s\alpha(u) = se\alpha(v)e$ (recall that $e = \alpha(u^n)$). Finally, e is an idempotent of M and since $u, v \in K$, we have $e, \alpha(v) \in \alpha(P^*)$. Hence, we may apply Fact 5.16 twice to get $se\alpha(v)e = s\alpha(v)$. Altogether, this yields $s\alpha(u) = s\alpha(v)$, as desired.

Inductive step: s is not \mathbf{H} -stable. By hypothesis, we know that (4) does not hold. Therefore, we get some $H \in \mathbf{H}$ such that the following *strict* inclusion holds,

$$s \cdot \alpha(P^*H) \subsetneq s \cdot \alpha(P^*). \quad (6)$$

We fix this language $H \in \mathbf{H}$ for the remainder of the proof. The following fact is proved by induction on our second parameter (the size of \mathbf{H}).

Fact 5.17. *There exists an $SD(\mathcal{C})$ -partition \mathbf{U} of $(P \setminus H)^*$ such that every $U \in \mathbf{U}$ is 1_M -safe.*

PROOF. Clearly, $P \setminus H \subseteq P$ remains a prefix code with bounded synchronization delay by Fact 4.6. Moreover, it is immediate that $\mathbf{G} = \mathbf{H} \setminus \{H\}$ is an $SD(\mathcal{C})$ -partition of $P \setminus H$ such that every $G \in \mathbf{G}$ is 1_M -safe. Additionally, it is clear that $\alpha((P \setminus H)^+) \subseteq \alpha(P^+)$ (our first induction parameter has not increased) and $\mathbf{G} \subsetneq \mathbf{H}$ (our second parameter has decreased). Hence, we may apply induction in Lemma 5.15 for the case when P, \mathbf{H} and s have been replaced by $P \setminus H, \mathbf{G}$ and 1_M respectively. This yields an $SD(\mathcal{C})$ -partition \mathbf{U} of $(P \setminus H)^*$ such that every $U \in \mathbf{U}$ is 1_M -safe. \square

We fix the partition \mathbf{U} of $(P \setminus H)^*$ given by Fact 5.17 for the remainder of the proof. We distinguish two independent subcases. Since H is an element of the partition \mathbf{H} of P , we have $H \subseteq P$. It is therefore immediate that the inclusion $\alpha(P^*H) \subseteq \alpha(P^+)$ holds. We use a different argument depending on whether this inclusion is strict or not.

Subcase 1: we have the equality $\alpha(P^*H) = \alpha(P^+)$. We handle this subcase with induction on our third parameter (*i.e.*, the size of $s\alpha(P^*)$). Recall that we have to build an $SD(\mathcal{C})$ -partition \mathbf{K} of P^* containing only s -safe languages.

Observe that the hypothesis that H is 1_M -safe means that there exists some element $t \in M$ satisfying $\alpha(H) = \{t\}$. Similarly, since every $U \in \mathbf{U}$ is 1_M -safe, there exists some element $r_U \in M$ such that $\alpha(U) = \{r_U\}$. We fix these elements of M for the rest of this subcase. The construction of \mathbf{K} is based on the following lemma, which is where we use our hypotheses and induction.

Fact 5.18. *For every $U \in \mathbf{U}$, there exists an $SD(\mathcal{C})$ -partition \mathbf{W}_U of P^* such that every $W \in \mathbf{W}_U$ is $sr_U t$ -safe.*

PROOF. We fix $U \in \mathbf{U}$ for the proof. Since \mathbf{U} is a partition of $(P \setminus H)^*$, we have $\alpha(U) \subseteq \alpha(P^*)$ which means that $r_U \in \alpha(P^*)$. Thus, we have $sr_U t \in s\alpha(P^*H)$. Therefore, $sr_U t\alpha(P^*) \subseteq s\alpha(P^*HP^*)$ and since $H \subseteq P$, we get $sr_U t\alpha(P^*) \subseteq s\alpha(P^+)$. Combined with our hypothesis in Subcase 1 (*i.e.*, $\alpha(P^*H) = \alpha(P^+)$), this yields $sr_U t\alpha(P^*) \subseteq s\alpha(P^*H)$. Finally, the hypothesis (6) of the inductive step yields the *strict* inclusion $sr_U t\alpha(P^*) \subsetneq s\alpha(P^*)$: the third parameter in our induction has decreased. On the other hand, the first two parameters have not increased, as they only depend on P and \mathbf{H} , which remain unchanged. Consequently, by induction, we may apply Lemma 5.15 in the case when $s \in M$ has been replaced by $sr_U t \in M$. This yields the desired $SD(\mathcal{C})$ -partition \mathbf{W}_U of P^* . \square

We are ready to define the partition \mathbf{K} of P^* . Using Fact 5.18, we define,

$$\mathbf{K} = \mathbf{U} \cup \bigcup_{U \in \mathbf{U}} \{UHW \mid W \in \mathbf{W}_U\}.$$

It remains to show that \mathbf{K} is an $SD(\mathcal{C})$ -partition of P^* and that every $K \in \mathbf{K}$ is s -safe. Let us first verify that \mathbf{K} is a partition of P^* . Since P is a prefix code, every word $w \in P^*$ admits a *unique* decomposition $w = w_1 \cdots w_n$ with $w_1, \dots, w_n \in P$. If no factor w_i belongs to H , then $w \in (P \setminus H)^*$ and w belongs to some unique $U \in \mathbf{U}$. Otherwise, let w_i be the leftmost factor such that $w_i \in H$. This implies that $w_1 \cdots w_{i-1} \in (P \setminus H)^*$, which yields a unique $U \in \mathbf{U}$ such that $w_1 \cdots w_{i-1} \in U$. Moreover, $w_{i+1} \cdots w_n \in P^*$, which yields a unique $W \in \mathbf{W}_U$ such that $w_{i+1} \cdots w_n \in W$. It follows that $w \in UHW$, and that UHW is the unique element of \mathbf{K} containing w .

Let us next verify that every $K \in \mathbf{K}$ belongs to $SD(\mathcal{C})$. If $K \in \mathbf{U}$, this is immediate by definition of \mathbf{U} in Fact 5.17. Otherwise, $K = UHW$ with $U \in \mathbf{U}$ and $W \in \mathbf{W}_U$. We know that $U, H, W \in SD(\mathcal{C})$: this is an hypothesis for H and stated in Facts 5.17 and 5.18 for U and W . Furthermore, one may verify that the concatenation UHW is *unambiguous* since P is a prefix code, $U \subseteq (P \setminus H)^*$ and $W \subseteq P^*$. Altogether, it follows that $K \in SD(\mathcal{C})$.

Finally, we prove that every $K \in \mathbf{K}$ is s -safe. If $K \in \mathbf{U}$, this is immediate since K is actually 1_M -safe by definition of \mathbf{U} in Fact 5.17. Otherwise, $K = UHW$ with $U \in \mathbf{U}$ and $W \in \mathbf{W}_U$. Consider $w, w' \in K$. We show that $s\alpha(w) = s\alpha(w')$. By definition, $\alpha(H) = \{t\}$ and $\alpha(U) = \{r_U\}$ which implies that $s\alpha(w) = str_U\alpha(x)$ and $s\alpha(w') = str_U\alpha(x')$ for $x, x' \in W$. Moreover, $W \in \mathbf{W}_U$ is $sr_U t$ -safe by definition in Fact 5.18. Therefore, $s\alpha(w) = s\alpha(w')$. This concludes the proof of Subcase 1.

Subcase 2: we have the strict inclusion $\alpha(P^*H) \subsetneq \alpha(P^+)$. In this case, we conclude using induction on the first parameter (*i.e.*, the size of $\alpha(P^+)$). Recall that our objective is to construct an $SD(\mathcal{C})$ -partition \mathbf{K} of P^* containing only s -safe languages.

Consider a word $w \in P^*$. Since P is a prefix code, w admits a unique decomposition $w = w_1 \cdots w_n$ with $w_1, \dots, w_n \in P$. We may uniquely decompose w in two (possibly empty) parts: a prefix $w_1 \cdots w_i \in ((P \setminus H)^*H)^*$ and a suffix in $w_{i+1} \cdots w_n \in (P \setminus H)^*$. Using induction, we construct $SD(\mathcal{C})$ -partitions of the possible prefixes and suffixes. Then, we combine them to construct a partition of the whole set P^* . Actually, we already handled the suffixes: Fact 5.17 provides an $SD(\mathcal{C})$ -partition \mathbf{U} of $(P \setminus H)^*$. It remains to partition the prefixes. We do so this in the following fact, which is proved using the hypothesis of Subcase 2 and induction.

Fact 5.19. *There exists an $SD(\mathcal{C})$ -partition \mathbf{V} of $((P \setminus H)^*H)^*$ such that every $V \in \mathbf{V}$ is 1_M -safe.*

PROOF. Let $Q = (P \setminus H)^*H$. In view of Fact 4.7, Q is a prefix code with bounded synchronization delay. We apply induction in Lemma 5.15 for the case when P has been replaced by Q . Doing so requires building an appropriate $SD(\mathcal{C})$ -partition of Q and proving that one of our induction parameters has decreased.

Let $\mathbf{F} = \{UH \mid U \in \mathbf{U}\}$. Since \mathbf{U} is a partition of $(P \setminus H)^*$ and P is a prefix code, one may verify that \mathbf{F} is a partition of $Q = (P \setminus H)^*H$. Moreover, it only contains languages in $SD(\mathcal{C})$. Indeed, if $U \in \mathbf{U}$, then the concatenation UH is *unambiguous* since $U \subseteq (P \setminus H)^*$ and P is a prefix code. Moreover, $U, H \in SD(\mathcal{C})$ by hypothesis. Finally, UH is 1_M -safe since this is the case for both U and H by definition. It remains to show that our induction parameters have decreased. Since $Q = (P \setminus H)^*H$, it is clear that $Q^+ \subseteq P^*H$. Now, $\alpha(P^*H) \subsetneq \alpha(P^+)$ by hypothesis in Subcase 2, whence $\alpha(Q^+) \subsetneq \alpha(P^+)$: our first induction parameter has decreased. Thus, we may apply Lemma 5.15 in the case when P, H and s have been replaced by Q, \mathbf{F} and 1_M respectively. This yields the desired $SD(\mathcal{C})$ -partition \mathbf{V} of $((P \setminus H)^*H)^*$. \square

We are ready to construct the $SD(\mathcal{C})$ -partition \mathbf{K} of P^* and conclude the main argument. Let $\mathbf{K} = \{VU \mid V \in \mathbf{V} \text{ and } U \in \mathbf{U}\}$. It is immediate by definition that \mathbf{K} is a partition of P^* since P is a prefix code and \mathbf{V}, \mathbf{U} are partitions of $((P \setminus H)^*H)^*$ and $(P \setminus H)^*$ respectively (cf. the above discussion). Moreover, every $K \in \mathbf{K}$ belongs to $SD(\mathcal{C})$. Indeed, one may verify that K is the *unambiguous* concatenation VU of $V \in \mathbf{V}$ and $U \in \mathbf{U}$ which both belong to $SD(\mathcal{C})$. It remains to prove that every

$K \in \mathbf{K}$ is s -safe. Let $w, w' \in K$, we show that $s\alpha(w) = s\alpha(w')$. By definition, we have $K = VU$ with $V \in \mathbf{V}$ and $U \in \mathbf{U}$. Therefore, $w = vu$ and $w' = v'u'$ with $u, u' \in U$ and $v, v' \in V$. Since U and V are both 1_M -safe by definition, we have $\alpha(u) = \alpha(u')$ and $\alpha(v) = \alpha(v')$. It follows that $s\alpha(w) = s\alpha(w')$, which concludes the proof of Lemma 5.15. \square

6 FIRST LOGICAL CHARACTERIZATION: FIRST-ORDER LOGIC

We now turn to the logical characterizations of star-free closure. In this section, we present the first one. It generalizes a well-known theorem of McNaughton and Papert [23], which characterizes the star-free languages as those which can be defined by a sentence of first-order logic equipped with the linear ordering (i.e., $SF = SF(ST) = FO(<)$). Here, we extend this theorem to all classes $SF(\mathcal{C})$ where \mathcal{C} is a prevariety. More precisely, we associate a set $\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{C}}$ of first-order predicates to every prevariety \mathcal{C} (its definition is taken from [32]). Then, we show that $SF(\mathcal{C})$ contains exactly the languages that can be defined by a sentence of first-order logic equipped with the predicates in $\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{C}}$ (i.e., $SF(\mathcal{C}) = FO(\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{C}})$). First, we briefly recall the definition of first-order logic over words. Then, we present the theorem itself.

6.1 Definitions

We view each word $w \in A^*$ as a logical structure. Its domain is the set $\text{Pos}(w) = \{0, \dots, |w| + 1\}$ of positions in w . A position i such that $1 \leq i \leq |w|$ carries a label in A . On the other hand, 0 and $|w| + 1$ are artificial *unlabeled* positions. We use first-order logic (FO) to express properties of words w : a formula can quantify over the positions of w with first-order variables and use a predetermined set of predicates to test properties of these positions. We also allow two constants “*min*” and “*max*” interpreted as the artificial unlabeled positions 0 and $|w| + 1$. Let us briefly recall the definition.

Signatures. A *signature* is a (possibly infinite) set of predicates interpreted over words in A^* . Consider a natural number $k \in \mathbb{N}$. A *predicate of arity k* over A is defined by a symbol P and for every word $w \in A^*$, an interpretation of P as a relation of arity k over the set of positions of w . More precisely, with every word $w \in A^*$, the predicate P associates a set of k -tuples of positions of w (i.e., a subset of $((\text{Pos}(w))^k)$). If (i_1, \dots, i_k) is a k -tuple in this set, we shall say that $P(i_1, \dots, i_k)$ *holds* (in w). All predicates that we consider in practice are either unary (they have arity 1) or binary (they have arity 2). Let us present them.

First, we use *label predicates*. For every letter $a \in A$, we associate a unary predicate (also denoted by “ a ”). It is interpreted as the unary relation selecting all positions whose label is a : given a word $w \in A^*$ and $i \in \text{Pos}(w)$, we have that $a(i)$ holds when the label of i is “ a ”. In particular, if $a(i)$ holds, then i cannot be one of the two artificial positions 0 and $|w| + 1$. Abusing notation, we write “ A ” for the set of all label predicates. Moreover, we use a binary predicate “ $<$ ”, interpreted as the linear ordering between positions. Given a word w and $i, j \in \text{Pos}(w)$, we have that $<(i, j)$ holds if $i < j$. For the sake of improved readability, we use the infix notation, writing $i < j$ instead of $<(i, j)$.

Finally, with each class \mathcal{C} , we associate two *generic* sets of predicates. The first one, written $\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{C}}$, contains a binary “infix” predicate $I_L(x, y)$ for every $L \in \mathcal{C}$. Given $w \in A^*$ and two positions $i, j \in \text{Pos}(w)$, we have $w \models I_L(i, j)$ when $i < j$ and $w(i, j) \in L$. The second set, written $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{C}}$, contains a unary “prefix” predicate $P_L(x)$ for every $L \in \mathcal{C}$. Given $w \in A^*$ and a position $i \in \text{Pos}(w)$, we have $w \models P_L(i)$ when $0 < i$ and $w(0, i) \in L$.

Remark 6.1. All classes \mathcal{C} that we consider in practice are prevarieties. In particular, this implies that $A^* \in \mathcal{C}$. Hence, set $\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{C}}$ always contains the linear order predicate, since “ $x < y$ ” is clearly equivalent to “ $I_{A^*}(x, y)$ ”. In particular, when \mathcal{C} is the trivial prevariety $ST = \{\emptyset, A^*\}$, the signature \mathbb{I}_{ST} contains only I_{A^*} and I_{\emptyset} . Since $I_{\emptyset}(i, j)$ never holds, using \mathbb{I}_{ST} boils down to considering $\{<\}$.

First-order formulas. With a signature \mathcal{S} (i.e., \mathcal{S} is a possibly infinite set of predicates), we associate a set $\text{FO}[\mathcal{S}]$ of first-order formulas. They are built-up from simple expressions called *atomic formulas*. The atomic formulas can test properties of the positions that were quantified by first-order variables using either equality or the predicates in \mathcal{S} . More precisely, they are of the form:

$$x_1 = x_2 \quad \text{or} \quad P(x_1, \dots, x_k),$$

where $P \in \mathcal{S}$ is a predicate of arity k for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and, for every $i \leq k$, x_i is either a first-order variable or one of the two constants *min* and *max* (symbols can be repeated: it may happen that x_i and x_j are the same symbol for $i \neq j$). We define $\text{FO}[\mathcal{S}]$ as the least set of expressions containing the atomic formulas and closed under the following rules:

- *Disjunction*: if φ and ψ are $\text{FO}[\mathcal{S}]$ formulas, then so is $(\varphi \vee \psi)$.
- *Negation*: if φ is an $\text{FO}[\mathcal{S}]$ formula, then so is $(\neg\varphi)$.
- *Existential quantification*: for any first-order variable x , if φ is an $\text{FO}[\mathcal{S}]$ formula, then so is $(\exists x \varphi)$.

For the sake of improved readability, we omit the parentheses when there is no ambiguity. Moreover, we define the other standard logical connectives as abbreviations. We write $\varphi \wedge \psi$ for $\neg((\neg\varphi) \vee (\neg\psi))$ and $\varphi \Rightarrow \psi$ for $(\neg\varphi) \vee \psi$. We also write $\forall x \varphi$ for $\neg(\exists x \neg\varphi)$.

Finally, we use the standard notion of “free variable”. Let φ be an $\text{FO}[\mathcal{S}]$ formula. An occurrence of some variable x in φ is said to be *bound* when it occurs inside an atomic formula that is under the scope of a quantification $\exists x$. For example, in the following formula $a(x) \wedge \exists y (x < y \wedge b(y)) \wedge \exists x c(x)$, the occurrence of the variable x inside the atomic formula $c(x)$ is bound. We say that a variable x is *free* in a formula φ if there *exists* an occurrence of x in φ that is *not* bound. For example, in the formula above, there also exist two occurrences of x that are not bound (inside the atomic formula $a(x)$ and inside the atomic formula $x < y$). Hence, x is a free variable of this formula. A *sentence* is a formula that has no free variable.

Semantics. We define when a word $w \in A^*$ satisfies a *sentence* φ (a fact that we denote by $w \models \varphi$). The definition is by structural induction on the sentence φ . This means that we actually need to give the semantics of *all formulas*, not just sentences. Indeed, in general, a sentence may have subformulas with free variables. To tackle this issue, we need the notion of variable assignment. Let $w \in A^*$ be a word and let \mathcal{X} be a finite set of variables. We define an *assignment* of \mathcal{X} in w as a map $\mu : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \text{Pos}(w)$. Additionally, we canonically extend every such assignment as a map $\mu : \mathcal{X} \cup \{\text{min}, \text{max}\} \rightarrow \text{Pos}(w)$ by defining $\mu(\text{min}) = 0$ and $\mu(\text{max}) = |w| + 1$.

Let φ be an $\text{FO}[\mathcal{S}]$ formula and let \mathcal{X} be a set of variables containing all free variables of φ . For every word $w \in A^*$ and every assignment $\mu : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \text{Pos}(w)$, we write $w, \mu \models \varphi$ when one of the following properties hold:

- $\varphi := “x_1 = x_2”$ and $\mu(x_1) = \mu(x_2)$ holds.
- $\varphi := “P(x_1, \dots, x_k)”$ for some predicate $P \in \mathcal{S}$ and $P(\mu(x_1), \dots, \mu(x_k))$ holds.
- $\varphi := “\psi \vee \chi”$ and either $w, \mu \models \psi$ or $w, \mu \models \chi$.
- $\varphi := “\neg\psi”$ and $w, \mu \not\models \psi$ (w does not satisfy ψ under μ).
- $\varphi := “\exists y \psi”$ and there exists an assignment $\gamma : \mathcal{X} \cup \{y\} \rightarrow \text{Pos}(w)$ such that $\mu(x) = \gamma(x)$ for every $x \in \mathcal{X} \setminus \{y\}$ and $w, \gamma \models \psi$.

The definition depends on an assignment $\mu : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \text{Pos}(w)$ where \mathcal{X} contains *all* free variables of φ . In particular, it may happen that \mathcal{X} contains variables that are *not* free in φ . Yet, this is allowed only for the sake of simplifying the presentation: one may verify that whether $w, \mu \models \varphi$ only depends on the restriction of μ to the variables that are free in φ . In particular, when no variable is free variable (i.e., φ is a sentence), whether $w, \mu \models \varphi$ holds is independent from the assignment

μ . Hence, we simply write $w \models \varphi$ in this case. Altogether, it follows that each sentence φ of $\text{FO}[\$]$ defines a language: we let $L(\varphi) = \{w \in A^* \mid w \models \varphi\}$.

Classes associated to first-order logic. To every set of predicates $\$$, we associate a class of languages $\text{FO}(\$)$. It consists of all languages that can be defined by a sentence in $\text{FO}[A, \$]$ (that is, we use the signature $A \cup \$$, containing the label predicates *and* those in $\$$). For the sake of avoiding clutter, we often abuse terminology and speak of an $\text{FO}(\$)$ -sentence to mean an $\text{FO}[A, \$]$ -sentence.

Example 6.2. Let $A = \{a, b\}$. Let us present some languages in $\text{FO}(<)$. We use the following abbreviation in first-order sentences: we write “ $x+1 = y$ ” for the formula “ $(x < y) \wedge \neg \exists z (x < z \wedge z < y)$ ”. In other words, “+1” is interpreted as the successor relation over positions. We have $A^*aA^*bA^*a \in \text{FO}(<)$ since it is defined by the following sentence: $\exists x \exists y (x < y) \wedge a(x) \wedge b(y) \wedge (\exists x a(x) \wedge (x+1 = \max))$. Moreover, $(ab)^* \in \text{FO}(<)$ as well, since it is defined by the following $\text{FO}(<)$ sentence:

$$\forall x \forall y (x+1 = y) \Rightarrow \left(\begin{array}{l} (x = \min \wedge y = \max) \\ \vee (x = \min \wedge a(y)) \\ \vee (a(x) \wedge b(y)) \\ \vee (b(x) \wedge a(y)) \\ \vee (b(x) \wedge y = \max) \end{array} \right).$$

We are interested in classes $\text{FO}(\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{C}})$ where \mathcal{C} is a prevariety. Indeed, we prove below that $\text{FO}(\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{C}}) = \text{SF}(\mathcal{C})$ in that case. However, when \mathcal{C} is a *group prevariety*, the presentation of $\text{FO}(\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{C}})$ can be simplified in view of the following lemma.

Lemma 6.3. Let \mathcal{G} be a group prevariety. Then, $\text{FO}(\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{G}}) = \text{FO}(<, \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{G}})$.

PROOF. The inclusion $\text{FO}(<, \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{G}}) \subseteq \text{FO}(\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{G}})$ is immediate since all predicates in $\{<\} \cup \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{G}}$ can be simulated using those in $\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{G}}$. Indeed, $x < y$ is equivalent to $I_{A^*}(x, y)$ and $P_L(x)$ (for $L \in \mathcal{G}$) is equivalent to $I_L(\min, x)$. We now prove that $\text{FO}(\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{G}}) \subseteq \text{FO}(<, \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{G}})$. By definition, it suffices to prove that for every language $L \in \mathcal{G}$, the atomic formula $I_L(x, y)$ is equivalent to a formula of $\text{FO}(<, \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{G}})$. Proposition 2.4 yields a \mathcal{G} -morphism $\alpha : A^* \rightarrow G$ recognizing L . Since \mathcal{G} is a group prevariety, Lemma 3.5 implies that G is a group. Let $F \subseteq G$ be the set such that $\alpha^{-1}(F) = L$.

For every $g \in G$, the language $\alpha^{-1}(g)$ belongs to \mathcal{G} , whence $P_{\alpha^{-1}(g)}$ is a predicate in $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{G}}$. Since G is a group, it is immediate that $\alpha(v) = (\alpha(ua))^{-1}\alpha(uav)$ for all $u, v \in A^*$ and $a \in A$. Therefore, one may verify that $I_L(x, y)$ is equivalent to the following formula of $\text{FO}(<, \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{G}})$, where $T \subseteq G \times A \times G$ is the set of all triples $(g, a, h) \in G \times A \times G$ such that $(g\alpha(a))^{-1}h \in F$:

$$(x < y) \wedge \left((x = \min \wedge P_L(y)) \vee \bigvee_{(g,a,h) \in T} (P_{\alpha^{-1}(g)}(x) \wedge a(x) \wedge P_{\alpha^{-1}(h)}(y)) \right).$$

This concludes the proof. □

Example 6.4. Lemma 6.3 applies to important sets of predicates. First, if \mathcal{G} is the trivial prevariety $\text{ST} = \{\emptyset, A^*\}$, all predicates in \mathbb{P}_{ST} are trivial. Hence, $\text{FO}(<, \mathbb{P}_{\text{ST}}) = \text{FO}(<)$.

Next, let us consider the class **MOD** of modulo languages, consisting in Boolean combinations of languages $\{w \in A^* \mid |w| \equiv k \pmod m\}$ with $k, m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $k < m$. In this case, we obtain first-order logic with modular predicates. For all $k, m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $k < m$, the set “MOD” of modular predicates contains a unary predicate $M_{k,m}$ selecting the positions i such that $i \equiv k \pmod m$. One may use Lemma 6.3 to verify that $\text{FO}(<, \mathbb{P}_{\text{MOD}}) = \text{FO}(<, \text{MOD})$.

Finally, we consider the class **AMT** of alphabet modulo testable languages. If $w \in A^*$ and $a \in A$, we let $\#_a(w) \in \mathbb{N}$ be the number of occurrences of letter a in w . The class **AMT** consists of all Boolean combinations of languages $\{w \in A^* \mid \#_a(w) \equiv k \pmod m\}$ where $a \in A$ and $k, m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$k < m$ (these are the languages recognized by commutative groups). In this case, we obtain first-order logic with alphabetic modular predicates. For all $a \in A$ and all $k, m \in \mathbb{N}$ the set “AMOD” of alphabetic modular predicates contains a unary predicate $M_{k,m}^a$ selecting the positions i such $\#_a(w(0, i)) \equiv k \pmod{m}$. One may use Lemma 6.3 to verify that $\text{FO}(<, \mathbb{P}_{\text{AMT}}) = \text{FO}(<, \text{AMOD})$.

6.2 Main theorem

We may now present the main result of the section. It connects star-free closure to first-order logic for all input classes that are prevarieties.

Theorem 6.5. *Let \mathcal{C} be a prevariety. Then, $SF(\mathcal{C}) = \text{FO}(\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{C}})$.*

Additionally, in view of Lemma 6.3, Theorem 6.5 can be simplified when the input class is a group prevariety \mathcal{G} . More precisely, we have the following theorem.

