

Probabilistic Reversible Automata and Quantum Automata

Marats Golovkins * and Maksim Kravtsev **

Institute of Mathematics and Computer Science, University of Latvia
Raiņa bulv. 29, Riga, Latvia
marats@latnet.lv, maksims@batsoft.lv

Abstract. To study relationship between quantum finite automata and probabilistic finite automata, we introduce a notion of probabilistic reversible automata (PRA, or doubly stochastic automata). We find that there is a strong relationship between different possible models of PRA and corresponding models of quantum finite automata. We also propose a classification of reversible finite 1-way automata.

1 Introduction

Here we introduce common notions used throughout the paper as well as summarize its contents.

We analyze two models of probabilistic reversible automata in this paper, namely, 1-way PRA and 1.5-way PRA.

In this section, we define notions applicable to both models in a quasi-formal way, including a general definition for probabilistic reversibility. These notions are defined formally in further sections.

If not specified otherwise, we denote by Σ an input alphabet of an automaton.

Every input word is enclosed into *end-marker* symbols # and \$. Therefore we introduce a *working alphabet* as $\Gamma = \Sigma \cup \{\#, \$\}$.

By Q we normally understand the set of states of an automaton.

By \bar{L} we understand complement of a language L .

Given an input word ω , by $|\omega|$ we understand the number of symbols in ω and with $[\omega]_i$ we denote i -th symbol of ω , counting from the beginning (excluding end-markers).

Definition 1.1. A configuration of a finite automaton is $c = \langle \nu_i q_j \nu_k \rangle$, where the automaton is in a state $q_j \in Q$, $\nu_i \nu_k \in \# \Sigma^* \$$ is a finite word on the input tape and input tape head is above the first symbol of the word ν_k .

* Research partially supported by the Latvian Council of Science, grant No. 01.0354 and grant for Ph.D. students; University of Latvia, K. Morbergs grant; European Commission, contract IST-1999-11234

** Research partially supported by the Latvian Council of Science, grant No. 01.0354 and European Commission, contract IST-1999-11234

By C we denote the set of all configurations of an automaton. This set is countably infinite.

After its every step, a probabilistic automaton is in some probability distribution $p_0c_0 + p_1c_1 + \dots + p_nc_n$, where $p_0 + p_1 + \dots + p_n = 1$. Such probability distribution is called a *superposition of configurations*. Given an input word ω , the number of configurations in every accessible superposition does not exceed $|Q|$ in case of 1-way automata, and $|\omega||Q|$ in case of 1.5-way automata.

A linear closure of C forms a linear space, where every configuration can be viewed as a basis vector. This basis is called a *canonical basis*. Every probabilistic automaton defines a linear operator over this linear space.

Let us consider A. Nayak's model of quantum automata with mixed states. (Evolution is characterized by a unitary matrix and subsequent measurements are performed after each step, POVM measurements not being allowed, [N 99].) If a result of every measurement is a single configuration, not a superposition, and measurements are performed after each step, we actually get a probabilistic automaton. However, the following property applies to such probabilistic automata - their evolution matrices are *doubly stochastic*. This encourages us to give the following definition for probabilistic reversible automata:

Definition 1.2. *A probabilistic automaton is called reversible if its linear operator can be described by a doubly stochastic matrix, using canonical basis.*

To make accessible configurations of type $\langle q_i \# \omega \$ \rangle$, we assume that every word is written on a circular tape, and after the right end-marker $\$$ the next symbol is the left end-marker $\#$. Such precondition is the same as used for quantum finite automata. (See, for example, [KW 97].)

At least two definitions exist, how to interpret word acceptance, and hence, language recognition, for reversible automata.

Definition 1.3. *Classical acceptance. We say that an automaton accepts (rejects) a word classically, if its set of states consists of two disjoint subsets: accepting states and rejecting states, and the following conditions hold:*

- *the automaton accepts the word, if it is in accepting state after having read the last symbol of the word;*
- *the automaton rejects the word, if it is in rejecting state after having read the last symbol of the word.*

We refer to the classical acceptance automata as C-automata further in the paper.

Definition 1.4. *“Decide and halt” acceptance. We say that an automaton accepts (rejects) a word in a decide-and-halt manner, if its set of states consists of three disjoint subsets: accepting states, rejecting states and non-halting states, and the following conditions hold:*

- *the computation is continued only if the automaton enters a non-halting state.*
- *if the automaton enters an accepting state, the word is accepted;*

– if the automaton enters a rejecting state, the word is rejected.

We refer to the decide-and-halt automata as DH-automata further in the paper.

Having defined word acceptance, we define language recognition in an equivalent way as in [R 63]. We consider only bounded error language recognition in this paper.

By $P_{x,A}$ we denote the probability that a word x is accepted by an automaton A .

Definition 1.5. *We say that a language L is recognized with bounded error by an automaton A with interval (p_1, p_2) if $p_1 < p_2$ and $p_1 = \sup\{P_{x,A} \mid x \notin L\}$, $p_2 = \inf\{P_{x,A} \mid x \in L\}$.*

Definition 1.6. *We say that a language is recognized with a probability p if the language is recognized with interval $(1 - p, p)$.*

Definition 1.7. *We say that a language is recognized with probability $1 - \varepsilon$, if for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists an automaton which recognizes the language with interval $(\varepsilon_1, 1 - \varepsilon_2)$, where $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2 \leq \varepsilon$.*

Definition 1.8. *By $q \xrightarrow{S} q'$, $S \subset \Sigma^*$, we denote that there is a positive probability to get to a state q' by reading a single word $\xi \in S$, starting in a state q .*

We refer to several existing models of quantum finite automata:

1. Measure-once quantum finite automata [MC 97] (QFA-MC);
2. Measure-many quantum finite automata [KW 97] (QFA-KW);
3. Enhanced quantum finite automata [N 99] (QFA-N).

Following the notions above, QFA-MC can be characterized as C-automata whereas QFA-KW and QFA-N as DH-automata.

In Section 2, we discuss properties of PRA C-automata (PRA-C). We prove that PRA-C recognize the class of languages $a_1^* a_2^* \dots a_n^*$ with probability $1 - \varepsilon$. This class can be recognized by QFA-KW, with worse acceptance probabilities, however [ABFK 99]. This also implies that QFA-N recognize this class of languages with probability $1 - \varepsilon$.

Further, we show general class of regular languages, not recognizable by PRA-C. In particular, such languages as $(a,b)^*a$ and $a(a,b)^*$ are in this class. This class has strong similarities with the class of languages, not recognizable by QFA-KW [AKV 00].

We also show that the class of languages recognized by PRA-C is closed under boolean operations, inverse homomorphisms and word quotient, but is not closed under homomorphisms.

In Section 3 we prove, that PRA DH-automata do not recognize the language $(a,b)^*a$.

In Section 4 we discuss some properties of 1.5-way PRA. We also present an alternative notion of probabilistic reversibility, not connected with quantum automata.

In Section 5 we propose a classification of reversible automata (deterministic, probabilistic and quantum).

2 1-way Probabilistic Reversible C-Automata

Definition 2.1. *1-way probabilistic reversible C-automaton (PRA-C)*

$A = (Q, \Sigma, q_0, Q_F, \delta)$ is specified by a finite set of states Q , a finite input alphabet Σ , an initial state $q_0 \in Q$, a set of accepting states $Q_F \subseteq Q$, and a transition function

$$\delta : Q \times \Gamma \times Q \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}_{[0,1]},$$

where $\Gamma = \Sigma \cup \{\#, \$\}$ is the input tape alphabet of A and $\#, \$$ are end-markers not in Σ . Furthermore, transition function satisfies the following requirements:

$$\forall (q_1, \sigma_1) \in Q \times \Gamma \sum_{q \in Q} \delta(q_1, \sigma_1, q) = 1 \quad (1)$$

$$\forall (q_1, \sigma_1) \in Q \times \Gamma \sum_{q \in Q} \delta(q, \sigma_1, q_1) = 1 \quad (2)$$

For every input symbol $\sigma \in \Gamma$, the transition function may be determined by a $|Q| \times |Q|$ matrix V_σ , where $(V_\sigma)_{i,j} = \delta(q_j, \sigma, q_i)$.

Lemma 2.2. *All matrices V_σ are doubly stochastic iff conditions (1) and (2) of Definition 2.1 hold.*

Proof. Trivial. □

We define word acceptance as specified in Definition 1.3. The set of rejecting states is $Q \setminus Q_F$. We define language recognition as in Definition 1.5.

