

Foundations of XML Types: Tree Automata

Pierre Genevès
CNRS


(slides mostly based on slides by W. Martens and T. Schwentick)

University Grenoble Alpes, 2022–2023

Why Tree Automata?

- Foundations of XML type languages (DTD, XML Schema, Relax NG...)
- Provide a general framework for XML type languages
- A tool to define regular tree languages with an operational semantics
- Provide algorithms for efficient validation
- Basic tool for static analysis (proofs, decision procedures in logic)

Prelude: Word Automata



Transitions


even \xrightarrow{a} *odd*

odd \xrightarrow{a} *even*

...

From Words to Trees: Binary Trees


Binary trees with an even number of *a*'s



How to write transitions?

From Words to Trees: Binary Trees


Binary trees with an even number of *a*'s



How to write transitions?

From Words to Trees: Binary Trees

Binary trees with an even number of a 's



How to write transitions?

$(\text{even}, \text{odd}) \xrightarrow{a} \text{even}$


$(\text{even}, \text{even}) \xrightarrow{a} \text{odd}$

etc.

Ranked Trees?

They come from *parse trees* of data (or programs)...


A function call $f(a, b)$ is a ranked tree



Ranked Trees?

They come from *parse trees* of data (or programs)...

A function call $f(g(a, b, c), h(i))$ is a ranked tree



Ranked Alphabet

A ranked alphabet symbol is:

- a formalisation of a function call
- a symbol a with an integer $\text{arity}(a)$
 - $\text{arity}(a)$ indicates the number of children of a


Notation

$a^{(k)}$: symbol a with $\text{arity}(a) = k$

Example

Alphabet: $\{a^{(2)}, b^{(2)}, c^{(3)}, \#^{(0)}\}$

Possible tree:



Ranked Tree Automata

A ranked tree automaton A consists in:

Alphabet(A): finite alphabet of symbols

States(A): finite set of states

Rules(A): finite set of transition rules

Final(A): finite set of final states (\subseteq States(A))

where :

Rules(A) are of the form $(q_1, \dots, q_k) \xrightarrow{a^{(k)}} q$

if $k = 0$, we write $\epsilon \xrightarrow{a^{(0)}} q$

Ranked Tree Automata

A ranked tree automaton A consists in:

Alphabet(A): finite alphabet of symbols

States(A): finite set of states

Rules(A): finite set of transition rules

Final(A): finite set of final states (\subseteq States(A))


where :

Rules(A) are of the form $(q_1, \dots, q_k) \xrightarrow{a^{(k)}} q$

if $k = 0$, we write $\epsilon \xrightarrow{a^{(0)}} q$

How do they work?

Example: Boolean Expressions



Principle


- $\text{Alphabet}(A) = \{\wedge, \vee, 0, 1\}$
- $\text{States}(A) = \{q_0, q_1\}$
- 1 accepting state at the root:
 $\text{Final}(A) = \{q_1\}$

Rules(A)

$$\begin{array}{ll} \epsilon \xrightarrow{0} q_0 & \epsilon \xrightarrow{1} q_1 \\ (q_1, q_1) \xrightarrow{\wedge} q_1 & (q_0, q_1) \xrightarrow{\vee} q_1 \\ (q_0, q_1) \xrightarrow{\wedge} q_0 & (q_1, q_0) \xrightarrow{\vee} q_1 \\ (q_1, q_0) \xrightarrow{\wedge} q_0 & (q_1, q_1) \xrightarrow{\vee} q_1 \\ (q_0, q_0) \xrightarrow{\wedge} q_0 & (q_0, q_0) \xrightarrow{\vee} q_0 \end{array}$$

How do they work?

Example: Boolean Expressions



Principle


- $\text{Alphabet}(A) = \{\wedge, \vee, 0, 1\}$
- $\text{States}(A) = \{q_0, q_1\}$
- 1 accepting state at the root:
 $\text{Final}(A) = \{q_1\}$

Rules(A)

$$\begin{array}{ll} \epsilon \xrightarrow{0} q_0 & \epsilon \xrightarrow{1} q_1 \\ (q_1, q_1) \xrightarrow{\wedge} q_1 & (q_0, q_1) \xrightarrow{\vee} q_1 \\ (q_0, q_1) \xrightarrow{\wedge} q_0 & (q_1, q_0) \xrightarrow{\vee} q_1 \\ (q_1, q_0) \xrightarrow{\wedge} q_0 & (q_1, q_1) \xrightarrow{\vee} q_1 \\ (q_0, q_0) \xrightarrow{\wedge} q_0 & (q_0, q_0) \xrightarrow{\vee} q_0 \end{array}$$

How do they work?