Corollary 6.6. *Let \mathcal{G} be a group prevariety. Then, $SF(\mathcal{G}) = \text{FO}(<, \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{G}})$.*

Remark 6.7. *Corollary 6.6 has interesting applications when combined with Corollary 5.13 (i.e., the algebraic characterization of the class $SF(\mathcal{G})$): we obtain that a regular language belongs to $\text{FO}(<, \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{G}})$ if and only if the \mathcal{G} -kernel of its syntactic morphism is aperiodic. In particular when $\mathcal{G} = \text{MOD}$, recall from Remark 5.8 that MOD-kernels correspond to a standard notion: stable monoids. Hence, we obtain that a regular language belongs to $\text{FO}(<, \text{MOD})$ if and only if the stable monoid of its syntactic morphism is aperiodic. This is a well-known theorem of Barrington, Compton, Straubing and Thérien [4], whose original proof relies on entirely different techniques.*

We now concentrate on the proof of Theorem 6.5. Let us point out that both directions of the proofs are handled directly: we “translate” $\text{FO}(\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{C}})$ sentences into expressions witnessing membership in $SF(\mathcal{C})$ and vice-versa.

PROOF OF THEOREM 6.5. We fix a prevariety \mathcal{C} and show that $SF(\mathcal{C}) = \text{FO}(\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{C}})$. The two inclusions are proved independently. We start with $SF(\mathcal{C}) \subseteq \text{FO}(\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{C}})$, which is simpler.

Inclusion $SF(\mathcal{C}) \subseteq \text{FO}(\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{C}})$. By definition of $SF(\mathcal{C})$, it suffices to prove that $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \text{FO}(\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{C}})$, that $\{a\} \in \text{FO}(\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{C}})$ for every $a \in A$ and that $\text{FO}(\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{C}})$ is closed under union, complement and concatenation. It is clear that every $L \in \mathcal{C}$ is defined by the sentence $I_L(\min, \max)$ of $\text{FO}(\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{C}})$. Therefore, $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \text{FO}(\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{C}})$. Moreover, for every letter $a \in A$, the language $\{a\}$ is defined by the sentence $\exists x (a(x) \wedge (\min + 1 = x) \wedge (x + 1 = \max))$. It is also clear that $\text{FO}(\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{C}})$ is closed under union and complement since Boolean connectives can be used freely in $\text{FO}(\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{C}})$ sentences. It remains to prove that $\text{FO}(\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{C}})$ is closed under concatenation. The argument is based on the following lemma.

Lemma 6.8. *Let $L \in \text{FO}(\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{C}})$. There exists an $\text{FO}(\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{C}})$ formula $\varphi_L(x, y)$ with two free variables x and y such that for every $w \in A^*$ and every positions $i, j \in \text{Pos}(w)$ in w such that $i < j$, we have $w \models \varphi_L(i, j)$ if and only if $w(i, j) \in L$*

PROOF. By hypothesis, there exists a sentence ψ of $\text{FO}(\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{C}})$ defining L . We build $\varphi_L(x, y)$ from ψ by restricting quantifications with respect to the free variables x, y : we only allow quantification over positions between x and y . Moreover, we use x and y themselves as substitutes for the unlabeled positions. More precisely, $\varphi_L(x, y)$ is defined by applying the following modifications to ψ :

- (1) Every subformula of the form $\exists z \Gamma$ is recursively replaced by,

$$\exists z (((z = x) \vee (x < z \wedge z < y) \vee (z = y)) \wedge \Gamma).$$

- (2) All occurrences of the constant \min are replaced by the free variable x and all occurrences of the constant \max are replaced by y .

(3) Every atomic subformula of the form $a(z)$ for some $a \in A$ is replaced by,

$$a(z) \wedge (x < z) \wedge (z < y).$$

One may verify that $\varphi_L(x, y)$ satisfies the desired property. \square

We may now prove that $\text{FO}(\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{C}})$ is closed under concatenation. Let $K, L \in \text{FO}(\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{C}})$. We prove that $KL \in \text{FO}(\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{C}})$. Lemma 6.8 yields two formulas $\varphi_K(x, y)$ and $\varphi_L(y, z)$ such that for every $w \in A^*$ and every positions $i, j \in \text{Pos}(w)$ in w such that $i < j$, we have $w \models \varphi_K(i, j)$ if and only if $w(i, j) \in K$ and $w \models \varphi_L(i, j)$ if and only if $w(i, j) \in L$. It is now immediate that KL is defined by the following sentence of $\text{FO}(\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{C}})$:

$$\exists x \exists y \quad (x + 1 = y) \wedge \varphi_K(\min, y) \wedge \varphi_L(x, \max).$$

We obtain $KL \in \text{FO}(\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{C}})$, as desired. This completes the proof of the first inclusion: $\text{SF}(\mathcal{C}) \subseteq \text{FO}(\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{C}})$.

Inclusion $\text{FO}(\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{C}}) \subseteq \text{SF}(\mathcal{C})$. The proof of this inclusion is more involved. Yet, it is constructive as well: starting from an $\text{FO}(\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{C}})$ sentence φ , we use structural induction on φ to prove that the language it defines may be built from basic languages in \mathcal{C} using Boolean combinations and concatenations. Of course, this means that we shall have to deal with formulas that are *not* sentences. We start with preliminary definitions.

Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$. An n -scheme is a tuple $\bar{L} = (L_0, a_1, L_1, \dots, a_n, L_n)$ where $L_0, \dots, L_n \subseteq A^*$ and $a_1, \dots, a_n \in A$. Note that 0-schemes are well-defined: they are simply languages. We write $\bar{L} \in \text{SF}(\mathcal{C})$ to indicate that $L_0, \dots, L_n \in \text{SF}(\mathcal{C})$. Additionally, we define an n -blueprint as a finite set \mathbf{L} of n -schemes. We write $\mathbf{L} \in \text{SF}(\mathcal{C})$ to indicate that $\bar{L} \in \text{SF}(\mathcal{C})$ for every n -scheme $\bar{L} \in \mathbf{L}$. Let us provide semantics for n -blueprints.

Given $n \in \mathbb{N}$, an n -split is a linearly ordered set \mathcal{X} of exactly $n+2$ first-order variables. For the sake of avoiding clutter, we often make the linear ordering implicit. For example, if we say that the set $\mathcal{X} = \{x_0, \dots, x_{n+1}\}$ is an n -split, we implicitly mean that the ordering is $x_0 < x_1 < \dots < x_n < x_{n+1}$. Moreover, given an n -split $\mathcal{X} = \{x_0, \dots, x_{n+1}\}$ and a word $w \in A^*$, we say that an assignment $\mu : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \text{Pos}(w)$ is *correct* to indicate that,

$$0 = \mu(x_0) < \mu(x_1) < \dots < \mu(x_{n+1}) = |w| + 1.$$

Now, consider an n -blueprint \mathbf{L} and an n -split $\mathcal{X} = \{x_0, \dots, x_{n+1}\}$, a word $w \in A^*$ and a correct assignment $\mu : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \text{Pos}(w)$. We say that (w, μ) satisfies \mathbf{L} and write $w, \mu \models \mathbf{L}$ if and only if there exists an n -scheme $(L_0, a_1, L_1, \dots, a_n, L_n) \in \mathbf{L}$ which satisfies the two following conditions:

- (1) For all $1 \leq i \leq n$, the position $\mu(x_i) \in \text{Pos}(w)$ is labeled by a_i .
- (2) For all $0 \leq i \leq n$, we have $w(\mu(x_i), \mu(x_{i+1})) \in L_i$.

Observe that when $n = 0$, there exists only one correct assignment $\mu : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \text{Pos}(w)$: we have $\mu(x_0) = 0$ and $\mu(x_1) = |w| + 1$. Moreover, in that case, $w, \mu \models \mathbf{L}$ if and only if there exists a language $L \in \mathbf{L}$ such that $w \in L$.

The argument is based on the next proposition, proved by induction on the size of $\text{FO}(\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{C}})$ formulas. The statement only applies to *constant-free* formulas (*i.e.*, which do not involve symbols “*min*” and “*max*”), a restriction we shall deal with when using it to complete the main proof.

Proposition 6.9. *Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$, \mathcal{X} be an n -split and φ be a constant-free $\text{FO}(\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{C}})$ -formula whose free variables are contained in \mathcal{X} . Then, there exists an n -blueprint $\mathbf{L}_{\varphi} \in \text{SF}(\mathcal{C})$ such that for all $w \in A^*$ and for all correct assignment $\mu : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \text{Pos}(w)$, we have:*

$$w, \mu \models \mathbf{L}_{\varphi} \iff w, \mu \models \varphi. \tag{7}$$

We first apply Proposition 6.9 to prove that $\text{FO}(\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{C}}) \subseteq \text{SF}(\mathcal{C})$. Let $L \in \text{FO}(\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{C}})$. We prove that $L \in \text{SF}(\mathcal{C})$. The hypothesis $L \in \text{FO}(\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{C}})$ means that there is an $\text{FO}(\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{C}})$ -sentence ψ defining L . Consider the 0-split $\mathcal{X} = \{x_0, x_1\}$. Since variables can be renamed, we may assume without loss of generality that x_0 and x_1 do *not* occur in ψ . Let φ be the formula obtained from ψ by replacing all occurrences of the constant symbols *min* and *max* by x_0 and x_1 , respectively. It follows from Proposition 6.9 that there exists a 0-blueprint $\mathbf{L}_\varphi \in \text{SF}(\mathcal{C})$ satisfying (7). By definition \mathbf{L}_φ is a finite set of languages in $\text{SF}(\mathcal{C})$. We let $H = \bigcup_{K \in \mathbf{L}_\varphi} K \in \text{SF}(\mathcal{C})$ and show that $H = L$ to complete the proof. Consider a word $w \in A^*$ and let $\mu : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \text{Pos}(w)$ be the only correct assignment: $\mu(x_0) = 0$ and $\mu(x_1) = |w| + 1$. By definition of φ from ψ , it is immediate that $w \in L \Leftrightarrow w, \mu \models \varphi$. It then follows from (7) that $w \in L \Leftrightarrow w, \mu \models \mathbf{L}_\varphi$. Finally by definition of H , we obtain $w \in L \Leftrightarrow w \in H$, as desired.

This concludes the main argument. It remains to prove Proposition 6.9. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$, \mathcal{X} be an n -split and φ be a constant-free $\text{FO}(\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{C}})$ formula whose free variables are contained in \mathcal{X} . We write $\mathcal{X} = \{x_0, \dots, x_{n+1}\}$. Moreover, we may assume without loss of generality that φ does not contain the equality predicate, as subformulas of the form “ $y = z$ ” may be replaced by the equivalent formula “ $\neg(y < z \vee z < y)$ ” (recall from Remark 6.1 that the linear ordering is available in $\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{C}}$). We use induction on the size of φ (i.e., on the number of symbols in its syntax tree) to construct an n -blueprint $\mathbf{L}_\varphi \in \text{SF}(\mathcal{C})$ satisfying (7).

Atomic Formulas. By hypothesis on φ there are only two kinds of atomic formulas: those involving the label predicates and those involving the predicates in $\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{C}}$. Note that since φ is constant-free, there are no atomic formulas involving the constants *min* and *max*.

Assume first that $\varphi := “a(x_h)”$ for some $a \in A$ and h such that $0 \leq h \leq n+1$. There are two cases. If $h = 0$ or $h = n+1$, then it suffices to define $\mathbf{L}_\varphi = \emptyset \in \text{SF}(\mathcal{C})$. Otherwise, we have $1 \leq h \leq n$. We define \mathbf{L}_φ as the set of all n -schemes $(A^*, a_1, A^*, \dots, a_n, A^*)$ where $a_1, \dots, a_n \in A$ are letters such that $a_h = a$. It is clear that $\mathbf{L}_\varphi \in \text{SF}(\mathcal{C})$ and one may verify from the definitions that it satisfies (7).

Assume now that $\varphi := “I_L(x_g, x_h)”$ for g, h such that $0 \leq g, h \leq n+1$ and $L \in \mathcal{C}$. Recall that given a word $w \in A^*$ and two positions $i, j \in \text{Pos}(w)$, $I_L(i, j)$ holds if and only if $i < j$ and $w(i, j) \in L$. Hence, there are two cases. First, if $h \leq g$, it suffices to define $\mathbf{L}_\varphi = \emptyset \in \text{SF}(\mathcal{C})$. Assume now that $g < h$. Since \mathcal{C} is a prevariety, Proposition 2.4 yields a \mathcal{C} -morphism $\eta : A^* \rightarrow N$ recognizing L . Let $F \subseteq M$ such that $L = \alpha^{-1}(F)$. We define a set of tuples $T \subseteq M \times (A \times M)^n$ (when $n = 0$, we have $T \subseteq M$) as follows:

$$T = \{(s_0, a_1, s_1, \dots, a_n, s_n) \mid s_g \alpha(a_{g+1}) s_{g+1} \cdots \alpha(a_{h-1}) s_{h-1} \in F\}.$$

We define \mathbf{L}_φ as the set of all n -schemes of the form $(\eta^{-1}(s_0), \{a_1\}, \eta^{-1}(s_1), \dots, \{a_n\}, \eta^{-1}(s_n))$ such that $(s_0, a_1, s_1, \dots, a_n, s_n) \in T$. Since η is a \mathcal{C} -morphism, it is immediate that $\mathbf{L}_\varphi \in \mathcal{C} \subseteq \text{SF}(\mathcal{C})$. One may now verify from the definitions that \mathbf{L}_φ satisfies (7).

Disjunction. Let us now assume that $\varphi := “\psi_1 \vee \psi_2”$. For $i = 1, 2$, induction yields an n -blueprint $\mathbf{L}_i \in \text{SF}(\mathcal{C})$ which satisfies (7) for ψ_i . It is now immediate from the definitions that $\mathbf{L}_\varphi = \mathbf{L}_1 \cup \mathbf{L}_2 \in \text{SF}(\mathcal{C})$ satisfies (7) for φ .

Negation. We assume that $\varphi := “\neg\psi”$. Induction yields an n -blueprint $\mathbf{L}_\psi \in \text{SF}(\mathcal{C})$ such that if $w \in A^*$ and $\mu : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \text{Pos}(w)$ is a correct assignment, then $w, \mu \in \mathbf{L}_\psi \Leftrightarrow w, \mu \models \psi$. Let $\bar{L}_1, \dots, \bar{L}_k \in \text{SF}(\mathcal{C})$ be the n -schemes such that $\mathbf{L}_\psi = \{\bar{L}_1, \dots, \bar{L}_k\}$. Finally, for every $j \leq k$, we let $(L_{0,j}, a_{1,j}, L_{1,j}, \dots, a_{n,j}, L_{n,j}) = \bar{L}_j$. Let $J \subseteq \{1, \dots, k\}$. We define,

$$H_{i,J} = A^* \setminus \left(\bigcup_{j \in J} L_{i,j} \right) \text{ for } 0 \leq i \leq n.$$

Note that $H_{i,0} = A^*$. Moreover, since $SF(\mathcal{C})$ is closed under union and complement by definition, we have $H_{i,J} \in SF(\mathcal{C})$. We now define \mathbf{L}_φ as the set of all n -schemes $(H_{0,J_0}, b_1, H_{1,J_1}, \dots, b_n, H_{n,J_n})$ where $b_1, \dots, b_n \in A$ and $J_0, \dots, J_n \subseteq \{1, \dots, k\}$ are such that for every $j \leq k$, either $b_i \neq a_{i,j}$ for some i such that $1 \leq i \leq n$, or $j \in J_i$ for some i such that $0 \leq i \leq n$. By definition, \mathbf{L}_φ is an n -blueprint satisfying $\mathbf{L}_\varphi \in SF(\mathcal{C})$. Moreover, it is straightforward to verify that if $w \in A^*$ and $\mu : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \text{Pos}(w)$ is a correct assignment, then $w, \mu \models \mathbf{L}_\varphi$ if and only if $w, \mu \not\models \mathbf{L}_\psi$. Since $\varphi := \neg\psi$, it is immediate that \mathbf{L}_φ satisfies (7), as desired.

First-order quantification. Finally, assume that $\varphi := \exists y \psi$. Since variables may be renamed, we may assume without loss of generality that $y \notin \mathcal{X} = \{x_0, \dots, x_{n+1}\}$. We define \mathbf{L}_φ as the union of some n -blueprints that we build by induction. We use two kinds of n -blueprints in this union.

For every i such that $0 \leq i \leq n+1$, let ψ_i be the formula obtained from ψ by replacing every free occurrence of the variable y with x_i . By definition all free variables in ψ_i belong to \mathcal{X} . Moreover, the size of ψ_i is the same as the one of ψ which is strictly smaller than the size of $\varphi := \exists y \psi$. Consequently, induction yields an n -blueprint $\mathbf{L}_i \in SF(\mathcal{C})$ such that if $w \in A^*$ and $\mu : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \text{Pos}(w)$ is a correct assignment, then $w, \mu \models \mathbf{L}_i \Leftrightarrow w, \mu \models \psi_i$.

We turn to the second kind of n -blueprint. Let i such that $0 \leq i \leq n$. We consider the linearly ordered set of first-order variables $\mathcal{Y}_i = \{x_0, \dots, x_i, y, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_{n+1}\}$ (i.e., $\mathcal{Y}_i = \mathcal{X} \cup \{y\}$ and y is placed between x_i and x_{i+1} for the linear ordering). Since the size of ψ is strictly smaller than the one of $\varphi := \exists y \psi$, induction yields an $(n+1)$ -blueprint $\mathbf{G}_i \in SF(\mathcal{C})$ such that if $w \in A^*$ and $\gamma : \mathcal{Y}_i \rightarrow \text{Pos}(w)$ is a correct assignment, then $w, \mu \models \mathbf{G}_i \Leftrightarrow w, \gamma \models \psi$. We use \mathbf{G}_i to define an n -blueprint \mathbf{H}_i . Let $\bar{G} = (G_0, c_1, G_1, \dots, c_{n+1}, G_{n+1})$ be an arbitrary $(n+1)$ -scheme. We associate to \bar{G} an n -scheme $f_i(\bar{G}) = (H_0, d_1, H_1, \dots, d_n, H_n)$ as follows:

- for every j such that $0 \leq j \leq i-1$, we let $H_j = G_j$ and $d_{j+1} = c_{j+1}$.
- we let $H_i = G_i c_{i+1} G_{i+1}$.
- for every j such that $i+1 \leq j \leq n$, we let $d_j = c_{j+1}$ and $H_j = G_{j+1}$.

Finally, we define $\mathbf{H}_i = \{f_i(\bar{G}) \mid \bar{G} \in \mathbf{G}_i\}$. Observe that since $\mathbf{G}_i \in SF(\mathcal{C})$, $\{c_{i+1}\} \in SF(\mathcal{C})$ and $SF(\mathcal{C})$ is closed under concatenation, it is immediate that $\mathbf{H}_i \in SF(\mathcal{C})$.

We may now define the n -blueprint \mathbf{L}_φ . We let,

$$\mathbf{L}_\varphi = \left(\bigcup_{0 \leq i \leq n+1} \mathbf{L}_i \right) \cup \left(\bigcup_{0 \leq i \leq n} \mathbf{H}_i \right).$$

It is clear that \mathbf{L}_φ is an n -blueprint such that $\mathbf{L}_\varphi \in SF(\mathcal{C})$ since this is the case for all sets \mathbf{L}_i and \mathbf{H}_i by definition. Hence, it remains to verify that (7) is satisfied. Let $w \in A^*$ and $\mu : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \text{Pos}(w)$ a correct assignment. We prove that $w, \mu \models \mathbf{L}_\varphi \Leftrightarrow w, \mu \models \varphi$. There are two directions.

First, assume that $w, \mu \models \varphi$. We prove that $w, \mu \models \mathbf{L}_\varphi$. Since $\varphi := \exists y \psi$, there exists an assignment $\gamma : \mathcal{X} \cup \{y\} \rightarrow \text{Pos}(w)$ such that $\gamma(x) = \mu(x)$ for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $w, \gamma \models \psi$ (note that at this stage, γ is not a “correct assignment”: indeed, this is not well-defined since we have not specified any linear ordering on $\mathcal{X} \cup \{y\}$) yet. We distinguish two cases. First, assume that there exists i satisfying $0 \leq i \leq n+1$ and $\gamma(y) = \gamma(x_i) = \mu(x_i)$. In that case, one may verify from the definitions that $w, \gamma \models \psi$ entails $w, \mu \models \psi_i$. By definition of ψ_i , it follows that $w, \mu \models \mathbf{L}_i$ and therefore that $w, \mu \models \mathbf{L}_\varphi$ as desired, since $\mathbf{L}_i \subseteq \mathbf{L}_\varphi$. In the second case, since $\mu(x_0) = 0$ and $\mu(x_{n+1}) = |w| + 1$ (by definition of increasing assignments), there exists i such that $0 \leq i \leq n$ and $\mu(x_i) < \gamma(y) < \mu(x_{i+1})$. Hence, γ can be viewed as a *correct* assignment $\gamma : \mathcal{Y}_i \rightarrow \text{Pos}(w)$. Since $w, \gamma \models \psi$, it follows that $w, \gamma \models \mathbf{G}_i$ by definition of \mathbf{G}_i . One may then verify from the definition of \mathbf{H}_i from \mathbf{G}_i that $w, \mu \models \mathbf{H}_i$. Consequently, $w, \mu \models \mathbf{L}_\varphi$ again, since $\mathbf{H}_i \subseteq \mathbf{L}_\varphi$ by definition.

We turn to the converse implication. Assume that $w, \mu \models \mathbf{L}_\varphi$. We prove that $w, \mu \models \varphi$. By definition of \mathbf{L}_φ as the union of smaller n -blueprints, there are two cases. In the first case, we assume

that there exists i such that $0 \leq i \leq n+1$ and $w, \mu \models L_i$. By definition of L_i , it follows that $w, \mu \models \psi_i$. Moreover, by definition of ψ_i from ψ , this implies that $w, \gamma \models \exists y \psi$ where $\gamma : \mathcal{X} \cup \{y\} \rightarrow \text{Pos}(w)$ is the assignment defined by $\gamma(x) = \mu(x)$ for every $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $\gamma(y) = \mu(x_i)$. Thus, since $\varphi := \exists y \psi$, it follows that $w, \mu \models \varphi$, as desired. In the second case, we assume that there exists i such that $0 \leq i \leq n$ and $w, \mu \models H_i$. By definition of H_i from G_i , one may verify that there exists a correct assignment $\gamma : \mathcal{Y}_i \rightarrow \text{Pos}(w)$ such $\mu(x) = \gamma(x)$ for every $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $w, \gamma \models G_i$. By definition of G_i , it follows that $w, \gamma \models \psi$. Since $\varphi := \exists y \psi$, it follows that $w, \mu \models \varphi$, concluding the proof. \square

7 SECOND LOGICAL CHARACTERIZATION: LINEAR TEMPORAL LOGIC

We present a second logical characterization of star-free closure. It also generalizes a well-known result concerning the star-free languages: they are exactly those that can be defined in linear temporal logic (LTL). This is a consequence of Kamp's theorem [17] which implies the equality $\text{FO}(<) = \text{LTL}$. It then follows from the theorem of McNaughton and Papert that $SF = \text{FO}(<) = \text{LTL}$. Here, we introduce a generalized definition of linear temporal logic, which is parameterized by a class \mathcal{C} . Actually, we define two classes $\text{LTL}(\mathcal{C})$ and $\text{LTLP}(\mathcal{C})$. They generalize the two classical variants of linear temporal logic: without and with past, respectively. Then, we prove that $SF(\mathcal{C}) = \text{LTL}(\mathcal{C}) = \text{LTLP}(\mathcal{C})$ for every prevariety \mathcal{C} . The proof argument relies heavily on the characterizations of star-free closure that we already presented. The proof that $\text{LTLP}(\mathcal{C}) \subseteq SF(\mathcal{C})$ is based on the equality $SF(\mathcal{C}) = \text{FO}(\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{C}})$ (Theorem 6.5). Moreover, the proof that $SF(\mathcal{C}) \subseteq \text{LTL}(\mathcal{C})$ uses the algebraic characterization of star-free closure (Theorem 5.11).

7.1 Preliminaries

We first define the generalized notion of “linear temporal logic over finite words”. Then, we present some useful results about it, which we shall need later when proving the correspondence with star-free closure.

Syntax. For every class \mathcal{C} , we define two sets of temporal formulas denoted by $\text{LTL}[\mathcal{C}]$ and $\text{LTLP}[\mathcal{C}]$, which generalize the classical notions of “linear temporal logic” and “linear temporal logic with past”. We first define the $\text{LTLP}[\mathcal{C}]$ formulas, which are more general.

A particular formula is built from the atomic formulas using Boolean connectives and temporal modalities. The atomic formulas are: \min , \max , \top and a for every letter $a \in A$. Moreover, we allow all Boolean connectives: if ψ_1 and ψ_2 are $\text{LTLP}[\mathcal{C}]$ formulas, then so are $(\psi_1 \vee \psi_2)$, $(\psi_1 \wedge \psi_2)$ and $(\neg\psi_1)$. Finally, there are two binary temporal modalities “until” and “since”. They are parameterized by a language in \mathcal{C} . If ψ_1 and ψ_2 are $\text{LTLP}[\mathcal{C}]$ formulas and $L \in \mathcal{C}$, then the following expressions are $\text{LTLP}[\mathcal{C}]$ formulas as well:

$$(\psi_1 U_L \psi_2) \quad \text{and} \quad (\psi_1 S_L \psi_2).$$

Moreover, we write “U” for “ U_{A^*} ” and “S” for “ S_{A^*} ” (their semantics will be the same as the standard modalities “until” and “since” in classical linear temporal logic). We also use the following abbreviations: given an $\text{LTLP}[\mathcal{C}]$ formula ψ and a language $L \in \mathcal{C}$, we write $F_L \psi$ for $\top U_L \psi$ and $X \psi$ for $(\neg\top) U \psi$.

Finally, an $\text{LTL}[\mathcal{C}]$ formula is an $\text{LTLP}[\mathcal{C}]$ formula that only contains “until” modalities (i.e., “since” is disallowed).