A linear operator U_A corresponds to the automaton A . Formal definition of this operator follows:

Definition 2.3. *Given a configuration $c = \langle \nu_i q_j \sigma \nu_k \rangle$,*

$$U_A c \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{q \in Q} \delta(q_j, \sigma, q) \langle \nu_i \sigma q \nu_k \rangle.$$

Given a superposition of configurations $\psi = \sum_{c \in C} p_c c$,

$$U_A \psi \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{c \in C} p_c U_A c.$$

Using canonical basis, U_A is described by an infinite matrix M_A .

To comply with Definition 1.2, we have to state the following:

Lemma 2.4. *Matrix M_A is doubly stochastic iff conditions (1) and (2) of Definition 2.1 hold.*

Proof. Condition (1) takes place if and only if the sum of elements in every column in M_A equal to 1. Condition (2) takes place if and only if the sum of elements in every row in M_A equal to 1. □

This completes our formal definition of PRA-C.

Use of end-markers does not affect computational power of PRA-C. For every PRA-C with end-markers which recognizes some language it is possible to construct a PRA-C without end-markers which recognizes the same language. (Number of states needed may increase, however.) See Appendix for further details.

Lemma 2.5. *If a language is recognized by a PRA-C A with interval (p_1, p_2) , exists a PRA-C which recognizes the language with probability p , where*

$$p = \begin{cases} \frac{p_2}{p_1+p_2}, & \text{if } p_1 + p_2 \geq 1 \\ \frac{1-p_1}{2-p_1-p_2}, & \text{if } p_1 + p_2 < 1. \end{cases}$$

Proof. Let us assume, that the automaton A has $n - 1$ states. We consider the case $p_1 + p_2 > 1$.

Informally, having read end-marker symbol $\#$, we simulate the automaton A with probability $\frac{1}{p_1+p_2}$ and reject input with probability $\frac{p_1+p_2-1}{p_1+p_2}$.

Formally, to recognize the language with probability $\frac{p_2}{p_1+p_2}$, we modify the automaton A . We add a new state $q_r \notin Q_F$, and change the transition function in the following way:

$$\begin{aligned} - \forall \sigma, \sigma \neq \#, \delta(q_r, \sigma, q_r) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 1; \\ - \delta(q_0, \#, q_r) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{p_1+p_2-1}{p_1+p_2}; \\ - \forall q, q \neq q_r, \delta(q_0, \#, q) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{p_1+p_2} \delta_{old}(q_0, \#, q). \end{aligned}$$

Now the automaton has n states. Since end-marker symbol $\#$ is read only once at the beginning of an input word, we can disregard the rest of transition function values, associated with $\#$: $\forall q_i, q_j$, where $q_i \neq q_0$, $\delta(q_i, \#, q_j) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1-\delta(q_0, \#, q_j)}{n-1}$.

The transition function satisfies the requirements of Definition 2.1 and the constructed automaton recognizes the language with probability $\frac{p_2}{p_1+p_2}$.

The case $p_1 + p_2 < 1$ is very similar. Informally, having read end-marker symbol $\#$, we simulate the automaton A with probability $\frac{1}{2-p_1-p_2}$ and accept input with probability $\frac{1-p_1-p_2}{2-p_1-p_2}$. \square

Theorem 2.6. *If a language is recognized by a PRA-C, it is recognized by PRA-C with probability $1 - \varepsilon$.*

Proof. We assume that a language L is recognized by a PRA-C automaton $A = (Q, \Sigma, q_0, Q_F, \delta)$ with interval (p_1, p_2) . Let $\delta = \frac{1}{2}(p_1 + p_2)$.

Let us consider a system of m copies of the automaton A , denoted as A_m . We say that our system has accepted (rejected) a word if more (less or equal) than $m\delta$ automata in the system have accepted (rejected) the word. We define language recognition as in Definition 1.5.

Let us consider a word $\omega \in L$. The automaton A accepts ω with probability $p_\omega \geq p_2$. As a result of reading ω , μ_m^ω automata of the system accept the word, and the rest reject it. The system has accepted the word, if $\frac{\mu_m^\omega}{m} > \delta$. Let us take

η_0 , such that $0 < \eta_0 < p_2 - \delta \leq p_\omega - \delta$. Estimating the probability that $\frac{\mu_m^\omega}{m} > \delta$, we have

$$P \left\{ \frac{\mu_m^\omega}{m} > \delta \right\} \geq P \left\{ p_\omega - \eta_0 < \frac{\mu_m^\omega}{m} < p_\omega + \eta_0 \right\} = P \left\{ \left| \frac{\mu_m^\omega}{m} - p_\omega \right| < \eta_0 \right\} \quad (3)$$

In case of m Bernoulli trials, Chebyshev's inequality may be used to prove the following ([GS 97], p. 312):

$$P \left\{ \left| \frac{\mu_m^\omega}{m} - p_\omega \right| \geq \eta_0 \right\} \leq \frac{p_\omega(1-p_\omega)}{m\eta_0^2} \leq \frac{1}{4m\eta_0^2} \quad (4)$$

The last inequality induces that

$$P \left\{ \left| \frac{\mu_m^\omega}{m} - p_\omega \right| < \eta_0 \right\} \geq 1 - \frac{1}{4m\eta_0^2} \quad (5)$$

Finally, putting (3) and (5) together,

$$P \left\{ \frac{\mu_m^\omega}{m} > \delta \right\} \geq 1 - \frac{1}{4m\eta_0^2} \quad (6)$$

Inequality (6) is true for every $\omega \in L$.

On the other hand, let us consider a word $\xi \notin L$. The automaton A accepts ξ with probability $p_\xi \leq p_1$. If we take the same η_0 , $0 < \eta_0 < \delta - p_1 \leq \delta - p_\xi$ and for every ξ we have

$$P \left\{ \frac{\mu_m^\xi}{m} > \delta \right\} \leq P \left\{ \left| \frac{\mu_m^\xi}{m} - p_\xi \right| \geq \eta_0 \right\} \leq \frac{1}{4m\eta_0^2} \quad (7)$$

Due to (6) and (7), for every $\varepsilon > 0$, if we take $n > \frac{1}{4\varepsilon\eta_0^2}$, we get a system A_n which recognizes the language L with interval $(\varepsilon_1, 1 - \varepsilon_2)$, where $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2 < \varepsilon$.

Let us show that A_n can be simulated by a PRA-C. The automaton $A' = (Q', \Sigma, q'_0, Q'_F, \delta')$ is constructed as follows:

$$Q' \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{ \langle q_{s_1} q_{s_2} \dots q_{s_n} \rangle \mid 0 \leq s_i \leq |Q| - 1 \}; \quad q'_0 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \langle q_0 q_0 \dots q_0 \rangle.$$

A sequence $\langle q_{s_1} q_{s_2} \dots q_{s_n} \rangle$ is an accepting state of A' if more than $n\delta$ elements in the sequence are accepting states of A . We have defined the set Q'_F .

$$\text{Given } \sigma \in \Gamma, \delta'(\langle q_{a_1} q_{a_2} \dots q_{a_n} \rangle, \sigma, \langle q_{b_1} q_{b_2} \dots q_{b_n} \rangle) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \prod_{i=1}^n \delta(q_{a_i}, \sigma, q_{b_i}).$$

In essence, Q' is n -th Cartesian power of Q and the linear space formed by A' is n -th tensor power of the linear space formed by A . If we take a symbol $\sigma \in \Gamma$, transition is determined by $|Q|^n \times |Q|^n$ matrix V'_σ , which is n -th matrix direct power of V_σ , i.e., $V'_\sigma = \bigotimes_{i=1}^n V_\sigma$.

A' simulates the system A_n . Since matrix direct product of two doubly stochastic matrices is a doubly stochastic matrix, $\forall \sigma V'_\sigma$ are doubly stochastic matrices. Therefore our automaton A' is a PRA-C.

We have proved that $\forall \varepsilon > 0$ the language L is recognized by some PRA-C with interval $(\varepsilon_1, 1 - \varepsilon_2)$, where $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2 < \varepsilon$. Therefore the language L is recognized with probability $1 - \varepsilon$. \square

Lemma 2.7. *If a language L_1 is recognizable with probability greater than $\frac{2}{3}$ and a language L_2 is recognizable with probability greater than $\frac{2}{3}$ then languages $L_1 \cap L_2$ and $L_1 \cup L_2$ are recognizable with probability greater than $\frac{1}{2}$.*

Proof. Let us consider automata $A = (Q_A, \Sigma, q_{0,A}, Q_{F,A}, \delta_A)$ and $B = (Q_B, \Sigma, q_{0,B}, Q_{F,B}, \delta_B)$ which recognize the languages L_1, L_2 with probabilities $p_1, p_2 > \frac{2}{3}$, respectively. Let us assume that A, B have m and n states, respectively. Without loss of generality we can assume that $p_1 \leq p_2$.

