

It Is NL-complete to Decide Whether a Hairpin Completion of Regular Languages Is Regular

BY VOLKER DIEKERT, STEFFEN KOPECKI

{DIEKERT,KOPECKI}@FMI.UNI-STUTTGART.DE

UNIVERSITY OF STUTT GART, INSTITUTE FOR FORMAL METHODS IN COMPUTER SCIENCE
(FMI),

UNIVERSITÄTSSTRASSE 38, D-70569 STUTT GART

July 16, 2018

Abstract

The hairpin completion is an operation on formal languages which is inspired by the hairpin formation in biochemistry. Hairpin formations occur naturally within DNA-computing. It has been known that the hairpin completion of a regular language is linear context-free, but not regular, in general. However, for some time it was open whether the regularity of the hairpin completion of a regular language is decidable. In 2009 this decidability problem has been solved positively in [DiekertKM09] by providing a polynomial time algorithm. In this paper we improve the complexity bound by showing that the decision problem is actually **NL**-complete. This complexity bound holds for both, the one-sided and the two-sided hairpin completions.

Keywords: Automata and Formal Languages; Regular Languages, Finite Automata; **NL**-Complete Problems; DNA-Computing; Hairpin Completion.

1 Introduction

The hairpin completion is a natural operation of formal languages which has been inspired by molecular phenomena in biology and which occurs naturally during DNA-computing. An intramolecular base pairing, known as a *hairpin*, is a pattern that can occur in single-stranded DNA and, more commonly, in RNA. Hairpin or hairpin-free structures have numerous applications to DNA computing and molecular genetics, see [garzon1, garzon2, garzon3, KariKLST05, KariMT07] and the references within for a detailed discussion. For example, an instance of 3-SAT has been solved with a DNA-

algorithm and one of the main concepts was to eliminate all molecules with a hairpin structure, see [KensakuSakamoto05192000].

In this paper we study the hairpin completion from a purely formal language viewpoint. The hairpin completion of a formal language was first defined by Cheptea, Martín-Vide, and Mitrana in [ChepteaMM06]; here we use a slightly more general definition which was introduced in [DiekertKM09]. The hairpin completion and some related operations have been studied in a series of papers from language theoretic and algorithmic point of view, see e.g., [DBLP:conf/cie/ManeaM07, ManeaMY09tcs, ManeaMM09, Ito2010, ManeaMY10, ManeaMM10, Kopecki10]. The formal operation of the hairpin completion on words is best explained in Figure 1. In that picture as in the rest of the paper we mean by putting a *bar* on a word (like $\langle \text{mspace} | 1\text{mu} \rangle \overline{\langle \text{mspace} | -1\text{mu} \rangle} \alpha \langle \text{mspace} | -1\text{mu} \rangle \langle \text{mspace} | 1\text{mu} \rangle$) to read it from right-to-left and in addition to replace a letter a with the (Watson-Crick) complement $\langle \text{mspace} | 1\text{mu} \rangle \overline{\langle \text{mspace} | -1\text{mu} \rangle} a \langle \text{mspace} | -1\text{mu} \rangle \langle \text{mspace} | 1\text{mu} \rangle$. The hairpin completion of a regular language is linear context-free, but not regular, in general [ChepteaMM06].

```

\begin{tikzpicture}[text height=1.5ex,text depth=.25ex]
  \draw [|-|] (-4,1) .. controls +(.5,.25) and +(-.5,-.25) ..
    node [above] {$\gamma$} (-3,1);
  \draw [-] (-3,1) .. controls +(.25,.125) and +(-.25,.125) ..
    node [above] {$\alpha$} (-2.5,1);
  \draw [|-|] (-2.5,1) .. controls +(.5,-.25) and +(-.5,.25) ..
    node [above] {$\beta$} (-1.5,1);
  \draw [-|] (-1.5,1) .. controls +(.25,-.125) and +(-.25,-.125) ..
    node [above] {$\text{ov}\alpha$} (-1,1);

  \draw [->,decorate,decoration=
    ---{snake,amplitude=.3mm,segment length=1.5mm,post length=1mm}]
  --(-.5,1) -- (2,1) node [above,text centered,midway] {annealing};
  \draw [|-|] (2.5,0) -- node [above,sloped] {$\gamma$} (2.5,1);
  \draw [|-|] (2.5,1) -- node [above,sloped] {$\alpha$} (2.5,1.5);
  \draw [-] (2.5,1.5) .. controls +(up:.25) and +(down:.25) .. (2.25,2)
    .. controls +(up:.5) and +(up:.5) .. node [above,sloped] {$\beta$} (3,2)
    .. controls +(down:.25) and +(up:.25) .. (2.75,1.5);
  \draw [|-|] (2.75,1.5) -- node [above,sloped] {$\text{ov}\alpha$} (2.75,1);

  \draw [->,decorate,decoration=
    ---{snake,amplitude=.3mm,segment length=1.5mm,post length=1mm}]
  --(3.25,1) -- (5.75,1) node [above,text centered,midway] {lengthening};

  \draw [|-|] (6.25,0) -- node [above,sloped] {$\gamma$} (6.25,1);
  \draw [|-|] (6.25,1) -- node [above,sloped] {$\alpha$} (6.25,1.5);
  \draw [-] (6.25,1.5) .. controls +(up:.25) and +(down:.25) .. (6,2)
    .. controls +(up:.5) and +(up:.5) .. node [above,sloped] {$\beta$}
    (6.75,2) .. controls +(down:.25) and +(up:.25) .. (6.5,1.5);
  \draw [|-|] (6.5,1.5) -- node [above,sloped] {$\text{ov}\alpha$} (6.5,1);
  \draw [-|] (6.5,1) -- node [above,sloped] {$\text{ov}\gamma$} (6.5,0);

  \node at (-2.5,-.5) {strand};
  \node at (2.625,-.5) {hairpin};
  \node at (6.375,-.5) {hairpin completion};
\end{tikzpicture}

```

Figure 1. Hairpin completion of a DNA-strand (or a word).

For some time it was not known whether regularity of the hairpin completion of a regular language is decidable. It was only in 2009 when we presented in [DiekertKM09] a decision algorithm. Actually, we proved a better result by providing a polynomial time algorithm with a (rough) runtime estimation of about $\mathcal{O}(n^{20})$.

In an extended abstract which appeared at the CIAA 2010 we presented a modified approach to solve the same problem [DieKop11] which led, in particular, to the following two new results: First, the time complexity of

the new decision algorithm is in $\mathcal{O}(n^8)$. Second, the decision problem is NLOGSPACE-complete, i.e., **NL**-complete.

This paper is the journal version of [DieKop11] for the second result. We decided to focus on the space complexity since, in terms of complexity, **NL**-completeness yields a precise characterization and because the given page limit did not allow to include full proofs for all results of [DieKop11]. Moreover, our proofs are still rather technical and the focus on the **NL**-algorithm simplifies the presentation.

We consider the one-sided and the two-sided hairpin completions simultaneously. It turns out that **NL**-completeness holds in both cases.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section ? we fix the notation used throughout. We give the formal definition of the hairpin completion $\mathcal{H}_k(L_1, L_2)$ and we discuss our input model using appropriate deterministic automata.

In Section ? we state the main result (Theorem ?) and we give a full proof in the subsequent subsections. A main technical tool is the use of single-valued non-deterministic log-space transductions, which might be not fairly standard. They are explained in Section ?. In Section ? we give a short conclusion and we state some open problems.

2 Preliminaries and Notation

We assume the reader to be familiar with the basic concepts of formal language theory, automata theory, and complexity theory, as one can find in the text books [HU, pap94]. By **NL** we mean the complexity class NLOGSPACE, which contains the problems which can be decided by a non-deterministic Turing machine using $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$ work space. Throughout we use the well-known result that **NL** is closed under complementation, see e.g. [pap94]. We also use the fact that if L can be reduced to L' via some single-valued non-deterministic log-space transduction and $L' \in \mathbf{NL}$, then we have $L \in \mathbf{NL}$, see [AlvarezJenner95] <varspace> and Section ? for more details.

By Σ we denote a finite alphabet with at least two letters. The set of words over Σ is denoted Σ^* ; and the *empty word* is denoted by 1. Given a word w , we denote by $|w|$ its length and $w(m) \in \Sigma$ its m -th letter. If $w = xyz$ for some $x, y, z \in \Sigma^*$, then x and z are called *prefix* and *suffix* of w , respectively. By a proper prefix x of w we mean a prefix such that $x \neq w$ (but we allow $x = 1$). The prefix relation between words x and w is denoted by $x \leq w$ and for proper prefixes by $x < w$.

We assume that the alphabet Σ is equipped with an involution $\bar{\cdot} : \Sigma \rightarrow \Sigma$. An *involution* for a set is a bijection such that $\overline{\langle \text{mspace} | 1 \mu \rangle} \overline{\langle \text{mspace} | -1 \mu \rangle} a \overline{\langle \text{mspace} | -1 \mu \rangle} \overline{\langle \text{mspace} | 1 \mu \rangle} = a$. We extend the involution to words $a_1 \cdots a_n$ by $\overline{\langle \text{mspace} | 1 \mu \rangle} \overline{\langle \text{mspace} | -1 \mu \rangle} a_1 \cdots a_n \overline{\langle \text{mspace} | -1 \mu \rangle} \overline{\langle \text{mspace} | 1 \mu \rangle} = \langle \text{mspace} | 1 \mu \rangle a_1 \cdots a_n \langle \text{mspace} | -1 \mu \rangle$.

$\langle \text{mspace} | 1\text{mu} \rangle \overline{\langle \text{mspace} | -1\text{mu} \rangle a_n \langle \text{mspace} | -1\text{mu} \rangle} \langle \text{mspace} | 1\text{mu} \rangle \dots \langle \text{mspace} | 1\text{mu} \rangle \overline{\langle \text{mspace} | -1\text{mu} \rangle a_1 \langle \text{mspace} | -1\text{mu} \rangle} \langle \text{mspace} | 1\text{mu} \rangle$ where the a_i 's are letters. This convention is like taking inverses in groups. For languages $L \subseteq \Sigma^*$ we denote by $\langle \text{mspace} | 1\text{mu} \rangle \overline{\langle \text{mspace} | -1\text{mu} \rangle L \langle \text{mspace} | -1\text{mu} \rangle} \langle \text{mspace} | 1\text{mu} \rangle$ the set

$$\langle \text{mspace} | 1\text{mu} \rangle \overline{\langle \text{mspace} | -1\text{mu} \rangle L \langle \text{mspace} | -1\text{mu} \rangle} \langle \text{mspace} | 1\text{mu} \rangle = \infty.$$

Throughout the paper L_1, L_2 are two regular languages in Σ^* and by k we mean a (small) constant. (In a biological setting $k \sim 10$ yields a reasonable value.) According to Figure ?<varspace> we define the *hairpin completion* $\mathcal{H}_k(L_1, L_2)$ by

$$\mathcal{H}_k(L_1, L_2) = \infty.$$

This definition is slightly more general than the original definition in [ChepteaMM06, ManeaMY09tcs]. It allows us to treat the two-sided hairpin completion ($L_1 = L_2$) and the one-sided hairpin completion (either $L_1 = \emptyset$ or $L_2 = \emptyset$) simultaneously.