Semantics. In order to evaluate an $\text{LTLP}[\mathcal{C}]$ formula φ , one needs a word $w \in A^*$ and a position $i \in \text{Pos}(w)$. We use structural induction to define when the pair (w, i) satisfies the formula φ . We denote this property by $w, i \models \varphi$:

- **Atomic formulas:** We always have $w, i \models \top$. For $a \in A$, we have $w, i \models a$ when a is the letter at position i in w . Moreover, we have $w, i \models \min$ when $i = 0$ (i.e., i is the leftmost unlabeled position) and $w, i \models \max$ when $i = |w| + 1$ (i.e., i is the rightmost unlabeled position).
- **Disjunction:** $w, i \models \psi_1 \vee \psi_2$ when $w, i \models \psi_1$ or $w, i \models \psi_2$.
- **Conjunction:** $w, i \models \psi_1 \wedge \psi_2$ when $w, i \models \psi_1$ and $w, i \models \psi_2$.
- **Negation:** $w, i \models \neg\psi$ when $w, i \models \psi$ does not hold.
- **Until:** $w, i \models \psi_1 U_L \psi_2$ when there exists $j \in \text{Pos}(w)$ such that $i < j$, $w(i, j) \in L$, and
 - (1) For every $k \in \text{Pos}(w)$ such that $i < k < j$, we have $w, k \models \psi_1$, and,
 - (2) $w, j \models \psi_2$.
- **Since:** $w, i \models \psi_1 S_L \psi_2$ when there exists $j \in \text{Pos}(w)$ such that $j < i$, $w(j, i) \in L$ and
 - (1) For every $k \in \text{Pos}(w)$ such that $j < k < i$, we have $w, k \models \psi_1$, and,
 - (2) $w, j \models \psi_2$.

It remains to define what it means for a single word w (without any distinguished position) to satisfy an LTLP[\mathcal{C}] formula φ : we evaluate formulas at the *leftmost unlabeled position* of each word. That is, we say that a word $w \in A^*$ satisfies φ and write $w \models \varphi$ if and only if $w, 0 \models \varphi$. The language defined by the formula φ is $L(\varphi) = \{w \in A^* \mid w \models \varphi\}$.

Finally, we let LTL(\mathcal{C}) (resp. LTLP(\mathcal{C})) be the class consisting of all languages defined by a formula in LTL[\mathcal{C}] (resp. LTLP[\mathcal{C}]). The classes LTL(ST) and LTLP(ST) (where $\text{ST} = \{\emptyset, A^*\}$ is the trivial prevariety) correspond to the classical variants of linear temporal logic from the literature. Typically, the classes LTL(\mathcal{G}) and LTLP(\mathcal{G}) associated to some standard group prevariety \mathcal{G} (such as MOD or AMT), are also natural. We present an example using the class MOD of modulo languages.

Example 7.1. Let $A = \{a, b\}$. The language $(ab)^*$ belongs to LTL(ST) since it is defined by the LTL[ST] formula $X(a \vee \max) \wedge ((a \Rightarrow X b) \wedge (b \Rightarrow X(a \vee \max))) U \max$. Moreover $(aa + bb)^* \in \text{LTL}(\text{MOD})$. It is defined by the following LTL[MOD] formula:

$$(\mathbb{F}_{(AA)^*} \max) \wedge \left(((\mathbb{F}_{(AA)^*} \max) \Rightarrow ((a \wedge X a) \vee (b \wedge X b))) U \max \right).$$

Properties. We present a few properties of the classes LTL(\mathcal{C}), which we shall use later for proving that $\text{SF}(\mathcal{C}) \subseteq \text{LTL}(\mathcal{C})$ (when \mathcal{C} is a prevariety). A key point is that the proof involves auxiliary arbitrary alphabets, independent from the alphabet A that we fix at the beginning. When B is such an alphabet, we need to specify what are the languages over B corresponding to the class LTL(\mathcal{C}) (this is not clear since \mathcal{C} will be defined over our fixed alphabet A). We shall do so using morphisms $\eta : B^* \rightarrow N$ that we obtain from the class \mathcal{C} .

Consider an alphabet B and a morphism $\eta : B^* \rightarrow N$ into a finite monoid. An LTL[η] formula is an LTL[\mathcal{D}] formula φ where \mathcal{D} is the (finite) class consisting of all languages recognized by η (in particular, this means that atomic formulas in φ are \min , \max , \top and letters from B). Additionally, we write LTL(η) for the class consisting of all languages (over B) that can be defined by an LTL[η] formula. We complete these definitions with two lemmas, which are useful to build LTL[η] formulas.

Lemma 7.2. Let B be an alphabet, $\eta : B^* \rightarrow N$ be a morphism into a finite monoid and $L \in \text{LTL}(\eta)$. There exists a formula $\varphi \in \text{LTL}[\eta]$ such that for every $w \in B^*$ and $i \in \text{Pos}(w)$ we have $w, i \models \varphi$ if and only if $w(i, |w| + 1) \in L$.

PROOF. By definition, there exists a formula $\varphi \in \text{LTL}[\eta]$ such that $L(\varphi) = L$. Moreover, as φ is evaluated at the leftmost unlabeled position in words, we may assume without loss of generality that φ is a Boolean combination of formulas of the form $\psi_1 U_H \psi_2$. Since LTL[η] formulas only contain “until” modalities by definition, it can now be verified that for every $w \in B^*$ and $i \in \text{Pos}(w)$ we have $w, i \models \varphi$ if and only if $w(i, |w| + 1) \in L$. \square

Lemma 7.3. *Let B be an alphabet, $\eta : B^* \rightarrow N$ be a morphism into a finite monoid, $L \in \text{LTL}(\eta)$ and $\zeta \in \text{LTL}[\eta]$. There exists a formula $\varphi \in \text{LTL}[\eta]$ such that for all $w \in B^*$ and $i \in \text{Pos}(w)$, we have $w, i \models \varphi$ if and only if there exists $j \in \text{Pos}(w)$ satisfying the three following conditions:*

- (1) $i < j$ and for all $k \in \text{Pos}(w)$ such that $i < k < j$, we have $w, k \not\models \zeta$,
- (2) $w, j \models \zeta$, and
- (3) $w(i, j) \in L$.

PROOF. Lemma 7.2 yields a formula $\psi \in \text{LTL}[\eta]$ such that for every $w \in B^*$ and $i \in \text{Pos}(w)$ we have $w, i \models \psi$ if and only if $w(i, |w| + 1) \in L$. We build a new formula ψ' by applying the two following modifications to ψ :

- we replace every occurrence of the atomic formula max by ζ .
- we recursively replace every sub-formula of the form $\psi_1 U_H \psi_2$ by $(\neg \zeta) \wedge ((\psi_1 \wedge \neg \zeta) U_H \psi_2)$.

It can now be verified that the formula $\varphi := (\text{F } \zeta) \wedge \psi'$ satisfies the property described in the lemma. \square

7.2 Main Theorem

It is well-known that we have $SF = \text{FO}(<) = \text{LTL}(\text{ST}) = \text{LTLP}(\text{ST})$. The equality $\text{FO}(<) = \text{LTL}(\text{ST}) = \text{LTLP}(\text{ST})$ follows from Kamp's theorem [17] (these equalities are only an instance of Kamp's theorem, which is more general, as it connects first-order logic to linear temporal logic for more general structures than finite words). Then, the equality $SF = \text{FO}(<)$ follows from the work of McNaughton and Papert [23]. Here, we generalize this result to arbitrary input classes that are prevarieties. More precisely, we prove the following theorem.

Theorem 7.4. *Let \mathcal{C} be a prevariety. Then, $SF(\mathcal{C}) = \text{LTL}(\mathcal{C}) = \text{LTLP}(\mathcal{C})$.*

Note that, in view of Corollary 5.12, Theorem 7.4 implies that for every prevariety \mathcal{C} with decidable separation, the class $\text{LTL}(\mathcal{C}) = \text{LTLP}(\mathcal{C})$ has decidable membership. We now concentrate on the proof of Theorem 7.4.

PROOF OF THEOREM 7.4. We fix a prevariety \mathcal{C} for the proof. The inclusion $\text{LTL}(\mathcal{C}) \subseteq \text{LTLP}(\mathcal{C})$ is trivial. We prove that $\text{LTLP}(\mathcal{C}) \subseteq SF(\mathcal{C})$ and $SF(\mathcal{C}) \subseteq \text{LTL}(\mathcal{C})$. Let us start with the former, which is simpler.

Inclusion $\text{LTLP}(\mathcal{C}) \subseteq SF(\mathcal{C})$. The proof is based on Theorem 6.5. It states the equality $SF(\mathcal{C}) = \text{FO}(\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{C}})$. Thus, it suffices to prove that $\text{LTLP}(\mathcal{C}) \subseteq \text{FO}(\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{C}})$. Let φ be an $\text{LTLP}[\mathcal{C}]$ formula. We use structural induction on φ to build an $\text{FO}(\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{C}})$ formula $[\varphi](x)$ with at most one free variable x which satisfies the following condition:

$$\text{for all } w \in A^* \text{ and } i \in \text{Pos}(w), \quad w, i \models \varphi \quad \text{if and only if} \quad w, x \mapsto i \models [\varphi](x), \quad (8)$$

where $x \mapsto i$ denotes the assignment that maps x to i . It will then be immediate that the language $L \subseteq A^*$ defined by the $\text{LTL}[\mathcal{C}]$ formula φ (i.e., $L = \{w \in A^* \mid w \models \varphi\}$) is defined by the $\text{FO}(\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{C}})$ sentence $[\varphi](\text{min})$ (which is obtained from $[\varphi](x)$ by replacing every free occurrence of the variable x by the constant min). Hence, we obtain $\text{LTLP}(\mathcal{C}) \subseteq \text{FO}(\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{C}})$ as desired.

If $\varphi = \top$, then we let $[\varphi](x) := (\text{min} = \text{min})$. If $\varphi = \text{min}$ or $\varphi = \text{max}$, then we define $[\varphi](x) := (x = \text{min})$ or $[\varphi](x) := (x = \text{max})$, respectively. If $\varphi = a$ for some $a \in A$, then we let $[\varphi](x) := a(x)$. Logical connectives are handled in the usual way. It remains to treat the temporal operators *until* and *since*.

- (1) If $\varphi = \varphi_1 U_L \varphi_2$ for some $L \in \mathcal{C}$, we define:

$$[\varphi](x) := \exists x_2 I_L(x, x_2) \wedge [\varphi_2](x_2) \wedge \forall x_1 (x < x_1 \wedge x_1 < x_2) \Rightarrow [\varphi_1](x_1).$$

(2) If $\varphi = \varphi_1 \text{S}_L \varphi_2$ for some $L \in \mathcal{C}$, we define:

$$[\varphi](x) := \exists x_2 I_L(x_2, x) \wedge [\varphi_2](x_2) \wedge \forall x_1 (x_2 < x_1 \wedge x_1 < x) \Rightarrow [\varphi_1](x_1).$$

It is simple to verify that this construction satisfies (8), as desired.

Inclusion $SF(\mathcal{C}) \subseteq \text{LTL}(\mathcal{C})$. Let $L \in SF(\mathcal{C})$. We prove that $L \in \text{LTL}(\mathcal{C})$. The argument is based on Theorem 5.11 which implies that all the \mathcal{C} -orbits for the syntactic morphism $\alpha : A^* \rightarrow M$ of L are aperiodic. We use this hypothesis and induction to construct an $\text{LTL}[\mathcal{C}]$ formula defining L . This implies that $L \in \text{LTL}(\mathcal{C})$, as desired.

The construction borrows ideas from the argument of Theorem 5.11, which proves that under the same hypotheses on L , we have $L \in SD(\mathcal{C})$. Yet, there are key differences, as $\text{LTL}(\mathcal{C})$ and $SD(\mathcal{C})$ are distinct formalisms. In particular, as mentioned above, we shall consider auxiliary alphabets independent from A . We start with preliminary definitions aimed at manipulating them.

First, each time we consider an auxiliary alphabet B , we shall have to recast the morphism $\alpha : A^* \rightarrow M$ into a morphism $\beta : B^* \rightarrow M$ and reformulate on β the hypothesis that all \mathcal{C} -orbits for α are aperiodic. For this, we consider another morphism $\eta : B^* \rightarrow N$ into a finite monoid. Roughly, η is used as an abstraction of the class \mathcal{C} over the alphabet B . We say that the pair (β, η) is *tame* to indicate that the following property holds:

$$\text{For all } u, v \in B^*, \text{ if } \eta(u) = \eta(v) \text{ and } \beta(u) \in E(M), \text{ then } (\beta(uvu))^\omega = (\beta(uvu))^{\omega+1}. \quad (9)$$

We first connect this definition to our hypothesis in the following simple fact.

Fact 7.5. *There exists a \mathcal{C} -morphism $\eta : A^* \rightarrow N$ such that the pair (α, η) is tame.*

PROOF. Lemma 5.3 yields a \mathcal{C} -morphism $\eta : A^* \rightarrow N$ such that for every $u, v \in A^*$, if $\eta(u) = \eta(v)$, then $(\alpha(u), \alpha(v))$ is a \mathcal{C} -pair. Since all \mathcal{C} -orbits for α are aperiodic by hypothesis, it follows that if we additionally know that $\alpha(u) \in E(M)$, then $(\alpha(uvu))^\omega = (\alpha(uvu))^{\omega+1}$. Hence, (9) holds and (α, η) is tame. \square

Given an alphabet B , a morphism $\eta : B^* \rightarrow N$ into a finite monoid and $P \subseteq B^*$, an $\text{LTL}(\eta)$ -partition of P is a *finite* partition \mathbf{K} of P into languages of $\text{LTL}(\eta)$. Moreover, given a morphism $\beta : B^* \rightarrow M$ (where M is the original finite monoid used in α) and $s \in M$, we say that \mathbf{K} is (η, β, s) -safe to indicate that for every $K \in \mathbf{K}$ and every $w, w' \in K$, we have $\eta(w) = \eta(w')$ and $\beta(w)s = \beta(w')s$. We may now start the proof. The argument is based on the following lemma.

Lemma 7.6. *Let B be an alphabet and consider a morphism $\beta : B^* \rightarrow M$ into the fixed monoid M and another morphism $\eta : B^* \rightarrow N$ into a finite monoid such that (β, η) is tame. Let $C \subseteq B$ and $s \in M$. Then, there exists an (η, β, s) -safe $\text{LTL}(\eta)$ -partition of C^* .*

Let us first apply Lemma 7.6 to prove that $L \in \text{LTL}(\mathcal{C})$. Fact 7.5 yields a \mathcal{C} -morphism $\eta : A^* \rightarrow N$ such that the pair (α, η) is tame. Since η is a \mathcal{C} -morphism, $\text{LTL}(\eta) \subseteq \text{LTL}(\mathcal{C})$. Hence, it suffices to prove that $L \in \text{LTL}(\eta)$. We apply the lemma for $B = C = A$, $\beta = \alpha$ and $s = 1_M$. This yields an $(\eta, \alpha, 1_M)$ -safe $\text{LTL}(\eta)$ -partition \mathbf{K} of A^* . Now, \mathbf{K} being $(\eta, \alpha, 1_M)$ -safe implies that for every $K \in \mathbf{K}$, there exists $s \in M$ such that $K \subseteq \alpha^{-1}(s)$. Since \mathbf{K} is a partition of A^* and L is recognized by α , it follows that L is a union of languages of \mathbf{K} . Since $\text{LTL}(\eta)$ is closed under union, it follows that L itself belongs to $\text{LTL}(\eta)$, which completes the main argument.

It remains to prove Lemma 7.6. Let B be an alphabet and consider two morphisms $\beta : B^* \rightarrow M$ and $\eta : B^* \rightarrow N$ such that (β, η) is tame. Moreover, let $C \subseteq B$ and $s \in M$. We build an $\text{LTL}(\eta)$ -partition of C^* which is (η, β, s) -safe using induction on the three following parameters listed by order of importance:

(1) The size of $\beta(C^+) \subseteq M$.

- (2) The size of C .
- (3) The size of $\beta(C^*) \cdot s \subseteq M$.

Remark 7.7. *As already mentioned, the proof is similar to that of Theorem 5.11. In particular, the current proof resembles to that of Corollary 5.13. The reader may wonder why the element s , which serves as a buffer in these proofs, is not on the same side. The reason is that it was easier to consider $s\alpha(P^*)$ in Corollary 5.13, due to the fact that P is a prefix code, while it is easier to consider $\beta(C^*) \cdot s$ here, due to the fact that we are dealing with pure future linear time temporal logic.*

We distinguish two cases depending on the following property of β , C and s . We say that s is (β, C) -stable when the following holds:

$$\text{for every } c \in C, \quad \beta(C^*) \cdot s = \beta(cC^*) \cdot s. \quad (10)$$

We first consider the case when s is (β, C) -stable. This is the base case. Otherwise, we use induction on our three parameters.

Base case: s is (β, C) -stable. In that case, we define $\mathbf{K} = \{C^* \cap \eta^{-1}(t) \mid t \in N\}$. Clearly, this is a finite partition of C^* . Moreover, it is clear that $C^* \cap \eta^{-1}(t) \in \text{LTL}(\eta)$ for every $t \in N$. Indeed, it is defined by the LTL $[\eta]$ formula $\left(\bigvee_{c \in C} c \bigcup_{\eta^{-1}(t)} \max \right)$.

It remains to show that \mathbf{K} is (η, β, s) -safe. We use the hypothesis that (β, η) is tame. First, we use the hypothesis that s is (β, C) -stable to prove the following statement, analogous to Fact 5.16.

Fact 7.8. *Let $q, f \in \beta(C^*)$ such that f is idempotent. Then, we have $fqs = qs$.*

PROOF. The proof is based on the following preliminary result. For $u, v \in C^*$, we show that,

$$\text{there exists } r \in \beta(C^*) \text{ such that } \beta(u)rs = \beta(v)s. \quad (11)$$

We fix $u, v \in C^*$ for the proof of (11). We use induction on the length of u . If $u = \varepsilon$, it suffices to choose $r = \beta(v) \in \beta(C^*)$. Otherwise, $u = u'c$ with $u' \in C^*$, $c \in C$. Induction yields $r' \in \beta(C^*)$ such that $\beta(u')r's = \beta(v)s$. Moreover, since s is (β, C) -stable and $r' \in \beta(C^*)$, it follows from (10) that there exists $r \in \beta(C^*)$ such that $r's = \beta(c)rs$. Altogether, this yields $\beta(u')\beta(c)rs = \beta(v)s$ and as $u = u'c$, we get $\beta(u)rs = \beta(v)s$, concluding the proof of (11).

We now prove the fact. Let $q, f \in \beta(C^*)$ such that f is idempotent. By definition, we $u, v \in C^*$ such that $q = \beta(v)$ and $f = \beta(u)$. Hence, (11) yields $r \in \alpha(C^*)$ such that $frs = qs$. Since f is idempotent, this implies that $fqs = ffrs = frs = qs$. \square

We now prove that every $K \in \mathbf{K}$ is (η, β, s) -safe. By definition, $K = C^* \cap \eta^{-1}(t)$ for $t \in N$. Given $u, v \in K$, we have to show that $\eta(u) = \eta(v)$ and $\beta(u)s = \beta(v)s$. Let $n = \omega(M)$. Since $u, v \in K$, we have $\eta(u) = \eta(v) = t$. Hence, $\eta(u^n) = \eta(u^{n-1}v)$ and since $\beta(u^n)$ is idempotent, the hypothesis that (β, η) is tame yields $(\beta(u^{2n-1}vu^n))^n = (\beta(u^{2n-1}vu^n))^{n+1}$. We now multiply by s on the right to obtain $(\beta(u^{2n-1}vu^n))^n s = (\beta(u^{2n-1}vu^n))^{n+1} s$. Since $n = \omega(M)$, we know that $(\beta(u^{2n-1}vu^n))^n$ is an idempotent of $\beta(C^*)$. Therefore, Fact 7.8 yields $(\beta(u^{2n-1}vu^n))^n s = s$. Altogether, we obtain that $s = \beta(u^{2n-1}vu^n)s$. We now multiply by $\beta(u)$ on the left to get $\beta(u)s = \beta(u^{2n}vu^n)s$. Finally, $\beta(u^n) \in \beta(C^*)$ is an idempotent, we may apply Fact 7.8 twice to get $\beta(u^{2n}vu^n)s = \beta(v)s$. Altogether, this yields $\beta(u)s = \beta(v)s$, as desired.

Inductive case: s is not (β, C) -stable. By hypothesis, there exists some letter $c \in C$ such that the following property holds:

$$\beta(cC^*) \cdot s \subsetneq \beta(C^*) \cdot s. \quad (12)$$

We fix this letter $c \in C$ for the rest of the argument and we let D be the sub-alphabet $D = C \setminus \{c\}$.

The restrictions $\beta : D^* \rightarrow M$ and $\eta : D^* \rightarrow N$ still form a tame pair (β, η) . Therefore, we may apply induction in Lemma 7.6 when replacing C by D . Indeed, the first induction parameter (the

size of $\beta(C^+)$) has not increased here since $D \subseteq C$ and β remains unchanged, while the second parameter has decreased: $|D| < |C|$. This yields an $(\eta, \beta, 1_M)$ -safe LTL(η)-partition \mathbf{H} of D^* . We may assume without loss of generality that $H \neq \emptyset$ for every $H \in \mathbf{H}$.

Fact 7.9. *There exists an $(\eta, \beta, 1_M)$ -safe LTL(η)-partition \mathbf{H} of D^* made of nonempty languages.*

We distinguish two independent subcases. Observe that the inclusion $\beta(cC^*) \subseteq \beta(C^+)$ holds. The argument differs depending on whether it is strict or not.

Subcase 1: $\beta(cC^*) = \beta(C^+)$. We use induction on our third parameter (*i.e.*, the size of $\beta(C^*)$ s). Let $H \in \mathbf{H}$. Since \mathbf{H} is a partition of D^* which is $(\eta, \beta, 1_M)$ -safe by definition and $H \neq \emptyset$, there exists a unique element $t_H \in \beta(D^*)$ such that $\beta(x) = t_H$ for every $x \in H$. The construction of \mathbf{K} is based on the following fact (this is where we use induction).

Fact 7.10. *For all $H \in \mathbf{H}$, there exists an $(\eta, \beta(c)t_{HS})$ -safe LTL(η)-partition \mathbf{U}_H of C^* .*

PROOF. We fix $H \in \mathbf{H}$. Since $t_H \in \beta(D^*)$, we have $\beta(c)t_{HS} \in \beta(cD^*)$ s. Therefore, we have $\beta(C^*)\beta(c)t_{HS} \subseteq \beta(C^+)$ s. Combined with our hypothesis in Subcase 1 (*i.e.*, $\beta(cC^*) = \beta(C^+)$), this yields $\beta(C^*)\beta(c)t_{HS} \subseteq \beta(cC^*)$ s. Finally, we obtain from (6) (*i.e.*, $\beta(cC^*) \subseteq \beta(C^*)$ s) that the *strict* inclusion $\beta(C^*)\beta(c)t_{HS} \subsetneq \beta(C^*)$ s holds. Hence, we may apply induction on our third parameter in Lemma 7.6 (*i.e.*, the size of $\beta(C^*)$ s) to obtain the desired finite partition \mathbf{U}_H of C^* which is $(\eta, \beta(c)t_{HS})$ -safe. Note that here, our first two parameters have not increased as β and C remain unchanged. \square

We may now define the desired partition \mathbf{K} of C^* . Using the partitions \mathbf{U}_H given by Fact 7.10, we define,

$$\mathbf{K} = \mathbf{H} \cup \{UcH \mid H \in \mathbf{H} \text{ and } U \in \mathbf{U}_H\}.$$

It remains to show that \mathbf{K} is indeed an LTL(η)-partition of C^* which is (η, β, s) -safe. One may verify that \mathbf{K} is a partition of C^* since \mathbf{H} is a partition of D^* and \mathbf{U}_H is a partition of C^* for every $H \in \mathbf{H}$ (recall that $D = C \setminus \{c\}$). Let us prove that every $K \in \mathbf{K}$ belongs to LTL(η). This is immediate if $K \in \mathbf{H}$ by hypothesis on \mathbf{H} . Otherwise, there exist $H \in \mathbf{H}$ and $U \in \mathbf{U}_H$ such that $K = UcH$. Since $H \in \text{LTL}(\eta)$, it follows from Lemma 7.2 that there exists a formula $\psi_H \in \text{LTL}[\eta]$ such that for every $w \in B^*$ and every $i \in \text{Pos}(w)$, we have $w, i \models \psi_H$ if and only if $w(i, |w| + 1) \in H$. Moreover, let $\zeta \in \text{LTL}[\eta]$ be the formula $\zeta := c \wedge \neg F c$ (given a word $w \in B^*$ and $i \in \text{Pos}(w)$, we have $w, i \models \zeta$ if and only if i is the rightmost position in w carrying the letter c). Since $U \in \text{LTL}(\eta)$ (by definition of \mathbf{U}_H), Lemma 7.3 yields a formula $\psi_U \in \text{LTL}[\eta]$ such that for every $w \in B^*$, we have $w \models \psi_U$ if and only if there exists $j \in \text{Pos}(w)$ such that $w, j \models \zeta$ (by definition of ζ , j must be unique) and $w(0, j) \in U$. Since $c \notin D$ and $H \subseteq D^*$, one may now verify that $K = UcH$ is defined by the formula $\psi_U \wedge F(\zeta \wedge \psi_H)$. Hence, we get $K \in \text{LTL}(\eta)$, as desired.

It remains to prove that \mathbf{K} is (η, β, s) -safe. Consider $K \in \mathbf{K}$ and $w, w' \in K$. We have to show that $\eta(w) = \eta(w')$ and $\beta(w)s = \beta(w')s$. By definition of \mathbf{K} , there are two cases: first, if $K \in \mathbf{H}$ we know by Fact 7.9 that \mathbf{H} is an $(\eta, \beta, 1_M)$ -safe LTL(η)-partition of D^* . Therefore, we obtain $\eta(w) = \eta(w')$ and $\beta(w) = \beta(w')$, whence $\beta(w)s = \beta(w')s$, as desired. Otherwise, $K = UcH$ with $H \in \mathbf{H}$ and $U \in \mathbf{U}_H$. Thus, we get $x, x' \in H$ and $u, u' \in U$ such that $w = ucx$ and $w' = u'cx'$. By definition of t_H , we have $\beta(x) = \beta(x') = t_H$. Moreover, since \mathbf{H} is $(\eta, \beta, 1_M)$ -safe and \mathbf{U}_H is $(\eta, \beta(c)t_{HS})$ -safe by Fact 7.10, we also have $\eta(x) = \eta(x')$ and $\eta(u) = \eta(u')$, whence $\eta(w) = \eta(w')$. Finally, $\beta(w)s = \beta(u)\beta(c)t_{HS}$ and $\beta(w')s = \beta(u')\beta(c)t_{HS}$ and since \mathbf{U}_H is $(\eta, \beta(c)t_{HS})$ -safe, we obtain $\beta(w)s = \beta(w')s$. This concludes the proof of this subcase.