Informally, having read end-marker symbol $\#$, with probability $\frac{1}{2}$ we simulate the automaton A_1 and with the same probability we simulate the automaton A_2 .

Formally, we construct an automaton $C = (Q, \Sigma, q_0, Q_F, \delta)$ with the following properties.

$Q \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} Q_A \cup Q_B$; $q_0 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} q_{0,A}$; $Q_F \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} Q_{F,A} \cup Q_{F,B}$; $\delta \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \delta_A \cup \delta_B$, with an exception that:

$$\begin{aligned} - \delta(q_0, \#, q_{i,A}) &= \frac{1}{2} \delta_A(q_0, \#, q_{i,A}); \\ - \delta(q_0, \#, q_{i,B}) &= \frac{1}{2} \delta_B(q_0, \#, q_{i,B}); \\ - \forall q_i, q_i \neq q_0, \delta(q_i, \#, q) &= \frac{1 - \delta(q_0, \#, q)}{m+n-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Since δ satisfies Definition 2.1, our construction of PRA-C is complete.

The automaton C recognizes the language $L_1 \cap L_2$ with interval $(p, \frac{p_1+p_2}{2})$, where $p \leq 1 - \frac{1}{2}p_1$. (Since $p_1, p_2 > \frac{2}{3}$, $1 - \frac{1}{2}p_1 < \frac{p_1+p_2}{2}$)

The automaton C recognizes the language $L_1 \cup L_2$ with interval $(\frac{2-p_1-p_2}{2}, p)$, where $p \geq \frac{1}{2}p_1$. (Again, $\frac{2-p_1-p_2}{2} < \frac{1}{2}p_1$)

Therefore by Lemma 2.5, the languages $L_1 \cap L_2$ and $L_1 \cup L_2$ are recognizable with probabilities greater than $\frac{1}{2}$. \square

Theorem 2.8. *The class of languages recognized by PRA-C is closed under intersection, union and complement.*

Proof. Let us consider languages L_1, L_2 recognized by some PRA-C automata. By Theorem 2.6, these languages is recognizable with probability $1 - \varepsilon$, and therefore by Lemmas 2.5 and 2.7, union and intersection of these languages are also recognizable. If a language L is recognizable by a PRA-C A , we can construct an automaton which recognizes a language \bar{L} just by making accepting states of A to be rejecting, and vice versa. \square

It is natural to ask what are the languages recognized by PRA-C with probability exactly 1.

Theorem 2.9. *If a language is recognized by a PRA-C with probability 1, the language is recognized by a permutation automaton.*

Proof. Let us consider a language L and a PRA-C A , which recognizes L with probability 1.

If a word is in L , the automaton A has to accept the word with probability 1. Conversely, if a word is not in L , the word must be accepted with probability 0. Therefore,

$$\forall q \in Q \forall \omega \in \Sigma^* \text{ either } q\omega \subseteq Q_F, \text{ or } q\omega \subseteq \bar{Q}_F. \quad (8)$$

Consider a relation between the states of A defined as

$R = \{(q_i, q_j) \mid \forall \omega \ q_i \omega \subseteq Q_F \Leftrightarrow q_j \omega \subseteq Q_F\}$. R is symmetric, reflexive and transitive, therefore Q can be partitioned into equivalence classes $Q/R = \{[q_0], [q_{i_1}], \dots, [q_{i_k}]\}$. Suppose A is in a state q . Due to (8), $\forall \omega \ \exists n \ q \omega \subseteq [q_{i_n}]$. In fact, having read a symbol in the alphabet, A goes from one equivalence class to another with probability 1.

Hence it is possible to construct the following deterministic automaton D , which simulates A . The states are s_0, \dots, s_k and $s_n \sigma = s_m$ iff $[q_{i_n}] \sigma \subseteq [q_{i_m}]$ and s_n is an accepting state iff $[q_{i_n}] \subseteq Q_F$. Since all transition matrices of A are doubly stochastic, all transition matrices of D are permutation matrices. \square

Theorem 2.10. *The class of languages recognized by PRA-C is closed under inverse homomorphisms.*

Proof. Let us consider finite alphabets Σ, T , a homomorphism $h : \Sigma \rightarrow T^*$, a language $L \subseteq T^*$ and a PRA-C $A = (Q, T, q_0, Q_F, \delta)$, which recognizes L with interval (p_1, p_2) . We prove that exists an automaton $B = (Q, \Sigma, q_0, Q_F, \delta')$ which recognizes the language $h^{-1}(L)$.

Transition function δ of A sets transition matrices V_τ , where $\tau \in T$. To determine δ' , we define transition matrices V_σ , $\sigma \in \Sigma$. Let us define a transition matrix V_{σ_k} :

$$V_{\sigma_k} = V_{[h(\sigma_k)]_m} V_{[h(\sigma_k)]_{m-1}} \cdots V_{[h(\sigma_k)]_1},$$

where $m = |h(\sigma_k)|$. Multiplication of two doubly stochastic matrices is a doubly stochastic matrix, therefore B is a PRA-C. Automaton B recognizes $h^{-1}(L)$ with the same interval (p_1, p_2) . \square

Corollary 2.11. *The class of languages recognized by PRA-C is closed under word quotient.*

Proof. This follows from closure under inverse homomorphisms and presence of end-markers $\#, \$$. \square

Even if PRA-C without end-markers are considered, closure under word quotient remains true. See Appendix for details.

Lemma 2.12. *If A is a doubly stochastic matrix and X - a vector, then $\max(X) \geq \max(AX)$ and $\min(X) \leq \min(AX)$.*

Proof. Let us consider $X = \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \\ \dots \\ x_n \end{pmatrix}$ and $A = \begin{pmatrix} a_{11} & a_{12} & \dots & a_{1n} \\ a_{21} & a_{22} & \dots & a_{2n} \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ a_{n1} & a_{n2} & \dots & a_{nn} \end{pmatrix}$, where A is doubly stochastic. Let us suppose that $x_j = \max(X)$. For any i , $1 \leq i \leq n$,

$$x_j = a_{i1}x_1 + a_{i2}x_2 + \dots + a_{in}x_n \geq a_{i1}x_1 + a_{i2}x_2 + \dots + a_{in}x_j.$$

Therefore x_j is greater or equal than any component of AX . The second inequality is proved in the same way. \square

Theorem 2.13. For every natural positive n , a language $L_n = a_1^* a_2^* \dots a_n^*$ is recognizable by some PRA-C with alphabet $\{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n\}$.

Proof. We construct a PRA-C with $n + 1$ states, q_0 being the initial state, corresponding to probability distribution vector $\begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ \dots \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$. The transition function is

determined by $(n + 1) \times (n + 1)$ matrices

$$V_{a_1} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{n} & \dots & \frac{1}{n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & \frac{1}{n} & \dots & \frac{1}{n} \end{pmatrix}, V_{a_2} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2} & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2} & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{n-1} & \dots & \frac{1}{n-1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{n-1} & \dots & \frac{1}{n-1} \end{pmatrix}, \dots, V_{a_n} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{n} & \dots & \frac{1}{n} & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \frac{1}{n} & \dots & \frac{1}{n} & 0 \\ 0 & \dots & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

The accepting states are $q_0 \dots q_{n-1}$, the only rejecting state is q_n . We prove, that the automaton recognizes the language L_n .

Case $\omega \in L_n$. Having read $\omega \in a_1^* \dots a_{k-1}^* a_k^+$, the automaton is in probability distribution $\begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{k} \\ \dots \\ \frac{1}{k} \\ 0 \\ \dots \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$. Therefore all $\omega \in L_n$ are accepted with probability 1.