A regular language can be specified by a non-deterministic finite automaton (NFA) $\mathcal{A} = (\mathcal{Q}, \Sigma, E, \mathcal{I}, \mathcal{F})$, where \mathcal{Q} is the finite set of *states*, $\mathcal{I} \subseteq \mathcal{Q}$ is the set of *initial states*, and $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{Q}$ is the set of *final states*. The set E contains labeled *edges* (or *arcs*), it is a subset of $\mathcal{Q} \times \Sigma \times \mathcal{Q}$. For a word $u \in \Sigma^*$ we write $p \langle \text{overset} | u \rangle \rightarrow q$, if there is a path from state p to q which is labeled by the word u . Thus, the accepted language becomes

$$L(\mathcal{A}) = \infty.$$

Later it will be crucial to use also paths which avoid final states. For this we introduce a special notation. First remove all arcs (p, a, q) where $q \in \mathcal{F}$ is a final state. Thus, final states do not have incoming arcs anymore. Let us write $p \langle \text{overset} | u \rangle \Rightarrow q$, if there is a path from state p to q which is labeled by the word u in this new automaton after removing these arcs. Note that for such a path $p \langle \text{overset} | u \rangle \Rightarrow q$ we allow $p \in \mathcal{F}$, but on the path we never enter any final state again.

An NFA is called a *deterministic finite automaton* (DFA), if it has exactly one initial state and for every state $p \in \mathcal{Q}$ and every letter $a \in \Sigma$ there is exactly one arc $(p, a, q) \in E$. In particular, in this paper a DFA is always *complete*.<varspace> Thus, we can read every word to its end. We also write $p \cdot u = q$, if $p \langle \text{overset} | u \rangle \rightarrow q$. This yields a (totally defined) function $\mathcal{Q} \times \Sigma^* \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}$. (It defines an action of Σ^* on \mathcal{Q} on the right.)

In the following we use a DFA accepting L_1 as well as a DFA accepting L_2 , but the DFA for L_2 has to work from right-to-left. Instead of introducing this concept we use a DFA (working as usual from left-to-right), which accepts $\langle \text{mspace} | 1\text{mu} \rangle \overline{\langle \text{mspace} | -1\text{mu} \rangle L_2 \langle \text{mspace} | -1\text{mu} \rangle} \langle \text{mspace} | 1\text{mu} \rangle$. This automaton has the same number of states as (and is structurally isomorphic to) a DFA accepting the *reversal language* of L_2 .

As input we assume that the regular languages L_1 and $\langle \text{mspace} \mid 1\text{mu} \rangle \langle \text{mspace} \mid -1\text{mu} \rangle L_2 \langle \text{mspace} \mid -1\text{mu} \rangle \langle \text{mspace} \mid 1\text{mu} \rangle$ are specified by DFAs \mathcal{A}_1 and \mathcal{A}_2 with state set \mathcal{Q}_i , state $q_{0i} \in \mathcal{Q}_i$ as initial state, and $\mathcal{F}_i \subseteq \mathcal{Q}_i$ as final states. By n we denote the input size

$$n = |\langle \text{mathinner} \mid \mathcal{Q}_1 \rangle| + |\langle \text{mathinner} \mid \mathcal{Q}_2 \rangle|.$$

We also need the usual product DFA with state space

$$\mathcal{Q} = \times.$$

The action is given by $(p_1, p_2) \cdot a = (p_1 \cdot a, p_2 \cdot a)$. As \mathcal{Q} contains only reachable states, the size of \mathcal{Q} might be smaller than $|\langle \text{mathinner} \mid \mathcal{Q}_1 \rangle| \cdot |\langle \text{mathinner} \mid \mathcal{Q}_2 \rangle|$. In the following we work simultaneously in all three automata defined so far. Moreover, in \mathcal{Q}_1 and \mathcal{Q}_2 we are going to work backwards. This leads to nondeterminism.

3 Main result

The purpose of this paper is to prove the following result:

Theorem 1. *The following problem is **NL**-complete:*

Input: $\langle \text{varspace} \rangle$ Two DFAs \mathcal{A}_1 and \mathcal{A}_2 recognizing L_1 and $\langle \text{mspace} \mid 1\text{mu} \rangle \langle \text{mspace} \mid -1\text{mu} \rangle L_2 \langle \text{mspace} \mid -1\text{mu} \rangle \langle \text{mspace} \mid 1\text{mu} \rangle$ with state sets \mathcal{Q}_1 and \mathcal{Q}_2 resp. $\langle \text{varspace} \rangle$ such that $n = |\langle \text{mathinner} \mid \mathcal{Q}_1 \rangle| + |\langle \text{mathinner} \mid \mathcal{Q}_2 \rangle|$.

Question: Is $\mathcal{H}_k(L_1, L_2)$ regular?

Since **NL** is included in **P** we obtain the following result from [DiekertKM09] as a corollary.

Corollary 2. *The problem whether the hairpin completion $\mathcal{H}_k(L_1, L_2)$ is regular is decidable in polynomial time.*

We now turn to the proof of Theorem ?. The **NL**-hardness is immediate:

Lemma 3. *The problem whether the hairpin completion $\mathcal{H}_k(L_1, L_2)$ is regular is **NL**-hard, even for $L_2 = \emptyset$.*

Proof. The well-known **NL**-complete *Graph-Accessibility-Problem* [pap94] can easily be reduced to the following problem for DFAs:

Let $\Sigma = \{ \langle \text{mathinner} \mid \mid a, \langle \text{mspace} \mid 1\text{mu} \rangle \langle \text{mspace} \mid -1\text{mu} \rangle a \langle \text{mspace} \mid -1\text{mu} \rangle \langle \text{mspace} \mid 1\text{mu} \rangle, b, \langle \text{mspace} \mid 1\text{mu} \rangle \langle \text{mspace} \mid -1\text{mu} \rangle b \langle \text{mspace} \mid -1\text{mu} \rangle \langle \text{mspace} \mid 1\text{mu} \rangle \}$ be an alphabet with four letters. Decide for a given DFA, which accepts a language $L \subseteq \{ \langle \text{mathinner} \mid b, \langle \text{mspace} \mid 1\text{mu} \rangle \langle \text{mspace} \mid -1\text{mu} \rangle b \langle \text{mspace} \mid -1\text{mu} \rangle \langle \text{mspace} \mid 1\text{mu} \rangle \}^*$, whether or not L is empty.

Now let $L_1 = a^* L \langle \text{mspace} | 1\text{mu} \rangle \overline{\langle \text{mspace} | -1\text{mu} \rangle a \langle \text{mspace} | -1\text{mu} \rangle \langle \text{mspace} | 1\text{mu} \rangle^k}$. The hairpin completion

$$\mathcal{H}_k(L_1, \emptyset) = \times$$

is regular if and only if L is empty (because $L \subseteq \{ \langle \text{mathinner} | b, \langle \text{mspace} | 1\text{mu} \rangle \langle \text{mspace} | -1\text{mu} \rangle b \langle \text{mspace} | -1\text{mu} \rangle \langle \text{mspace} | 1\text{mu} \rangle \}^*$). \square

The difficult part is to show that deciding regularity of $\mathcal{H}_k(L_1, L_2)$ is in **NL**. This is subject of the rest of this section.

3.1 Single-valued non-deterministic log-space transductions

A single-valued non-deterministic log-space transduction is performed by a non-deterministic log-space Turing machine which may stop on every input w with some output $r(w)$. *Single-valued* means that, in case that the machine stops on input w , the output is always the same, independently of non-deterministic moves during the computation. Thus, $w \mapsto r(w)$ is a well-defined function from words to words. A single-valued non-deterministic log-space transduction is a *reduction* from a language L to L' , if we have $w \in L \iff r(w) \in L'$.

The following lemma belongs to folklore. Its proof is exactly the same as for the standard case of deterministic log-space reductions [HU] and therefore omitted.

Lemma 4. *Let $L' \in \mathbf{NL}$ and assume that there exists a single-valued non-deterministic log-space transduction from L to L' . Then we have $L \in \mathbf{NL}$, too.*

Due to Lemma ? we are free to use several single-valued non-deterministic log-space transductions in order to enrich the input.

3.2 Bridges

Let $\mathcal{Q}_1, \mathcal{Q}_2$ be the state sets as fixed by Theorem ?. For every quadruple $(p_1, p_2, q_1, q_2) \in \mathcal{Q}_1 \times \mathcal{Q}_2 \times \mathcal{Q}_1 \times \mathcal{Q}_2$ we define a regular language $B(p_1, p_2, q_1, q_2)$ as follows:

$$B(p_1, p_2, q_1, q_2) = \times.$$

We say that a quadruple (p_1, p_2, q_1, q_2) is a *bridge*, if $B(p_1, p_2, q_1, q_2) \neq \emptyset$. The idea behind this notation is that $B(p_1, p_2, q_1, q_2)$ closes a gap between pairs (p_1, p_2) and (q_1, q_2) . For a bridge (p_1, p_2, q_1, q_2) the words $\beta \in B(p_1, p_2, q_1, q_2)$ correspond later exactly to the β -part in Figure ?.

Lemma 5. *There is a single-valued non-deterministic log-space transduction which outputs the table of all bridges.*

Proof. Graph reachability and its complement are solvable in **NL**. Therefore we can decide for each quadruple $(p_1, p_2, q_1, q_2) \in \mathcal{Q}_1 \times \mathcal{Q}_2 \times \mathcal{Q}_1 \times \mathcal{Q}_2$ if it is a bridge, and we can output (p_1, p_2, q_1, q_2) in the affirmative case. \square

3.3 The NFA \mathcal{A}

Next, we construct an NFA, which is called simply \mathcal{A} , and we explore properties of this NFA. The NFA \mathcal{A} uses $k+1$ levels (or layers) of a product automaton over $\mathcal{Q} \times \mathcal{Q}_1 \times \mathcal{Q}_2 \subseteq \mathcal{Q}_1 \times \mathcal{Q}_2 \times \mathcal{Q}_1 \times \mathcal{Q}_2$ where \mathcal{Q} has been defined as in Section 2. Hence, the number of states is at most $(k+1)n^4$ which is in $\mathcal{O}(n^4)$.

Formally, we use a *level* for each ℓ with $0 \leq \ell \leq k$, hence there are $k+1$ levels. By $[k]$ we denote in this paper the set $\{\langle \text{mathinner}{0, \dots, k} \rangle\}$. Define

$$\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{A}} = \times$$

as the state space of an NFA called \mathcal{A} .

We call a state $((p_1, p_2), q_1, q_2, \ell)$ a *bridge at level ℓ* , and we keep in mind that there exists a word w such that $p_1 \cdot w = q_1$ and $p_2 \cdot \langle \text{mspace} | \text{1mu} \rangle \langle \text{mspace} | -1\text{mu} \rangle w \langle \text{mspace} | -1\text{mu} \rangle \langle \text{mspace} | \text{1mu} \rangle = q_2$. Frequently (and by a slight abuse of language) we call a state $((p_1, p_2), q_1, q_2, \ell)$ simply a *bridge*, too. Bridges at level ℓ are also denoted by (P, q_1, q_2, ℓ) with $P = (p_1, p_2) \in \mathcal{Q}$, $q_i \in \mathcal{Q}_i$, $i = 1, 2$, and $\ell \in [k]$. Bridges at different levels play a central rôle in the following.