Subcase 2: $\beta(cC^*) \subsetneq \beta(C^+)$. We use induction on our first parameter (*i.e.*, the size of $\beta(C^+)$). Consider a word $w \in C^*$. Since $D = C \setminus \{c\}$, w admits a unique decomposition $w = uv$ such that $u \in D^*$ and $v \in (cD^*)^*$ (*i.e.*, u is the largest prefix of w in D^* and v is the corresponding suffix). Using

induction, we construct $\text{LTL}(\eta)$ -partitions of the possible prefixes and suffixes. Then, we combine them to construct a partition of the whole set C^* . Actually, not that we already partitioned the set of prefixes: we have an $\text{LTL}(\eta)$ -partition \mathbf{H} of D^* which is $(\eta, \beta, 1_M)$ -safe. It remains to partition the set of suffixes: this is where we use induction.

Lemma 7.11. *There exists an $\text{LTL}(\eta)$ -partition \mathbf{V} of $(cD^*)^*$ which is $(\eta, \beta, 1_M)$ -safe.*

PROOF. For each language $H \in \mathbf{H}$, we create a letter written \mathbb{b}_H and let $\mathbb{B} = \{\mathbb{b}_H \mid H \in \mathbf{H}\}$ as a new alphabet. Moreover, we define new morphisms $\gamma : \mathbb{B}^* \rightarrow M$ and $\delta : \mathbb{B}^* \rightarrow N$. Let $H \in \mathbf{H}$ and consider the letter \mathbb{b}_H . Since \mathbf{H} is a partition of D^* which is $(\eta, \beta, 1_M)$ -safe by definition and $H \neq \emptyset$, there exist unique elements $t_H \in \beta(D^*)$ and $q_H \in \eta(D^*)$ such that $\eta(x) = q_H$ and $\beta(x) = t_H$ for every $x \in H$. We let $\gamma(\mathbb{b}_H) = \beta(c)t_H$ and $\delta(\mathbb{b}_H) = \eta(c)q_H$.

Observe that the pair (γ, δ) is tame. Indeed, let $u, v \in \mathbb{B}^*$ such that $\delta(u) = \delta(v)$ and $\gamma(u) \in E(M)$. By definition of \mathbb{B} , there exist $w_u, w_v \in (cD^*)^*$ such that $\gamma(u) = \beta(w_u)$, $\gamma(v) = \beta(w_v)$, $\delta(u) = \eta(w_u)$ and $\delta(v) = \eta(w_v)$. Hence, $\eta(w_u) = \eta(w_v)$ and $\beta(w_u) \in E(M)$. Since (β, η) is tame, it then follows from (9) that $(\beta(w_u w_v w_u))^\omega = (\beta(w_u w_v w_u))^{\omega+1}$. This exactly says that $(\gamma(u v u))^\omega = (\gamma(u v u))^{\omega+1}$, as desired. Moreover, by definition of \mathbb{B} , one may verify that $\gamma(\mathbb{B}^+) = \beta((cD)^+) \subseteq \beta(cC^*)$. Hence, since $\beta(cC^*) \subsetneq \beta(C^+)$ (this is our hypothesis in Subcase 2), we get $|\gamma(\mathbb{B}^+)| < |\beta(C^+)|$. Consequently, we may apply induction on the first parameter in Lemma 7.6 (i.e., the size of $\beta(C^+)$) to get an $\text{LTL}(\delta)$ -partition \mathbf{G} of \mathbb{B}^* which is $(\delta, \gamma, 1_M)$ -safe. We use it to construct \mathbf{V} .

First, we define a map $\mu : (cD^*)^* \rightarrow \mathbb{B}^*$. Observe that since $c \notin D$, every word $u \in (cD^*)^*$ admits a unique decomposition $u = cu_1 \cdots cu_n$ with $u_1, \dots, u_n \in D^*$. For every $i \leq n$, we let H_i as the unique language in \mathbf{H} such that $u_i \in H_i$ (recall that \mathbf{H} is partition of D^*). We then define $\mu(w) = \mathbb{b}_{H_1} \cdots \mathbb{b}_{H_n}$. Note that by definition, each position $i \in \text{Pos}(w)$ which is labeled by a “c” corresponds to a unique position in $\mu(w)$. We may now define $\mathbf{V} = \{\mu^{-1}(G) \mid G \in \mathbf{G}\}$. It remains to show that \mathbf{V} is an $\text{LTL}(\eta)$ -partition of $(cD^*)^*$ which is $(\eta, \beta, 1_M)$ -safe. Clearly, \mathbf{V} is a partition of $(cD^*)^*$ by definition since \mathbf{G} is a partition of \mathbb{B}^* .

We first prove that every $V \in \mathbf{V}$ belongs to $\text{LTL}(\eta)$. By definition, $V = \mu^{-1}(G)$ for some $G \in \mathbf{G}$. Let $\zeta := c \vee \max \in \text{LTL}[\eta]$. We know that every $H \in \mathbf{H}$ belongs to $\text{LTL}(\eta)$. Hence, Lemma 7.3 yields a formula $\psi'_H \in \text{LTL}[\eta]$ such that for every $w \in B^*$ and $i \in \text{Pos}(w)$, we have $w, i \models \psi'_H$ if and only if there exists $j \in \text{Pos}(w)$ such that $i < j$, $w, j \models \zeta$, $w, k \not\models \zeta$ for every $i < k < j$ and $w(i, j) \in H$. We let $\psi_H = c \wedge \psi'_H$. By definition, $w, i \models \psi_H$ if and only if i has label c and the greatest prefix of $w(i, |w| + 1)$ which is in D^* belongs to H . The key idea is that when $w \in (cD^*)^*$, the formula ψ_H holds for the positions $i \in \text{Pos}(w)$ which are labeled by c and such that the position of $\mu(w) \in \mathbb{B}^*$ corresponding to i is labeled by $\mathbb{b}_H \in \mathbb{B}$. Moreover, since $G \in \mathbf{G}$, there exists an $\text{LTL}[\delta]$ formula Γ_G defining G by hypothesis on \mathbf{G} . We modify Γ_G into an $\text{LTL}[\eta]$ formula φ_V defining $V = \mu^{-1}(G)$. First, let φ'_V be the formula obtained from Γ_G by applying the two following modifications:

- (1) We replace each atomic sub-formula “ \mathbb{b}_H ” for $H \in \mathbf{H}$ by the $\text{LTL}[\eta]$ formula ψ_H .
- (2) We recursively replace all sub-formulas $\varphi_1 \text{ U}_X \varphi_2$. Since Γ_G is an $\text{LTL}[\delta]$ -formula, we have $F \subseteq N$ such that $X = \delta^{-1}(F)$. We recursively replace $\varphi_1 \text{ U}_X \varphi_2$ by,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(X \zeta \wedge (\zeta \Rightarrow \varphi_1) \text{ U}_{\eta^{-1}(F)} (\zeta \wedge \varphi_2) \right) \\ \vee & \left((\neg X \zeta) \wedge \left((\neg X \zeta) \text{ U} \left(X \zeta \wedge \left((\zeta \Rightarrow \varphi_1) \text{ U}_{\eta^{-1}(F)} (\zeta \wedge \varphi_2) \right) \right) \right) \right) \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we let $\varphi_V := X (c \vee \max) \wedge \varphi'_V$. One may now verify from the definition that φ_V defines $V = \mu^{-1}(G)$.

It remains to prove that \mathbf{V} is $(\eta, \beta, 1_M)$ -safe. Let $V \in \mathbf{V}$ and $v, v' \in V$. By definition, there exists $G \in \mathbf{G}$ such that $V = \mu^{-1}(G)$. Hence, we have $\mu(v), \mu(v') \in G$ and since \mathbf{G} is $(\delta, \gamma, 1_M)$ -safe, this yields $\gamma(\mu(v)) = \gamma(\mu(v'))$ and $\delta(\mu(v)) = \delta(\mu(v'))$. One may verify that $\delta(\mu(v)) = \eta(v)$, $\delta(\mu(v')) =$

$\eta(v'), \gamma(\mu(v)) = \beta(v)$ and $\gamma(\mu(v')) = \beta(v')$. Thus, we get $\beta(v) = \beta(v')$ and $\delta(v) = \delta(v')$, concluding the proof. \square

We are ready to build our $LTL(\eta)$ -partition \mathbf{K} of C^* . Let \mathbf{V} be the $(\eta, \beta, 1_M)$ -safe $LTL(\eta)$ -partition of $(cD^*)^*$ given by Lemma 7.11. We let,

$$\mathbf{K} = \{HV \mid H \in \mathbf{H} \text{ and } V \in \mathbf{V}\}.$$

It is immediate by definition that \mathbf{K} is a partition of C^* since $D = C \setminus \{c\}$ and \mathbf{H} is a partition of D^* . Let us verify that every $K \in \mathbf{K}$ belongs to $LTL(\eta)$. By definition, one can write $K = HV$ for some $H \in \mathbf{H}$ and $V \in \mathbf{V}$. Let $\zeta := c \vee \max$. Since $H \in LTL(\eta)$, Lemma 7.3 yields an $LTL[\eta]$ formula ψ_H such that for every $w \in B^*$, we have $w \models \psi_H$ if and only if there exists $j \in \text{Pos}(w) \setminus \{0\}$ such that $w, j \models \zeta$, $w, k \not\models \zeta$ for every $k \in \text{Pos}(w)$ such that $0 < k < j$ and $w(0, j) \in H$. Since $V \in LTL(\eta)$ (by hypothesis on \mathbf{V}), Lemma 7.2 yields an $LTL[\eta]$ formula ψ_V such that for every $w \in B^*$ and every $i \in \text{Pos}(w)$, we have $w, i \models \psi_V$ if and only if $w(i, |w| + 1) \in V$. One may now verify that $K = HV$ is defined by the formula,

$$\psi_H \wedge ((X \zeta \wedge \psi_V) \vee ((\neg X \zeta) \wedge ((\neg X \zeta) \cup (X \zeta \wedge \psi_V)))).$$

Hence, we get $K \in LTL(\eta)$. It remains to verify that \mathbf{K} is (η, β, s) -safe (it is in fact $(\eta, \beta, 1_M)$ -safe). Let $K \in \mathbf{K}$ and $w, w' \in K$, we show that $\eta(w) = \eta(w')$ and $\beta(w) = \beta(w')$ (which implies $\beta(w)s = \beta(w')s$). By definition, $K = HV$ with $H \in \mathbf{H}$ and $V \in \mathbf{V}$. Therefore, $w = uv$ and $w' = u'v'$ with $u, u' \in H$ and $v, v' \in V$. Since \mathbf{H} and \mathbf{V} are both $(\eta, \beta, 1_M)$ -safe by definition, we have $\eta(u) = \eta(u')$, $\beta(u) = \beta(u')$, $\eta(v) = \eta(v')$ and $\beta(v) = \beta(v')$. It follows that $\eta(w) = \eta(w')$ and $\beta(w) = \beta(w')$ which concludes the proof. \square

8 RATING MAPS

We now turn to separation and covering. We prove two results in the paper. In Section 9, we show that $SF(\mathcal{C})$ -covering is decidable for every *finite* prevariety \mathcal{C} . Then, in Section 10, we prove that $SF(\mathcal{G})$ -covering is decidable for every group prevariety \mathcal{G} that has decidable separation. In both cases, the algorithms are based on a generic framework which was introduced in [39] for the specific purpose of handling separation and covering. It relies on simple algebraic objects called *rating maps*. We recall this framework in this preliminary section.

We define rating maps and present two particular kinds: the nice and the multiplicative ones. We use this notion to associate a computational problem with each lattice \mathcal{C} : “given as input a nice multiplicative rating map ρ and a regular language L , compute an optimal \mathcal{C} -cover of L for ρ ”. Then, we connect this problem to \mathcal{C} -covering. Finally, we present new notions that are not defined in [39]. They are specifically designed for handling the classes of the form $Op(\mathcal{C})$ built from an input class \mathcal{C} using an operator. In the paper, we are interested in the case when Op is star-free closure.

8.1 Definition

We first introduce *rating algebras*. A *rating algebra* is a monoid $(R, +)$ which is *commutative* ($q+r = r+q$ for every $q, r \in R$) and *idempotent* ($r+r = r$ for all $r \in R$). The binary operation $+$ is called *addition* and we denote the neutral element of R by 0_R (we use an additive notation here, since we are dealing with a commutative monoid). Given a rating algebra R , we also define a canonical ordering “ \leq ” over R as follows:

$$\text{for all } r, s \in R, \quad r \leq s \text{ when } r + s = s.$$

One may verify that \leq is a partial order and that it makes R an ordered monoid (i.e., \leq is compatible with addition). It can be verified that every morphism between two rating algebras is *increasing* for the canonical orderings. We often use this property implicitly.

Example 8.1. For every set S , the algebra $(2^S, \cup)$ is a rating algebra whose neutral element is \emptyset . The canonical ordering “ \leq ” on 2^S is inclusion. Indeed, given $P, Q \in 2^S$, it is clear that $P \subseteq Q$ if and only if $P \cup Q = Q$. In particular, if A is an alphabet, then $(2^{A^*}, \cup)$ is a rating algebra. In practice, these are the only infinite rating algebras that we shall consider.

We often apply a “downset operator” to subsets of our rating algebras R . That is, for every $S \subseteq R$, we write $\downarrow_R S$ for the set $\downarrow_R S = \{r \mid \exists s \in S \text{ such that } r \leq s\}$. We also consider Cartesian products $X \times R$ of an arbitrary set X with a rating algebra R . Given $S \subseteq X \times R$, we write $\downarrow_R S = \{(x, r) \in X \times R \mid \exists r' \in R \text{ such that } r \leq r' \text{ and } (x, r') \in S\}$.

Definition of a rating map. As seen above, $(2^{A^*}, \cup)$ is a rating algebra. A *rating map* (over A) is a monoid morphism $\rho : (2^{A^*}, \cup) \rightarrow (R, +)$ where $(R, +)$ is an arbitrary *finite* rating algebra. In other words, we have $\rho(\emptyset) = 0_R$ and $\rho(K_1 \cup K_2) = \rho(K_1) + \rho(K_2)$ for all $K_1, K_2 \subseteq A^*$. Note that since rating maps are morphisms of rating algebras, they are necessarily increasing: if $K_1 \subseteq K_2$, then $\rho(K_1) \leq \rho(K_2)$. For the sake of improved readability, when applying a rating map ρ to a singleton language $K = \{w\}$ (i.e., $w \in A^*$ is a word), we write $\rho(w)$ for $\rho(\{w\})$. We often consider rating maps satisfying additional properties.

Nice rating maps. We say that a rating map $\rho : 2^{A^*} \rightarrow R$ is *nice* to indicate that for every language $K \subseteq A^*$, there exists a *finite* set $F \subseteq K$ such that $\rho(K) = \rho(F)$.

Remark 8.2. Not all rating maps are nice. Consider the rating algebra $R = \{0, 1\}$ whose addition is defined by $i + j = \max(i, j)$ for $i, j \in R$. We define $\rho : 2^{A^*} \rightarrow R$ by $\rho(K) = 0$ if $K \subseteq A^*$ is finite and $\rho(K) = 1$ if $K \subseteq A^*$ is infinite. One may verify that ρ is not nice: if K is infinite, then $\rho(K) = 1$ while $\rho(F) = 0$ for every finite subset $F \subseteq K$.

The definition of nice rating maps motivates the following object. For every rating map $\rho : 2^{A^*} \rightarrow R$ (nice or not), we associate a map $\rho_* : A^* \rightarrow R$ defined as the restriction of ρ to A^* : for every $w \in A^*$, $\rho_*(w) = \rho(w)$. One may verify that when ρ is nice, it is characterized by ρ_* . More precisely, for every $K \subseteq A^*$, we have $\rho(K) = \sum_{w \in K} \rho_*(w)$ (the sum is well-defined as it boils down to a finite one since ρ is nice and R is idempotent and commutative).

Multiplicative rating maps. The rating algebras of multiplicative rating maps have more structure: they are *idempotent semirings*. A *semiring* is a tuple $(R, +, \cdot)$ where R is a set and “+” and “ \cdot ” are two binary operations, such that the following axioms are satisfied:

- $(R, +)$ is a commutative monoid (its neutral element is denoted by 0_R).
- (R, \cdot) is a monoid (its neutral element is denoted by 1_R).
- The neutral element of $(R, +)$ is a zero for multiplication: $0_R r = r 0_R = 0_R$ for all $r \in R$.
- The multiplication distributes over addition: $r(s + t) = rs + rt$ and $(r + s)t = rt + st$ for every $r, s, t \in R$.

Finally, a semiring $(R, +, \cdot)$ is *idempotent* when $r + r = r$ for every $r \in R$ (on the other hand, there is no additional constraint on the multiplication). By definition, it follows that in this case, the additive monoid $(R, +)$ is a rating algebra.

Example 8.3. For every alphabet A , the triple $(2^{A^*}, \cup, \cdot)$ is an idempotent semiring (here, we use language concatenation “ \cdot ” as the multiplication; its neutral element is the singleton $\{\varepsilon\}$).

A rating map $\rho : 2^{A^*} \rightarrow R$ is *multiplicative* when the rating algebra $(R, +)$ is equipped with a second binary operation “ \cdot ” such that $(R, +, \cdot)$ is an *idempotent semiring* and ρ is also a monoid morphism from $(2^{A^*}, \cup)$ to (R, \cdot) . Thus, the axioms are as follows:

- (1) $\rho(\emptyset) = 0_R$ and for all $K_1, K_2 \subseteq A^*$, we have $\rho(K_1 \cup K_2) = \rho(K_1) + \rho(K_2)$.
- (2) $\rho(\varepsilon) = 1_R$ and for all $K_1, K_2 \subseteq A^*$, we have $\rho(K_1 K_2) = \rho(K_1) \cdot \rho(K_2)$.

Altogether, this exactly says that ρ is a semiring morphism from $(2^{A^*}, \cup, \cdot)$ to $(R, +, \cdot)$.

A key point is that a rating map $\rho : 2^{A^*} \rightarrow (R, +, \cdot)$ that is both *nice* and *multiplicative* can be finitely represented. Indeed, since ρ is nice, it is characterized by the map $\rho_* : A^* \rightarrow R$. Moreover, since ρ is multiplicative, ρ_* is a monoid morphism from A^* to (R, \cdot) . Altogether, it follows that ρ is finitely representable: it suffices to store the image $\rho(a) \in R$ of each letter $a \in A$ as well as the addition and multiplication tables of $(R, +, \cdot)$. This means that we can speak of algorithms *taking a nice multiplicative rating map as input*.

Canonical nice multiplicative rating map associated to a morphism. We complete the presentation with a simple construction. It associates a canonical nice multiplicative rating map to a morphism into a finite monoid. We shall use it to make the link with covering. Consider a morphism $\alpha : A^* \rightarrow M$ into a finite monoid. We associate a nice multiplicative rating map $\rho_\alpha : 2^{A^*} \rightarrow 2^M$ to α . Consider the triple $(2^M, \cup, \cdot)$ whose multiplication is defined as follows for all $T, T' \in 2^M$:

$$TT' = \{tt' \in M \mid t \in T \text{ and } t' \in T'\}.$$

One may verify that $(2^M, \cup, \cdot)$ is an idempotent semiring. For every $K \subseteq A^*$, we define,

$$\rho_\alpha(K) = \alpha(K) = \{t \in M \mid \alpha^{-1}(t) \cap K \neq \emptyset\}.$$

One may verify that $\rho_\alpha : 2^{A^*} \rightarrow 2^M$ is a *nice multiplicative rating map*.

8.2 Optimal covers and optimal imprints.

Now that we have defined what rating maps are, we turn to imprints. Consider a rating map $\rho : 2^{A^*} \rightarrow R$. Given any finite set of languages \mathbf{K} , we define the ρ -*imprint* of \mathbf{K} . Roughly speaking, when \mathbf{K} is a cover of some language L , this object measures the “quality” of \mathbf{K} , which is a subset of R . Intuitively, the smaller the imprint, the better the cover. The ρ -*imprint of \mathbf{K}* is the subset of R defined by:

$$\mathcal{J}[\rho](\mathbf{K}) = \downarrow_R \{\rho(K) \mid K \in \mathbf{K}\}.$$

We now define optimality. Consider an arbitrary rating map $\rho : 2^{A^*} \rightarrow R$ and a lattice \mathcal{D} . Given a language L , an *optimal \mathcal{D} -cover* of L for ρ is a \mathcal{D} -cover \mathbf{K} of L having the least possible imprint among all \mathcal{D} -covers, *i.e.*, which satisfies the following property:

$$\mathcal{J}[\rho](\mathbf{K}) \subseteq \mathcal{J}[\rho](\mathbf{K}') \quad \text{for every } \mathcal{D}\text{-cover } \mathbf{K}' \text{ of } L.$$

In general, there can be infinitely many optimal \mathcal{D} -covers for a given rating map ρ . The key point is that there always exists at least one, provided that \mathcal{D} is a lattice. We state this simple property in the following lemma (proved in [39, Lemma 4.15]).

Lemma 8.4. *Let \mathcal{D} be a lattice. For every language L and every rating map ρ , there exists an optimal \mathcal{D} -cover of L for ρ .*

Clearly, given a lattice \mathcal{D} , a language L and a rating map ρ , all optimal \mathcal{D} -covers of L for ρ have the same ρ -imprint. Hence, this unique ρ -imprint is a *canonical* object for \mathcal{D} , L and ρ . We call it the *optimal ρ -imprint on L for \mathcal{D}* and we denote it by $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{D}}[L, \rho]$:

$$\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{D}}[L, \rho] = \mathcal{J}[\rho](\mathbf{K}) \quad \text{for any optimal } \mathcal{D}\text{-cover } \mathbf{K} \text{ of } L \text{ for } \rho.$$

An important special case is when $L = A^*$. In this case, we write $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{D}}[\rho]$ for $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{D}}[A^*, \rho]$. Let us present a few properties of optimal imprints. First, we have the following useful fact (proved in [39, Facts 4.16 and 4.17]).

Fact 8.5. *Let \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{D} be lattices such that $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{D}$, $\rho : 2^{A^*} \rightarrow R$ be a rating map and $H, L \subseteq A^*$ be two languages such that $H \subseteq L$. Then, $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{D}}[H, \rho] \subseteq \mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{C}}[L, \rho]$.*

Additionally, we have the following lemma (proved in [38, Fact 4.7]).

Lemma 8.6. *Let \mathcal{D} be a lattice and let $\rho : 2^{A^*} \rightarrow R$ be a rating map. Then, $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{D}}[\emptyset, \rho] = \emptyset$. Moreover, given two languages H, L , we have $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{D}}[H \cup L, \rho] = \mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{D}}[H, \rho] \cup \mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{D}}[L, \rho]$*

We complete Lemma 8.6 with a similar statement for language concatenation instead of union (proved in [39, Lemma 5.8]). Note that it requires more hypotheses: \mathcal{D} must be a prevariety and the rating map ρ must be multiplicative.

Lemma 8.7. *Let \mathcal{D} be a prevariety and let $\rho : 2^{A^*} \rightarrow R$ be a multiplicative rating map. Given two languages $H, L \subseteq A^*$, we have $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{D}}[H, \rho] \cdot \mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{D}}[L, \rho] \subseteq \mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{D}}[HL, \rho]$.*

8.3 Connection with covering.

We now connect these definitions to the covering problem. The key idea is that solving \mathcal{D} -covering for a class \mathcal{D} boils down to finding an algorithm that computes the optimal imprint for \mathcal{D} from a nice multiplicative rating map given as input. In [39], two statements are presented. The first is simpler but it only applies Boolean algebras, while the second, more involved, applies to all lattices. Since all classes investigated in the paper are Boolean algebras, we only present the first one.

Proposition 8.8. *Let \mathcal{D} be a Boolean algebra. There exists an effective reduction from \mathcal{D} -covering to the following problem:*

Input: *A nice multiplicative rating map $\rho : 2^{A^*} \rightarrow R$ and $F \subseteq R$.*

Question: *Is it true that $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{D}}[\rho] \cap F = \emptyset$?*

PROOF SKETCH. We briefly describe the reduction (we refer the reader to [39] for details). Consider an input pair $(L_0, \{L_1, \dots, L_n\})$ for \mathcal{D} -covering. Since the languages L_i are regular, for every $i \leq n$, one may compute a morphism $\alpha_i : A^* \rightarrow M_i$ into a finite monoid recognizing L_i together with the set $F_i \subseteq M_i$ such that $L_i = \alpha_i^{-1}(F_i)$. Consider the associated nice multiplicative rating maps $\rho_{\alpha_i} : 2^{A^*} \rightarrow 2^{M_i}$. Moreover, let R be the idempotent semiring $2^{M_0} \times \dots \times 2^{M_n}$ equipped with the componentwise addition and multiplication. We define a nice multiplicative rating map $\rho : 2^{A^*} \rightarrow R$ by letting $\rho(K) = (\rho_{\alpha_0}(K), \dots, \rho_{\alpha_n}(K))$ for every $K \subseteq A^*$. Finally, let $F \subseteq R$ be the set of all tuples $(X_0, \dots, X_n) \in R$ such that $X_i \cap F_i \neq \emptyset$ for every $i \leq n$. One may now verify that $(L_0, \{L_1, \dots, L_n\})$ is \mathcal{D} -coverable if and only if $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{D}}[\rho] \cap F = \emptyset$. Let us point out that this equivalence is only true when \mathcal{D} is a Boolean algebra. When \mathcal{D} is only a lattice, one has to handle the language L_0 separately. \square

In view of Proposition 8.8, for a Boolean algebra \mathcal{D} , getting a \mathcal{D} -covering algorithm boils down to finding a procedure computing the set $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{D}}[\rho] \subseteq R$ from a nice multiplicative rating map $\rho : 2^{A^*} \rightarrow R$. In practice, these procedures are often presented as elegant *characterization theorems*. The key idea is that such a theorem should provide a description of the set $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{D}}[\rho] \subseteq R$, which yields an algorithm for computing it as an immediate corollary. Typically, such a result is called a “characterization of optimal imprints for \mathcal{D} ”. For example a characterization of optimal imprints for SF is presented in [39] (recall that SF is the class of star-free languages). This procedure reformulates a result of [35] in the framework of rating maps.

Example 8.9. It is shown in [35, 39] that for every nice multiplicative rating map $\rho : 2^{A^*} \rightarrow R$, the optimal ρ -imprint for SF , $\mathcal{J}_{SF}[\rho] \subseteq R$, is the least subset $S \subseteq R$ which satisfies the following conditions:

- (1) **Trivial elements.** For every $w \in A^*$, we have $\rho(w) \in S$.
- (2) **Closure under downset.** $\downarrow_R S = S$.
- (3) **Closure under multiplication.** For every $q, r \in S$, we have $qr \in S$.
- (4) **SF-closure.** For every $r \in S$, we have $r^\omega + r^{\omega+1} \in S$.