Case $\omega \notin L_n$. Consider k such that $\omega = \omega_1 \sigma \omega_2$, $|\omega_1| = k$, $\omega_1 \in L_n$ and $\omega_1 \sigma \notin L_n$. Since all one-letter words are in L_n , $k > 0$. Let $a_t = [\omega]_k$ and $a_s = \sigma$. So we have $s < t$, $1 \leq s \leq n - 1$, $2 \leq t \leq n$. Having read $\omega_1 \in a_1^* \dots a_{t-1}^* a_t^+$, the

automaton is in distribution $\begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{t} \\ \dots \\ \frac{1}{t} \\ 0 \\ \dots \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$. After that, having read a_s , the automaton is

in distribution $\begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{s} & \dots & \frac{1}{s} & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ \frac{1}{s} & \dots & \frac{1}{s} & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & \dots & 0 & \frac{1}{n-s+1} & \dots & \frac{1}{n-s+1} \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ 0 & \dots & 0 & \frac{1}{n-s+1} & \dots & \frac{1}{n-s+1} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{t} \\ \dots \\ \frac{1}{t} \\ 0 \\ \dots \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{t} \\ \dots \\ \frac{1}{t} \\ \frac{t-s}{t(n-s+1)} \\ \dots \\ \frac{t-s}{t(n-s+1)} \end{pmatrix} \begin{matrix} s \\ n-s+1 \end{matrix}.$

So the word $\omega_1 a_s$ is accepted with probability $1 - \frac{t-s}{t(n-s+1)}$. By Lemma 2.12, since $\frac{t-s}{t(n-s+1)} < \frac{1}{t}$, reading the symbols succeeding $\omega_1 a_s$ does not increase accepting probability. Therefore, to find maximum accepting probability for words not in L_n , we have to maximize $1 - \frac{t-s}{t(n-s+1)}$, where $s < t$, $1 \leq s \leq n - 1$, $2 \leq t \leq n$. Solving this problem, we get $t = k + 1, s = k$ for $n = 2k$, and we get $t = k + 1, s = k$ or $t = k + 2, s = k + 1$ for $n = 2k + 1$. So the maximum accepting

probability is $1 - \frac{1}{(k+1)^2}$, if $n = 2k$, and it is $1 - \frac{1}{(k+1)(k+2)}$, if $n = 2k + 1$. All in all, the automaton recognizes the language with interval $\left(1 - \frac{1}{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor + n + 1}, 1\right)$. (Actually, by Theorem 2.6, L_n can be recognized with probability $1 - \varepsilon$). \square

Corollary 2.14. *Quantum finite automata with mixed states (model of Nayak, [N 99]) recognize $L_n = a_1^* a_2^* \dots a_n^*$ with probability $1 - \varepsilon$.*

Proof. This comes from the fact, that matrices $V_{a_1}, V_{a_2}, \dots, V_{a_n}$ from the proof of Theorem 2.13 (as well as tensor powers of those matrices) all have unitary prototypes (see Definition 5.1). \square

Definition 2.15. *We say that a regular language is of type (*) if the following is true for the minimal deterministic automaton recognizing this language: Exist three states q, q_1, q_2 , exist words x, y such that*

1. $q_1 \neq q_2$;
2. $qx = q_1, qy = q_2$;
3. $q_1x = q_1, q_2y = q_2$;
4. $\forall t \in (x, y)^* \exists t_1 \in (x, y)^* q_1 t t_1 = q_1$;
5. $\forall t \in (x, y)^* \exists t_2 \in (x, y)^* q_2 t t_2 = q_2$.

Definition 2.16. *We say that a regular language is of type (*') if the following is true for the minimal deterministic automaton recognizing this language: Exist three states q, q_1, q_2 , exist words x, y such that*

1. $q_1 \neq q_2$;
2. $qx = q_1, qy = q_2$;
3. $q_1x = q_1, q_1y = q_1$;
4. $q_2x = q_2, q_2y = q_2$.




Fig. 1. Type (*) construction




Fig. 2. Type (*') construction

Definition 2.17. We say that a regular language is of type $(*')$ if the following is true for the minimal deterministic automaton recognizing this language: Exist two states q_1, q_2 , exist words x, y such that

1. $q_1 \neq q_2$;
2. $q_1x = q_2, q_2x = q_2$;
3. $q_2y = q_1$.




Fig. 3. Type $(*')$ construction

Type $(*')$ languages are exactly those languages that violate the partial order condition of [BP 99].

Lemma 2.18. If A is a deterministic finite automaton with a set of states Q and alphabet Σ , then $\forall q \in Q \forall x \in \Sigma^* \exists k > 0 qx^k = qx^{2k}$.

Proof. We paraphrase a result from the theory of finite semigroups. Consider a state q and a word x . Since number of states is finite, $\exists m \geq 0 \exists s \geq 1 \forall n qx^m = qx^m x^{sn}$. Take n_0 , such that $sn_0 > m$. Note that $\forall t \geq 0 qx^{m+t} = qx^{m+t} x^{sn_0}$. We take $t = sn_0 - m$, so $qx^{sn_0} = qx^{sn_0} x^{sn_0}$. Take $k = sn_0$. \square

Lemma 2.19. A regular language is of type $(*)$ iff it is of type $(*')$ or type $(*')$.

Proof. 1) If a language is of type $(*')$, it is of type $(*)$. Obvious.

2) If a language is of type $(*')$, it is of type $(*)$. Consider a language of type $(*')$ with states q_1'', q_2'' and words x'', y'' . To build construction of type $(*)$, we take $q = q_1 = q_1'', q_2 = q_2'', x = x''y'', y = x''$. That forms transitions $qx = q_1, qy = q_2, q_1x = q_1, q_1y = q_2, q_2x = q_1, q_2y = q_2$. We have satisfied all the rules of $(*)$.

3) If a language is of type $(*)$, it is of type $(*')$ or $(*')$. Consider a language whose minimal deterministic automaton has construction $(*)$. By Lemma 2.18,

$$\begin{aligned} \exists t \exists b q_1 y^b = q_t \text{ and } q_t y^b = q_t; \\ \exists u \exists c q_2 x^c = q_u \text{ and } q_u x^c = q_u. \end{aligned}$$

If $q_1 \neq q_t$, by the 4th rule of $(*)$, $\exists z q_t z = q_1$. Therefore the language is of type $(*')$. If $q_2 \neq q_u$, by the 5th rule of $(*)$, $\exists z q_u z = q_2$, and the language is of type $(*')$.

If $q_1 = q_t$ and $q_2 = q_u$, we have $qx^c = q_1, qy^b = q_2, q_1x^c = q_1y^b = q_1, q_2x^c = q_2y^b = q_2$. We get the construction $(*')$ if we take $x' = x^c, y' = y^b$. \square

We are going to prove that every language of type $(*)$ is not recognizable by any PRA-C. For this purpose, we recall several definitions from the theory of finite Markov chains ([KS 76], etc.)

A Markov chain with n states can be determined by an $n \times n$ stochastic matrix A , i.e., matrix, where the sum of elements of every column in the matrix is 1. If $A_{i,j} = p > 0$, it means that a state q_i is accessible from a state q_j with a positive probability p in one step. Generally speaking, the matrix depends on the numbering of the states; if the states are renumbered, the matrix changes, as its rows and columns also need to be renumbered.

Definition 2.20. A state q_j is accessible from q_i (denoted $q_i \rightarrow q_j$) if there is a positive probability to get from q_i to q_j (possibly in several steps).

Definition 2.21. States q_i and q_j communicate (denoted $q_i \leftrightarrow q_j$) if $q_i \rightarrow q_j$ and $q_j \rightarrow q_i$.

Definition 2.22. A state q is called ergodic if $\forall i \ q \rightarrow q_i \Rightarrow q_i \rightarrow q$. Otherwise the state is called transient.

Definition 2.23. A Markov chain without transient states is called irreducible if for all $q_i, q_j \ q_i \leftrightarrow q_j$. Otherwise the chain without transient states is called reducible.

Definition 2.24. The period of an ergodic state $q_i \in Q$ of a Markov chain with a matrix A is defined as $d(q_i) = \gcd\{n > 0 \mid (A^n)_{i,i} > 0\}$.

Definition 2.25. An ergodic state q_i is called aperiodic if $d(q_i) = 1$. Otherwise the ergodic state is called periodic.

Definition 2.26. A Markov chain without transient states is called aperiodic if all its states are aperiodic. Otherwise the chain without transient states is called periodic.

Definition 2.27. A probability distribution X of a Markov chain with a matrix A is called stationary, if $AX = X$.

Definition 2.28. A Markov chain is called doubly stochastic, if its transition matrix is a doubly stochastic matrix.

We recall the following theorem from the theory of finite Markov chains:

Theorem 2.29. If a Markov chain with a matrix A is irreducible and aperiodic, then

- a) it has a unique stationary distribution Z ;
- b) $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} A^n = (Z, \dots, Z)$;
- c) $\forall X \ \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} A^n X = Z$.

Corollary 2.30. If a doubly stochastic Markov chain with an $m \times m$ matrix A is irreducible and aperiodic,

- a) $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} A^n = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{m} & \dots & \frac{1}{m} \\ \dots & \dots & \dots \\ \frac{1}{m} & \dots & \frac{1}{m} \end{pmatrix}$;
- b) $\forall X \ \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} A^n X = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{m} \\ \dots \\ \frac{1}{m} \end{pmatrix}$.