Let $a \in \Sigma$. The a -transitions in the NFA are given by the following arcs:

$$\begin{array}{l} \langle \text{mspace} | \text{mspace} | -1\text{mu} \rangle a \langle \text{mspace} | -1\text{mu} \rangle \langle \text{mspace} | \text{mspace} | -1\text{mu} \rangle a \langle \text{mspace} | -1\text{mu} \rangle \langle \text{mspace} | \text{mspace} | -1\text{mu} \rangle \\ \longrightarrow (P \cdot a, q_1, q_2, 0) \quad \text{for } q_i \cdot \langle \text{mspace} | \text{1mu} \rangle \langle \text{mspace} | -1\text{mu} \rangle a \langle \text{mspace} | -1\text{mu} \rangle \langle \text{mspace} | \text{1mu} \rangle \notin \mathcal{F}_i, i = 1, 2, \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{\langle \text{mspace} \mid}{\text{pace} \mid - 1\text{mu} \rangle a \langle \text{mspace} \mid - 1\text{mu} \rangle \langle \text{mspace} \mid} \\
\cdot \langle \text{mspace} \mid \\
\text{pace} \mid - 1\text{mu} \rangle a \langle \text{mspace} \mid - 1\text{mu} \rangle \langle \text{mspace} \mid}
\end{array}
\quad
\begin{array}{c}
\langle \text{overset} \mid a \rangle \longrightarrow (P \cdot a, q_1, q_2, 1) \quad \text{for } q_1 \cdot \langle \text{mspace} \mid \\
1\text{mu} \rangle \langle \text{mspace} \mid - 1\text{mu} \rangle a \langle \text{mspace} \mid - 1\text{mu} \rangle \langle \text{mspace} \mid \\
1\text{mu} \rangle \in \mathcal{F}_1 \text{ or} \\
q_2 \cdot \langle \text{mspace} \mid \\
1\text{mu} \rangle \langle \text{mspace} \mid - 1\text{mu} \rangle a \langle \text{mspace} \mid - 1\text{mu} \rangle \langle \text{mspace} \mid \\
1\text{mu} \rangle \in \mathcal{F}_2,
\end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{c}
\frac{\langle \text{mspace} \mid}{\text{pace} \mid - 1\text{mu} \rangle a \langle \text{mspace} \mid - 1\text{mu} \rangle \langle \text{mspace} \mid} \\
\cdot \langle \text{mspace} \mid \\
\text{pace} \mid - 1\text{mu} \rangle a \langle \text{mspace} \mid - 1\text{mu} \rangle \langle \text{mspace} \mid}
\end{array}
\quad
\langle \text{overset} \mid a \rangle \longrightarrow (P \cdot a, q_1, q_2, \ell + 1) \text{ for } 1 \leq \ell < k.$$

Thus, for the P -component an a -transition behaves as in a usual product automaton, but for the q_1 - and q_2 -components we move backwards using the $\langle \text{mspace} \mid 1\text{mu} \rangle \langle \text{mspace} \mid - 1\text{mu} \rangle a \langle \text{mspace} \mid - 1\text{mu} \rangle \langle \text{mspace} \mid 1\text{mu} \rangle$ -transitions in the original automata. This is why the resulting automaton \mathcal{A} is non-deterministic.

Observe that no state of the form $(P, q_1, q_2, 0)$ with $q_1 \in \mathcal{F}_1$ or $q_2 \in \mathcal{F}_2$ has an outgoing arc to level zero; we must switch to level one. There are no outgoing arcs on level k , and for each tuple $(a, P, q_1, q_2, \ell) \in \Sigma \times \mathcal{Q} \times \mathcal{Q}_1 \times \mathcal{Q}_2 \times [k-1]$ there exists at most one arc $(P, q'_1, q'_2, \ell) \langle \text{overset} \mid a \rangle \longrightarrow (P \cdot a, q_1, q_2, \ell')$. Indeed, the $P \cdot a$ is determined by P and the letter a , and the triple (q'_1, q'_2, ℓ') is determined by (q_1, q_2, ℓ) and the letter a . Not all such arcs exist in \mathcal{A} , because (P, q'_1, q'_2, ℓ) might be a bridge whereas $(P \cdot a, q_1, q_2, \ell')$ is not. (Observe however that if $(P \cdot a, q_1, q_2, \ell')$ is a bridge, then (P, q'_1, q'_2, ℓ) is a bridge, too.)

The set of initial states \mathcal{I} contains all bridges at level zero of the form $(Q_0, q'_1, q'_2, 0)$ with $Q_0 = (q_{01}, q_{02})$. The set of final states \mathcal{F} is given by all bridges (P, q_1, q_2, k) at level k .

This concludes the definition of the NFA \mathcal{A} . For an example and a graphical presentation of the NFA, see Figure 2.

Remark 6. By Lemma 5, the NFA \mathcal{A} can be computed by a single-valued non-deterministic log-space transduction. Thus, we have direct access to \mathcal{A} and henceforth we assume that \mathcal{A} is also written on the input tape.

```

\begin{tikzpicture}[shorten >=1pt,node distance=2cm,auto,initial text=,%
  initial distance=4mm,bend angle=45,scale=.85]
  \tikzstyle{every node}=[scale=.85]
  \tikzstyle{every loop}=[distance=.5cm]
  \node at (0,5.5)[state,initial]--(A0)-----{$q_{01}$};
  \node ---[state]----(A1)--[right of=A0]--{$p_1$};
  \node ---[state, accepting]--(A2)--[right of=A1]--{$f_1$};
  \node ---[state]----(A3)--[below of=A1]--{$\dead_1$};
  \node---[above of=A1,node distance=1.5cm]---{$L_1 = a^*(b+ \ov b)\ov a$};

  \path [->]--(A0)--edge--[loop above]--node---{$a$}---()
  -----edge-----node---{$b, \ov b$}--(A1)
  -----edge--[bend right]--node--[swap]--{$\ov a$}--(A3)
  --- (A1)--edge-----node---{$\ov a$}--(A2)
  - -----edge-----node---{$a,b, \ov b$}--(A3)
  --- (A2)--edge--[bend left]--node---{$\Sigma$}--(A3)
  --- (A3)--edge--[loop below]--node---{$\Sigma$}--();

  \node at (7,5.5)[state,initial]--(B0)-----{$q_{02}$};
  \node---[state]----(B1)--[right of=B0]--{$p_2$};
  \node---[state, accepting]--(B2)--[right of=B1]--{$f_2$};
  \node---[state]----(B3)--[below of=B1]--{$\dead_2$};
  \node---[above of=B1,node distance=1.5cm]---{$\ov{L_2} = a^*\ov b\ov a$};

  \path [->]--(B0)--edge--[loop above]--node---{$a$}---()
  -----edge-----node---{$\ov b$}--(B1)
  -----edge--[bend right]--node--[swap]--{$\ov a,b$}--(B3)
  --- (B1)--edge-----node---{$\ov a$}--(B2)
  -----edge-----node---{$a,b, \ov b$}--(B3)
  --- (B2)--edge--[bend left]--node---{$\Sigma$}--(B3)
  --- (B3)--edge--[loop below]--node---{$\Sigma$}--();

% \end{tikzpicture}
%\end{figure}

%
%\begin{figure}
% \centering
% \begin{tikzpicture}[shorten >=1pt,auto,initial text=]
% \tikzstyle{every state}=[rectangle]
% \tikzstyle{every pin}=[pin distance=4mm]
% \tikzstyle{every pin edge}=[shorten <=1pt]
% \tikzstyle{init}=[pin={[pin edge={<-}]170:}]

% \node at (0,0)--[state,initial]--(A)--{$(Q_0,\dead_1,\dead_2,0)$};
% \node at (3,0)--[state,init]--(B)--{$(Q_0,f_1,f_2,0)$};
% \node at (6,0)--[state,accepting]--(B1)--{$(Q_0,p_1,p_2,1)$};
% \node at (7.25,0)--[right]-----{$B(q_{01},q_{02},p_1,p_2)= b$};
% \node at (3,1)--[state,initial]--(C)--{$(Q_0,f_1,\dead_2,0)$};
% \node at (6,1)--[state,accepting]--(C1)--{$(Q_0,p_1,\dead_2,1)$};
% \node at (7.25,1)--[right]-----{$B(q_{01},q_{02},p_1,\dead_2)= aa^+b + a^*\ov b$};
% \node at (6,2)--[state,accepting]--(C2)--{$(Q_0,p_1,f_2,1)$};
% \node at (7.25,2)--[right]-----{$B(q_{01},q_{02},p_1,f_2)= ab$};
% \node at (3,-1)--[state,initial]--(D)--{$(Q_0,\dead_1,f_2,0)$};
% \node at (6,-1)--[state,accepting]--(D1)--{$(Q_0,\dead_1,p_2,1)$};
% \node at (7.25,-1)--[right]-----{$B(q_{01},q_{02},\dead_1,p_2)= b\ov a\ov a^+$};
% \node at (6,-2)--[state,accepting]--(D2)--{$(Q_0,f_1,p_2,1)$};
% \node at (7.25,-2)--[right]-----{$B(q_{01},q_{02},f_1,p_2)= b\ov a$};
% \node at (-.8,2) --{$\cA$};

% \path [->]--(A)--edge-----node---{$a$}--(B)
% -----edge--[loop out=125 in=55 distance=1cm]--node---{$a$}--(A)

```

The next result shows the unambiguity of paths in the automaton \mathcal{A} . It is a crucial property.

Lemma 7. *Let $w \in \Sigma^*$ be the label of a path in \mathcal{A} from a bridge $A = (P, p_1, p_2, \ell)$ to $A' = (P', p'_1, p'_2, \ell')$, then the path is unique. This means that $B = B'$ whenever $w = uv$ and*

$$A \langle \text{overset} | u \rangle \longrightarrow B \langle \text{overset} | v \rangle \longrightarrow A', \quad A \langle \text{overset} | u \rangle \longrightarrow B' \langle \text{overset} | v \rangle \longrightarrow A'.$$

Proof. It is enough to consider $u = a \in \Sigma$. Let $B = (Q, q_1, q_2, m)$. Then we have $Q = P \cdot a$ and $q_i = p'_i \cdot \langle \text{mspace} | 1\text{mu} \rangle \langle \text{mspace} | -1\text{mu} \rangle v \langle \text{mspace} | -1\text{mu} \rangle \langle \text{mspace} | 1\text{mu} \rangle$. If $\ell = 0$ and $p_i \notin \mathcal{F}_i$ for $i = 1, 2$, then $m = 0$, too; otherwise $m = \ell + 1$. Thus, B is determined by A , A' , and u, v . We conclude $B = B'$. \square

We will now show that the automaton \mathcal{A} encodes the hairpin completion in a natural way. For languages U and V we define the language V^U as follows:

$$V^U = \text{✂}.$$

Clearly, if U and V are regular, then V^U is linear context-free, but not regular, in general. (The notation V^U is adopted from group theory where exponentiation denotes conjugation and the canonical involution refers to taking inverses.)

Lemma 8. *For each pair $\tau = (I, F) \in \mathcal{I} \times \mathcal{F}$ with $F = ((d_1, d_2), e_1, e_2, k)$ let R_τ be the (regular) set of words which label a path from the initial bridge I to the final bridge F , and let $B_\tau = B(d_1, d_2, e_1, e_2)$.*

The hairpin completion $\mathcal{H}_k(L_1, L_2)$ is a disjoint union

$$\mathcal{H}_k(L_1, L_2) = \bigcup_{\tau \in \mathcal{I} \times \mathcal{F}} B_\tau^{R_\tau}.$$

Moreover, for each word $w \in B_\tau^{R_\tau}$ there is a unique factorization $w = \rho \beta \langle \text{mspace} | 1\text{mu} \rangle \langle \text{mspace} | -1\text{mu} \rangle \rho \langle \text{mspace} | -1\text{mu} \rangle \langle \text{mspace} | 1\text{mu} \rangle$ with $\rho \in R_\tau$ and $\beta \in B_\tau$.