This characterization yields a least fixpoint procedure that computes $\mathcal{J}_{SF}[\rho]$ from ρ : it starts from the set of all trivial elements and saturates it with the operations given by conditions (2)–(4) above. Together with Proposition 8.8, this yields the decidability of SF-covering.

In the paper, our aim is to generalize the characterization presented in Example 8.9 to arbitrary classes of the form $SF(\mathcal{C})$ where \mathcal{C} is a prevariety. We are able to handle two cases: the case when \mathcal{C} is a *finite prevariety* and the case when \mathcal{C} is a *group prevariety*. We present two characterizations of optimal imprints, one for each case. They are generic in the sense that each of them applies to families of classes rather than to a single class. This raises a question. Intuitively, a generic characterization of optimal imprints for $SF(\mathcal{C})$ should be parametrized by the class \mathcal{C} . How is this achieved? It turns out that this requires to work with *more general objects* capturing *additional information*. Roughly speaking, given a nice multiplicative rating map $\rho : 2^{A^*} \rightarrow R$, our characterizations describe a single object that captures both $\mathcal{J}_{SF(\mathcal{C})}[\rho] \subseteq R$ and $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{C}}[\rho] \subseteq R$, as well as extra information, which connects them. The key idea is that while we are only interested in the set $\mathcal{J}_{SF(\mathcal{C})}[\rho]$, this more general object is required to formulate a characterization. This is not surprising since characterizations of optimal imprints are often *fixpoint descriptions*, as seen in Example 8.9. An important point is that these more general objects are also optimal imprints. However, they involve auxiliary rating maps built from \mathcal{C} and ρ . The last part of the section is devoted to defining these objects.

8.4 Nested optimal imprints

We introduce a construction from [30, 38], which takes as input a lattice \mathcal{D} and a rating map $\rho : 2^{A^*} \rightarrow R$ and builds a new rating map $\xi_{\mathcal{D}}[\rho]$ whose rating algebra is $(2^R, \cup)$. We let,

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_{\mathcal{D}}[\rho] : 2^{A^*} &\rightarrow (2^R, \cup) \\ K &\mapsto \mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{D}}[K, \rho]. \end{aligned}$$

Let us reformulate Lemma 8.6, which exactly states that $\xi_{\mathcal{D}}[\rho] : 2^{A^*} \rightarrow (2^R, \cup)$ is itself a rating map.

Corollary 8.10. Let \mathcal{D} be a lattice and $\rho : 2^{A^*} \rightarrow R$ a rating map., Then, $\xi_{\mathcal{D}}[\rho] : 2^{A^*} \rightarrow 2^R$ is a rating map as well.

Let us point out that $\xi_{\mathcal{D}}[\rho]$ is neither nice nor multiplicative in general, even if this is the case for the original rating map ρ . In practice, this is not an issue for the “multiplicative” property. Actually, $\xi_{\mathcal{D}}[\rho]$ is multiplicative when ρ is multiplicative and the lattice \mathcal{D} is a prevariety *closed under concatenation* (such as when $\mathcal{D} = SF(\mathcal{C})$). On the other hand, $\xi_{\mathcal{D}}[\rho]$ is rarely nice (see [38, Example 6.3] for a counterexample). This is why it is important that most results of the framework hold for *arbitrary rating maps*.

Let us now provide some high-level intuition on why this construction is important when dealing with star-free closure. Consider some input prevariety \mathcal{C} . Since $SF(\mathcal{C})$ is a Boolean algebra, we know by Proposition 8.8 that in order to solve $SF(\mathcal{C})$ -covering, it suffices to characterize the set $\mathcal{J}_{SF(\mathcal{C})}[\rho] \subseteq R$ for every nice multiplicative rating map $\rho : 2^{A^*} \rightarrow R$. Roughly

speaking, the two characterizations of optimal imprints for $SF(\mathcal{C})$ that we present (for finite prevarieties \mathcal{C} in Section 9 and for prevarieties of group languages in Section 10) consider the set $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{C}}[\xi_{SF(\mathcal{C})}[\rho]] \subseteq 2^R$, which is more general. Indeed, one may verify that $\mathcal{J}_{SF(\mathcal{C})}[\rho]$ is the union of all sets in $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{C}}[\xi_{SF(\mathcal{C})}[\rho]]$. The point is that the extra information contained in this set is required in order to formulate these characterizations. Let us point out that this discussion is only meant to provide a sketchy general intuition. In practice, we shall refine these ideas by adopting an approach tailored to the two particular kinds of input prevarieties that we shall consider.

9 COVERING FOR FINITE INPUT CLASSES

In this section, we prove that separation and covering are both decidable for the class $SF(\mathcal{C})$ when \mathcal{C} is a finite prevariety. The algorithm is based on the framework introduced in Section 8: we present a generic effective characterization of optimal imprints for $SF(\mathcal{C})$. Given as input an arbitrary *finite* prevariety \mathcal{C} and a nice multiplicative rating map $\rho : 2^{A^*} \rightarrow R$, it provides an effective description of the set $\mathcal{J}_{SF(\mathcal{C})}[\rho] \subseteq R$. By Proposition 8.8, having this set in hand suffices to decide $SF(\mathcal{C})$ -covering. As announced at the end of Section 8, the characterization actually describes more information than just the set $\mathcal{J}_{SF(\mathcal{C})}[\rho] \subseteq R$. The first part of the section is devoted to defining the full object that we characterize. In the second part, we present the characterization itself and its proof.

9.1 Pointed optimal imprints

Consider an arbitrary finite prevariety \mathcal{C} . Recall that since \mathcal{C} is *finite*, Lemma 2.5 implies that there exists a *unique* (up to renaming) \mathcal{C} -morphism recognizing exactly all languages in \mathcal{C} . We denote it by $\eta_{\mathcal{C}} : A^* \rightarrow N_{\mathcal{C}}$ and call it the *canonical \mathcal{C} -morphism*. The set $\mathbf{K} = \{\eta_{\mathcal{C}}^{-1}(t) \mid t \in N_{\mathcal{C}}\}$ is the *finest* partition of A^* into languages of \mathcal{C} . Consequently, \mathbf{K} is an optimal \mathcal{C} -cover of A^* for all rating maps. In particular, if $\rho : 2^{A^*} \rightarrow R$ is a nice multiplicative rating map, then \mathbf{K} is an optimal \mathcal{C} -cover of A^* for the auxiliary rating map $\xi_{SF(\mathcal{C})}[\rho] : 2^{A^*} \rightarrow 2^R$. By definition, it follows that,

$$\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{C}}[\xi_{SF(\mathcal{C})}[\rho]] = \mathcal{J}[\xi_{SF(\mathcal{C})}[\rho]](\mathbf{K}) = \downarrow_{2^R} \{ \xi_{SF(\mathcal{C})}[\rho](K) \mid K \in \mathbf{K} \} = \downarrow_{2^R} \{ \mathcal{J}_{SF(\mathcal{C})}[\eta_{\mathcal{C}}^{-1}(t), \rho] \mid t \in N_{\mathcal{C}} \}.$$

As explained in Section 8, the set $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{C}}[\xi_{SF(\mathcal{C})}[\rho]]$ is exactly the information that our characterization of optimal imprints for $SF(\mathcal{C})$ will describe. More precisely, we characterize the family of sets $\mathcal{J}_{SF(\mathcal{C})}[\eta_{\mathcal{C}}^{-1}(t), \rho] \subseteq R$ for $t \in N_{\mathcal{C}}$. According to Lemma 8.6, the union of these sets is $\mathcal{J}_{SF(\mathcal{C})}[A^*, \rho] = \mathcal{J}_{SF(\mathcal{C})}[\rho]$, whose knowledge is enough to decide $SF(\mathcal{C})$ -covering. Let us point out that this is also how the characterization depends on the finite prevariety \mathcal{C} : it is parametrized by the canonical \mathcal{C} -morphism $\eta_{\mathcal{C}} : A^* \rightarrow N_{\mathcal{C}}$. We now introduce additional notations that will be convenient in order to manipulate the family of sets $\mathcal{J}_{SF(\mathcal{C})}[\eta_{\mathcal{C}}^{-1}(t), \rho]$ in our statements and our proofs.

Definition. Let \mathcal{D} be a lattice, $\eta : A^* \rightarrow N$ be a morphism into a finite monoid and $\rho : 2^{A^*} \rightarrow R$ be a rating map. The η -pointed optimal ρ -imprint for \mathcal{D} is defined as the following set $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{D}}[\eta, \rho] \subseteq N \times R$:

$$\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{D}}[\eta, \rho] = \{ (t, r) \in N \times R \mid r \in \mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{D}}[\eta^{-1}(t), \rho] \}.$$

Clearly, $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{D}}[\eta, \rho]$ encodes all sets $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{D}}[\eta^{-1}(t), \rho]$ for $t \in N$. We shall use the notation in the case when $\mathcal{D} = SF(\mathcal{C})$ for some prevariety \mathcal{C} and η is the canonical \mathcal{C} -morphism $\eta_{\mathcal{C}}$.

We complete the definition with a simple result which implies that $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{D}}[\eta, \rho] \subseteq N \times R$ is more general than the set $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{D}}[\rho] \subseteq R$. Indeed, since $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{D}}[\rho] = \mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{D}}[A^*, \rho]$, we have the following immediate corollary of Lemma 8.6.

Corollary 9.1. *Let \mathcal{D} be a lattice, $\eta : A^* \rightarrow N$ be a morphism into a finite monoid and $\rho : 2^{A^*} \rightarrow R$ be a multiplicative rating map. Then,*

$$\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{D}}[\rho] = \bigcup_{t \in N} \mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{D}}[\eta^{-1}(t), \rho] = \{r \in R \mid \text{there exists } t \in N \text{ such that } (t, r) \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{D}}[\eta, \rho]\}.$$

Pointed covers. Pointed optimal imprints are closer to being a notation rather than a new notion. Yet, it is possible to define them *directly* in terms of “covers”. This will be convenient for manipulating them. However, we have to slightly generalize the notion of cover in order to do so.

Consider a morphism $\eta : A^* \rightarrow N$ into a finite monoid and a language $L \subseteq A^*$. An η -pointed cover of L is a finite set \mathbf{K} of pairs $(s, K) \in N \times 2^{A^*}$ such that for every $w \in L$, there exists $(s, K) \in \mathbf{K}$ such that $\eta(w) = s$ and $w \in K$. In other words, the set $\{K \mid (s, K) \in \mathbf{K}\}$ must be a cover of $L \cap \eta^{-1}(s)$ for every $s \in N$. Additionally, given some class \mathcal{D} , we say that \mathbf{K} is an η -pointed \mathcal{D} -cover when it also satisfies $K \in \mathcal{D}$ for each pair $(s, K) \in \mathbf{K}$.

We generalize imprints to pointed covers. Let $\eta : A^* \rightarrow N$ be a morphism into a finite monoid and $\rho : 2^{A^*} \rightarrow R$ be a rating map. If \mathbf{K} is an η -pointed cover of some language $L \subseteq A^*$, we write,

$$\mathcal{P}[\eta, \rho](\mathbf{K}) = \downarrow_R \{(s, \rho(K)) \mid (s, K) \in \mathbf{K}\} \subseteq N \times R.$$

Here, we use the extended definition of the downset operation (see the definition page 39). The following lemma provides an alternate definition of pointed optimal imprints. Roughly, it implies that when \mathcal{D} is a lattice, there always exists an “optimal” η -pointed \mathcal{D} -cover \mathbf{K} of A^* (i.e., such that $\mathcal{P}[\eta, \rho](\mathbf{K})$ is minimal for inclusion) and that it satisfies $\mathcal{P}[\eta, \rho](\mathbf{K}) = \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{D}}[\eta, \rho]$.

Lemma 9.2. *Let \mathcal{D} be a lattice, $\eta : A^* \rightarrow N$ be a morphism into a finite monoid and $\rho : 2^{A^*} \rightarrow R$ be a rating map. The two following properties hold:*

- For every η -pointed \mathcal{D} -cover \mathbf{K} of A^* , we have $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{D}}[\eta, \rho] \subseteq \mathcal{P}[\eta, \rho](\mathbf{K})$.
- There exists an η -pointed \mathcal{D} -cover \mathbf{K} of A^* such that $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{D}}[\eta, \rho] = \mathcal{P}[\eta, \rho](\mathbf{K})$.

PROOF. For the first assertion, let \mathbf{K} be an η -pointed \mathcal{D} -cover \mathbf{K} of A^* and let $(s, r) \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{D}}[\eta, \rho]$. Let $\mathbf{K}_s = \{K \mid (s, K) \in \mathbf{K}\}$, which is a \mathcal{D} -cover of $\eta^{-1}(s)$ by definition of pointed covers. Since $(s, r) \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{D}}[\eta, \rho]$, we have $r \in \mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{D}}[\eta^{-1}(s), \rho]$, which yields $K \in \mathbf{K}_s$ such that $r \leq \rho(K)$. By definition of \mathbf{K}_s , we have $(s, K) \in \mathbf{K}$. Hence, we get $(s, r) \in \mathcal{P}[\eta, \rho](\mathbf{K})$, as desired.

We turn to the second assertion. For every $s \in N$, let \mathbf{K}_s be an optimal \mathcal{D} -cover of $\eta^{-1}(s)$ for ρ : $\mathcal{J}[\rho](\mathbf{K}_s) = \mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{D}}[\eta^{-1}(s), \rho]$. We let $\mathbf{K} = \{(s, K) \mid s \in N \text{ and } K \in \mathbf{K}_s\}$. By definition, \mathbf{K} is an η -pointed cover of L . Let us prove that $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{D}}[\eta, \rho] = \mathcal{P}[\eta, \rho](\mathbf{K})$. The left to right inclusion is immediate from the first assertion. For the converse one, let $(s, r) \in \mathcal{P}[\eta, \rho](\mathbf{K})$. By definition of \mathbf{K} , we get $K \in \mathbf{K}_s$ such that $r \leq \rho(K)$, i.e., $r \in \mathcal{J}[\rho](\mathbf{K}_s) = \mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{D}}[\eta^{-1}(s), \rho]$. Hence, $(s, r) \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{D}}[\eta, \rho]$ by definition. \square

9.2 Characterization

Let us first present the characterization. Given an arbitrary morphism $\eta : A^* \rightarrow N$ into a finite monoid and a multiplicative rating map $\rho : 2^{A^*} \rightarrow R$, we define the *SF*-saturated subsets of $N \times R$ for η and ρ (this notion makes sense for arbitrary multiplicative rating maps, but it is only useful for those that are *nice*). Let $S \subseteq N \times R$. We say that S is *SF-saturated for η and ρ* when it satisfies the following properties:

- (1) **Trivial elements.** For every $w \in A^*$, we have $(\eta(w), \rho(w)) \in S$.
- (2) **Closure under downset.** $\downarrow_R S = S$.
- (3) **Closure under multiplication.** For every $(s, q), (t, r) \in S$, we have $(st, qr) \in S$.
- (4) **SF-closure.** For every $(e, r) \in S$, if $e \in N$ is an idempotent, then $(e, r^\omega + r^{\omega+1}) \in S$.

We are ready to present the characterization. Given a finite prevariety \mathcal{C} , if ρ is nice, we show that the least *SF*-saturated subset of $N_{\mathcal{C}} \times R$ for $\eta_{\mathcal{C}}$ and ρ is exactly $\mathcal{P}_{SF(\mathcal{C})}[\eta_{\mathcal{C}}, \rho]$.

Theorem 9.3. *Let \mathcal{C} be a finite prevariety and $\rho : 2^{A^*} \rightarrow R$ be a nice multiplicative rating map. Then, $\mathcal{P}_{SF(\mathcal{C})}[\eta_{\mathcal{C}}, \rho]$ is the least SF -saturated subset of $N_{\mathcal{C}} \times R$ for $\eta_{\mathcal{C}}$ and ρ .*

Given a nice multiplicative rating map $\rho : 2^{A^*} \rightarrow R$ as input, it is clear the one may compute the least SF -saturated subset of $N_{\mathcal{C}} \times R$ for $\eta_{\mathcal{C}}$ and ρ . This is achieved with a least fixpoint procedure. Hence, Theorem 9.3 provides an algorithm for computing $\mathcal{P}_{SF(\mathcal{C})}[\eta_{\mathcal{C}}, \rho]$. It then follows from Corollary 9.1 that one may compute $\mathcal{J}_{SF(\mathcal{C})}[\rho]$ from $\mathcal{P}_{SF(\mathcal{C})}[\eta_{\mathcal{C}}, \rho]$:

$$\mathcal{J}_{SF(\mathcal{C})}[\rho] = \{r \in R \mid \text{there exists } t \in N \text{ such that } (t, r) \in \mathcal{P}_{SF(\mathcal{C})}[\eta_{\mathcal{C}}, \rho]\}.$$

Together with Proposition 8.8, we obtain that $SF(\mathcal{C})$ -covering is decidable. Naturally, this result extends to separation by Lemma 2.2. Altogether, we get the following corollary.

Corollary 9.4. *Let \mathcal{C} be a finite prevariety. Then, $SF(\mathcal{C})$ -covering and $SF(\mathcal{C})$ -separation are decidable.*

In practice, there are not many interesting applications of Corollary 9.4. Indeed, the only important class that is the star-free closure of a finite prevariety is the original class of star-free languages. Indeed, we have $SF = SF(ST)$ where $ST = \{\emptyset, A^*\}$. It was already known that SF has decidable covering: we presented an effective characterization of optimal imprints for SF taken from [39] in Example 8.9. This specialized characterization is actually an immediate corollary of Theorem 9.3 since the canonical ST -morphism is the unique one $\eta_{ST} : A^* \rightarrow \{1\}$ into a trivial monoid $\{1\}$.

Nonetheless, Theorem 9.3 is an important result. Indeed, we shall use it as a subresult in the proof of our second characterization, which describes optimal imprints for $SF(\mathcal{G})$ when \mathcal{G} is a group prevariety (more precisely, we shall apply Propositions 9.5 and 9.6 below).

We turn to the proof of Theorem 9.3. It involves two independent statements, which correspond respectively to soundness and completeness of the least fixpoint procedure computing $\mathcal{P}_{SF(\mathcal{C})}[\eta_{\mathcal{C}}, \rho]$ from a nice multiplicative rating map ρ . Let us start with soundness, which is simpler to establish and does not require the hypothesis that ρ is nice.

Proposition 9.5 (Soundness). *Consider a finite prevariety \mathcal{C} and a multiplicative rating map $\rho : 2^{A^*} \rightarrow R$. Then, the set $\mathcal{P}_{SF(\mathcal{C})}[\eta_{\mathcal{C}}, \rho] \subseteq N_{\mathcal{C}} \times R$ is SF -saturated for $\eta_{\mathcal{C}}$ and ρ .*

PROOF. Recall that $SF(\mathcal{C})$ is a prevariety by Proposition 3.2. There are four properties to verify. We start with the first three, which are standard. For the trivial elements, consider $w \in A^*$ and let \mathbf{K} be an optimal $SF(\mathcal{C})$ -cover of $\eta_{\mathcal{C}}^{-1}(\eta_{\mathcal{C}}(w))$. Since $w \in \eta_{\mathcal{C}}^{-1}(\eta_{\mathcal{C}}(w))$, there exists $K \in \mathbf{K}$ such that $w \in K$. Therefore, $\rho(w) \leq \rho(K)$, which yields $\rho(w) \in \mathcal{J}[\rho](\mathbf{K}) = \mathcal{J}_{SF(\mathcal{C})}[\eta_{\mathcal{C}}^{-1}(\eta_{\mathcal{C}}(w)), \rho]$. By definition, this implies that $(\eta_{\mathcal{C}}(w), \rho(w)) \in \mathcal{P}_{SF(\mathcal{C})}[\eta_{\mathcal{C}}, \rho]$. Closure under downset is immediate by definition of imprints. Finally, for closure under multiplication, consider $(s_1, r_1), (s_2, r_2) \in \mathcal{P}_{SF(\mathcal{C})}[\eta_{\mathcal{C}}, \rho]$. We have $r_i \in \mathcal{J}_{SF(\mathcal{C})}[\eta_{\mathcal{C}}^{-1}(s_i), \rho]$ for $i = 1, 2$. Since $SF(\mathcal{C})$ is a prevariety, Lemma 8.7 yields $r_1 r_2 \in \mathcal{J}_{SF(\mathcal{C})}[\eta_{\mathcal{C}}^{-1}(s_1) \eta_{\mathcal{C}}^{-1}(s_2), \rho]$. Clearly, $\eta_{\mathcal{C}}^{-1}(s_1) \eta_{\mathcal{C}}^{-1}(s_2) \subseteq \eta_{\mathcal{C}}^{-1}(s_1 s_2)$. Thus, Fact 8.5 yields $r_1 r_2 \in \mathcal{J}_{SF(\mathcal{C})}[\eta_{\mathcal{C}}^{-1}(s_1 s_2), \rho]$. By definition, this exactly says that $(s_1 s_2, r_1 r_2) \in \mathcal{P}_{SF(\mathcal{C})}[\eta_{\mathcal{C}}, \rho]$.

It remains to handle SF -closure. Let $(e, r) \in \mathcal{P}_{SF(\mathcal{C})}[\eta_{\mathcal{C}}, \rho]$ be such that $e \in N_{\mathcal{C}}$ is idempotent. We show that $(e, r^{\omega} + r^{\omega+1}) \in \mathcal{P}_{SF(\mathcal{C})}[\eta_{\mathcal{C}}, \rho]$. Let \mathbf{K} be an optimal $SF(\mathcal{C})$ -cover of $\eta_{\mathcal{C}}^{-1}(e)$. By definition, it now suffices to prove that $r^{\omega} + r^{\omega+1} \in \mathcal{J}[\rho](\mathbf{K})$. Since $SF(\mathcal{C})$ is a prevariety, Proposition 2.4 yields an $SF(\mathcal{C})$ -morphism $\alpha : A^* \rightarrow M$ recognizing every $K \in \mathbf{K}$. Let \mathbf{H} be the set of all languages $\alpha^{-1}(x)$ for $x \in M$ such that $\alpha^{-1}(x) \cap \eta_{\mathcal{C}}^{-1}(e) \neq \emptyset$. By definition, \mathbf{H} is an $SF(\mathcal{C})$ -cover of $\eta_{\mathcal{C}}^{-1}(e)$. Hence, since $(e, r) \in \mathcal{P}_{SF(\mathcal{C})}[\eta_{\mathcal{C}}, \rho]$, we have $r \in \mathcal{J}[\rho](\mathbf{H})$ which yields $H \in \mathbf{H}$ such that $r \leq \rho(H)$. By definition of \mathbf{H} , we get $x \in M$ such that $H = \alpha^{-1}(x)$ and some word $u \in H \cap \eta_{\mathcal{C}}^{-1}(e)$. Let $p = \omega(M) \times \omega(R)$

and $L = \alpha^{-1}(x^p)$. We claim that:

$$H^p \cup H^{p+1} \subseteq L. \quad (13)$$

Let us first explain why this implies that $r^\omega + r^{\omega+1} \in \mathcal{J}[\rho](\mathbf{K})$. Since $u^p \in \eta_{\mathcal{C}}^{-1}(e)$ (recall that $e \in N_{\mathcal{C}}$ is idempotent) and \mathbf{K} is a cover of $\eta_{\mathcal{C}}^{-1}(e)$, we get $K \in \mathbf{K}$ such that $u^p \in K$. Moreover, since $u^p \in L = \alpha^{-1}(x^p)$ and K is recognized by α (by definition), it follows that $L \subseteq K$. Hence, since $r \leq \rho(H)$ and $p = \omega(M) \times \omega(R)$, it follows from (13) that $r^\omega + r^{\omega+1} \leq \rho(K)$ which yields $r^\omega + r^{\omega+1} \in \mathcal{J}[\rho](\mathbf{K})$, as desired.

It remains to prove (13). Let $w \in H^p \cup H^{p+1}$. We need to prove that $\alpha(w) = x^p$. This is immediate when $w \in H^p$ since $H = \alpha^{-1}(x)$. Assume now that $w \in H^{p+1}$. In that case, we have $\alpha(w) = x^{p+1}$. Hence, it suffices to prove that $x^{p+1} = x^p$. By hypothesis $\eta_{\mathcal{C}}(u) = e$ is an idempotent of $N_{\mathcal{C}}$. Since $\eta_{\mathcal{C}}$ is the canonical \mathcal{C} -morphism, it follows from Lemma 2.5 that the image of u under any \mathcal{C} -morphism is an idempotent. Hence, since α is an $SF(\mathcal{C})$ -morphism, Proposition 3.3 implies that $(\alpha(u))^{\omega+1} = (\alpha(u))^\omega$. Since $x = \alpha(u)$ and $p = \omega(M) \times \omega(R)$, it follows that $x^{p+1} = x^p$, as desired. \square

We now turn to completeness. As usual, this is the most difficult part of the proof. Note that again, we shall rely on Theorem 4.10: we build our languages in $SF(\mathcal{C})$ using the operations available in the definition of $SD(\mathcal{C})$.

Proposition 9.6 (Completeness). *Let \mathcal{C} be a prevariety, $\eta : A^* \rightarrow N$ be a \mathcal{C} -morphism, $\rho : 2^{A^*} \rightarrow R$ be a nice multiplicative rating map and $S \subseteq N \times R$ be an SF -saturated set for η and ρ . There exists an η -pointed $SF(\mathcal{C})$ -cover \mathbf{K} of A^* such that $\mathcal{P}[\eta, \rho](\mathbf{K}) \subseteq S$.*

PROOF. We build the η -pointed $SF(\mathcal{C})$ -cover \mathbf{K} using induction. Let us start with some terminology. A first point is that we build particular η -pointed covers. Let $P \subseteq A^*$ be an arbitrary language. An η -pointed $SF(\mathcal{C})$ -partition of P is a finite set $\mathbf{H} \subseteq N \times 2^{A^*}$ such that for every $(t, H) \in \mathbf{H}$, we have $H \in SF(\mathcal{C})$ and for every $t \in N$, the set $\{H \mid (t, H) \in \mathbf{H}\}$ is a partition of $P \cap \eta^{-1}(t)$ (this implies that $H \subseteq \eta^{-1}(t)$ for every $(t, H) \in \mathbf{H}$). Note that in particular, \mathbf{H} is an η -pointed $SF(\mathcal{C})$ -cover of P .

If \mathbf{H} is an η -pointed $SF(\mathcal{C})$ -partition, an \mathbf{H} -product is a pair $(t_1 \cdots t_n, H_1 \cdots H_n)$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$ where $(t_i, H_i) \in \mathbf{H}$ for every $i \leq n$. In particular, the pair $(1_N, \{\varepsilon\})$ is an \mathbf{H} -product: this is the case $n = 0$ in the definition. When $n \geq 1$, we speak of *strict \mathbf{H} -products*. Finally, an \mathbf{H} -union (resp. *strict \mathbf{H} -union*) is a pair $(t, G_1 \cup \cdots \cup G_m)$ for some $t \in N$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that (t, G_j) is an \mathbf{H} -product (resp. *strict \mathbf{H} -product*) for every $j \leq m$. Note that (t, \emptyset) is a *strict \mathbf{H} -union* for every $t \in \mathbb{N}$: this corresponds to the case $m = 0$ in the definition.