Proof. By Theorem 2.29. □

Lemma 2.31. *If M is a doubly stochastic Markov chain with a matrix A , then $\forall q \ q \rightarrow q$.*

Proof. Assume existence of q_0 such that q_0 is not accessible from itself. Let $Q_{q_0} = \{q_i \mid q_0 \rightarrow q_i\} = \{q_1, \dots, q_k\}$. Q_{q_0} is not empty set. Consider those rows and columns of A , which are indexed by states in Q_{q_0} . These rows and columns form a submatrix A' . Each column j of A' must include all non-zero elements of the corresponding column of A as those states are accessible from the state q_j , hence also from q_0 and are in Q_{q_0} . Therefore $\forall j, 1 \leq j \leq k, \sum_{i=1}^k A'_{i,j} = 1$ and $\sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq k} A'_{i,j} = k$. On the other hand, since $q_0 \notin Q_{q_0}$, a row of A' indexed by a state accessible in one step from q_0 does not include all nonzero elements. Since A is doubly stochastic, $\exists i, 1 \leq i \leq k, \sum_{j=1}^k A'_{i,j} < 1$ and $\sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq k} A'_{i,j} < k$. This is a contradiction. □

Corollary 2.32. *Suppose A is a doubly stochastic matrix. Then exists $k > 0$, such that $\forall i \ (A^k)_{i,i} > 0$.*

Proof. Consider an $m \times m$ doubly stochastic matrix A . By Lemma 2.31, $\forall i \ \exists n_i > 0 \ (A^{n_i})_{i,i} > 0$. Take $n = \prod_{s=1}^m n_s$. For every $i, (A^n)_{i,i} > 0$. □

Lemma 2.33. *If M is a doubly stochastic Markov chain with a matrix A , then $\forall q_a, q_b \ A_{b,a} > 0 \Rightarrow q_b \rightarrow q_a$.*

Proof. $A_{b,a} > 0$ means that q_b is accessible from q_a in one step. We have to prove, that $q_b \rightarrow q_a$. Assume from the contrary, that q_a is not accessible from q_b . Let $Q_{q_b} = \{q_i \mid q_b \rightarrow q_i\} = \{q_1, q_2, \dots, q_k\}$. By Lemma 2.31, $q_b \in Q_{q_b}$. As in proof of Lemma 2.31, consider a matrix A' , which is a submatrix of A and whose rows and columns are indexed by states in Q_{q_b} . Each column j has to include all nonzero elements of the corresponding column of A . Therefore $\forall j, 1 \leq j \leq k, \sum_{i=1}^k A'_{i,j} = 1$ and $\sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq k} A'_{i,j} = k$. On the other hand, $A_{b,a} > 0$ and $q_a \notin Q_{q_b}$, therefore a row of A' indexed by q_b does not include all nonzero elements. Since A is doubly stochastic, $\sum_{j=1}^k A'_{b,j} < 1$ and $\sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq k} A'_{i,j} < k$. This is a contradiction. □

Corollary 2.34. *If M is a doubly stochastic Markov chain and $q_a \rightarrow q_b$, then $q_a \leftrightarrow q_b$.*

Proof. If $q_a \rightarrow q_b$ then exists a sequence $q_{i_1}, q_{i_2}, \dots, q_{i_k}$, such that $A_{i_1, a} > 0, A_{i_2, i_1} > 0, \dots, A_{i_k, i_{k-1}} > 0, A_{b, i_k} > 0$. By Lemma 2.33, we get $q_b \rightarrow q_{i_k}, q_{i_k} \rightarrow q_{i_{k-1}}, \dots, q_{i_2} \rightarrow q_{i_1}, q_{i_1} \rightarrow q_a$. Therefore $q_b \rightarrow q_a$. □

By Corollary 2.34, every doubly stochastic Markov chain does not have transient states, so it is either periodic or aperiodic, either reducible or irreducible.

Lemma 2.35. *If a regular language is of type $(*)'$, it is not recognizable by any PRA-C.*

Proof. Assume from the contrary, that A is a PRA-C automaton which recognizes a language $L \subset \Sigma^*$ of type $(*)'$.

Since L is of type $(*)'$, it is recognized by a deterministic automaton D which has three states q, q_1, q_2 such that $q_1 \neq q_2, qx = q_1, qy = q_2, q_1x = q_1, q_1y = q_1, q_2x = q_2, q_2y = q_2$, where $x, y \in \Sigma^*$. Furthermore, exists $\omega \in \Sigma^*$ such that $q_0\omega = q$, where q_0 is an initial state of D , and exists a word $z \in \Sigma^*$, such that $q_1z = q_{acc}$ if and only if $q_2z = q_{rej}$, where q_{acc} is an accepting state and q_{rej} is a rejecting state of D . Without loss of generality we assume that $q_1z = q_{acc}$ and $q_2z = q_{rej}$.

The transition function of the automaton A is determined by doubly stochastic matrices $V_{\sigma_1}, \dots, V_{\sigma_n}$. The words from the construction $(*)'$ are $x = \sigma_{i_1} \dots \sigma_{i_k}$ and $y = \sigma_{j_1} \dots \sigma_{j_s}$. The transitions induced by words x and y are determined by doubly stochastic matrices $X = V_{\sigma_{i_k}} \dots V_{\sigma_{i_1}}$ and $Y = V_{\sigma_{j_s}} \dots V_{\sigma_{j_1}}$. Similarly, the transitions induced by words ω and z are determined by doubly stochastic matrices W and Z . By Corollary 2.32, exists $K > 0$, such that

$$\forall i (X^K)_{i,i} > 0 \text{ and } (Y^K)_{i,i} > 0. \quad (9)$$

Consider a relation between the states of the automaton defined as $R = \{(q_i, q_j) \mid q_i \xrightarrow{(x^K, y^K)^*} q_j\}$. By (9), this relation is reflexive.

Suppose exists a word $\xi = \xi_1\xi_2 \dots \xi_k, \xi_s \in \{x^K, y^K\}$, such that $q \xrightarrow{\xi} q'$. This means that $q \xrightarrow{\xi_1} q_{i_1}, q_{i_1} \xrightarrow{\xi_2} q_{i_2}, \dots, q_{i_{k-1}} \xrightarrow{\xi_k} q'$. By Corollary 2.34, since both X^K and Y^K are doubly stochastic, $\exists \xi'_k \dots \xi'_1, \xi'_s \in \{(x^K)^*, (y^K)^*\}$, such that $q' \xrightarrow{\xi'_k} q_{i_{k-1}}, \dots, q_{i_2} \xrightarrow{\xi'_2} q_{i_1}, q_{i_1} \xrightarrow{\xi'_1} q$, therefore $q' \xrightarrow{\xi'} q$, where $\xi' \in (x^K, y^K)^*$. So the relation R is symmetric.

Surely R is transitive. Therefore all states of A may be partitioned into equivalence classes $[q_0], [q_{i_1}], \dots, [q_{i_n}]$. Let us renumber the states of A in such a way, that states from one equivalence class have consecutive numbers. First come the states in $[q_0]$, then in $[q_{i_1}]$, etc.

Consider the word $x^K y^K$. The transition induced by this word is determined by a doubly stochastic matrix $C = Y^K X^K$. We prove the following proposition. States q_a and q_b are in one equivalence class if and only if $q_a \rightarrow q_b$ with matrix C . Suppose $q_a \rightarrow q_b$. Then $(q_a, q_b) \in R$, and q_a, q_b are in one equivalence class. Suppose q_a, q_b are in one equivalence class. Then

$$q_a \xrightarrow{\xi_1} q_{i_1}, q_{i_1} \xrightarrow{\xi_2} q_{i_2}, \dots, q_{i_{k-1}} \xrightarrow{\xi_k} q_b, \text{ where } \xi_s \in \{x^K, y^K\}. \quad (10)$$

By (9), $q_i \xrightarrow{x^K} q_i$ and $q_j \xrightarrow{y^K} q_j$. Therefore, if $q_i \xrightarrow{x^K} q_j$, then $q_i \xrightarrow{x^K y^K} q_j$, and again, if $q_i \xrightarrow{y^K} q_j$, then $q_i \xrightarrow{x^K y^K} q_j$. That transforms (10) to

$$q_a \xrightarrow{(x^K y^K)^t} q_b, \text{ where } t > 0. \quad (11)$$

We have proved the proposition.