Proof. Let $w \in \mathcal{H}_k(L_1, L_2)$. There exists some factorization $w = \gamma \alpha \beta \langle \text{mspace} | 1\text{mu} \rangle \langle \text{mspace} | -1\text{mu} \rangle \alpha \langle \text{mspace} | -1\text{mu} \rangle \langle \text{mspace} | 1\text{mu} \rangle \langle \text{mspace} |$

$1\mu\rangle\overline{\langle\text{mspace}|1\mu\rangle\gamma\langle\text{mspace}|1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace}|1\mu\rangle}$ such that $|\langle\text{mathinner}|\alpha\rangle|=k$ and there are runs as in Figure ? in the original DFAs \mathcal{A}_1 and \mathcal{A}_2 where $f'_1 \in \mathcal{F}_1$ or $f'_2 \in \mathcal{F}_2$ (or both):

$$\begin{array}{l}
L_1: \quad q_{01}\langle\text{overset}|\gamma\rangle \longrightarrow c'_1\langle\text{overset}|\alpha\rangle \longrightarrow \\
\quad d'_1\langle\text{overset}|\beta\rangle \longrightarrow e'_1\langle\text{overset}|\langle\text{mspace}| \\
\quad 1\mu\rangle\overline{\langle\text{mspace}|1\mu\rangle\alpha\langle\text{mspace}|1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace}| \\
\quad 1\mu\rangle} \longrightarrow f'_1\langle\text{overset}|\langle\text{mspace}| \\
\quad 1\mu\rangle\overline{\langle\text{mspace}|1\mu\rangle\gamma\langle\text{mspace}|1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace}| \\
\quad 1\mu\rangle} \longrightarrow q'_1, \\
\text{mspace}|1\mu\rangle\overline{\langle\text{mspace}|1\mu\rangle}L_2\langle\text{mspace}|1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace}| \\
\text{mu}\rangle: \quad q_{02}\langle\text{overset}|\gamma\rangle \longrightarrow c'_2\langle\text{overset}|\alpha\rangle \longrightarrow d'_2\langle\text{overset}|\langle\text{mspace}| \\
\quad 1\mu\rangle\overline{\langle\text{mspace}|1\mu\rangle\beta\langle\text{mspace}|1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace}| \\
\quad 1\mu\rangle} \longrightarrow e'_2\langle\text{overset}|\langle\text{mspace}| \\
\quad 1\mu\rangle\overline{\langle\text{mspace}|1\mu\rangle\alpha\langle\text{mspace}|1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace}| \\
\quad 1\mu\rangle} \longrightarrow f'_2\langle\text{overset}|\langle\text{mspace}| \\
\quad 1\mu\rangle\overline{\langle\text{mspace}|1\mu\rangle\gamma\langle\text{mspace}|1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace}| \\
\quad 1\mu\rangle} \longrightarrow q'_2
\end{array}$$

Figure 3. Some run defined by $w \in \mathcal{H}_k(L_1, L_2)$

Choosing among all these runs the length $|\langle\text{mathinner}|\langle\text{mspace}|1\mu\rangle\overline{\langle\text{mspace}|1\mu\rangle\gamma\langle\text{mspace}|1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace}|1\mu\rangle}|$ to be minimal, we see that we actually find the following picture according to Figure ?. In other words, either $\gamma\alpha\beta\langle\text{mspace}|1\mu\rangle\overline{\langle\text{mspace}|1\mu\rangle\alpha\langle\text{mspace}|1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace}|1\mu\rangle}$ is the longest prefix of w belonging to L_1 or $\alpha\beta\langle\text{mspace}|1\mu\rangle\overline{\langle\text{mspace}|1\mu\rangle\alpha\langle\text{mspace}|1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace}|1\mu\rangle}$ is the longest suffix of w belonging to L_2 , or both. The difference to the precedent figure is that between f_i and q'_i ($i = 1, 2$) we never enter a final state.

$$\begin{aligned}
L_1: \quad & q_{01} \langle \text{overset } | \gamma \rangle \longrightarrow c_1 \langle \text{overset } | \alpha \rangle \longrightarrow \\
& d_1 \langle \text{overset } | \beta \rangle \longrightarrow e_1 \langle \text{overset } | \langle \text{mspace } | \\
& 1\text{mu} \rangle \langle \text{mspace } | -1\text{mu} \rangle \alpha \langle \text{mspace } | -1\text{mu} \rangle \langle \text{mspace } | \\
& 1\text{mu} \rangle \rangle \longrightarrow f_1 \langle \text{overset } | \langle \text{mspace } | \\
& 1\text{mu} \rangle \langle \text{mspace } | -1\text{mu} \rangle \gamma \langle \text{mspace } | -1\text{mu} \rangle \langle \text{mspace } | \\
& 1\text{mu} \rangle \rangle \Longrightarrow q'_1, \\
\text{mspace } | 1\text{mu} \rangle \langle \text{mspace } | -1\text{mu} \rangle L_2 \langle \text{mspace } | -1\text{mu} \rangle \langle \text{mspace } | \\
\text{mu} \rangle: \quad & q_{02} \langle \text{overset } | \gamma \rangle \longrightarrow c_2 \langle \text{overset } | \\
& \alpha \rangle \longrightarrow d_2 \langle \text{overset } | \langle \text{mspace } | \\
& 1\text{mu} \rangle \langle \text{mspace } | -1\text{mu} \rangle \beta \langle \text{mspace } | -1\text{mu} \rangle \langle \text{mspace } | \\
& 1\text{mu} \rangle \rangle \longrightarrow e_2 \langle \text{overset } | \langle \text{mspace } | \\
& 1\text{mu} \rangle \langle \text{mspace } | -1\text{mu} \rangle \alpha \langle \text{mspace } | -1\text{mu} \rangle \langle \text{mspace } | \\
& 1\text{mu} \rangle \rangle \longrightarrow f_2 \langle \text{overset } | \langle \text{mspace } | \\
& 1\text{mu} \rangle \langle \text{mspace } | -1\text{mu} \rangle \gamma \langle \text{mspace } | -1\text{mu} \rangle \langle \text{mspace } | \\
& 1\text{mu} \rangle \rangle \Longrightarrow q'_2
\end{aligned}$$

Figure 4. The unique run defined by $w \in \mathcal{H}_k(L_1, L_2)$ with $|\langle \text{mathinner } | \langle \text{mspace } | 1\text{mu} \rangle \langle \text{mspace } | -1\text{mu} \rangle \gamma \langle \text{mspace } | -1\text{mu} \rangle \langle \text{mspace } | 1\text{mu} \rangle \rangle|$ minimal

By the definition of the NFA \mathcal{A} we see that $\rho = \gamma\alpha$ is the unique prefix of w such that $w = \rho\beta \langle \text{mspace } | 1\text{mu} \rangle \langle \text{mspace } | -1\text{mu} \rangle \rho \langle \text{mspace } | -1\text{mu} \rangle \langle \text{mspace } | 1\text{mu} \rangle$ with $\rho \in R_\tau$ and $\beta \in B_\tau$ for some τ . Now, as the length $|\langle \text{mathinner } | \langle \text{mspace } | 1\text{mu} \rangle \langle \text{mspace } | -1\text{mu} \rangle \gamma \langle \text{mspace } | -1\text{mu} \rangle \langle \text{mspace } | 1\text{mu} \rangle \rangle|$ is fixed by w , we see that all states c_i, d_i, e_i, f_i , and q'_i are uniquely defined by w for $i = 1, 2$. Thus, there is a unique $\tau \in \mathcal{I} \times \mathcal{F}$ with $w \in B_\tau^{R_\tau}$. More precisely, we have:

$$\tau = (((q_{01}, q_{02}), q'_1, q'_2, 0), ((d_1, d_2), e_1, e_2, k)). \quad \square$$

3.4 First Tests

By construction, the automaton \mathcal{A} accepts the union of the languages R_τ as defined in Lemma 8. If the accepted language is finite then all R_τ are finite and hence all $B_\tau^{R_\tau}$ are regular. This leads immediately to the following result:

Proposition 9. *It can be decided in **NL** whether or not the accepted language of the NFA \mathcal{A} is finite. If the accepted language is finite, then the hairpin completion $\mathcal{H}_k(L_1, L_2)$ is regular.*

Proof. To see that the accepted language is infinite it is enough to guess a path from an initial state to final one which uses some (guessed) state at least twice. Since **NL** is closed under complementation the finiteness test is possible in **NL**, too. The second assertion follows from Lemma 8. \square

We check this property (although strictly speaking Test 0 is redundant):

$\langle \text{macro } 1 \mid \text{body} \rangle \langle \text{test } 1: \text{body} \rangle$

For convenience we may assume in the following that \mathcal{A} accepts an infinite language and that all states are reachable from an initial bridge and lead to some final bridge.

For sake of completeness let us state another result which shows that deciding regularity of the one-sided hairpin completion is somewhat easier, because the finiteness condition is also necessary in this case. However, as we neither use this result nor does it change the **NL**-completeness of the problem, we leave the proof of Proposition ? to the interested reader.

Proposition 10. *If L_1 or L_2 is finite, but the accepted language of \mathcal{A} is infinite, then the hairpin completion $\mathcal{H}_k(L_1, L_2)$ is not regular.*

Let K be the set of non-trivial strongly connected components of the automaton \mathcal{A} (read as a directed graph). Every non-trivial strongly connected component is on level 0 and, moreover, as \mathcal{A} accepts an infinite language, there is at least one. For $\kappa \in K$ let N_κ be the number of states in the component κ . We have $N_\kappa = |\langle \text{mathinner} | \kappa \rangle| \leq n^4$.

The next lemma tells us that for a regular hairpin completion $\mathcal{H}_k(L_1, L_2)$ every strongly connected component $\kappa \in K$ is a simple cycle.

Lemma 11. *Let the hairpin completion $\mathcal{H}_k(L_1, L_2)$ be regular, $A \langle \text{overset} | v_A \rangle \rightarrow A$ be a path in a strongly connected component κ with $1 \leq |\langle \text{mathinner} | v_A \rangle| \leq N_\kappa$, and let $A \langle \text{overset} | w \rangle \rightarrow F$ be a path in \mathcal{A} from A to a final bridge F . Then the word w is a prefix of some word in v_A^+ .*

In addition, the word v_A is uniquely defined by the conditions $A \langle \text{overset} | v_A \rangle \rightarrow A$ and $1 \leq |\langle \text{mathinner} | v \rangle|_A \leq N_\kappa$. The loop $A \langle \text{overset} | v_A \rangle \rightarrow A$ visits every other state $B \in \kappa$ exactly once. Thus it builds a Hamiltonian cycle of κ and $|\langle \text{mathinner} | v_A \rangle| = N_\kappa$.

Proof. Let $A \langle \text{overset} | v \rangle \rightarrow A$ be some non-trivial loop. We see that A is on level zero. Consider a path labeled by w from A to a final bridge $F = ((p_1, p_2), q_1, q_2, k)$. By assumption, all states in \mathcal{A} are reachable from some initial state. Thus, we find a word u such that the automaton \mathcal{A} accepts $u v^i w$ for all $i \geq 0$. We see next that $u v^i w \beta \langle \text{mspace} | 1 \mu \rangle \langle \text{mspace} | -1 \mu \rangle w \langle \text{mspace} | -1 \mu \rangle \langle \text{mspace} | 1 \mu \rangle \langle \text{mspace} | 1 \mu \rangle \langle \text{mspace} | -1 \mu \rangle v \langle \text{mspace} | -1 \mu \rangle \langle \text{mspace} | 1 \mu \rangle^i \langle \text{mspace} | 1 \mu \rangle \langle \text{mspace} | -1 \mu \rangle u \langle \text{mspace} | -1 \mu \rangle \langle \text{mspace} | 1 \mu \rangle \in \mathcal{H}_k(L_1, L_2)$ for all $i \geq 0$ and all $\beta \in B(p_1, p_2, q_1, q_2)$. As $\mathcal{H}_k(L_1, L_2)$ is regular, there are $s, t \in \mathbb{N}$ with $u v^s w \beta \langle \text{mspace} | 1 \mu \rangle \langle \text{mspace} | -1 \mu \rangle w \langle \text{mspace} | -1 \mu \rangle \langle \text{mspace} | 1 \mu \rangle \langle \text{mspace} | 1 \mu \rangle \langle \text{mspace} | -1 \mu \rangle v \langle \text{mspace} | -1 \mu \rangle \langle \text{mspace} | 1 \mu \rangle^{s+t} \langle \text{mspace} | 1 \mu \rangle \langle \text{mspace} | -1 \mu \rangle u \langle \text{mspace} | -1 \mu \rangle \langle \text{mspace} | 1 \mu \rangle \in \mathcal{H}_k(L_1, L_2)$ and $t > |\langle \text{mathinner} | w \beta \rangle|$, by pumping. This means that the hairpin completion is forced to use a suffix in L_2 , because the longest prefix belonging to L_1 is too short to create the hairpin completion. Due to the definition of \mathcal{A} we conclude that $u v^s w$ must be a prefix of $u v^{s+t} w$. This implies that w is a prefix of v^t and thus the first statement of our lemma.