Additionally, we write $Q = N \times R$. Observe that Q is a monoid for the componentwise multiplication. Moreover, $S \subseteq Q$ by definition. Finally, for every η -pointed $SF(\mathcal{C})$ -partition of \mathbf{H} , we associate two subsets of Q . The definitions are as follows:

- We let $Q_{\mathbf{H}}^+ \subseteq Q$ be the set of all elements $(t, \rho(H)) \in Q$ where (t, H) is a *strict \mathbf{H} -union*.
- We let $Q_{\mathbf{H}}^* \subseteq Q$ be the set of all elements $(t, \rho(H)) \in Q$ where (t, H) is an \mathbf{H} -union.

Clearly, $Q_{\mathbf{H}}^+ \subseteq Q_{\mathbf{H}}^*$. Moreover, we have the following simple fact which we shall use implicitly throughout the proof.

Fact 9.7. *Let $P \subseteq A^*$ and \mathbf{H} be an η -pointed $SF(\mathcal{C})$ -partition of P . For all $(t_1, q_1), (t_2, q_2) \in Q_{\mathbf{H}}^*$, we have $(t_1 t_2, q_1 q_2) \in Q_{\mathbf{H}}^*$.*

PROOF. By definition, there are two \mathbf{H} -unions $(t_1, H_1), (t_2, H_2) \in \mathbf{H}$ such that $q_i = \rho(H_i)$ for $i = 1, 2$. One may verify from the definition that $(t_1 t_2, H_1 H_2)$ remains an \mathbf{H} -union since language distributes over union. Since $q_1 q_2 = \rho(H_1 H_2)$, it follows that $(t_1 t_2, q_1 q_2) \in Q_{\mathbf{H}}^*$. \square

We are ready to prove Proposition 9.6. It is based on the following statement.

Lemma 9.8. *Let $P \subseteq A^+$ be a prefix code with bounded synchronization delay and \mathbf{H} be an η -pointed $SF(\mathcal{C})$ -partition of P such that $(t, \rho(H)) \in S$ for every $(t, H) \in \mathbf{H}$. Then, for every $(s, r) \in S$, there exists an η -pointed $SF(\mathcal{C})$ -partition \mathbf{K} of P^* such that,*

$$\text{for every } (t, K) \in \mathbf{K}, \text{ we have } (t, \rho(K)) \in Q_{\mathbf{H}}^* \text{ and } (st, r\rho(K)) \in S. \quad (14)$$

Before we prove Lemma 9.8, let us first complete the main argument. We have to build an η -pointed $SF(\mathcal{C})$ -cover \mathbf{K} of A^* such that $\mathcal{P}[\eta, \rho](\mathbf{K}) \subseteq S$. Observe that $A \subseteq A^+$ is a prefix code with bounded synchronization delay. Moreover, $\mathbf{H} = \{(\eta(a), \{a\}) \mid a \in A\}$ is an η -pointed $SF(\mathcal{C})$ -partition of A and we have $(\eta(a), \rho(a)) \in S$ for every $a \in A$ since S is SF -saturated (these are trivial elements). Finally, $(1_N, 1_R) \in S$ (again, this is a trivial element). Therefore, we may apply Lemma 9.8 in the case when $P = A$ and $(s, r) = (1_N, 1_R) \in S$. This yields an η -pointed $SF(\mathcal{C})$ -partition \mathbf{K} of A^* satisfying (14). In particular, $(t, \rho(K)) \in S$ for every $(t, K) \in \mathbf{K}$. Therefore, since S is SF -saturated, closure under downset yields $\mathcal{P}[\eta, \rho](\mathbf{K}) \subseteq S$, which completes the proof.

We now prove Lemma 9.8. Let $P \subseteq A^+$ be a prefix code with bounded synchronization delay and \mathbf{H} be an η -pointed $SF(\mathcal{C})$ -partition of P such that $(t, \rho(H)) \in S$ for all $(t, H) \in \mathbf{H}$. Finally, let $(s, r) \in S$. We need to build an η -pointed $SF(\mathcal{C})$ -partition \mathbf{K} of P^* satisfying (14). We proceed by induction on the three following parameters, listed by order of importance:

- (1) The size of the set $Q_{\mathbf{H}}^+ \subseteq Q$,
- (2) The size of \mathbf{H} ,
- (3) The size of the set $(s, r) \cdot Q_{\mathbf{H}}^* \subseteq Q$.

We distinguish two main cases depending on the following property. We say that (s, r) is \mathbf{H} -stable when the following holds,

$$\text{for every } (t, H) \in \mathbf{H}, \quad (s, r) \cdot Q_{\mathbf{H}}^* = (s, r) \cdot Q_{\mathbf{H}}^* \cdot (t, \rho(H)). \quad (15)$$

We first consider the case when (s, r) is \mathbf{H} -stable. This is the base case: we construct \mathbf{K} directly. Then, we handle the case when (s, r) is not \mathbf{H} -stable using induction on our three parameters.

Base case: (s, r) is \mathbf{H} -stable. In this case, we let $\mathbf{K} = \{(t, P^* \cap \eta^{-1}(t)) \mid t \in N\}$. Let us first verify that this is an η -pointed $SF(\mathcal{C})$ -partition \mathbf{K} of P^* . It is immediate that $\{P^* \cap \eta^{-1}(t)\}$ is a partition of $P^* \cap \eta^{-1}(t)$ for every $t \in N$. Moreover, we have $P^* \cap \eta^{-1}(t) \in SF(\mathcal{C})$ for every $t \in N$. Indeed, we have $P \in SF(\mathcal{C})$: it is the disjoint union of all languages involved in the η -pointed $SF(\mathcal{C})$ -partition \mathbf{H} of P . Since $SF(\mathcal{C}) = SD(\mathcal{C})$ by Theorem 4.10, we obtain $P^* \cap \eta^{-1}(t) \in SF(\mathcal{C})$ since P is a prefix code with bounded synchronization delay and $\eta^{-1}(t) \in \mathcal{C}$ (recall that η is a \mathcal{C} -morphism by hypothesis). It remains to prove that \mathbf{K} satisfies (14): for every $(t, K) \in \mathbf{K}$, we show that $(t, \rho(K)) \in Q_{\mathbf{H}}^*$ and $(st, r\rho(K)) \in S$. We start with the former property (this is where we use the hypothesis that ρ is nice).

Fact 9.9. *For every $(t, K) \in \mathbf{K}$, we have $(t, \rho(K)) \in Q_{\mathbf{H}}^*$.*

PROOF. By definition of \mathbf{K} , we have $K = P^* \cap \eta^{-1}(t)$. Since \mathbf{H} is an η -pointed partition of P , one may verify that $P^* \cap \eta^{-1}(t)$ is the (infinite) union of all \mathbf{H} -products (t', H) such that $t' = t$. Since ρ is nice, it follows that there exists *finitely many* \mathbf{H} -products $(t, H_1), \dots, (t, H_\ell)$ such that $\rho(K) = \rho(H_1) + \dots + \rho(H_\ell) = \rho(H_1 \cup \dots \cup H_\ell)$. Clearly, $(t, H_1 \cup \dots \cup H_\ell)$ is an \mathbf{H} -union and it follows that $(t, \rho(K)) \in Q_{\mathbf{H}}^*$, as desired. \square

It remains to show that $(st, r\rho(K)) \in S$ for every $K \in \mathbf{K}$. We prove that for every $(t, q) \in Q_{\mathbf{H}}^*$, we have $(st, rq) \in S$. In view of Fact 9.9, this yields the desired result. First, we use the hypothesis that (s, r) is \mathbf{H} -stable to prove the following fact.

Fact 9.10. *Let (e, H) be an \mathbf{H} -product such that $(e, \rho(H)) \in Q$ is a pair of idempotents. For every $(t, q) \in Q_{\mathbf{H}}^*$, we have $(ste, rq\rho(H)) = (st, rq)$.*

PROOF. We first use the hypothesis that (s, r) is \mathbf{H} -stable to prove the following preliminary result which holds regardless of whether $(e, \rho(H))$ is a pair of idempotents or not:

$$\text{there exists } (x, y) \in Q_{\mathbf{H}}^* \text{ such that } (sxe, ry\rho(H)) = (st, rq). \quad (16)$$

Since (e, H) is an \mathbf{H} -product, we can find elements $(t'_1, H_1), \dots, (t'_n, H_n)$ of \mathbf{H} such that $(e, H) = (t'_1 \cdots t'_n, H_1 \cdots H_n)$. We proceed by induction on n . If $n = 0$, then $e = 1_N$ and $H = \{\varepsilon\}$. It suffices to choose $(x, y) = (t, q) \in Q_{\mathbf{H}}^*$. We now assume that $n \geq 1$. By induction, we get $(x', y') \in Q_{\mathbf{H}}^*$ such that $(sx't'_2 \cdots t'_n, ry'\rho(H_2 \cdots H_n)) = (st, rq)$. Since (s, r) is \mathbf{H} -stable, Property (15) yields $(x, y) \in Q_{\mathbf{H}}^*$ such that $(sx', ry') = (sxt'_1, ry\rho(H_1))$. Altogether, it follows that $(sxe, ry\rho(H)) = (st, rq)$. This concludes the proof of (16).

We use (16) to conclude Fact 9.10. Indeed, since $(sxe, ry\rho(H)) = (st, rq)$ for $(x, y) \in Q_{\mathbf{H}}^*$, if $(e, \rho(H))$ is a pair of multiplicative idempotents, then we obtain $(ste, rq\rho(H)) = (st, rq)$. \square

We are ready to prove that $(st, rq) \in S$ for every $(t, q) \in Q_{\mathbf{H}}^*$. We first treat the special case when t is an idempotent of N . Then, we reuse this special case to treat the general one. Assume that t is an idempotent $e \in E(N)$. Hence, $(e, q) \in Q_{\mathbf{H}}^*$ and we need to prove that $(se, rq) \in S$. By definition, there are finitely many \mathbf{H} -products $(e, H_1), \dots, (e, H_\ell)$ such that $q = \rho(H_1) + \cdots + \rho(H_\ell)$. Consider an index $i \leq \ell$. Since (e, H_i) is an \mathbf{H} -product and we know that $(t', \rho(H')) \in S$ for every $(t', H') \in \mathbf{H}$, it follows from closure under multiplication for S (recall that S is SF -saturated) that $(e, \rho(H_i)) \in S$. Since e is idempotent, it then follows from SF -closure that $(e, (\rho(H_i))^\omega + (\rho(H_i))^{\omega+1}) \in S$. Since this holds for all $i \leq \ell$, e is idempotent and $(s, r) \in S$, closure under multiplication yields,

$$\left(se, \quad r \prod_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} ((\rho(H_i))^\omega + (\rho(H_i))^{\omega+1}) \right) \in S.$$

Let $k = \omega(R)$. For every $i \leq \ell$, we have $(e, (\rho(H_i))^\omega) = (e, \rho(H_i^k))$ and it is clear that (e, H_i^k) is an \mathbf{H} -product since this is the case for (e, H_i) . Therefore, since $(e, (\rho(H_i))^\omega)$ is a pair of idempotents, Fact 9.10 implies that $(st'e, rq'(\rho(H_i))^\omega) = (st', rq')$ for every $(t', q') \in Q_{\mathbf{H}}^*$. This yields:

$$\left(se, \quad r \prod_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} ((\rho(H_i))^\omega + (\rho(H_i))^{\omega+1}) \right) = \left(se, \quad r \prod_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} (1_R + \rho(H_i)) \right),$$

Therefore, $(se, r \prod_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} (1_R + \rho(H_i))) \in S$. Note that $q = \rho(H_1) + \cdots + \rho(H_\ell) \leq \prod_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} (1_R + \rho(H_i))$. By closure under downset for S , we get $(se, rq) \in S$, which concludes the case when t is idempotent.

We now consider an arbitrary element $(t, q) \in Q_{\mathbf{H}}^*$ (i.e., $t \in N$ need not be idempotent) and show that $(st, rq) \in S$. By definition of $Q_{\mathbf{H}}^*$ there are finitely many \mathbf{H} -products $(t, H_1), \dots, (t, H_n)$ such that $q = \rho(H_1) + \cdots + \rho(H_n)$. Since every $(t', H') \in \mathbf{H}$ satisfies $(t', \rho(H')) \in S$ by hypothesis and S is closed under multiplication, we get $(t, \rho(H_i)) \in S$ for every $i \leq n$. Moreover, there exists a number $k \geq 1$ such that $(t^k, (\rho(H_i))^k) \in Q_{\mathbf{H}}^*$ is a pair of idempotents for each $i \leq n$. In particular, t^k is an idempotent of N . Clearly, we have $(t^k, q(\rho(H_1))^{k-1}) \in Q_{\mathbf{H}}^*$. Since $t^k \in N$ is an idempotent, we obtain from the above special case that $(st^k, rq(\rho(H_1))^{k-1}) \in S$. Since we also have $(t, \rho(H_1)) \in S$, it then follows from closure under multiplication that $(st^{k+1}, rq(\rho(H_1))^k) \in S$. Finally, since $(t^k, (\rho(H_1))^k)$ is a pair of idempotents, we obtain from Fact 9.10 that $(st, rq) = (st^{k+1}, rq(\rho(H_1))^k) \in S$. This concludes the proof for the base case.

Inductive step: (s, r) is not \mathbf{H} -stable. Our hypothesis yields a pair $(t, H) \in \mathbf{H}$ such that the following *strict* inclusion holds:

$$(s, r) \cdot Q_{\mathbf{H}}^* \cdot (t, \rho(H)) \subsetneq (s, r) \cdot Q_{\mathbf{H}}^*. \quad (17)$$

We fix this pair $(t, H) \in \mathbf{H}$ for the remainder of the proof. First, we use induction on our second parameter in Lemma 9.8 to prove the following fact.

Fact 9.11. *There exists an η -pointed $SF(\mathcal{C})$ -partition \mathbf{U} of $(P \setminus H)^*$ such that $(x, \rho(U)) \in Q_{\mathbf{H}}^* \cap S$ for every $(x, U) \in \mathbf{U}$.*

PROOF. Since P is a prefix code with bounded synchronization delay, Fact 4.6 implies that so is $P \setminus H$. We want to apply induction in Lemma 9.8 for the case when P has been replaced by $P \setminus H$. Let $\mathbf{G} = \mathbf{H} \setminus \{(t, H)\}$. By hypothesis on \mathbf{H} , one may verify that \mathbf{G} is an η -pointed $SF(\mathcal{C})$ -partition of $P \setminus H$ and that $(t', \rho(G)) \in S$ for every $(t', G) \in \mathbf{G}$. Finally, it is immediate that $Q_{\mathbf{G}}^+ \subseteq Q_{\mathbf{H}}^+$ (our first induction has not increased) and $\mathbf{G} \subseteq \mathbf{H}$ (our second induction parameter has decreased). Hence, we may apply Lemma 9.8 in the case when P, \mathbf{H} and $(s, r) \in S$ have been replaced by $P \setminus H, \mathbf{G}$ and $(1_N, 1_R) \in S$. This yields an η -pointed $SF(\mathcal{C})$ -partition \mathbf{U} of $(P \setminus H)^*$ such that $(x, \rho(U)) \in Q_{\mathbf{H}}^* \cap S$ for every $(x, U) \in \mathbf{U}$. \square

We fix the η -pointed $SF(\mathcal{C})$ -partition \mathbf{U} of $(P \setminus H)^*$ given by Fact 9.11 for the remainder of the proof. We distinguish two subcases. Since $(t, H) \in \mathbf{H}$, one may verify from the definitions of $Q_{\mathbf{H}}^+$ and $Q_{\mathbf{H}}^*$ that $Q_{\mathbf{H}}^* \cdot (t, \rho(H)) \subseteq Q_{\mathbf{H}}^+$. We consider two subcases depending on whether this inclusion is strict.

Subcase 1: we have the equality $Q_{\mathbf{H}}^* \cdot (t, \rho(H)) = Q_{\mathbf{H}}^+$. We use the following fact, which is proved using our hypotheses and induction on our third parameter (*i.e.*, the size of $(s, r) \cdot Q_{\mathbf{H}}^*$).

Fact 9.12. *For every $(x, U) \in \mathbf{U}$, there exists an η -pointed $SF(\mathcal{C})$ -partition $\mathbf{W}_{x,U}$ of P^* such that $(y, \rho(W)) \in Q_{\mathbf{H}}^*$ and $(sxt, r\rho(UHW)) \in S$ for every $(y, W) \in \mathbf{W}_{x,U}$.*

PROOF. We fix $(x, U) \in \mathbf{U}$ for the proof. By definition of \mathbf{U} in Fact 9.11, $(x, \rho(U)) \in Q_{\mathbf{H}}^*$ and $(x, \rho(U)) \in S$. Hence, since $(s, r), (t, \rho(H)) \in S$ by hypothesis and S is closed under multiplication, we get $(sxt, r\rho(UH)) \in S$. Moreover, it is clear that we have the inclusions $(sxt, r\rho(UH)) \cdot Q_{\mathbf{H}}^* \subseteq (s, r) \cdot Q_{\mathbf{H}}^* \cdot (t, \rho(H)) \cdot Q_{\mathbf{H}}^* \subseteq (s, r) \cdot Q_{\mathbf{H}}^+$. Combined with our hypothesis in Subcase 1 (*i.e.*, $Q_{\mathbf{H}}^* \cdot (t, \rho(H)) = Q_{\mathbf{H}}^+$), this yields $(sxt, r\rho(UH)) \cdot Q_{\mathbf{H}}^* \subseteq (s, r) \cdot Q_{\mathbf{H}}^* \cdot (t, \rho(H))$. We may then use (17) (*i.e.*, the inclusion $(s, r) \cdot Q_{\mathbf{H}}^* \cdot (t, \rho(H)) \subseteq (s, r) \cdot Q_{\mathbf{H}}^*$) to get the **strict** inclusion $(sxt, r\rho(UH)) \cdot Q_{\mathbf{H}}^* \subseteq (s, r) \cdot Q_{\mathbf{H}}^*$. Consequently, induction on our third parameter (*i.e.*, the size of $(s, r) \cdot Q_{\mathbf{H}}^*$) in Lemma 9.8 (we consider the case when $(s, r) \in S$ has been replaced by $(sxt, r\rho(UH)) \in S$) yields the desired η -pointed $SF(\mathcal{C})$ -partition $\mathbf{W}_{x,U}$ of P^* . Note that here, our first two parameters have not increased as they only depend on \mathbf{H} , which remains unchanged. \square

It remains to use Fact 9.12 to conclude the proof of Subcase 1. We build our $SF(\mathcal{C})$ -partition \mathbf{K} of P^* as follows,

$$\mathbf{K} = \mathbf{U} \cup \bigcup_{(x,U) \in \mathbf{U}} \{(xty, UHW) \mid (y, W) \in \mathbf{W}_{x,U}\}.$$

Let us show that \mathbf{K} is an η -pointed $SF(\mathcal{C})$ -partition of P^* satisfying (14). First, observe that for every $(t', K) \in \mathbf{K}$, we have $K \in SF(\mathcal{C})$. This is immediate by hypothesis on \mathbf{U} when $(t', K) \in \mathbf{U}$. Otherwise, $K = UHW$ for $(x, U) \in \mathbf{U}$ and $(y, W) \in \mathbf{W}_{x,U}$ and $U, H, W \in SF(\mathcal{C})$. Hence, $K \in SF(\mathcal{C})$ since $SF(\mathcal{C})$ is closed under concatenation.

That \mathbf{K} is an η -pointed $SF(\mathcal{C})$ -partition of P^* is also simple to verify since P is a prefix code, $H \subseteq P$ and $\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{W}_{x,U}$ are η -pointed partitions of $(P \setminus H)^*$ and P^* respectively. Each word $w \in P^*$ admits a *unique* decomposition $w = w_1 \cdots w_n$ with $w_1, \dots, w_n \in P$. We partition P^* by looking at the leftmost factor belonging to H (if it exists).

It remains to prove that (14) holds. Consider $(t', K) \in \mathbf{K}$, we show that $(t', \rho(K)) \in Q_{\mathbf{H}}^*$ and $(st', r\rho(K)) \in S$. If $(t', K) \in \mathbf{U}$, this is immediate by definition of \mathbf{U} in Fact 9.11. Otherwise, $(t', K) = (wty, UHW)$ with $(x, U) \in \mathbf{U}$ and $(y, W) \in \mathbf{W}_{x,U}$. By definition of \mathbf{U} and $\mathbf{W}_{x,U}$, we have $(x, \rho(U)), (y, \rho(W)) \in Q_{\mathbf{H}}^*$. Thus, $(xty, \rho(UHW)) \in Q_{\mathbf{H}}^*$. Moreover, $(sxt, r\rho(UHW)) \in S$ by definition of $\mathbf{W}_{x,U}$ in Fact 9.12. This concludes the first subcase.

Subcase 2: we have the strict inclusion $Q_H^* \cdot (t, \rho(H)) \subsetneq Q_H^+$. Recall that our objective is to construct an η -pointed $SF(\mathcal{C})$ -partition \mathbf{K} of P^* satisfying (14). We begin by giving a brief overview of the construction. Consider a word $w \in P^*$. Since P is a prefix code, w admits a unique decomposition as a concatenation of factors in P . We may look at the rightmost factor in $H \subseteq P$ to uniquely decompose w in two parts (each of them possibly empty): a prefix in $((P \setminus H)^*H)^*$ and a suffix in $(P \setminus H)^*$. We use induction to construct η -pointed $SF(\mathcal{C})$ -partitions of the sets of possible prefixes and suffixes. Then, we combine them to construct an η -pointed $SF(\mathcal{C})$ -partition of the whole set P^* . Actually, we already constructed a suitable η -pointed $SF(\mathcal{C})$ -partition of the possible suffixes in $(P \setminus H)^* : \mathbf{U}$ (see Fact 9.11). Hence, it remains to partition the prefixes. We do so in the following lemma, which is proved using the hypothesis of Subcase 2 and induction on our first parameter.

Fact 9.13. *There is an η -pointed $SF(\mathcal{C})$ -partition \mathbf{V} of $((P \setminus H)^*H)^*$ such that $(z, \rho(V)) \in Q_H^*$ and $(z, \rho(V)) \in S$ for every $V \in \mathbf{V}$.*

PROOF. Let $L = (P \setminus H)^*H$. Since P is a prefix code with bounded synchronization delay, so is L by Fact 4.7. We want to apply induction in Lemma 9.8 for the case when P has been replaced by L . Doing so requires building an appropriate η -pointed $SF(\mathcal{C})$ -partition of L and proving that one of our induction parameters has decreased.

Let $\mathbf{F} = \{(xt, UH) \mid (x, U) \in \mathbf{U}\}$. Since \mathbf{U} is an η -pointed $SF(\mathcal{C})$ -partition of $(P \setminus H)^*$ and P is a prefix code, one may verify that \mathbf{F} is an η -pointed $SF(\mathcal{C})$ -partition of $L = (P \setminus H)^*H$. Finally, given $(y, F) \in \mathbf{F}$, we have $(y, F) = (xt, UH)$ for $(x, U) \in \mathbf{U}$, which means that $(y, \rho(F)) = (xt, \rho(UH)) \in S$ since S is closed under multiplication. It remains to show that our induction parameters have decreased. Since $\mathbf{F} = \{(xt, UH) \mid (x, U) \in \mathbf{U}\}$ and $(x, \rho(U)) \in Q_H^*$ for every $(x, U) \in \mathbf{U}$ (by definition of \mathbf{U} in Fact 9.11), one may verify that $Q_F^+ \subseteq Q_H^* \cdot (t, \rho(H))$. Hence, since $Q_H^* \cdot (t, \rho(H)) \subsetneq Q_H^+$ by hypothesis in Subcase 2, we have $Q_F^+ \subseteq Q_H^+$. Our first induction parameter has decreased. Altogether, it follows that we may apply Lemma 9.8 in the case when P, H and $(s, r) \in S$ have been replaced by L, \mathbf{F} and $(1_N, 1_R) \in S$. This yields an η -pointed $SF(\mathcal{C})$ -partition \mathbf{V} of $L^* = ((P \setminus H)^*H)^*$ such that for every $(z, V) \in \mathbf{V}$, $(z, \rho(V)) \in Q_F^*$ and $(z, \rho(V)) \in S$. Finally, it is clear by definition that $Q_F^* \subseteq Q_H^*$. Hence, the lemma follows. \square

We are ready to construct the η -pointed $SF(\mathcal{C})$ -partition \mathbf{K} of P^* and conclude the main argument. We let $\mathbf{K} = \{(zx, VU) \mid (z, V) \in \mathbf{V} \text{ and } (x, U) \in \mathbf{U}\}$. It is immediate by definition and Fact 4.7 that \mathbf{K} is an η -pointed partition of P^* since P is a prefix code and \mathbf{V}, \mathbf{U} are η -pointed partitions of $((P \setminus H)^*H)^*$ and $(P \setminus H)^*$ respectively (see the above discussion). Additionally, it is immediate by definition that \mathbf{K} is actually an η -pointed $SF(\mathcal{C})$ -partition of P^* (it only contains concatenations of languages in $SF(\mathcal{C})$). It remains to prove that \mathbf{K} satisfies (14). Let $(t', K) \in \mathbf{K}$. By definition, there are $(z, V) \in \mathbf{V}$ and $(x, U) \in \mathbf{U}$ such that $(t', K) = (zx, VU)$. By definition of \mathbf{U} and \mathbf{V} , we have $(x, \rho(U))(z, \rho(V)) \in Q_H^*$ and $(x, \rho(U))(z, \rho(V)) \in S$. Moreover, $(s, r) \in S$ by hypothesis. Therefore, since both Q_H^* and S are closed under multiplication, it follows that $(t', \rho(K)) \in Q_H^*$ and $(st', r\rho(K)) \in S$. This completes the proof of Lemma 9.8. \square

We may now combine Proposition 9.5 and Proposition 9.6 to prove Theorem 9.3. The argument is standard.