By the proved proposition, due to the renumbering of states, matrix C is a block diagonal matrix, where each block corresponds to an equivalence class of the relation R . Let us identify these blocks as C_0, C_1, \dots, C_n . By (9), a Markov chain with matrix C is aperiodic. Therefore each block C_r corresponds to an aperiodic irreducible doubly stochastic Markov chain with states $[q_i]$. By Corollary 2.30, $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} C^m = J$, J is a block diagonal matrix, where

for each $(p \times p)$ block C_r $(C_r)_{i,j} = \frac{1}{p}$. Relation $q_i \xrightarrow{(y^K)^*} q_j$ is a subrelation of R , therefore Y^K is a block diagonal matrix with the same block ordering and sizes as C and J . (This does not eliminate possibility that some block of Y^K is constituted of smaller blocks, however.) Therefore $JY^K = J$, and $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} Z(Y^K X^K)^m W = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} Z(Y^K X^K)^m Y^K W = ZJW$. So

$$\forall \varepsilon > 0 \exists m \left\| \left(Z(Y^K X^K)^m W - Z(Y^K X^K)^m Y^K W \right) Q_0 \right\| < \varepsilon. \quad (12)$$

However, by construction $(*)'$, $\forall k \forall m \omega(x^k y^k)^m z \in L$ and $\omega y^k (x^k y^k)^m z \notin L$. This requires existence of $\varepsilon > 0$, such that

$$\forall m \left\| \left(Z(Y^K X^K)^m W - Z(Y^K X^K)^m Y^K W \right) Q_0 \right\| > \varepsilon. \quad (13)$$

This is a contradiction. \square

Lemma 2.36. *If a regular language is of type $(*')$, it is not recognizable by any PRA-C.*

Proof. Proof is nearly identical to that of Lemma 2.35. Consider a PRA-C which recognizes the language L of type $(*')$. We prove that for words x, y exists constant K , such that for every ε exists m , such that for two words $\xi_1 = \omega(x^K (xy)^K)^m z$ and $\xi_2 = \omega(x^K (xy)^K)^m x^K z$, $|p_{\xi_1} - p_{\xi_2}| < \varepsilon$. We can choose z , such that $\xi_1 \in L$ iff $\xi_2 \notin L$. \square

Theorem 2.37. *If a regular language is of type $(*)$, it is not recognizable by any PRA-C.*

Proof. By Lemmas 2.19, 2.35, 2.36. \square

We proved (Lemma 2.19) that the construction of type $(*)$ is a generalization the construction proposed by [BP 99]. Also it can be easily noticed, that the type $(*)$ construction is a generalization of construction proposed by [AKV 00]. (Constructions of [BP 99] and [AKV 00] characterize languages, not recognized by measure-many quantum finite automata of [KW 97].)

Corollary 2.38. *Languages $(a,b)^*a$ and $a(a,b)^*$ are not recognized by PRA-C.*

Proof. Both languages are of type $(*)$. \square

Corollary 2.39. *Class of languages recognizable by PRA-C is not closed under homomorphisms.*

Proof. Consider a homomorphism $a \rightarrow a, b \rightarrow b, c \rightarrow a$. Similarly as in Theorem 2.13, the language $(a,b)^*cc^*$ is recognizable by a PRA-C. (Take $n = 2, V_a = V_{a_1}, V_b = V_{a_1}, V_c = V_{a_2}$ from Theorem 2.13, $Q_F = \{q_1\}$) However, by Corollary 2.38 the language $(a,b)^*aa^*=(a,b)^*a$ is not recognizable. \square

3 1-way Probabilistic Reversible DH-Automata

Definition 3.1. *The definition differs from one for PRA-C (Definition 2.1) by the following: languages are recognized according to Definition 1.4.*

It is easy to see that the class of languages recognized by PRA-C is a proper subclass of languages recognized by PRA-DH. For example, the language $a(a,b)^*$ is recognizable by PRA-DH. However, the following theorem holds:

Theorem 3.2. *Language $(a,b)^*a$ is not recognized by PRA-DH.*

Proof. Assume from the contrary that such automaton exists. While reading any sequence of a and b , this automaton can halt only with some probability p strictly less than 1, so accepting and rejecting probabilities may differ only by $1-p$, because any word belonging to the language is not dependent on any prefix. Therefore for each $\varepsilon > 0$ we can find that after reading of a prefix of certain length, the total probability to halt while continue reading the word is less than ε . In this case we can apply similar techniques as in the proof of Lemma 2.35, such that for words x, y exists constant K , such that for every ε exists s , such that for two words $\xi_1 = \omega(x^K(xy)^K)^s z$ and $\xi_2 = \omega(x^K(xy)^K)^s x^K z$, $|p_{\xi_1} - p_{\xi_2}| < \varepsilon$. \square

4 Alternative Approach to Finite Reversible Automata and 1.5-way Probabilistic Reversible Automata

Let us consider automaton $A' = (Q, \Sigma, q_0, Q_F, \delta')$ that can be obtained from a probabilistic automaton $A = (Q, \Sigma, q_0, Q_F, \delta)$ by specifying $\delta'(q, \sigma, q') = \delta(q', \sigma, q)$ for all q', σ and q .

If A' is a valid probabilistic automaton then we can call A and A' probabilistic reversible automata.

Definition 4.1. *An automaton of some type is called **weakly reversible** if the reverse of its transition function corresponds to the transition function of a valid automaton of the same type.*

Note: in case of deterministic automaton where $\delta : Q \times \Gamma \times Q \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ this property means that A' is still deterministic automaton, not nondeterministic.

In case of one-way automata it is easy to check that this definition is equivalent to the one in Section 2.

We give an example that illustrates that in case of 1.5-way automata these definitions are different.

Definition 4.2. 1.5-way probabilistic **weakly** reversible C -automaton $A = (Q, \Sigma, q_0, Q_F, \delta)$ is specified by Q, Σ, q_0, Q_F defined as in 1-way PRA-C Definition 2.1, and a transition function

$$\delta : Q \times \Gamma \times Q \times D \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}_{[0,1]},$$

where Γ defined as in 1-way PRA-C definition and $D = \{0, 1\}$ denotes whether automaton stays on the same position or moves one letter ahead on the input tape. Furthermore, transition function satisfies the following requirements:

$$\forall (q_1, \sigma_1) \in Q \times \Gamma \quad \sum_{q \in Q, d \in D} \delta(q_1, \sigma_1, q, d) = 1 \quad (14)$$

$$\forall (q_1, \sigma_1) \in Q \times \Gamma \quad \sum_{q \in Q, d \in D} \delta(q, \sigma_1, q_1, d) = 1 \quad (15)$$

Definition 4.3. 1.5-way probabilistic reversible C -automaton $A = (Q, \Sigma, q_0, Q_F, \delta)$ is specified by Q, Σ, q_0, Q_F defined as in 1-way PRA-C Definition 2.1, and a transition function

$$\delta : Q \times \Gamma \times Q \times D \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}_{[0,1]},$$

where Γ defined as in 1-way PRA-C definition and $D = \{0, 1\}$ denotes whether automaton stays on the same position or moves one letter ahead on the input tape. Furthermore, transition function satisfies the following requirements:

$$\forall (q_1, \sigma_1) \in Q \times \Gamma \quad \sum_{q \in Q, d \in D} \delta(q_1, \sigma_1, q, d) = 1 \quad (16)$$

$$\forall (q_1, \sigma_1, \sigma_2) \in Q \times \Gamma^2 \quad \sum_{q \in Q} \delta(q, \sigma_1, q_1, 0) + \sum_{q \in Q, \sigma \in \Gamma} \delta(q, \sigma_2, q_1, 1) = 1 \quad (17)$$

Theorem 4.4. Language $(a,b)^*a$ is recognizable by 1.5-way weakly reversible PRA-C.