Let v_A be some shortest word such that $A \langle \text{overset} | v_A \rangle \rightarrow A$. Observe first that $|\langle \text{mathinner} | v_A \rangle| \leq N_\kappa$. Now, let $A \neq B \in \kappa$ and $A \langle \text{overset} | v' \rangle \rightarrow B \langle \text{overset} | v'' \rangle \rightarrow A$. For some $i, j > 0$ we have $|\langle \text{mathinner} | v_A^i \rangle| = |\langle \text{mathinner} | (v' v'')^j \rangle|$. Thus, $v_A^i = (v' v'')^j$ by the first statement. By the unique-path-property stated in Lemma 7 we obtain that the loop $A \langle \text{overset} | (v' v'')^j \rangle \rightarrow A$ just uses the shortest loop $A \langle \text{overset} | v_A \rangle \rightarrow A$ several times. In particular, B is on the shortest loop around A . This yields $|\langle \text{mathinner} | v_A \rangle| \geq N_\kappa$ and hence the second statement. \square

Example 12. *In the example given in Figure 2 the state $(Q_0, t_1, t_2, 0)$ forms the only strongly connected component and the corresponding path is labeled with a . As one can easily observe the automaton \mathcal{A} satisfies the properties stated in Lemma 11 (even though the hairpin completion is not regular).*

Due to the technique of single-valued non-deterministic log-space transductions we may assume that the set of non-trivial strongly connected components K is part of the input. Moreover, for each state A and $\kappa \in K$ we know whether or not $A \in \kappa$, and we know $N_\kappa = |\langle \text{mathinner} | \kappa \rangle|$.

The next test tries to falsify the property of Lemma 11. Hence it gives a sufficient condition that $\mathcal{H}_k(L_1, L_2)$ is not regular.

Test 1: *body*

The correctness of Test 1 follows by Lemma 11 and, because for the existence of paths 1.) and 2.) we only have to remember the triple (A, a, m) , Test 1 can be performed in **NL**.

Remark 13. *We can perform Test 1 in **NL** and in case it yields that the hairpin completion $\mathcal{H}_k(L_1, L_2)$ is not regular, we can stop. Henceforth, we assume that the algorithm did not stop during Test 1 and that every strongly connected component $\kappa \in K$ is a simple cycle. Performing another single-valued non-deterministic log-space transduction we may assume that for each $A \in \kappa$ the word v_A is attached to A and each v_A is part of the input.*

3.5 Second and Third Test

We fix a bridge $A = ((p_1, p_2), q_1, q_2)$ in a strongly connected component. We let $v = v_A$ as defined in Lemma 11 and let α be the prefix of length k of some long enough word in v^+ . (By Remark 13 the word v is written in plain form on the input tape.) By u we denote some word leading from an initial bridge to A . (The **NL** algorithm does not know u , but it knows that it exists.) The main idea is to investigate runs through the DFAs for L_1 and L_2 where $s, t \geq n$ according to Figure 3. Recall that n refers to the original input size, thus $n \geq |\langle \text{mathinner} | Q_i \rangle|$ for $i = 1, 2$.

L_1 :

$$q_{01} \langle \text{overset}|u \rangle \longrightarrow p_1 \langle \text{overset}|v^s \rangle \longrightarrow p_1 \langle \text{overset}|x \rangle \longrightarrow$$

$$\langle \text{mspace}|1\text{mu} \rangle \overline{\langle \text{mspace}|1\text{mu} \rangle L_2 \langle \text{mspace}|1\text{mu} \rangle} \langle \text{mspace}|1\text{mu} \rangle: \quad q_{02} \langle \text{overset}|u \rangle \longrightarrow p_2 \langle \text{overset}|v^t \rangle \longrightarrow p_2 \langle \text{overset}|\alpha \rangle \longrightarrow$$

We investigate the case where $u \ v^s \ x \ y \langle \text{mspace}|1\text{mu} \rangle \overline{\langle \text{mspace}|1\text{mu} \rangle \alpha \langle \text{mspace}|1\text{mu} \rangle} \langle \text{mspace}|1\text{mu} \rangle \langle \text{mspace}|1\text{mu} \rangle \overline{\langle \text{mspace}|1\text{mu} \rangle v \langle \text{mspace}|1\text{mu} \rangle} \langle \text{mspace}|1\text{mu} \rangle^t \langle \text{mspace}|1\text{mu} \rangle \overline{\langle \text{mspace}|1\text{mu} \rangle u \langle \text{mspace}|1\text{mu} \rangle} \langle \text{mspace}|1\text{mu} \rangle \in \mathcal{H}_k(L_1, L_2)$ for all $s \geq t$ and where (by symmetry) this property is due to the longest prefix belonging to L_1 (hence $e_1 \in \mathcal{F}_1$).

The following lemma is rather technical. The notations are however chosen to fit exactly to Figure ?.

Lemma 14. *Let $x, y \in \Sigma^*$ be words and $(d_1, d_2) \in \mathcal{Q}_1 \times \mathcal{Q}_2$ with the following properties:*

1. $\alpha \leq x$ and $x < v\alpha$.
2. $y \in B(c_1, c_2, d_1, d_2)$, where $c_1 = p_1 \cdot x$ and $c_2 = p_2 \cdot \alpha$, and x is the longest common prefix of $x y$ and $v\alpha$.
3. $e_1 = d_1 \cdot \langle \text{mspace}|1\text{mu} \rangle \overline{\langle \text{mspace}|1\text{mu} \rangle \alpha \langle \text{mspace}|1\text{mu} \rangle} \langle \text{mspace}|1\text{mu} \rangle \in \mathcal{F}_1$ is a final state, $q_1 = e_1 \cdot \langle \text{mspace}|1\text{mu} \rangle \overline{\langle \text{mspace}|1\text{mu} \rangle v \langle \text{mspace}|1\text{mu} \rangle} \langle \text{mspace}|1\text{mu} \rangle^n$, and during the computation of $e_1 \cdot \langle \text{mspace}|1\text{mu} \rangle \overline{\langle \text{mspace}|1\text{mu} \rangle v \langle \text{mspace}|1\text{mu} \rangle} \langle \text{mspace}|1\text{mu} \rangle^n$ we do not enter a final state in \mathcal{F}_1 .

4. $e_2 = d_2 \cdot \langle \text{mspace} | 1\text{mu} \rangle \overline{\langle \text{mspace} | -1\text{mu} \rangle x \langle \text{mspace} | -1\text{mu} \rangle \langle \text{mspace} | 1\text{mu} \rangle}$
 and $q_2 = e_2 \cdot \langle \text{mspace} | 1\text{mu} \rangle \overline{\langle \text{mspace} | -1\text{mu} \rangle v \langle \text{mspace} | -1\text{mu} \rangle \langle \text{mspace} | 1\text{mu} \rangle}^n$. Moreover, during the computation of $e_2 \cdot \langle \text{mspace} | 1\text{mu} \rangle \overline{\langle \text{mspace} | -1\text{mu} \rangle v \langle \text{mspace} | -1\text{mu} \rangle \langle \text{mspace} | 1\text{mu} \rangle}^n$ we do not enter a final state in \mathcal{F}_2 (but $e_2 \in \mathcal{F}_2$ is possible).

If $\mathcal{H}_k(L_1, L_2)$ is regular, then there exists a factorization $x y \langle \text{mspace} | 1\text{mu} \rangle \overline{\langle \text{mspace} | -1\text{mu} \rangle \alpha \langle \text{mspace} | -1\text{mu} \rangle \langle \text{mspace} | 1\text{mu} \rangle \langle \text{mspace} | 1\text{mu} \rangle \overline{\langle \text{mspace} | -1\text{mu} \rangle v \langle \text{mspace} | -1\text{mu} \rangle \langle \text{mspace} | 1\text{mu} \rangle} = \mu \delta \beta \langle \text{mspace} | 1\text{mu} \rangle \overline{\langle \text{mspace} | -1\text{mu} \rangle \delta \langle \text{mspace} | -1\text{mu} \rangle \langle \text{mspace} | 1\text{mu} \rangle \langle \text{mspace} | 1\text{mu} \rangle \overline{\langle \text{mspace} | -1\text{mu} \rangle \mu \langle \text{mspace} | -1\text{mu} \rangle \langle \text{mspace} | 1\text{mu} \rangle}$ where $|\langle \text{mspace} | 1\text{mu} \rangle \overline{\langle \text{mspace} | -1\text{mu} \rangle \mu \langle \text{mspace} | -1\text{mu} \rangle \langle \text{mspace} | 1\text{mu} \rangle \overline{\langle \text{mspace} | -1\text{mu} \rangle \beta \langle \text{mspace} | -1\text{mu} \rangle \langle \text{mspace} | 1\text{mu} \rangle} \in \mathcal{F}_2$ (which implies $\delta \beta \langle \text{mspace} | 1\text{mu} \rangle \overline{\langle \text{mspace} | -1\text{mu} \rangle \delta \langle \text{mspace} | -1\text{mu} \rangle \langle \text{mspace} | 1\text{mu} \rangle \langle \text{mspace} | 1\text{mu} \rangle \overline{\langle \text{mspace} | -1\text{mu} \rangle \mu \langle \text{mspace} | -1\text{mu} \rangle \langle \text{mspace} | 1\text{mu} \rangle \langle \text{mspace} | 1\text{mu} \rangle \overline{\langle \text{mspace} | -1\text{mu} \rangle v \langle \text{mspace} | -1\text{mu} \rangle \langle \text{mspace} | 1\text{mu} \rangle}^* \langle \text{mspace} | 1\text{mu} \rangle \overline{\langle \text{mspace} | -1\text{mu} \rangle u \langle \text{mspace} | -1\text{mu} \rangle \langle \text{mspace} | 1\text{mu} \rangle} \subseteq L_2$).

Proof. The conditions imply that $u v^s x y \langle \text{mspace} | 1\text{mu} \rangle \overline{\langle \text{mspace} | -1\text{mu} \rangle \alpha \langle \text{mspace} | -1\text{mu} \rangle \langle \text{mspace} | 1\text{mu} \rangle \langle \text{mspace} | 1\text{mu} \rangle \overline{\langle \text{mspace} | -1\text{mu} \rangle v \langle \text{mspace} | -1\text{mu} \rangle \langle \text{mspace} | 1\text{mu} \rangle}^t \langle \text{mspace} | 1\text{mu} \rangle \overline{\langle \text{mspace} | -1\text{mu} \rangle u \langle \text{mspace} | -1\text{mu} \rangle \langle \text{mspace} | 1\text{mu} \rangle} \in \mathcal{H}_k(L_1, L_2)$ for all $s \geq t \geq n$. Moreover, by 3.) the hairpin completion can be achieved with a prefix in L_1 and the longest prefix of $u v^s x y \langle \text{mspace} | 1\text{mu} \rangle \overline{\langle \text{mspace} | -1\text{mu} \rangle \alpha \langle \text{mspace} | -1\text{mu} \rangle \langle \text{mspace} | 1\text{mu} \rangle \langle \text{mspace} | 1\text{mu} \rangle \overline{\langle \text{mspace} | -1\text{mu} \rangle v \langle \text{mspace} | -1\text{mu} \rangle \langle \text{mspace} | 1\text{mu} \rangle}^t \langle \text{mspace} | 1\text{mu} \rangle \overline{\langle \text{mspace} | -1\text{mu} \rangle u \langle \text{mspace} | -1\text{mu} \rangle \langle \text{mspace} | 1\text{mu} \rangle}$ belonging to L_1 is $u v^s x y \langle \text{mspace} | 1\text{mu} \rangle \overline{\langle \text{mspace} | -1\text{mu} \rangle \alpha \langle \text{mspace} | -1\text{mu} \rangle \langle \text{mspace} | 1\text{mu} \rangle}$.