PROOF OF THEOREM 9.3. Let \mathcal{C} be a finite prevariety and $\rho : 2^{A^*} \rightarrow R$ be a nice multiplicative rating map. We have to prove that $\mathcal{P}_{SF(\mathcal{C})}[\eta_{\mathcal{C}}, \rho]$ is the least SF -saturated subset of $N_{\mathcal{C}} \times R$ for $\eta_{\mathcal{C}}$ and ρ . We proved in Proposition 9.5 that $\mathcal{P}_{SF(\mathcal{C})}[\eta_{\mathcal{C}}, \rho]$ is SF -saturated. We need to show that it is the least such set. Let $S \subseteq N_{\mathcal{C}} \times R$ which is SF -saturated for $\eta_{\mathcal{C}}$ and ρ . Proposition 9.6 yields an $\eta_{\mathcal{C}}$ -pointed $SF(\mathcal{C})$ -cover of \mathbf{K} of A^* such that $\mathcal{P}[\eta_{\mathcal{C}}, \rho](\mathbf{K}) \subseteq S$. Since Lemma 9.2 implies that $\mathcal{P}_{SF(\mathcal{C})}[\eta_{\mathcal{C}}, \rho] \subseteq \mathcal{P}[\eta_{\mathcal{C}}, \rho](\mathbf{K})$, we obtain $\mathcal{P}_{SF(\mathcal{C})}[\eta_{\mathcal{C}}, \rho] \subseteq S$, which completes the proof. \square

10 COVERING FOR GROUP INPUT CLASSES

We now consider separation and covering for the classes $SF(\mathcal{G})$ when \mathcal{G} is a group prevariety. We prove that both problems are decidable when \mathcal{G} -separation is decidable. In this case as well, the algorithm is based on the framework introduced in Section 8: we present a generic effective characterization of optimal imprints for $SF(\mathcal{G})$. Given an arbitrary *group prevariety* \mathcal{G} and a nice multiplicative rating map $\rho : 2^{A^*} \rightarrow R$, it describes the set $\mathcal{J}_{SF(\mathcal{G})}[\rho] \subseteq R$. Moreover, this description is effective when \mathcal{G} -separation is decidable. As announced at the end of Section 8, the characterization actually describes a more general object than the set $\mathcal{J}_{SF(\mathcal{G})}[\rho]$. The first part of the section is devoted to defining this object. In the second part, we present and prove the characterization itself.

10.1 Optimal \mathcal{G} -identities

As explained above, characterizing the optimal imprints for $SF(\mathcal{G})$ (when \mathcal{G} is a group prevariety) requires working with more general objects than the ones that we actually want to compute: the sets $\mathcal{J}_{SF(\mathcal{G})}[\rho] \subseteq R$ associated to a nice multiplicative rating map $\rho : 2^{A^*} \rightarrow R$. In this case as well, we look at sets which are strongly related to the “nested optimal imprints” $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{G}}[\xi_{SF(\mathcal{G})}[\rho]] \subseteq 2^R$ associated to the auxiliary rating maps $\xi_{SF(\mathcal{G})}[\rho] : 2^{A^*} \rightarrow 2^R$. Yet, since we are dealing with input classes that are *group prevarieties*, it will not be necessary to consider the whole set: a single special element of $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{G}}[\xi_{SF(\mathcal{G})}[\rho]] \subseteq 2^R$ suffices. Let us first define it. The definition makes sense for *all rating maps*: given an arbitrary rating map $\tau : 2^{A^*} \rightarrow Q$, we identify a special element of $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{G}}[\tau] \subseteq Q$.

The definition is based on a simple idea: a group prevariety \mathcal{G} does not contain any finite language. In particular, $\{\varepsilon\} \notin \mathcal{G}$. Hence, given a rating map $\tau : 2^{A^*} \rightarrow Q$, the optimal τ -imprint for \mathcal{G} on the singleton $\{\varepsilon\}$, *i.e.*, $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{G}}[\{\varepsilon\}, \tau]$, is an important object. This leads to the following definition.

Optimal \mathcal{G} -identities. Let \mathcal{G} be a lattice and let $\tau : 2^{A^*} \rightarrow Q$ be a rating map. We call *\mathcal{G} -identity* any language in \mathcal{G} containing ε . An *optimal \mathcal{G} -identity for τ* is a \mathcal{G} -identity L such that for every \mathcal{G} -identity L' , we have $\tau(L) \leq \tau(L')$. In practice, we use this notion when \mathcal{G} is a group prevariety, but this is not required for the definition. As expected, optimal \mathcal{G} -identities for τ always exist.

Lemma 10.1. *For any lattice \mathcal{G} and rating map $\tau : 2^{A^*} \rightarrow Q$, there exists an optimal \mathcal{G} -identity for τ .*

PROOF. Let $U = \{\tau(L) \mid L \in \mathcal{G} \text{ and } \varepsilon \in L\} = \{\tau(L) \mid L \text{ is a } \mathcal{G}\text{-identity}\}$. Clearly, U is nonempty: $\tau(A^*) \in U$ since $A^* \in \mathcal{G}$, as \mathcal{G} is a lattice. For every $q \in U$, fix an arbitrary \mathcal{G} -identity L_q such that $q = \tau(L_q)$ and let $L = \bigcap_{q \in U} L_q$. Since \mathcal{G} is a lattice, we have $L \in \mathcal{G}$. Moreover, $\varepsilon \in L$ by definition. Since $L \subseteq L_q$ for all $q \in U$, it follows that $\tau(L) \leq q$ for every $q \in U$. By definition of U , this implies that $\tau(L) \leq \tau(L')$ for every \mathcal{G} -identity L' . Hence, L is an optimal \mathcal{G} -identity for τ . \square

We complete the definition with a second notion, which is the counterpart of optimal imprints in this context. By definition, all optimal \mathcal{G} -identities for τ have the same image under τ . Hence, this image (in Q) is a canonical object for \mathcal{G} and τ . We write it $\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{G}}[\tau] \in Q$. In other words, $\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{G}}[\tau] = \tau(K)$ for every optimal \mathcal{G} -identity K for τ . We now connect this object with optimal imprints.

Lemma 10.2. *If \mathcal{G} is a lattice and $\tau : 2^{A^*} \rightarrow Q$ is a rating map, $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{G}}[\{\varepsilon\}, \tau] = \downarrow_Q\{\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{G}}[\tau]\}$.*

PROOF. For the left to right inclusion, let L be an optimal \mathcal{G} -identity for τ . By definition, we have $L \in \mathcal{G}$, $\varepsilon \in L$ and $\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{G}}[\tau] = \tau(L)$. Clearly, $\mathbf{K} = \{L\}$ is a \mathcal{G} -cover of $\{\varepsilon\}$. It follows that $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{G}}[\{\varepsilon\}, \tau] \subseteq \mathcal{J}[\tau](\mathbf{K}) = \downarrow_Q\{\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{G}}[\tau]\}$. Conversely, let \mathbf{H} be an optimal \mathcal{G} -cover of $\{\varepsilon\}$ for τ . There exists $H \in \mathbf{H}$ such that $\varepsilon \in H$. Hence, $\{H\}$ is also an optimal \mathcal{G} -cover of $\{\varepsilon\}$ for τ and it follows that $\downarrow_Q\{\tau(H)\} = \mathcal{J}[\tau](\{H\}) = \mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{G}}[\{\varepsilon\}, \tau]$. Finally, since $H \in \mathcal{G}$ and $\varepsilon \in H$, we have $\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{G}}[\tau] \leq \tau(H)$, which yields $\downarrow_Q\{\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{G}}[\tau]\} \subseteq \downarrow_Q\{\tau(H)\}$. Altogether, we obtain $\downarrow_Q\{\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{G}}[\tau]\} \subseteq \mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{G}}[\{\varepsilon\}, \tau]$, as desired. \square

We complete the definition with a key property. When τ is a nice rating map, the element $\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{G}}[\tau] \in Q$ can be specified in terms of \mathcal{G} -separation.

Lemma 10.3. *Let \mathcal{G} be a lattice and $\tau : 2^{A^*} \rightarrow Q$ be a nice rating map. Let $S \subseteq Q$ be the set of all elements $s \in Q$ such that $\{\varepsilon\}$ is not \mathcal{G} -separable from $\tau_*^{-1}(s)$. Then, $\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{G}}[\tau] = \sum_{s \in S} s$.*

PROOF. First, let us prove that $\sum_{s \in S} s \leq \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{G}}[\tau]$. This boils down to proving that $s \leq \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{G}}[\tau]$ for every $s \in S$. By definition of S , we know that $\{\varepsilon\}$ is not \mathcal{G} -separable from $\tau_*^{-1}(s)$. Let L be an optimal \mathcal{G} -identity for τ . By definition, we have $L \in \mathcal{G}$, $\varepsilon \in L$ and $\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{G}}[\tau] = \tau(L)$. Since $\{\varepsilon\}$ is not \mathcal{G} -separable from $\tau_*^{-1}(s)$, $L \in \mathcal{G}$ cannot separate $\{\varepsilon\}$ and $\tau_*^{-1}(s)$, and therefore $L \cap \tau_*^{-1}(s) \neq \emptyset$. It follows that $s \leq \tau(L)$, i.e., that $s \leq \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{G}}[\tau]$.

Conversely, we prove that $\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{G}}[\tau] \leq \sum_{s \in S} s$. For every $q \in Q \setminus S$, we know that $\{\varepsilon\}$ is \mathcal{G} -separable from $\tau_*^{-1}(q)$. Hence, we get $H_q \in \mathcal{G}$ such that $\varepsilon \in H_q$ and $H_q \cap \tau_*^{-1}(q) = \emptyset$. Let $H = \bigcap_{q \in Q \setminus S} H_q$. Since \mathcal{G} is a lattice, we have $H \in \mathcal{G}$. Moreover, $\varepsilon \in H$ by definition. Therefore, $\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{G}}[\tau] \leq \tau(H)$. Since τ is nice, there are finitely many words $w_1, \dots, w_k \in H$ such that $\tau(H) = \tau(w_1) + \dots + \tau(w_k)$. Finally, it follows from the definition of H that $\tau(w_i) \notin Q \setminus S$ for every $i \leq k$. In other words, we have $\tau(w_i) \in S$ for every $i \leq k$ and we obtain that $\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{G}}[\tau] \leq \tau(w_1) + \dots + \tau(w_k) \leq \sum_{s \in S} s$, as desired. \square

In particular when \mathcal{G} has decidable separation, Lemma 10.3 yields an algorithm taking a nice multiplicative rating map $\tau : 2^{A^*} \rightarrow Q$ as input and computing the element $\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{G}}[\tau] \in Q$.

Corollary 10.4. *Let \mathcal{G} be a lattice prevariety with decidable separation. Given a nice multiplicative rating map $\tau : 2^{A^*} \rightarrow Q$ as input, the element $\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{G}}[\tau] \in Q$ is computable.*

Application to $SF(\mathcal{G})$ -covering. We now explain how these notions are used in the context of $SF(\mathcal{G})$ -covering for a group prevariety \mathcal{G} . Consider a prevariety \mathcal{D} containing \mathcal{G} and which is closed under concatenation. Intuitively, \mathcal{D} is meant to be a class that has been built from \mathcal{G} using an operator. In practice, we shall use the case when $\mathcal{D} = SF(\mathcal{G})$. The high levels ideas outlined in Section 8 suggest that given a nice multiplicative rating map $\rho : 2^{A^*} \rightarrow R$, characterizing the optimal ρ -imprint for \mathcal{D} , i.e., $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{D}}[\rho] \subseteq R$, involves working with the set $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{G}}[\xi_{\mathcal{D}}[\rho]] \subseteq 2^R$ defined from the auxiliary rating map $\xi_{\mathcal{D}}[\rho] : 2^{A^*} \rightarrow 2^R$. Yet, because \mathcal{G} is a group prevariety and \mathcal{D} is closed under concatenation, partial information on $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{G}}[\xi_{\mathcal{D}}[\rho]]$ suffices. As we prove below, it is enough to consider the single element $\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{G}}[\xi_{\mathcal{D}}[\rho]] \in 2^R$ (which belongs to $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{G}}[\xi_{\mathcal{D}}[\rho]]$ by Lemma 10.2).

First, observe that regardless of our hypotheses on \mathcal{G} and \mathcal{D} , this set is directly connected to the object that we truly want to characterize: the set $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{D}}[\rho] \subseteq R$. Indeed, by definition, we have $\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{G}}[\xi_{\mathcal{D}}[\rho]] = \xi_{\mathcal{D}}[\rho](L) = \mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{D}}[L, \rho]$ where $L \in \mathcal{G}$ is an optimal \mathcal{G} -identity for $\xi_{\mathcal{D}}[\rho]$. Hence Fact 8.5 implies that,

$$\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{G}}[\xi_{\mathcal{D}}[\rho]] = \mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{D}}[L, \rho] \subseteq \mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{D}}[A^*, \rho] = \mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{D}}[\rho].$$

It turns out that when \mathcal{G} is a group prevariety and \mathcal{D} is closed under concatenation, $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{D}}[\rho]$ is characterized by its subset $\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{G}}[\xi_{\mathcal{D}}[\rho]]$. That is, one may compute the former from the latter.

Proposition 10.5. *Let \mathcal{G} be a group prevariety and \mathcal{D} be a prevariety closed under concatenation such that $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{D}$. Let $\rho : 2^{A^*} \rightarrow R$ be a multiplicative rating map. Then, $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{D}}[\rho]$ is the least subset $S \subseteq R$ containing $\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{G}}[\xi_{\mathcal{D}}[\rho]]$ and satisfying the following conditions:*

- (1) **Trivial elements:** For every $w \in A^*$, we have $\rho(w) \in S$.
- (2) **Closure under downset:** We have $\downarrow_R S = S$.
- (3) **Closure under multiplication:** For every $q, r \in S$, we have $qr \in S$.

Clearly, Proposition 10.5 yields a least fixpoint procedure for computing the set $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{D}}[\rho]$ from the set $\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{G}}[\xi_{\mathcal{D}}[\rho]]$. This is exactly how we handle optimal imprints for $SF(\mathcal{G})$ below. Rather than directly characterizing the sets $\mathcal{J}_{SF(\mathcal{G})}[\rho] \subseteq R$ for all nice multiplicative rating maps $\rho : 2^{A^*} \rightarrow R$, we

instead characterize the sets $\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{G}}[\xi_{SF(\mathcal{G})}[\rho]] \subseteq R$, which *carry more information* by Proposition 10.5. Before we present the characterization, let us prove Proposition 10.5.

PROOF OF PROPOSITION 10.5. Let $S \subseteq R$ be the least subset of R containing $\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{G}}[\xi_{\mathcal{D}}[\rho]]$ and satisfying the three conditions in Proposition 10.5. We first prove that $S \subseteq \mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{D}}[\rho]$. This is immediate. Indeed, as seen above, we have $\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{G}}[\xi_{\mathcal{D}}[\rho]] \subseteq \mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{D}}[\rho]$. Also, $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{D}}[\rho]$ contains all trivial elements: clearly, $\rho(w) \in \mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{D}}[A^*, \rho] = \mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{D}}[\rho]$ for every $w \in A^*$. Moreover, $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{D}}[\rho]$ is closed under downset since it is an imprint. Finally, since \mathcal{D} is a prevariety, Lemma 8.7 implies that $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{D}}[\rho]$ is closed under multiplication. Altogether, we get $S \subseteq \mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{D}}[\rho]$ as desired.

We turn to the inclusion $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{D}}[\rho] \subseteq S$. We build a \mathcal{D} -cover \mathbf{K} of A^* such that $\mathcal{J}[\rho](\mathbf{K}) \subseteq S$. Since $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{D}}[\rho] \subseteq \mathcal{J}[\rho](\mathbf{K})$ by definition, this yields the desired result. Let $L \subseteq A^*$ be an optimal \mathcal{G} -identity for $\xi_{\mathcal{D}}[\rho]$. By definition, $L \in \mathcal{G}$, $\varepsilon \in L$ and $\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{G}}[\xi_{\mathcal{D}}[\rho]] = \xi_{\mathcal{D}}[\rho](L) = \mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{D}}[L, \rho]$. We now use the following lemma to build a special cover of A^* .

Lemma 10.6. *There exists a cover \mathbf{U} of A^* such that each $U \in \mathbf{U}$ satisfies $U = La_1L \cdots a_\ell L$ where $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ and $a_1, \dots, a_\ell \in A$ (if $\ell = 0$, then $U = L$).*

PROOF. With every word $w = a_1 \cdots a_\ell \in A^*$, we associate the language $U_w = La_1L \cdots a_\ell L$ (in particular, $U_\varepsilon = L$). Since $L \in \mathcal{G}$, Proposition 2.4 yields a \mathcal{G} -morphism $\eta : A^* \rightarrow G$ recognizing L . By hypothesis on \mathcal{G} , Lemma 3.5 implies that G is a group. We let $k = |G|$ and $\mathbf{U} = \{U_w \mid w \in A^* \text{ and } |w| \leq k\}$. All languages in \mathbf{U} have the desired form. Hence, it suffices to verify that \mathbf{U} is a cover of A^* . We fix $v \in A^*$ and exhibit $U \in \mathbf{U}$ such that $v \in U$. It can be verified using a pumping argument that there exist $\ell \leq k$, $a_1, \dots, a_\ell \in A$ and $v_0, \dots, v_\ell \in A^*$ such that $v = v_0a_1v_1 \cdots a_\ell v_\ell$ and $\eta(v_0a_1v_1 \cdots a_i v_i) = \eta(v_0a_1v_1 \cdots a_i)$ for every $i \leq \ell$. Since G is a group, this yields $\eta(v_i) = 1_G$ for all $i \leq \ell$. Hence, since η recognizes L and $\varepsilon \in L$, we get $v_i \in L$ for every $i \leq \ell$. Thus $v \in U_w$ for $w = a_1 \cdots a_\ell$. Finally, we have $U_w \in \mathbf{U}$ since $|w| = \ell \leq k$. This completes the proof. \square

Let \mathbf{H} be an optimal \mathcal{D} -cover of L for ρ . By definition, we have $\mathcal{J}[\rho](\mathbf{H}) = \mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{D}}[L, \rho] = \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{G}}[\xi_{\mathcal{D}}[\rho]]$. Consider the cover \mathbf{U} of A^* given by Lemma 10.6. Let $U \in \mathbf{U}$. By definition $U = La_1L \cdots a_nL$ for $a_1, \dots, a_n \in A$. Let $\mathbf{K}_U = \{H_0a_1H_1 \cdots a_nH_n \mid H_0, \dots, H_n \in \mathbf{H}\}$. Since \mathbf{H} is a \mathcal{D} -cover of L and \mathcal{D} is closed under concatenation, \mathbf{K}_U is a \mathcal{D} -cover of U . Finally, let $\mathbf{K} = \bigcup_{U \in \mathbf{U}} \mathbf{K}_U$. Since \mathbf{U} is a cover of A^* and \mathbf{K}_U is a \mathcal{D} -cover of U for every $U \in \mathbf{U}$, it is immediate that \mathbf{K} is a \mathcal{D} -cover of A^* .

It remains to prove that $\mathcal{J}[\rho](\mathbf{K}) \subseteq S$. Since S is closed under downset, it suffices to prove that $\rho(K) \in S$ for every $K \in \mathbf{K}$. By definition, there exist $a_1, \dots, a_n \in A$ and $H_0, \dots, H_n \in \mathbf{H}$ such that $K = H_0a_1H_1 \cdots a_nH_n$. Hence, it suffices to prove that $\rho(H_0a_1H_1 \cdots a_nH_n) \in S$. By definition of \mathbf{H} , we have $\mathcal{J}[\rho](\mathbf{H}) = \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{G}}[\xi_{\mathcal{D}}[\rho]]$. Therefore, $\rho(H_i) \in \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{G}}[\xi_{\mathcal{D}}[\rho]]$ for every $i \leq n$. Since S contains $\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{G}}[\xi_{\mathcal{D}}[\rho]]$, this yields $\rho(H_i) \in S$ for every $i \leq n$. Moreover, since S contains the trivial elements, we have $\rho(a_i) \in S$ for every $i \leq n$. Finally, since S is closed under multiplication, we obtain $\rho(H_0a_1H_1 \cdots a_nH_n) \in S$, which completes the proof. \square

10.2 Characterization

Let us first present the characterization. Consider an arbitrary group prevariety \mathcal{G} and an arbitrary multiplicative rating map $\rho : 2^{A^*} \rightarrow R$. We define special subsets of R , which we call *SF-complete* for \mathcal{G} and ρ . The definition is based on an auxiliary nice multiplicative rating map $\mu_{\rho, S} : 2^{A^*} \rightarrow 2^R$, which we associate to every subset $S \subseteq R$. Its rating algebra is $(2^R, \cup, \cdot)$ (the multiplication on 2^R is obtained by lifting the multiplication on R to subsets). Since we are defining a *nice* multiplicative rating map, it suffices to specify the image of each letter $a \in A$. We let,

$$\mu_{\rho, S}(a) = \{s\rho(a)s' \mid s, s' \in S\} \in 2^R.$$

Observe that by definition, we have $\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{G}}[\mu_{\rho,S}] \subseteq R$ for each set $S \subseteq R$. Now, consider an arbitrary subset $S \subseteq R$. We say that S is *SF-complete for \mathcal{G} and ρ* when it satisfies the following properties:

- (1) **Closure under downset:** $\downarrow_R S = S$.
- (2) **Closure under multiplication:** For every $q, r \in S$, we have $qr \in S$.
- (3) **\mathcal{G} -operation:** We have $\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{G}}[\mu_{\rho,S}] \subseteq S$.
- (4) **SF-closure.** For every $r \in S$, we have $r^\omega + r^{\omega+1} \in S$.

Remark 10.7. *The definition does not explicitly require that an SF-complete subset $S \subseteq R$ for \mathcal{G} and ρ contains some trivial elements. Yet, this is a consequence of \mathcal{G} -operation. Indeed, we have $\mu_{\rho,S}(\varepsilon) = \{1_R\}$ (this is the multiplicative neutral element of 2^R). Thus, $1_R \in \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{G}}[\mu_{\rho,S}] \subseteq S$ by definition.*

With this definition in hand, we may state the main theorem of this section. When ρ is nice, $\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{G}}[\xi_{SF(\mathcal{G})}[\rho]]$ is the least SF-complete subset of R .

Theorem 10.8. *Let \mathcal{G} be a group prevariety and $\rho : 2^{A^*} \rightarrow R$ a nice multiplicative rating map. Then, $\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{G}}[\xi_{SF(\mathcal{G})}[\rho]]$ is the least SF-complete subset of R for \mathcal{G} and ρ .*

When \mathcal{G} -separation is decidable, Theorem 10.8 yields a least fixpoint procedure for computing $\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{G}}[\xi_{SF(\mathcal{G})}[\rho]]$ from a nice multiplicative rating map $\rho : 2^{A^*} \rightarrow R$. The computation starts from the empty set and saturates it with the operations in the definition of SF-complete subsets. It is clear that we may implement downset, multiplication and SF-closure. Moreover, we may compute $\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{G}}[\mu_{\rho,S}]$ from a set $S \subseteq R$ by Corollary 10.4 since \mathcal{G} -separation is decidable. Eventually, the computation reaches a fixpoint and it is straightforward to verify that this set is the least SF-complete subset of R , i.e., $\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{G}}[\xi_{SF(\mathcal{G})}[\rho]]$ by Theorem 10.8. One may then use a second least fixpoint procedure provided by Proposition 10.5 to compute the set $\mathbb{J}_{SF(\mathcal{G})}[\rho] \subseteq R$ from $\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{G}}[\xi_{SF(\mathcal{G})}[\rho]]$.

Consequently, it follows from Proposition 8.8 that SF(\mathcal{G})-covering is decidable if \mathcal{G} -separation is decidable. As before, the result can be lifted to separation for SF(\mathcal{G}) using Lemma 2.2. Altogether, we obtain the following corollary.

Corollary 10.9. *Let \mathcal{G} be a group prevariety with decidable separation. Then, separation and covering are decidable for SF(\mathcal{G}).*

Corollary 10.9 has three important applications: the group prevarieties MOD (the modulo languages), AMT (the alphabet modulo testable languages) and GR (all group languages). Indeed, since it is known that the three of them have decidable separation (see e.g., [33]), we obtain the decidability of covering for the classes SF(MOD), SF(AMT) and SF(GR).

We now concentrate on the proof of Theorem 10.8. In this case as well, we present two independent statements corresponding respectively to soundness and completeness. Let us start with the former. The argument is based on Proposition 9.5, which addresses soundness for the characterization of optimal imprints for SF(\mathcal{C}) when \mathcal{C} is a *finite* prevariety.

Proposition 10.10 (Soundness). *Let \mathcal{G} be a group prevariety of group languages and $\rho : 2^{A^*} \rightarrow R$ be a multiplicative rating map. Then, $\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{G}}[\xi_{SF(\mathcal{G})}[\rho]] \subseteq R$ is SF-complete for \mathcal{G} and ρ .*

PROOF. For the sake of avoiding clutter, let $S = \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{G}}[\xi_{SF(\mathcal{G})}[\rho]]$. We start with a preliminary result.

Lemma 10.11. *There exists a finite group prevariety \mathcal{H} that satisfies $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{G}$ and such that $S = \{r \in R \mid (1_G, r) \in \mathcal{P}_{SF(\mathcal{H})}[\eta_{\mathcal{H}}, \rho]\}$ where $\eta_{\mathcal{H}} : A^* \rightarrow G$ is the canonical \mathcal{H} -morphism.*

Before we prove Lemma 10.11, let us use it to complete the main argument. Note that Proposition 9.5 implies that $\mathcal{P}_{SF(\mathcal{H})}[\eta_{\mathcal{H}}, \rho] \subseteq G \times R$ is SF-saturated for $\eta_{\mathcal{H}}$ and ρ . We shall use this property

multiple times. We show that S is SF -complete for \mathcal{G} and ρ . That S is closed under downset, multiplication and SF -closure is immediate from Lemma 10.11 (more precisely, it follows from the equality $S = \{r \in R \mid (1_G, r) \in \mathcal{P}_{SF(\mathcal{H})}[\eta_{\mathcal{H}}, \rho]\}$ and the fact that $\mathcal{P}_{SF(\mathcal{H})}[\eta_{\mathcal{H}}, \rho]$ satisfies the three corresponding properties in the definition of SF -saturated sets). Hence, we concentrate on \mathcal{G} -operation. Given $s \in \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{G}}[\mu_{\rho, S}]$, we prove that $s \in S$. By hypothesis in Lemma 10.11, we have $\eta_{\mathcal{H}}^{-1}(1_G) \in \mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{G}$. Moreover, it is clear that $\varepsilon \in \eta_{\mathcal{H}}^{-1}(1_G)$. Therefore, we obtain $\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{G}}[\mu_{\rho, S}] \subseteq \mu_{\rho, S}(\eta_{\mathcal{H}}^{-1}(1_G))$. This yields $w \in \eta_{\mathcal{H}}^{-1}(1_G)$ such that $s \in \mu_{\rho, S}(w)$. There are now two cases. First, if $w = \varepsilon$, then $\mu_{\rho, S}(\varepsilon) = \{1_R\}$ which yields $s = 1_R$. Clearly, we have $(1_G, 1_R) \in \mathcal{P}_{SF(\mathcal{H})}[\eta_{\mathcal{H}}, \rho]$ (this is a trivial element), hence we obtain $s = 1_R \in S$ by Lemma 10.11. Assume now that $w \in A^+$ and let $a_1, \dots, a_n \in A$ be the letters such that $w = a_1 \cdots a_n$. By definition of $\mu_{\rho, S}$, the fact that $s \in \mu_{\rho, S}(w)$ yields $s_1, \dots, s_n, t_1, \dots, t_n \in S$ such that $s = s_1 \rho(a_1) t_1 \cdots s_n \rho(a_n) t_n$. Clearly, we have $(\eta_{\mathcal{H}}(a_i), \rho(a_i)) \in \mathcal{P}_{SF(\mathcal{H})}[\eta_{\mathcal{H}}, \rho]$ for every $i \leq n$ (this is a trivial element). Also, Lemma 10.11 yields $(1_G, s_i), (1_G, t_i) \in \mathcal{P}_{SF(\mathcal{H})}[\eta_{\mathcal{H}}, \rho]$ for every $i \leq n$. Altogether, since $\mathcal{P}_{SF(\mathcal{H})}[\eta_{\mathcal{H}}, \rho]$ is closed under multiplication, we get $(\eta_{\mathcal{H}}(w), s) = (\eta_{\mathcal{H}}(a_1 \cdots a_n), s) \in \mathcal{P}_{SF(\mathcal{H})}[\eta_{\mathcal{H}}, \rho]$. Finally, since $w \in \eta_{\mathcal{H}}^{-1}(1_G)$, we get $(1_G, s) \in \mathcal{P}_{SF(\mathcal{H})}[\eta_{\mathcal{H}}, \rho]$ and Lemma 10.11 yields $s \in S$, as desired.