Proof. The $Q = \{q_0, q_1\}$, $Q_F = \{q_1\}$, δ is defined as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \delta(q_0, a, q_0, 0) &= \frac{1}{2} & \delta(q_0, a, q_1, 1) &= \frac{1}{2} & \delta(q_1, a, q_0, 0) &= \frac{1}{2} & \delta(q_1, a, q_1, 1) &= \frac{1}{2} \\ \delta(q_0, b, q_0, 1) &= \frac{1}{2} & \delta(q_0, b, q_1, 0) &= \frac{1}{2} & \delta(q_1, b, q_0, 1) &= \frac{1}{2} & \delta(q_1, b, q_1, 0) &= \frac{1}{2} \\ \delta(q_0, \$, q_0, 1) &= 1 & \delta(q_1, \$, q_1, 1) &= 1 \end{aligned}$$

It is easy to check that such automaton moves ahead according to the transition of the following deterministic automaton

$$\begin{aligned} \delta(q_0, a, q_1, 1) &= 1 & \delta(q_1, a, q_1, 1) &= 1 \\ \delta(q_0, b, q_0, 1) &= 1 & \delta(q_1, b, q_0, 1) &= 1 \\ \delta(q_0, \$, q_0, 1) &= 1 & \delta(q_1, \$, q_1, 1) &= 1 \end{aligned}$$

So the probability of wrong answer is 0. The probability to be at the m -th position of the input tape after n steps of calculation for $m \leq n$ is C_n^m . Therefore it is necessary no more than $O(n * \log(p))$ steps to reach the end of the word of length n (and so obtain correct answer) with probability $1 - \frac{1}{p}$. \square

5 A Classification of Reversible Automata

We propose the following classification for finite 1-way reversible automata:

	C-automata	DH-automata
Deterministic Automata	Permutation Automata [HS 66,T 68] (DRA-C)	Reversible Finite Automata [AF 98] (DRA-DH)
Quantum Automata with Pure States	Measure-Once Quantum Finite Automata [MC 97] (QRA-P-C)	Measure-Many Quantum Finite Automata [KW 97] (QRA-P-DH)
Probabilistic Automata	Probabilistic Reversible C-automata (PRA-C)	Probabilistic Reversible DH-automata (PRA-DH)
Quantum Finite Automata with Mixed States	not considered yet (QRA-M-C)	Enhanced Quantum Finite Automata [N 99] (QRA-M-DH)

Language class problems are solved for DRA-C, DRA-DH, QRA-P-C, for the rest types they are still open. Every type of DH-automata may simulate the corresponding type of C-automata.

Generally, language classes recognized by C-automata are closed under boolean operations (though this is open for QRA-M-C), while DH-automata are not (though this is open for QRA-M-DH and possibly for PRA-DH).

Definition 5.1. *We say that a unitary matrix U is a prototype for a doubly stochastic matrix S , if $\forall i, j |U_{i,j}|^2 = S_{i,j}$.*

Not every doubly stochastic matrix has a unitary prototype. Such matrix is, for example, $\begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2} & 0 \\ \frac{1}{2} & 0 & \frac{1}{2} \\ 0 & \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2} \end{pmatrix}$.

In Introduction, we demonstrated some relation between PRA-C and QRA-M-DH (and hence, QRA-M-C). However, due to the example above, we do not know exactly, whether every PRA-C can be simulated by QRA-M-C, or whether every PRA-DH can be simulated by QRA-M-DH.

Theorem 5.2. *If all matrices of a PRA-C have unitary prototypes, then the PRA-C may be simulated by a QRA-M-C and by a QRA-M-DH.*

Proof. Trivial. □

Theorem 5.3. *If all matrices of a PRA-DH have unitary prototypes, then the PRA-DH may be simulated by a QRA-M-DH.*

Proof. Trivial. □

References

- ABFK 99. A. Ambainis, R. Bonner, R. Freivalds, A. Kikusts. Probabilities to Accept Languages by Quantum Finite Automata. *COCOON 1999, Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, 1999, Vol. 1627, pp. 174-183.
<http://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/9904066>

- AF 98. A. Ambainis, R. Freivalds. 1-Way Quantum Finite Automata: Strengths, Weaknesses and Generalizations. *Proc. 39th FOCS*, 1998, pp. 332-341.
<http://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/9802062>
- AKV 00. A. Ambainis, A. Ķikusts, M. Valdatš. On the Class of Languages Recognizable by 1-Way Quantum Finite Automata. *STACS 2001, Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, 2001, Vol. 2010, pp. 75-86.
<http://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0009004>
- BP 99. A. Brodsky, N. Pippenger. Characterizations of 1-Way Quantum Finite Automata.
<http://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/9903014>
- GS 97. C. M. Grinstead, J. L. Snell. Introduction to Probability. *American Mathematical Society*, 1997.
http://www.dartmouth.edu/~chance/teaching_aids/articles.html
- HW 79. G. H. Hardy, E. M. Wright. An Introduction to the Theory of Numbers. Fifth Edition. *Oxford University Press*, 1979.
- HS 66. J. Hartmanis, R. E. Stearns. Algebraic Structure Theory of Sequential Machines. *Prentice Hall*, 1966.
- KS 76. J. G. Kemeny, J. L. Snell. Finite Markov Chains. *Springer Verlag*, 1976.
- KW 97. A. Kondacs, J. Watrous. On The Power of Quantum Finite State Automata. *Proc. 38th FOCS*, 1997, pp. 66-75.
- MC 97. C. Moore, J. P. Crutchfield. Quantum Automata and Quantum Grammars. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 2000, Vol. 237(1-2), pp. 275-306.
<http://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/9707031>
- N 99. A. Nayak. Optimal Lower Bounds for Quantum Automata and Random Access Codes. *Proc. 40th FOCS*, 1999, pp. 369-377.
<http://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/9904093>
- R 63. M. O. Rabin. Probabilistic Automata. *Information and Control*, 1963, Vol. 6(3), pp. 230-245.
- T 68. G. Thierrin. Permutation Automata. *Mathematical Systems Theory*, 1968, Vol. 2(1), pp. 83-90.

A End-Marker Theorems for PRA-C Automata

We denote a PRA-C with both end-markers as $\#\$,$ -PRA-C. We denote a PRA-C with left end-marker only as $\#$ -PRA-C.

Theorem A.1. *Let A be a $\#\$,$ -PRA-C, which recognizes a language L . There exists a $\#$ -PRA-C which recognizes the same language.*

Proof. Suppose $A = (Q, \Sigma, q_0, Q_F, \delta)$, where $|Q| = n$. A recognizes L with interval (p_1, p_2) . We construct the following automaton $A' = (Q', \Sigma, q_{0,0}, Q'_F, \delta')$ with mn states. Informally, A' equiprobably simulates m copies of the automaton A .

$$Q' = \{q_{0,0}, \dots, q_{0,m-1}, q_{1,0}, \dots, q_{1,m-1}, \dots, q_{n-1,0}, \dots, q_{n-1,m-1}\}.$$

$$\text{If } \sigma \neq \#, \delta'(q_{i,k}, \sigma, q_{j,l}) = \begin{cases} \delta(q_i, \sigma, q_j), & \text{if } k = l \\ 0, & \text{if } k \neq l. \end{cases}$$

Otherwise, $\delta'(q_{0,0}, \#, q_{j,l}) = \frac{1}{m} \delta(q_0, \#, q_j)$, and if $q_{i,k} \neq q_{0,0}$, $\delta'(q_{i,k}, \#, q) = \frac{1 - \delta'(q_{0,0}, \#, q)}{mn-1}$. Function δ' satisfies the requirements (1) and (2) of Definition 2.1.

We define Q'_F as follows. A state $q_{i,k} \in Q'_F$ if and only if $0 \leq k < mp(q_i)$, where $p(q_i) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{q \in Q_F} \delta(q_i, \$, q)$.

Suppose $\#\omega\$$ is an input word. Having read $\#\omega$, A is in superposition $\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} a_i^\omega q_i$. After A has read $\$$, $\#\omega\$$ is accepted with probability $p_\omega = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} a_i^\omega p(q_i)$.

On the other hand, having read $\#\omega$, A' is in superposition $\frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} a_i^\omega q_{i,j}$.

So the input word $\#\omega$ is accepted with probability $p'_\omega = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} a_i^\omega [mp(q_i)]$.

Consider $\omega \in L$. Then $p'_\omega = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} a_i^\omega [mp(q_i)] \geq \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} a_i^\omega p(q_i) = p_\omega \geq p_2$.

Consider $\xi \notin L$. Then $p'_\xi = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} a_i^\xi [mp(q_i)] < \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} a_i^\xi p(q_i) + \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} a_i^\xi = p_\xi + \frac{1}{m} \leq p_1 + \frac{1}{m}$.

Therefore A' recognizes L with bounded error, provided $m > \frac{1}{p_2 - p_1}$. \square

Now we are going to prove that PRA-C without end-markers recognize the same languages as #-PRA-C automata.

If A is a #-PRA-C, then, having read the left end-marker $\#$, the automaton simulates some other automata A_0, A_1, \dots, A_{m-1} with positive probabilities p_0, \dots, p_{m-1} , respectively. A_0, A_1, \dots, A_{m-1} are automata without end-markers. By $p_{i,\omega}$, $0 \leq i < m$, we denote the probability that the automaton A_i accepts the word ω .

We prove the following lemma first.