If $\mathcal{H}_k(L_1, L_2)$ is regular, then we have $u v^s x y \langle \text{mspace} | 1\text{mu} \rangle \overline{\langle \text{mspace} | -1\text{mu} \rangle \alpha \langle \text{mspace} | -1\text{mu} \rangle \langle \text{mspace} | 1\text{mu} \rangle \langle \text{mspace} | 1\text{mu} \rangle \overline{\langle \text{mspace} | -1\text{mu} \rangle v \langle \text{mspace} | -1\text{mu} \rangle \langle \text{mspace} | 1\text{mu} \rangle}^{s+1} \langle \text{mspace} | 1\text{mu} \rangle \overline{\langle \text{mspace} | -1\text{mu} \rangle u \langle \text{mspace} | -1\text{mu} \rangle \langle \text{mspace} | 1\text{mu} \rangle} \in \mathcal{H}_k(L_1, L_2)$, too, as soon as s is large enough, by a simple pumping argument. For this hairpin completion we must use a suffix belonging to L_2 . For $y = 1$ this follows from $x < v\alpha$. For $y \neq 1$ we use $x < v\alpha$ and additionally that the word $x a$ with $a = y(1)$ is not a prefix of $v\alpha$.

By 4.) the longest suffix of $u v^s x y \langle \text{mspace} | 1\text{mu} \rangle \overline{\langle \text{mspace} | -1\text{mu} \rangle \alpha \langle \text{mspace} | -1\text{mu} \rangle \langle \text{mspace} | 1\text{mu} \rangle \langle \text{mspace} | 1\text{mu} \rangle \overline{\langle \text{mspace} | -1\text{mu} \rangle v \langle \text{mspace} | -1\text{mu} \rangle \langle \text{mspace} | 1\text{mu} \rangle}^{s+1} \langle \text{mspace} | 1\text{mu} \rangle \overline{\langle \text{mspace} | -1\text{mu} \rangle u \langle \text{mspace} | -1\text{mu} \rangle \langle \text{mspace} | 1\text{mu} \rangle}$ belonging to L_2 is a suffix of $x y \langle \text{mspace} | 1\text{mu} \rangle \overline{\langle \text{mspace} | -1\text{mu} \rangle \alpha \langle \text{mspace} | -1\text{mu} \rangle \langle \text{mspace} | 1\text{mu} \rangle}$.

$1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace}|1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace}|-1\mu\rangle v\langle\text{mspace}|-1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace}|1\mu\rangle^{s+1}\langle\text{mspace}|1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace}|-1\mu\rangle u\langle\text{mspace}|-1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace}|1\mu\rangle$. Thus, we can write

$$\begin{aligned} u v^s x y \langle\text{mspace} \quad | \quad 1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace}|-1\mu\rangle\alpha\langle\text{mspace}|-1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace} \quad | \quad 1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace} \quad | \quad 1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace}|-1\mu\rangle v\langle\text{mspace}|-1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace} \quad | \quad 1\mu\rangle^{s+1}\langle\text{mspace} \quad | \quad 1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace}|-1\mu\rangle u\langle\text{mspace}|-1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace} \quad | \quad 1\mu\rangle = u v^s x y \langle\text{mspace} \quad | \quad 1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace}|-1\mu\rangle\alpha\langle\text{mspace}|-1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace} \quad | \quad 1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace} \quad | \quad 1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace}|-1\mu\rangle v\langle\text{mspace}|-1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace} \quad | \quad 1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace} \quad | \quad 1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace}|-1\mu\rangle v\langle\text{mspace}|-1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace} \quad | \quad 1\mu\rangle^s\langle\text{mspace} \quad | \quad 1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace}|-1\mu\rangle u\langle\text{mspace}|-1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace} \quad | \quad 1\mu\rangle = u v^s \mu\delta\beta\langle\text{mspace} \quad | \quad 1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace}|-1\mu\rangle\delta\langle\text{mspace}|-1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace} \quad | \quad 1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace} \quad | \quad 1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace}|-1\mu\rangle\mu\langle\text{mspace}|-1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace} \quad | \quad 1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace} \quad | \quad 1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace}|-1\mu\rangle v\langle\text{mspace}|-1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace} \quad | \quad 1\mu\rangle^s\langle\text{mspace} \quad | \quad 1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace}|-1\mu\rangle u\langle\text{mspace}|-1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace}|1\mu\rangle \end{aligned}$$

where $\delta\beta\langle\text{mspace} \quad | \quad 1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace}|-1\mu\rangle\delta\langle\text{mspace}|-1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace} \quad | \quad 1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace} \quad | \quad 1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace}|-1\mu\rangle\mu\langle\text{mspace}|-1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace} \quad | \quad 1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace} \quad | \quad 1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace}|-1\mu\rangle v\langle\text{mspace}|-1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace} \quad | \quad 1\mu\rangle^s\langle\text{mspace} \quad | \quad 1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace}|-1\mu\rangle u\langle\text{mspace}|-1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace} \quad | \quad 1\mu\rangle \in L_2$ and $|\langle\text{mspace} \quad | \quad 1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace}|-1\mu\rangle\delta\langle\text{mspace}|-1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace} \quad | \quad 1\mu\rangle| = k$. We obtain $x y \langle\text{mspace}|1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace}|-1\mu\rangle\alpha\langle\text{mspace}|-1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace}|1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace} \quad | \quad 1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace}|-1\mu\rangle v\langle\text{mspace}|-1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace} \quad | \quad 1\mu\rangle = \mu\delta\beta\langle\text{mspace} \quad | \quad 1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace}|-1\mu\rangle\delta\langle\text{mspace}|-1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace} \quad | \quad 1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace} \quad | \quad 1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace}|-1\mu\rangle\mu\langle\text{mspace}|-1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace}|1\mu\rangle$.

(Recall that our second DFA \mathcal{A}_2 accepts $\langle\text{mspace} \quad | \quad 1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace}|-1\mu\rangle L_2 \langle\text{mspace}|-1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace} \quad | \quad 1\mu\rangle$.) Hence, as $p_2 = q_{02} \cdot u$ and $p_2 = p_2 \cdot v$, we see that $p_2 \cdot \mu\delta\langle\text{mspace} \quad | \quad 1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace}|-1\mu\rangle\beta\langle\text{mspace}|-1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace} \quad | \quad 1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace} \quad | \quad 1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace}|-1\mu\rangle\delta\langle\text{mspace}|-1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace}|1\mu\rangle \in \mathcal{F}_2$.

We conclude as desired: if $\mathcal{H}_k(L_1, L_2)$ is regular, then $p_2 \cdot \mu\delta\langle\text{mspace} \quad | \quad 1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace}|-1\mu\rangle\beta\langle\text{mspace}|-1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace} \quad | \quad 1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace} \quad | \quad 1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace}|-1\mu\rangle\delta\langle\text{mspace}|-1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace}|1\mu\rangle \in \mathcal{F}_2$. \square

Example 15. Let us take a look at Figure 2 again. Let $A = (Q_0, t_1, t_2, 0)$, $v = a$ and $u = 1$. If we choose $x = a$, $y = \langle\text{mspace} \quad | \quad 1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace}|-1\mu\rangle b\langle\text{mspace}|-1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace} \quad | \quad 1\mu\rangle$ and $(d_1, d_2) = (p_1, p_2)$ we can see, that conditions 1.) to 4.) of Lemma 14 are satisfied but there is no factorization $a\langle\text{mspace}|1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace}|-1\mu\rangle b\langle\text{mspace}|-1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace} \quad | \quad 1\mu\rangle$

$1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace} \mid 1\mu\rangle\overline{\langle\text{mspace} \mid -1\mu\rangle a \langle\text{mspace} \mid -1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace} \mid 1\mu\rangle} =$
 $\mu\delta\beta\langle\text{mspace} \mid 1\mu\rangle\overline{\langle\text{mspace} \mid -1\mu\rangle\delta\langle\text{mspace} \mid -1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace} \mid 1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace} \mid 1\mu\rangle} =$
 $\mu\delta\beta\langle\text{mspace} \mid 1\mu\rangle\overline{\langle\text{mspace} \mid -1\mu\rangle\mu\langle\text{mspace} \mid -1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace} \mid 1\mu\rangle}$ with $|\langle\text{mathinner} \mid \delta\rangle| = k$ such that $\delta\beta\langle\text{mspace} \mid 1\mu\rangle\overline{\langle\text{mspace} \mid -1\mu\rangle\delta\langle\text{mspace} \mid -1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace} \mid 1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace} \mid 1\mu\rangle} =$
 $\mu\delta\beta\langle\text{mspace} \mid 1\mu\rangle\overline{\langle\text{mspace} \mid -1\mu\rangle\mu\langle\text{mspace} \mid -1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace} \mid 1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace} \mid 1\mu\rangle} =$
 $1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace} \mid -1\mu\rangle u \langle\text{mspace} \mid -1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace} \mid 1\mu\rangle \in L_2$. Hence, the hairpin completion is not regular.

The next lemma yields another sufficient condition that $\mathcal{H}_k(L_1, L_2)$ is not regular.

Lemma 16. *The existence of words $x, y \in \Sigma^*$ and states $(d_1, d_2) \in Q_1 \times Q_2$ satisfying 1.) to 4.) of Lemma 14, but where for all factorizations $x y \langle\text{mspace} \mid 1\mu\rangle\overline{\langle\text{mspace} \mid -1\mu\rangle\alpha\langle\text{mspace} \mid -1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace} \mid 1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace} \mid 1\mu\rangle\overline{\langle\text{mspace} \mid -1\mu\rangle v \langle\text{mspace} \mid -1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace} \mid 1\mu\rangle} =$
 $\mu\delta\beta\langle\text{mspace} \mid 1\mu\rangle\overline{\langle\text{mspace} \mid -1\mu\rangle\delta\langle\text{mspace} \mid -1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace} \mid 1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace} \mid 1\mu\rangle\overline{\langle\text{mspace} \mid -1\mu\rangle\mu\langle\text{mspace} \mid -1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace} \mid 1\mu\rangle}$ we have $p_2 \cdot$
 $\mu\delta\langle\text{mspace} \mid 1\mu\rangle\overline{\langle\text{mspace} \mid -1\mu\rangle\beta\langle\text{mspace} \mid -1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace} \mid 1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace} \mid 1\mu\rangle\overline{\langle\text{mspace} \mid -1\mu\rangle\delta\langle\text{mspace} \mid -1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace} \mid 1\mu\rangle} \notin \mathcal{F}_2$ can be decided in **NL**.*

Proof. It is enough to perform either Test 2 or 3 below (non-deterministically chosen) and to prove the **NL**performance of these tests. The tests distinguish whether the word y is empty or non-empty.