It remains to prove Lemma 10.11. We first define \mathcal{H} . Let $L \in \mathcal{G}$ be an optimal \mathcal{G} -identity for $\xi_{SF(\mathcal{G})}[\rho]$. By definition, $\varepsilon \in L$ and $S = \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{G}}[\xi_{SF(\mathcal{G})}[\rho]] = \xi_{SF(\mathcal{G})}[\rho](L)$. Let \mathbf{K} be an optimal $SF(\mathcal{G})$ -cover of L for ρ , so that $\mathcal{J}[\rho](\mathbf{K}) = \mathcal{J}_{SF(\mathcal{G})}[L, \rho] = \xi_{SF(\mathcal{G})}[\rho](L) = S$. By definition of $SF(\mathcal{G})$, there exists a *finite* set of languages $\mathbf{H} \subseteq \mathcal{G}$ such that every language $K \in \mathbf{K} \subseteq SF(\mathcal{G})$ is built from the languages in \mathbf{H} and the singletons $\{a\}$ for $a \in A$ using only concatenation and Boolean combinations. It follows from Proposition 3.2 that $SF(\mathcal{G})$ is a prevariety. Therefore, Proposition 2.4 yields a \mathcal{G} -morphism $\eta : A^* \rightarrow G$ all languages in $\{L\} \cup \mathbf{H}$. Moreover, since \mathcal{G} is a group prevariety, Lemma 3.5 implies that G is a group. We write \mathcal{H} for the class of all languages recognized by η . That is, $\mathcal{H} = \{\eta^{-1}(F) \mid F \subseteq G\}$. One may verify that \mathcal{H} is a finite group prevariety such that $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{G}$. Moreover, η is an \mathcal{H} -morphism that recognizes every language in \mathcal{H} . Hence, η is the canonical \mathcal{H} -morphism by Lemma 2.5.

It remains to prove that $S = \{r \in R \mid (1_G, r) \in \mathcal{P}_{SF(\mathcal{H})}[\eta, \rho]\}$. We start with the left to right inclusion. Let $r \in S$. By definition, $S = \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{G}}[\xi_{SF(\mathcal{G})}[\rho]]$. Hence, since $\eta^{-1}(1_G) \in \mathcal{G}$ and $\varepsilon \in \eta^{-1}(1_G)$, we have $r \in \xi_{SF(\mathcal{G})}[\rho](\eta^{-1}(1_G)) = \mathcal{J}_{SF(\mathcal{G})}[\eta^{-1}(1_G), \rho]$. Finally, since $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{G}$, this implies by Fact 8.5 that $r \in \mathcal{J}_{SF(\mathcal{H})}[\eta^{-1}(1_G), \rho]$, which exactly says that $(1_G, r) \in \mathcal{P}_{SF(\mathcal{H})}[\eta, \rho]$, as desired. We turn to the converse inclusion. Let $r \in R$ such that $(1_G, r) \in \mathcal{P}_{SF(\mathcal{H})}[\eta, \rho]$. We show that $r \in S$. By definition $r \in \mathcal{J}_{SF(\mathcal{H})}[\eta^{-1}(1_G), \rho]$. Moreover, since η recognizes L and we have $\varepsilon \in L$, we have $\eta^{-1}(1_G) \subseteq L$. Therefore, Fact 8.5 yields $r \in \mathcal{J}_{SF(\mathcal{H})}[L, \rho]$. Moreover, it is immediate by definition of \mathcal{H} that every $K \in \mathbf{K}$ belongs to $SF(\mathcal{H})$. Hence, \mathbf{K} is an $SF(\mathcal{H})$ -cover of L and we get $r \in \mathcal{J}[\rho](\mathbf{K}) = S$. This completes the proof. \square

We turn to completeness. The argument is based on Proposition 9.6, the direction addressing completeness for the characterization of optimal imprints for $SF(\mathcal{C})$ when \mathcal{C} is a *finite* prevariety.

Proposition 10.12 (Completeness). *Let \mathcal{G} be a prevariety of group languages and $\rho : 2^{A^*} \rightarrow R$ be a nice multiplicative rating map. Let $S \subseteq R$ be SF -complete for \mathcal{G} and ρ . Then, there exists a language $L \in \mathcal{G}$ such that $\varepsilon \in L$, as well as an $SF(\mathcal{G})$ -cover \mathbf{K} of L such that $\mathcal{J}[\rho](\mathbf{K}) \subseteq S$.*

PROOF. We start with a preliminary lemma. It is based on the hypothesis that S is SF -complete for \mathcal{G} and ρ . We need it in order to apply Proposition 9.6.

Lemma 10.13. *There exist a \mathcal{G} -morphism $\eta : A^* \rightarrow G$ and a set $S' \subseteq G \times R$ which is SF -saturated for η and ρ , and such that $S = \{r \mid (1_G, r) \in S'\}$.*

We first apply Lemma 10.13 to complete the proof of Proposition 10.12. We define $L = \eta^{-1}(1_G)$. It is clear that $\varepsilon \in L$ and $L \in \mathcal{G}$ since η is a \mathcal{G} -morphism. Moreover, since S' is SF -saturated for η and ρ , Proposition 9.6 yields an η -pointed $SF(\mathcal{G})$ -cover \mathbf{H} of A^* such that $\mathcal{P}[\eta, \rho](\mathbf{H}) \subseteq S'$. We define $\mathbf{K} = \{K \mid (1_G, K) \in \mathbf{H}\}$. By definition, \mathbf{K} is an $SF(\mathcal{G})$ -cover of $L = \eta^{-1}(1_G)$. Moreover, since $S = \{r \mid (1_G, r) \in S'\}$ and $\mathcal{P}[\eta, \rho](\mathbf{H}) \subseteq S'$, it is immediate from the definition that $\mathcal{J}[\rho](\mathbf{K}) \subseteq S$, which completes the proof.

It remains to prove Lemma 10.13. Let us first define η . We let L be an optimal \mathcal{G} -identity for the nice multiplicative rating map $\mu_{\rho, S} : 2^{A^*} \rightarrow 2^R$. That is, we have $L \in \mathcal{G}$, $\varepsilon \in L$ and $\mu_{\rho, S}(L) = \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{G}}[\mu_{\rho, S}]$. Proposition 2.4 yields a \mathcal{G} -morphism $\eta : A^* \rightarrow G$ recognizing L . By hypothesis on \mathcal{G} , Lemma 3.5 implies that G is a group. Also since $\varepsilon \in L$ and L is recognized by η , it is immediate that $\eta^{-1}(1_G) \subseteq L$. Finally, we define $S' \subseteq G \times R$ as the following set:

$$S' = \{(1_G, s) \mid s \in S\} \cup \{(t, r) \mid r \in \downarrow_R \mu_{\rho, S}(\eta^{-1}(t))\}.$$

Let us first prove that $S = \{r \mid (1_G, r) \in S'\}$. The left to right inclusion is immediate by definition: if $r \in S$, then $(1_G, r) \in S'$. We turn to the converse inclusion. Let $r \in R$ such that $(1_G, r) \in S'$. By definition of S' , either $r \in S$ or $r \in \downarrow_R \mu_{\rho, S}(\eta^{-1}(1_G))$. In the former case, we are done. Hence, we assume that $r \in \downarrow_R \mu_{\rho, S}(\eta^{-1}(1_G))$. By definition, $\eta^{-1}(1_G) \subseteq L$ (L is recognized by η and $\varepsilon \in L$). Hence, since $\mu_{\rho, S}(L) = \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{G}}[\mu_{\rho, S}]$ we get $r \in \downarrow_R \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{G}}[\mu_{\rho, S}]$. Finally, since S is SF -complete for \mathcal{G} and ρ , we have $\downarrow_R \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{G}}[\mu_{\rho, S}] \subseteq S$ and we get $r \in S$, as desired.

It remains to prove that S' is SF -saturated for η and ρ . This involves four properties. Let us start with trivial elements. Consider $w \in A^*$, we show that $(\eta(w), \rho(w)) \in S'$. By definition of S' , it suffices to prove that $\rho(w) \in \downarrow_R \mu_{\rho, S}(\eta^{-1}(\eta(w)))$. Clearly, $w \in \eta^{-1}(\eta(w))$. Hence, it now suffices to prove that $\rho(w) \in \mu_{\rho, S}(w)$. If $w = \varepsilon$, then $\rho(w) = 1_R$ and $\mu_{\rho, S}(\varepsilon) = \{1_R\}$ (this is the neutral element of 2^R). Thus, it is immediate that $\rho(w) \in \mu_{\rho, S}(w)$. Assume now that $w \in A^+$. We have $a_1, \dots, a_n \in A$ such that $w = a_1 \cdots a_n$. Since S is SF -complete, we have $1_R \in S$ (see Remark 10.7). Hence, we get $\rho(a_i) \in S \cdot \{\rho(a_i)\} \cdot S = \mu_{\rho, S}(a_i)$ for every $i \leq n$. It then follows that $\rho(w) \in \mu_{\rho, S}(w)$ which concludes this case. We turn to downset. Consider $(t, r) \in S'$ and $q \leq r$. We show that $(t, q) \in S'$. By definition, there are two possible cases. First, it may happen that $t = 1_G$ and $r \in S$. In that case, $q \in S$ since $\downarrow_R S = S$ (S is complete) and we get that $(1_G, q) \in S'$ by definition. Otherwise, $r \in \downarrow_R \mu_{\rho, S}(\eta^{-1}(t))$ which yields $q \in \downarrow_R \mu_{\rho, S}(\eta^{-1}(t))$ as well and we get $(t, q) \in S'$, concluding the proof for downset.

We turn to closure under multiplication. Let $(s, q), (t, r) \in S'$. We have to show that $(st, qr) \in S'$. There are several cases. Assume first that $s = t = 1_G$. In that case, we proved above that $q, r \in S$. Since S is complete, this implies that $qr \in S$ and we obtain that $(st, qr) = (1_G, qr) \in S'$. We now assume that either s or t is distinct from 1_G for the remainder of this case. If both s and t are distinct from 1_G , we have $q \in \downarrow_R \mu_{\rho, S}(\eta^{-1}(s))$ and $r \in \downarrow_R \mu_{\rho, S}(\eta^{-1}(t))$ by definition of S' . It follows that $qr \in \downarrow_R \mu_{\rho, S}(\eta^{-1}(s)\eta^{-1}(t))$. Since $\eta^{-1}(s)\eta^{-1}(t) \subseteq \eta^{-1}(st)$, this yields $qr \in \downarrow_R \mu_{\rho, S}(\eta^{-1}(st))$ and we get $(st, qr) \in S'$. Finally, we handle the case when $s = 1_G$ and $t \neq 1_G$ (the symmetrical case is left to the reader). Since $S = S'(1_G)$, the hypothesis that $t = 1_G$ yields $q \in S$. Moreover, we have $r \in \downarrow_R \mu_{\rho, S}(\eta^{-1}(t))$ since $t \neq 1_G$. Note that $t \neq 1_G$ also implies that $\eta^{-1}(t) \subseteq A^+$. Thus, since $SS \subseteq S$ (S is complete), one may verify from the definition of $\mu_{\rho, S}$ that $S \cdot \mu_{\rho, S}(\eta^{-1}(t)) \subseteq \mu_{\rho, S}(\eta^{-1}(t))$. Thus, since $q \in S$ and $r \in \downarrow_R \mu_{\rho, S}(\eta^{-1}(t))$, we obtain that $qr \in \downarrow_R \mu_{\rho, S}(\eta^{-1}(t))$. Finally, $1_G t = t$. Thus, $qr \in \downarrow_R \mu_{\rho, S}(\eta^{-1}(1_G t))$ which yields $(1_G t, qr) \in S'$, concluding the proof.

It remains to prove that S' satisfies SF -closure. Since G is a group, 1_G is the only idempotent of G . Hence, we have to show that for $r \in R$ such that $(1_G, r) \in S'$, we have $(1_G, r^\omega + r^{\omega+1}) \in S'$. Since $S = \{r \mid (1_G, r) \in S'\}$, we know that $r \in S$. Hence, since S is SF -complete, we get $r^\omega + r^{\omega+1} \in S$ which implies $(1_G, r^\omega + r^{\omega+1}) \in S'$ since $S = \{r \mid (1_G, r) \in S'\}$. This completes the proof. \square

We may now combine Proposition 10.10 and Proposition 10.12 to prove Theorem 10.8.

PROOF OF THEOREM 10.8. Let \mathcal{G} be a group prevariety and $\rho : 2^{A^*} \rightarrow R$ be a nice multiplicative rating map. We prove that $\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{G}}[\xi_{SF(\mathcal{G})}[\rho]]$ is the least SF -complete subset of R for \mathcal{G} and ρ . Proposition 10.10 implies that $\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{G}}[\xi_{SF(\mathcal{G})}[\rho]]$ is SF -complete. We have to show that it is the least such set.

Let $S \subseteq R$ be SF -complete for \mathcal{G} and ρ . We prove that $\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{G}}[\xi_{SF(\mathcal{G})}[\rho]] \subseteq S$. Proposition 10.12 yields $L \in \mathcal{G}$ such that $\varepsilon \in L$ and an $SF(\mathcal{G})$ -cover \mathbf{K} of L such that $\mathcal{J}[\rho](\mathbf{K}) \subseteq S$. By definition of optimal \mathcal{G} -identities, we have $\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{G}}[\xi_{SF(\mathcal{G})}[\rho]] \subseteq \xi_{SF(\mathcal{G})}[\rho](L)$. Hence, it suffices to show that $\xi_{SF(\mathcal{G})}[\rho](L) \subseteq S$. By definition, we have $\xi_{SF(\mathcal{G})}[\rho](L) = \mathcal{J}_{SF(\mathcal{G})}[L, \rho] \subseteq \mathcal{J}[\rho](\mathbf{K}) \subseteq S$. This concludes the proof. \square

11 CONCLUSION

We investigated the star-free closure operator $\mathcal{C} \mapsto SF(\mathcal{C})$ applied prevarieties or regular languages. First, we presented several equivalent ways of defining $SF(\mathcal{C})$, including a generic algebraic characterization that generalizes earlier results [40, 44, 28]. It implies that $SF(\mathcal{C})$ -membership is decidable when \mathcal{C} -separation is decidable. A key proof ingredient for all these results is an alternative definition of star-free closure: the operator $\mathcal{C} \mapsto SD(\mathcal{C})$, which we prove to coincide with star-free closure. This correspondence generalizes the work of Schützenberger [41] who introduced a single class SD (i.e., $SD(ST)$) corresponding to the star-free languages (i.e., $SF(ST)$). Moreover, we presented two generic logical characterizations of star-free closure. The first one is based on first-order logic and generalizes the work of McNaughton and Papert on the star-free languages [23]: we have $SF(\mathcal{C}) = FO(\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{C}})$ for every prevariety \mathcal{C} . The second one is based on linear temporal logic and generalizes Kamp's theorem [17]: we have $SF(\mathcal{C}) = LTL(\mathcal{C}) = LTLP(\mathcal{C})$ for every prevariety \mathcal{C} . Finally, we gave two generic characterizations of optimal imprints for $SF(\mathcal{C})$, for two particular kinds of prevariety \mathcal{C} : the *finite* prevarieties and the *group* prevarieties. They imply that $SF(\mathcal{C})$ has decidable separation and covering when \mathcal{C} is a finite prevariety and that $SF(\mathcal{G})$ has decidable separation and covering when \mathcal{G} is a group prevariety with decidable separation.

REFERENCES

- [1] Douglas Albert, Robert Baldinger, and John Rhodes. “Undecidability of the Identity Problem for Finite Semigroups”. In: *The Journal of Symbolic Logic* 57.1 (1992), pp. 179–192.
- [2] Jorge Almeida. “Some Algorithmic Problems for Pseudovarieties”. In: *Publicationes Mathematicae Debrecen* 54 (1999), pp. 531–552.
- [3] Christopher J. Ash. “Inevitable Graphs: a Proof of the Type II Conjecture and some Related Decision Procedures”. In: *International Journal of Algebra and Computation* 1.1 (1991), pp. 127–146.
- [4] David A. Mix Barrington et al. “Regular languages in NC1”. In: *Journal of Computer and System Sciences* 44.3 (1992), pp. 478–499.
- [5] Jean Berstel, Dominique Perrin, and Christophe Reutenauer. *Codes and Automata*. Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications. Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- [6] Laura Chaubard, Jean-Éric Pin, and Howard Straubing. “First Order Formulas with Modular Predicates”. In: *Proceedings of the 21th IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (LICS'06)*. 2006, pp. 211–220.
- [7] Luc Dartois and Charles Paperman. “Two-variable first order logic with modular predicates over words”. In: *STACS'13*. Vol. 20. LIPIcs. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2013, pp. 329–340.
- [8] Manuel Delgado. “Abelian Poinlikes of a Monoid”. In: *Semigroup Forum* 56.3 (1998), pp. 339–361.

- [9] Volker Diekert and Manfred Kufleitner. “Omega-Rational Expressions with Bounded Synchronization Delay”. In: *Theory Comput. Syst.* 56.4 (2015), pp. 686–696. DOI: 10.1007/s00224-013-9526-4.
- [10] Volker Diekert and Tobias Walter. “Characterizing classes of regular languages using prefix codes of bounded synchronization delay”. In: *Proceedings of the 43rd International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming*. ICALP’16. 2016, 129:1–129:14.
- [11] Volker Diekert and Tobias Walter. “Characterizing classes of regular languages using prefix codes of bounded synchronization delay”. In: *IJAC* 27.6 (2017), pp. 561–590.
- [12] Samuel Eilenberg. *Automata, Languages, and Machines*. Vol. B. Orlando, FL, USA: Academic Press, Inc., 1976.
- [13] Paul Gastin and Dietrich Kuske. “Satisfiability and Model Checking for MSO-Definable Temporal Logics Are in PSPACE”. In: *CONCUR’03*. Ed. by Roberto Amadio and Denis Lugiez. Springer, 2003, pp. 222–236.
- [14] Christian Glaßer and Heinz Schmitz. “Languages of Dot-Depth $3/2$ ”. In: *Theory of Computing Systems* 42.2 (2007), pp. 256–286.
- [15] Karsten Henckell. “Pointlike sets: the finest aperiodic cover of a finite semigroup”. In: *Journal of Pure Applied Algebra* 55.1-2 (1988), pp. 85–126.
- [16] Karsten Henckell et al. “Ash’s type II theorem, profinite topology and Malcev products”. In: *International Journal of Algebra and Computation* 1 (1991), pp. 411–436.
- [17] Hans W. Kamp. “Tense Logic and the Theory of Linear Order”. PhD thesis. Computer Science Department, University of California at Los Angeles, USA, 1968.
- [18] Joel Karnofsky and John Rhodes. “Decidability of complexity one-half for finite semigroups”. In: *Semigroup Forum* 24.1 (1982), pp. 55–66.
- [19] Robert Knast. “A Semigroup Characterization of Dot-Depth One Languages”. In: *RAIRO - Theoretical Informatics and Applications* 17.4 (1983), pp. 321–330.
- [20] Andreas Krebs et al. “Two-variable logics with some betweenness relations: Expressiveness, satisfiability and membership”. In: *Logical Methods in Computer Science* Volume 16, Issue 3 (2020).
- [21] Manfred Kufleitner and Tobias Walter. “One Quantifier Alternation in First-Order Logic with Modular Predicates”. In: *RAIRO - Theoretical Informatics and Applications* 49 (2013), pp. 1–22.
- [22] Stuart Margolis and Jean-Éric Pin. “Product of Group Languages”. In: *FCT Conference*. Vol. 199. Springer-Verlag, 1985, pp. 285–299.
- [23] Robert McNaughton and Seymour A. Papert. *Counter-Free Automata*. MIT Press, 1971.
- [24] Jean-Éric Pin. “Bridges for Concatenation Hierarchies”. In: *Proceedings of the 25th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages and Programming*. ICALP’98. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag, 1998, pp. 431–442.
- [25] Jean-Éric Pin. “Mathematical Foundations of Automata Theory”. In preparation. 2022. URL: <http://www.irif.fr/~jep/PDF/MPRI/MPRI.pdf>.
- [26] Jean-Éric Pin. “PG = BG, a success story”. In: *NATO Advanced Study Institute, Semigroups, Formal Languages and Groups* (1995), pp. 33–47.
- [27] Jean-Éric Pin. “The dot-depth hierarchy, 45 years later”. In: *The Role of Theory in Computer Science. Essays Dedicated to Janusz Brzozowski*. World Scientific, 2017. Chap. 8, pp. 177–202.
- [28] Jean-Éric Pin, Howard Straubing, and Denis Thérien. “Locally trivial categories and unambiguous concatenation”. In: *Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra* 52.3 (1988), pp. 297–311.
- [29] Jean-Éric Pin and Pascal Weil. “Polynomial Closure and Unambiguous Product”. In: *Theory of Computing Systems* 30.4 (1997), pp. 383–422.
- [30] Thomas Place. “Separating regular languages with two quantifier alternations”. In: *Logical Methods in Computer Science* 14.4 (2018).

- [31] Thomas Place and Marc Zeitoun. *All about unambiguous polynomial closure*. Preprint. 2022. DOI: 10.48550/arxiv.2205.12703.
- [32] Thomas Place and Marc Zeitoun. “Generic results for concatenation hierarchies”. In: *Theory of Computing Systems (ToCS)* 63.4 (2019). Selected papers from CSR’17, pp. 849–901.
- [33] Thomas Place and Marc Zeitoun. “Group separation strikes back”. In: *Proceedings of the 38th Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science, LICS’23*. 2023. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2205.12703>.
- [34] Thomas Place and Marc Zeitoun. “On All Things Star-Free”. In: *Proceedings of the 46th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming*. ICALP’19. 2019, 126:1–126:14.
- [35] Thomas Place and Marc Zeitoun. “Separating Regular Languages with First-Order Logic”. In: *Logical Methods in Computer Science* 12.1 (2016).
- [36] Thomas Place and Marc Zeitoun. “Separating Regular Languages with First-order Logic”. In: *Proceedings of the Joint Meeting of the 23rd EACSL Annual Conference on Computer Science Logic (CSL’14) and the 29th Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (LICS’14)*. New York, NY, USA: ACM, 2014, 75:1–75:10.
- [37] Thomas Place and Marc Zeitoun. “Separation and covering for group based concatenation hierarchies”. In: *Proceedings of the 34th Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science*. LICS’19. 2019, pp. 1–13.
- [38] Thomas Place and Marc Zeitoun. “Separation for dot-depth two”. In: *Logical Methods in Computer Science* Volume 17, Issue 3 (2021).
- [39] Thomas Place and Marc Zeitoun. “The Covering Problem”. In: *Logical Methods in Computer Science* 14.3 (2018).
- [40] Marcel Paul Schützenberger. “On Finite Monoids Having Only Trivial Subgroups”. In: *Information and Control* 8.2 (1965), pp. 190–194.
- [41] Marcel Paul Schützenberger. “Sur certaines opérations de fermeture dans les langages rationnels”. In: *Symposia Mathematica XV* (1975). Convegno di Informatica Teorica, INDAM, Roma, 1973, pp. 245–253.
- [42] Imre Simon. “Piecewise Testable Events”. In: *Proceedings of the 2nd GI Conference on Automata Theory and Formal Languages*. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag, 1975, pp. 214–222.
- [43] Howard Straubing. “A Generalization of the Schützenberger Product of Finite Monoids”. In: *Theoretical Computer Science* 13.2 (1981), pp. 137–150.
- [44] Howard Straubing. “Aperiodic homomorphisms and the concatenation product of recognizable sets”. In: *Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra* 15.3 (1979), pp. 319–327.
- [45] Howard Straubing. “On Logical Descriptions of Regular Languages”. In: *LATIN 2002: Theoretical Informatics, 5th Latin American Symposium*. 2002, pp. 528–538.
- [46] Howard Straubing and Pascal Weil. “Varieties”. In: *Handbook of Automata Theory*. Ed. by Jean-Éric Pin. European Mathematical Society Publishing House, Zürich, Switzerland, 2021, pp. 569–614. DOI: 10.4171/Automata-1/16. URL: <https://doi.org/10.4171/Automata-1/16>.
- [47] Denis Thérien. “Classification of Finite Monoids: The Language Approach”. In: *Theoretical Computer Science* 14.2 (1981), pp. 195–208.
- [48] Denis Thérien and Thomas Wilke. “Over Words, Two Variables Are As Powerful As One Quantifier Alternation”. In: *Proceedings of the 30th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*. STOC’98. New York, NY, USA: ACM, 1998, pp. 234–240.
- [49] Gabriel Thierrin. “Permutation automata”. In: *Theory of Computing Systems* 2.1 (1968), pp. 83–90.

- [50] Thomas Wilke. “Classifying Discrete Temporal Properties”. In: *Proceedings of the 16th Annual Conference on Theoretical Aspects of Computer Science*. STACS’99. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag, 1999, pp. 32–46.