Lemma A.2. *Suppose A' is a #-PRA-C which recognizes a language L with interval (a_1, a_2) . Then for every ε , $0 < \varepsilon < 1$, exists a #-PRA-C A which recognizes L with interval (a_1, a_2) , such that*

- a) if $\omega \in L$, $p_{0,\omega} + p_{1,\omega} + \dots + p_{n-1,\omega} > \frac{a_2 n}{1 + \varepsilon}$
- b) if $\omega \notin L$, $p_{0,\omega} + p_{1,\omega} + \dots + p_{n-1,\omega} < \frac{a_1 n}{1 - \varepsilon}$.

Here n is the number of automata without end-markers, being simulated by A , and $p_{i,\omega}$ is the probability that i -th simulated automaton A_i accepts ω .

Proof. Suppose a #-PRA-C A' recognizes a language L with interval (a_1, a_2) . Having read the symbol $\#$, A' simulates automata A'_0, \dots, A'_{m-1} with probabilities p'_0, \dots, p'_{m-1} , respectively. We choose ε , $0 < \varepsilon < 1$.

By Dirichlet's principle ([HW 79], p. 170), $\forall \varphi > 0$ exists $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$ such that $\forall i$ $p'_i n$ differs from some positive integer by less than φ .

Let $0 < \varphi < \min(\frac{1}{m}, \varepsilon)$. Let g_i be the nearest integer of $p'_i n$. So $|p'_i n - g_i| < \varphi$ and $\left| \frac{p'_i}{g_i} - \frac{1}{n} \right| < \frac{\varphi}{ng_i} \leq \frac{\varphi}{n}$. Since $|p'_i n - g_i| < \varphi$, we have $\left| n - \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} g_i \right| < \varphi m < 1$.

Therefore, since $g_i \in \mathbb{N}^+$, $\sum_{i=0}^{m-1} g_i = n$.

Now we construct the #-PRA-C A , which satisfies the properties expressed in Lemma A.2. For every i , we make g_i copies of A'_i . Having read #, for every i A simulates each copy of A'_i with probability $\frac{p'_i}{g_i}$. The construction of $V_{\#}$ is equivalent to that used in the proof of Lemma 2.7. Therefore A is characterized by doubly stochastic matrices. A recognizes L with the same interval as A' , i.e., (a_1, a_2) .

Using new notations, A simulates n automata A_0, A_1, \dots, A_{n-1} with probabilities p_0, p_1, \dots, p_{n-1} , respectively. Note that $\forall i \left| p_i - \frac{1}{n} \right| < \frac{\varphi}{n}$. Let $p_{i,\omega}$ be the probability that A_i accepts the word ω .

Consider $\omega \in L$. We have $p_0 p_{0,\omega} + p_1 p_{1,\omega} + \dots + p_{n-1} p_{n-1,\omega} \geq a_2$. Since $p_i < \frac{1+\varphi}{n}$, $\frac{1+\varphi}{n}(p_{0,\omega} + p_{1,\omega} + \dots + p_{n-1,\omega}) > a_2$. Hence

$$p_{0,\omega} + p_{1,\omega} + \dots + p_{n-1,\omega} > \frac{a_2 n}{1+\varphi} > \frac{a_2 n}{1+\varepsilon}.$$

Consider $\xi \notin L$. We have $p_0 p_{0,\xi} + p_1 p_{1,\xi} + \dots + p_{n-1} p_{n-1,\xi} \leq a_1$. Since $p_i > \frac{1-\varphi}{n}$, $\frac{1-\varphi}{n}(p_{0,\xi} + p_{1,\xi} + \dots + p_{n-1,\xi}) < a_1$. Hence

$$p_{0,\xi} + p_{1,\xi} + \dots + p_{n-1,\xi} < \frac{a_1 n}{1-\varphi} < \frac{a_1 n}{1-\varepsilon}.$$

□

Theorem A.3. *Let A be a #-PRA-C, which recognizes a language L . There exists a PRA-C without end-markers, which recognizes the same language.*

Proof. Consider a #-PRA-C which recognizes a language L with interval (a_1, a_2) . Using Lemma A.2, we choose ε , $0 < \varepsilon < \frac{a_2 - a_1}{a_2 + a_1}$, and construct an automaton A' which recognizes L with interval (a_1, a_2) , with the following properties.

Having read #, A' simulates A'_0, \dots, A'_{m-1} with probabilities p'_0, \dots, p'_{m-1} , respectively. A'_0, \dots, A'_{m-1} are automata without end-markers. A'_i accepts ω with probability $p'_{i,\omega}$. If $\omega \in L$, $p'_{0,\omega} + p'_{1,\omega} + \dots + p'_{m-1,\omega} > \frac{a_2 m}{1+\varepsilon}$. Otherwise, if $\omega \notin L$, $p'_{0,\omega} + p'_{1,\omega} + \dots + p'_{m-1,\omega} < \frac{a_1 m}{1-\varepsilon}$.

That also implies that for every $n = km$, $k \in \mathbb{N}^+$, we are able to construct a #-PRA-C A which recognizes L with interval (a_1, a_2) , such that

- a) if $\omega \in L$, $p_{0,\omega} + p_{1,\omega} + \dots + p_{n-1,\omega} > \frac{a_2 n}{1+\varepsilon}$;
- b) if $\omega \notin L$, $p_{0,\omega} + p_{1,\omega} + \dots + p_{n-1,\omega} < \frac{a_1 n}{1-\varepsilon}$.

A simulates A_0, \dots, A_{n-1} . Let us consider the system $F_n = (A_0, \dots, A_{n-1})$. Let $\delta = \frac{1}{2}(a_1 + a_2)$. Since $\varepsilon < \frac{a_2 - a_1}{a_2 + a_1}$, $\frac{a_2}{1+\varepsilon} > \delta$ and $\frac{a_1}{1-\varepsilon} < \delta$. As in the proof of Theorem 2.6, we define that the system accepts a word, if more than $n\delta$ automata in the system accept the word.

Let us take η_0 , such that $0 < \eta_0 < \frac{a_2}{1+\varepsilon} - \delta < \delta - \frac{a_1}{1-\varepsilon}$.

Consider $\omega \in L$. We have that $\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} p_{i,\omega} > \frac{a_2 n}{1+\varepsilon} > n\delta$. As a result of reading ω , μ_n^ω automata in the system accept the word, and the rest reject it. The system

has accepted the word, if $\frac{\mu_n^\omega}{n} > \delta$. Since $0 < \eta_0 < \frac{a_2}{1+\varepsilon} - \delta < \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} p_{i,\omega} - \delta$, we have

$$P \left\{ \frac{\mu_n^\omega}{n} > \delta \right\} \geq P \left\{ \left| \frac{\mu_n^\omega}{n} - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} p_{i,\omega} \right| < \eta_0 \right\}. \quad (18)$$

If we look on $\frac{\mu_n^\omega}{n}$ as a random variable X , $E(X) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} p_{i,\omega}$ and variance $V(X) = \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} p_{i,\omega}(1-p_{i,\omega})$, therefore Chebyshev's inequality yields the following:

$$P \left\{ \left| \frac{\mu_n^\omega}{n} - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} p_{i,\omega} \right| \geq \eta_0 \right\} \leq \frac{1}{n^2 \eta_0^2} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} p_{i,\omega}(1-p_{i,\omega}) \leq \frac{1}{4n\eta_0^2}.$$

That is equivalent to $P \left\{ \left| \frac{\mu_n^\omega}{n} - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} p_{i,\omega} \right| < \eta_0 \right\} \geq 1 - \frac{1}{4n\eta_0^2}$. So, taking into account (18),

$$P \left\{ \frac{\mu_n^\omega}{n} > \delta \right\} \geq 1 - \frac{1}{4n\eta_0^2}. \quad (19)$$

On the other hand, consider $\xi \notin L$. So $\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} p_{i,\xi} < \frac{a_1 n}{1-\varepsilon} < n\delta$. Again, since $0 < \eta_0 < \delta - \frac{a_1}{1-\varepsilon} < \delta - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} p_{i,\xi}$,

$$P \left\{ \frac{\mu_n^\xi}{n} > \delta \right\} \leq P \left\{ \left| \frac{\mu_n^\xi}{n} - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} p_{i,\xi} \right| \geq \eta_0 \right\} \leq \frac{1}{4n\eta_0^2}. \quad (20)$$

The constant η_0 does not depend on n and n may be chosen sufficiently large. Therefore, by (19) and (20), the system F_n recognizes L with bounded error, if $n > \frac{1}{2\eta_0^2}$.

Following a way identical to that used in the proof of Theorem 2.6, it is possible to construct a single PRA-C without end-markers, which simulates the system F_n and therefore recognizes the language L . \square