Test 1: $\text{body}\rangle\rangle$

Test 1: $\text{body}\rangle\rangle$

The correctness of both tests follows by Lemma 14 and they can be performed as follows: For both tests we guess the length of a word x which satisfies 1.) and which is therefore a prefix of $v\alpha$. Thus we can remember x , because $v\alpha$ is available by the input. We guess states $(d_1, d_2) \in Q_1 \times Q_2$, and verify that conditions 3.) and 4.) hold, which is easy because we can reconstruct x . For Test 2 we check that $p_1 \cdot x = d_1$ and $p_2 \cdot \alpha = d_2$. Then we have to test whether for all factorizations $x \langle\text{mspace} \mid 1\mu\rangle\overline{\langle\text{mspace} \mid -1\mu\rangle\alpha\langle\text{mspace} \mid -1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace} \mid 1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace} \mid 1\mu\rangle\overline{\langle\text{mspace} \mid -1\mu\rangle v \langle\text{mspace} \mid -1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace} \mid 1\mu\rangle} =$
 $\mu\delta\beta\langle\text{mspace} \mid 1\mu\rangle\overline{\langle\text{mspace} \mid -1\mu\rangle\delta\langle\text{mspace} \mid -1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace} \mid 1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace} \mid 1\mu\rangle\overline{\langle\text{mspace} \mid -1\mu\rangle\mu\langle\text{mspace} \mid -1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace} \mid 1\mu\rangle}$ with $|\langle\text{mathinner} \mid \delta\rangle| = k$ the condition $p_2 \cdot \mu\delta\langle\text{mspace} \mid 1\mu\rangle\overline{\langle\text{mspace} \mid -1\mu\rangle\beta\langle\text{mspace} \mid -1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace} \mid 1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace} \mid 1\mu\rangle\overline{\langle\text{mspace} \mid -1\mu\rangle\delta\langle\text{mspace} \mid -1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace} \mid 1\mu\rangle} \notin \mathcal{F}_2$ holds. This can easily be done in **NL** because we have full access to the word

$x\langle\text{mspace} \mid 1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace}\mid-1\mu\rangle\alpha\langle\text{mspace}\mid-1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace} \mid 1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace} \mid 1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace}\mid-1\mu\rangle v\langle\text{mspace}\mid-1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace}\mid 1\mu\rangle$.

Test 3 is a bit more tricky. We guess $a \in \Sigma$ and we check that xa is not a prefix of $v\alpha$. We have to verify that a path from c_1 to d_1 exists which is labelled by some non-empty word $y \in a\Sigma^*$ and that a path from c_2 to d_2 exists which is labelled by $\langle\text{mspace}\mid 1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace}\mid-1\mu\rangle y\langle\text{mspace}\mid-1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace}\mid 1\mu\rangle$. This can be achieved by a graph reachability algorithm which uses forward edges in the DFA of L_1 and simultaneously uses backwards edges in the DFA of $\langle\text{mspace}\mid 1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace}\mid-1\mu\rangle L_2 \langle\text{mspace}\mid-1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace}\mid 1\mu\rangle$. Now, in a factorization $xy\langle\text{mspace}\mid 1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace}\mid-1\mu\rangle\alpha\langle\text{mspace}\mid-1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace}\mid 1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace} \mid 1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace}\mid-1\mu\rangle v\langle\text{mspace}\mid-1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace} \mid 1\mu\rangle = \mu\delta\beta\langle\text{mspace} \mid 1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace}\mid-1\mu\rangle\delta\langle\text{mspace}\mid-1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace} \mid 1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace} \mid 1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace}\mid-1\mu\rangle\mu\langle\text{mspace}\mid-1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace} \mid 1\mu\rangle$ we cannot have that x is a proper prefix of $\mu\delta$ otherwise xa would be a prefix of $v\alpha$. But this was excluded by the choice of a . Thus, $\mu\delta$ is a prefix of x and $\langle\text{mspace} \mid 1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace}\mid-1\mu\rangle\delta\langle\text{mspace}\mid-1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace} \mid 1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace} \mid 1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace}\mid-1\mu\rangle\mu\langle\text{mspace}\mid-1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace} \mid 1\mu\rangle$ is a suffix of $\langle\text{mspace} \mid 1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace}\mid-1\mu\rangle x\langle\text{mspace}\mid-1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace} \mid 1\mu\rangle$. This means, to ensure that there is no factorization with $p_2 \cdot \mu\delta\langle\text{mspace} \mid 1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace}\mid-1\mu\rangle\beta\langle\text{mspace}\mid-1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace} \mid 1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace} \mid 1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace}\mid-1\mu\rangle\delta\langle\text{mspace}\mid-1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace} \mid 1\mu\rangle \in \mathcal{F}_2$, we do not need to remember the word y . We just compute $d_2 \cdot \langle\text{mspace} \mid 1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace}\mid-1\mu\rangle x\langle\text{mspace}\mid-1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace}\mid 1\mu\rangle$ and during this computation we validate that there are no final states in \mathcal{F}_2 after k or more steps. \square

We claim that, if all three tests did not yield that the hairpin completion $\mathcal{H}_k(L_1, L_2)$ is not regular, then the hairpin completion is indeed regular. This will complete the proof of Theorem 1.

Lemma 17. *Suppose no outcome of Tests 1, 2, and 3 is “not regular”. Then the hairpin completion $\mathcal{H}_k(L_1, L_2)$ is regular.*

Proof. Let $\pi \in \mathcal{H}_k(L_1, L_2)$. Write $\pi = \gamma\alpha\beta\langle\text{mspace} \mid 1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace}\mid-1\mu\rangle\alpha\langle\text{mspace}\mid-1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace} \mid 1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace} \mid 1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace}\mid-1\mu\rangle\gamma\langle\text{mspace}\mid-1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace} \mid 1\mu\rangle$ with $|\langle\text{mathinner}{\mid \gamma}\rangle|$ minimal such that either $\gamma\alpha\beta\langle\text{mspace} \mid 1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace}\mid-1\mu\rangle\alpha\langle\text{mspace}\mid-1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace} \mid 1\mu\rangle \in L_1$ or $\alpha\beta\langle\text{mspace} \mid 1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace}\mid-1\mu\rangle\alpha\langle\text{mspace}\mid-1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace} \mid 1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace} \mid 1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace}\mid-1\mu\rangle\gamma\langle\text{mspace}\mid-1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace}\mid 1\mu\rangle \in L_2$. By symmetry we assume $\gamma\alpha\beta\langle\text{mspace} \mid 1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace}\mid-1\mu\rangle\alpha\langle\text{mspace}\mid-1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace} \mid 1\mu\rangle \in L_1$. We may also assume that $|\langle\text{mathinner}{\mid \gamma}\rangle| > 2n^4$ (cf. Proposition 9 and Test 0). We can factorize $\gamma = uvw$ with $|\langle\text{mathinner}{\mid uv}\rangle| \leq n^4$ and $1 \leq |\langle\text{mathinner}{\mid v}\rangle| \leq |\langle\text{mathinner}{\mid w}\rangle|$ such that there are runs as in Figure 6.

L_1 :

$$q_{01} \langle \text{overset}{u} \rangle \longrightarrow p_1 \langle \text{overset}{v} \rangle \longrightarrow p_1 \langle \text{overset}{w\alpha\beta} \rangle$$

$$\langle \text{mspace} | 1\mu \rangle \overline{\langle \text{mspace} | -1\mu \rangle L_2 \langle \text{mspace} | -1\mu \rangle} \langle \text{mspace} | 1\mu \rangle : \quad q_{02} \langle \text{overset}{u} \rangle \longrightarrow p_2 \langle \text{overset}{v} \rangle \longrightarrow p_2 \langle \text{overset}{w\alpha} \rangle$$

Figure 6. Runs through \mathcal{A}_1 and \mathcal{A}_2

We infer from Test 1 that $w\alpha$ is a prefix of some word in v^+ . We may assume that $w \in v^+$ by adjusting the choices of u , v , and w . (Possibly, u gets longer but it is still shorter than n^4 , v is transposed, and w gets shorter.)

Hence, we can write $w\alpha\beta = v^m x y$ with $m \geq 0$ such that $v^m x$ is the maximal common prefix of $w\alpha\beta$ and some word in v^+ with $\alpha \leq x < v\alpha$.

We see that for some $s \geq t \geq 0$ we can write

$$\pi = u v^s x y \langle \text{mspace} | 1\mu \rangle \overline{\langle \text{mspace} | -1\mu \rangle \alpha \langle \text{mspace} | -1\mu \rangle} \langle \text{mspace} | 1\mu \rangle \langle \text{mspace} | 1\mu \rangle \overline{\langle \text{mspace} | -1\mu \rangle v \langle \text{mspace} | -1\mu \rangle} \langle \text{mspace} | 1\mu \rangle^t \langle \text{mspace} | 1\mu \rangle \overline{\langle \text{mspace} | -1\mu \rangle u \langle \text{mspace} | -1\mu \rangle} \langle \text{mspace} | 1\mu \rangle.$$

Moreover, $u v^s x y \langle \text{mspace} \mid 1\mu \rangle \langle \text{mspace} \mid -1\mu \rangle \alpha \langle \text{mspace} \mid -1\mu \rangle \langle \text{mspace} \mid 1\mu \rangle \langle \text{mspace} \mid 1\mu \rangle \langle \text{mspace} \mid -1\mu \rangle \langle \text{mspace} \mid -1\mu \rangle v \langle \text{mspace} \mid -1\mu \rangle \langle \text{mspace} \mid 1\mu \rangle^t \langle \text{mspace} \mid 1\mu \rangle \langle \text{mspace} \mid -1\mu \rangle u \langle \text{mspace} \mid -1\mu \rangle \langle \text{mspace} \mid 1\mu \rangle \in \mathcal{H}_k(L_1, L_2)$ for all $s \geq t \geq 0$. There are only finitely many choices for u, v, x (due to the lengths bounds) and for each of them there is a regular set R_y associated to the finite collection of bridges such that

$$\pi \in \prec \subseteq \mathcal{H}_k(L_1, L_2).$$

More precisely, we can choose $R_y = \{\langle \text{mathinner}[1] \rangle\}$ for $y = 1$, and otherwise we can choose

$$R_y \in \prec.$$

Note that the sets \prec are not regular, in general. If we bound however the exponent t by n , then the finite union

$$\bigcup_{0 \leq t \leq n} \prec$$

becomes regular. Thus, we may assume that $t > n$. Let $e_2 = p_2 \cdot \alpha \langle \text{mspace} \mid 1\mu \rangle \langle \text{mspace} \mid -1\mu \rangle y \langle \text{mspace} \mid -1\mu \rangle \langle \text{mspace} \mid 1\mu \rangle \langle \text{mspace} \mid 1\mu \rangle \langle \text{mspace} \mid -1\mu \rangle \langle \text{mspace} \mid -1\mu \rangle x \langle \text{mspace} \mid -1\mu \rangle \langle \text{mspace} \mid 1\mu \rangle$. We have $e_2 \cdot \langle \text{mspace} \mid 1\mu \rangle \langle \text{mspace} \mid -1\mu \rangle v \langle \text{mspace} \mid -1\mu \rangle \langle \text{mspace} \mid 1\mu \rangle^n = q_2$ and, if there is a final state during the computation of $e_2 \cdot \langle \text{mspace} \mid 1\mu \rangle \langle \text{mspace} \mid -1\mu \rangle v \langle \text{mspace} \mid -1\mu \rangle \langle \text{mspace} \mid 1\mu \rangle^n$, then for all $t \geq s \geq n$ and $y \in R_y$ we have that $u v^s x y \langle \text{mspace} \mid 1\mu \rangle \langle \text{mspace} \mid -1\mu \rangle \alpha \langle \text{mspace} \mid -1\mu \rangle \langle \text{mspace} \mid 1\mu \rangle \langle \text{mspace} \mid 1\mu \rangle \langle \text{mspace} \mid -1\mu \rangle \langle \text{mspace} \mid -1\mu \rangle v \langle \text{mspace} \mid -1\mu \rangle \langle \text{mspace} \mid 1\mu \rangle^t \langle \text{mspace} \mid 1\mu \rangle \langle \text{mspace} \mid -1\mu \rangle u \langle \text{mspace} \mid -1\mu \rangle \langle \text{mspace} \mid 1\mu \rangle \in \mathcal{H}_k(L_1, L_2)$, due to a suffix in L_2 , and $u v^n v^+ x R_y \langle \text{mspace} \mid 1\mu \rangle \langle \text{mspace} \mid -1\mu \rangle \alpha \langle \text{mspace} \mid -1\mu \rangle \langle \text{mspace} \mid 1\mu \rangle \langle \text{mspace} \mid 1\mu \rangle \langle \text{mspace} \mid -1\mu \rangle \langle \text{mspace} \mid -1\mu \rangle v \langle \text{mspace} \mid -1\mu \rangle \langle \text{mspace} \mid 1\mu \rangle^+ \langle \text{mspace} \mid 1\mu \rangle \langle \text{mspace} \mid -1\mu \rangle v \langle \text{mspace} \mid -1\mu \rangle \langle \text{mspace} \mid 1\mu \rangle^n \langle \text{mspace} \mid 1\mu \rangle \langle \text{mspace} \mid -1\mu \rangle u \langle \text{mspace} \mid -1\mu \rangle \langle \text{mspace} \mid 1\mu \rangle \subseteq \mathcal{H}_k(L_1, L_2)$.

Otherwise Test 2 or 3 tells us that for all $y \in R_y$ the word $x y \langle \text{mspace} \mid 1\mu \rangle \langle \text{mspace} \mid -1\mu \rangle \alpha \langle \text{mspace} \mid -1\mu \rangle \langle \text{mspace} \mid 1\mu \rangle \langle \text{mspace} \mid 1\mu \rangle \langle \text{mspace} \mid -1\mu \rangle v \langle \text{mspace} \mid -1\mu \rangle \langle \text{mspace} \mid 1\mu \rangle$ has a factorization $\mu \delta \nu \langle \text{mspace} \mid 1\mu \rangle \langle \text{mspace} \mid -1\mu \rangle \delta \langle \text{mspace} \mid -1\mu \rangle \langle \text{mspace} \mid 1\mu \rangle \langle \text{mspace} \mid 1\mu \rangle \langle \text{mspace} \mid -1\mu \rangle \mu \langle \text{mspace} \mid -1\mu \rangle \langle \text{mspace} \mid 1\mu \rangle$ such that $|\langle \text{mathinner}[\delta] \rangle| = k$ and $p_2 \cdot \mu \delta \langle \text{mspace} \mid 1\mu \rangle \langle \text{mspace} \mid -1\mu \rangle \nu \langle \text{mspace} \mid -1\mu \rangle \langle \text{mspace} \mid 1\mu \rangle \langle \text{mspace} \mid 1\mu \rangle \langle \text{mspace} \mid -1\mu \rangle \delta \langle \text{mspace} \mid -1\mu \rangle \langle \text{mspace} \mid 1\mu \rangle \in \mathcal{F}_2$. The paths $q_{02} \cdot u = p_2$ and $p_2 \cdot v = p_2$ yield $\delta \nu \langle \text{mspace} \mid 1\mu \rangle \langle \text{mspace} \mid -1\mu \rangle \delta \langle \text{mspace} \mid -1\mu \rangle \langle \text{mspace} \mid 1\mu \rangle \langle \text{mspace} \mid 1\mu \rangle \langle \text{mspace} \mid -1\mu \rangle \mu \langle \text{mspace} \mid -1\mu \rangle \langle \text{mspace} \mid 1\mu \rangle \langle \text{mspace} \mid 1\mu \rangle \langle \text{mspace} \mid -1\mu \rangle \langle \text{mspace} \mid 1\mu \rangle$.

$1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace}|1\mu\rangle v\langle\text{mspace}|1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace}|1\mu\rangle^*\langle\text{mspace}|1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace}|1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace}|1\mu\rangle u\langle\text{mspace}|1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace}|1\mu\rangle\subseteq L_2$ and, again,
 $u v^n v^+ x R_y\langle\text{mspace}|1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace}|1\mu\rangle\alpha\langle\text{mspace}|1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace}|1\mu\rangle^+\langle\text{mspace}|1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace}|1\mu\rangle v\langle\text{mspace}|1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace}|1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace}|1\mu\rangle^n\langle\text{mspace}|1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace}|1\mu\rangle u\langle\text{mspace}|1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace}|1\mu\rangle\subseteq \mathcal{H}_k(L_1, L_2)$.

The hairpin completion $\mathcal{H}_k(L_1, L_2)$ is a finite union of regular languages and hence it is regular itself. \square

4 Conclusion and open problems

We have shown that the problem to decide the regularity of hairpin completion $\mathcal{H}_k(L_1, L_2)$ for given regular languages L_1 and L_2 is **NL**-complete. In particular it can be solved efficiently in parallel with Boolean circuits of polynomial size and poly-log depth, because **NL** is contained in *Nick's Class* \mathbf{NC}_2 (see e.g. [pap94, Thm. 16.1]).

Our **NL**-result is based on the fact that the input is given by DFAs accepting L_1 and $\langle\text{mspace}|1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace}|1\mu\rangle L_2\langle\text{mspace}|1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace}|1\mu\rangle$. It is open, what happens if the input is given in a more concise form, say the input is given by NFAs accepting L_1 and L_2 (or $\langle\text{mspace}|1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace}|1\mu\rangle L_2\langle\text{mspace}|1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace}|1\mu\rangle$).

Another result of [DieKop11] says that the time complexity of the same problem is in $\mathcal{O}(n^8)$. The full proof of this fact is quite involved, and it employs different ideas. It will appear elsewhere. It is open whether the $\mathcal{O}(n^8)$ time bound is optimal. A further improvement on this time bound seems however to ask for quite different ideas. So far, the best algorithm known (to us) considers all pairs of states in the automaton \mathcal{A} . There are $\Omega(n^8)$ pairs and it is unclear how to avoid this bound.

There is also a very natural variant of hairpin completion which was introduced in [DiekertKM09]. It has been called *partial hairpin completion* **<varspace>** and further investigated in [ManeaMM10], where the operation has been called *hairpin lengthening*. The partial hairpin completion of L_1 and L_2 is given by the set of words $\gamma\alpha\beta\langle\text{mspace}|1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace}|1\mu\rangle\alpha\langle\text{mspace}|1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace}|1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace}|1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace}|1\mu\rangle\gamma'\langle\text{mspace}|1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace}|1\mu\rangle$, where γ' is a prefix γ and $\gamma\alpha\beta\langle\text{mspace}|1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace}|1\mu\rangle\alpha\langle\text{mspace}|1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace}|1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace}|1\mu\rangle\in L_1$ or γ is a prefix γ' and $\alpha\beta\langle\text{mspace}|1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace}|1\mu\rangle\alpha\langle\text{mspace}|1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace}|1\mu\rangle\langle\text{mspace}|1\mu\rangle\in L_2$.

Again, the partial hairpin completion of a regular language is linear context-free, but not regular, in general. It is open whether regularity of the partial hairpin completion of regular languages is decidable.

Bibliography

- [AlvarezJenner95] C. Álvarez and B. Jenner. A note on logspace optimization. *Comput. Complex.*, 5:155–166, April 1995.
- [ChepteaMM06] D. Cheptea, C. Martín-Vide, and V. Mitrana. A new operation on words suggested by DNA biochemistry: Hairpin completion. *Transgressive Computing*, pages 216–228, 2006.
- [garzon1] R. Deaton, R. Murphy, M. Garzon, D. Franceschetti, and S. Stevens. Good encodings for DNA-based solutions to combinatorial problems. *Proc. of DNA-based computers DIMACS Series*, 44:247–258, 1998.
- [DieKop11] V. Diekert and S. Kopecki. Complexity results and the growths of regular languages (extended abstract). In M. Domaratzki and K. Salomaa, editors, *CIAA 2010*, number 6482 in Lecture Notes in Computer Science, pages 105–114. Springer-Verlag, 2011.
- [DiekertKM09] V. Diekert, S. Kopecki, and V. Mitrana. On the hairpin completion of regular languages. In M. Leucker and C. Morgan, editors, *ICTAC*, volume 5684 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 170–184. Springer, 2009.
- [garzon2] M. Garzon, R. Deaton, P. Neathery, R. Murphy, D. Franceschetti, and E. Stevens. On the encoding problem for DNA computing. *The Third DIMACS Workshop on DNA-Based Computing*, pages 230–237, 1997.
- [garzon3] M. Garzon, R. Deaton, L. Nino, S. Stevens Jr., and M. Wittner. Genome encoding for DNA computing. *Proc. Third Genetic Programming Conference*, pages 684–690, 1998.
- [HU] J. E. Hopcroft and J. D. Ullman. *Introduction to Automata Theory, Languages and Computation*. Addison-Wesley, 1979.
- [Ito2010] M. Ito, P. Leupold, F. Manea, and V. Mitrana. Bounded hairpin completion. *Information and Computation*, In Press, Accepted Manuscript:–, 2010.
- [KariKLST05] L. Kari, S. Konstantinidis, E. Losseva, P. Sosík, and G. Thierrin. Hairpin structures in DNA words. In A. Carbone and N. A. Pierce, editors, *DNA*, volume 3892 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 158–170. Springer, 2005.
- [KariMT07] L. Kari, K. Mahalingam, and G. Thierrin. The syntactic monoid of hairpin-free languages. *Acta Inf.*, 44(3-4):153–166, 2007.
- [Kopecki10] S. Kopecki. On the iterated hairpin completion. In Y. Gao, H. Lu, S. Seki, and S. Yu, editors, *Developments in Language Theory*, volume 6224 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 438–439. Springer Berlin / Heidelberg, 2010.
- [ManeaMM09] F. Manea, C. Martín-Vide, and V. Mitrana. On some algorithmic problems regarding the hairpin completion. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 157(9):2143–2152, 2009.
- [ManeaMM10] F. Manea, C. Martín-Vide, and V. Mitrana. Hairpin lengthening. In F. Ferreira, B. Löwe, E. Mayordomo, and L. M. Gomes, editors, *CiE*, volume 6158 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 296–306. Springer, 2010.
- [DBLP:conf/cie/ManeaM07] F. Manea and V. Mitrana. Hairpin completion versus hairpin reduction. In S. B. Cooper, B. Löwe, and A. Sorbi, editors, *CiE*, volume 4497 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 532–541. Springer, 2007.
- [ManeaMY09tcs] F. Manea, V. Mitrana, and T. Yokomori. Two complementary operations inspired by the DNA hairpin formation: Completion and reduction. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 410(4-5):417–425, 2009.
- [ManeaMY10] F. Manea, V. Mitrana, and T. Yokomori. Some remarks on the hairpin completion. *Int. J. Found. Comput. Sci.*, 21(5):859–872, 2010.
- [pap94] Ch. H. Papadimitriou. *Computational Complexity*. Addison Wesley, 1994.
- [KensakuSakamoto05192000] K. Sakamoto, H. Gouzu, K. Komiya, D. Kiga, S. Yokoyama, T. Yokomori, and M. Hagiya. Molecular Computation by DNA Hairpin Formation. *Science*, 288(5469):1223–1226, 2000.