Example: Boolean Expressions



Principle

- $\text{Alphabet}(A) = \{\wedge, \vee, 0, 1\}$
- $\text{States}(A) = \{q_0, q_1\}$
- 1 accepting state at the root:
 $\text{Final}(A) = \{q_1\}$

Rules(A)

$$\begin{array}{ll} \epsilon \xrightarrow{0} q_0 & \epsilon \xrightarrow{1} q_1 \\ (q_1, q_1) \xrightarrow{\wedge} q_1 & (q_0, q_1) \xrightarrow{\vee} q_1 \\ (q_0, q_1) \xrightarrow{\wedge} q_0 & (q_1, q_0) \xrightarrow{\vee} q_1 \\ (q_1, q_0) \xrightarrow{\wedge} q_0 & (q_1, q_1) \xrightarrow{\vee} q_1 \\ (q_0, q_0) \xrightarrow{\wedge} q_0 & (q_0, q_0) \xrightarrow{\vee} q_0 \end{array}$$

Terminology

- $\text{Language}(A)$: set of trees accepted by A
- For a tree automaton A , $\text{Language}(A)$ is a *regular tree language* [Thatcher and Wright, 1968, Doner, 1970]

Example

Tree automaton A over $\{a^{(2)}, b^{(2)}, \#^{(0)}\}$ which recognizes trees with an even number of a 's

Alphabet(A) : $\{a, b, \#\}$

States(A) :

Final(A) :

Rules(A) :

Example

Tree automaton A over $\{a^{(2)}, b^{(2)}, \#^{(0)}\}$ which recognizes trees with an even number of a 's

Alphabet(A) : $\{a, b, \#\}$

States(A) : $\{\text{even}, \text{odd}\}$

Final(A) : $\{\text{even}\}$

Rules(A) :

$(\text{even}, \text{even}) \xrightarrow{a} \text{odd}$ $(\text{even}, \text{even}) \xrightarrow{b} \text{even}$

$(\text{even}, \text{odd}) \xrightarrow{a} \text{even}$ $(\text{even}, \text{odd}) \xrightarrow{b} \text{odd}$

$(\text{odd}, \text{even}) \xrightarrow{a} \text{even}$ $(\text{odd}, \text{even}) \xrightarrow{b} \text{odd}$

$(\text{odd}, \text{odd}) \xrightarrow{a} \text{odd}$ $(\text{odd}, \text{odd}) \xrightarrow{b} \text{even}$

$\epsilon \xrightarrow{\#} \text{even}$

Outline

1. Can we implement a tree automaton efficiently? (notion of determinism)
 2. Are tree automata closed under set-theoretic operations?
 3. Can we check type inclusion?
 4. Can we build equivalent top-down tree automata?
 5. Nice theory. But... what should I do with my *unranked* XML trees?
- Can we apply this for XML type-checking?

Deterministic Tree Automata

Deterministic

does not have two rules of the form:

$$\begin{aligned}(q_1, \dots, q_k) &\xrightarrow{a^{(k)}} q \\ (q_1, \dots, q_k) &\xrightarrow{a^{(k)}} q'\end{aligned}$$

for two different states q and q'

Intuition

At most one possible transition at a given node \rightarrow implementation...

Can we Make a Tree Automaton Deterministic?

Theorem (determinization)

From a given non-deterministic (bottom-up) tree automaton we can build a deterministic tree automaton

Corollary

Non-deterministic and deterministic (bottom-up) tree automata recognize the same languages.

Complexity

EXPTIME ($|\text{States}(A_{\text{det}})| = 2^{|\text{States}(A)|}$)

Implementing Validation

Membership Checking

Given a tree automaton A and a tree t , does $t \in \text{Language}(A)$?


Remark

We can implement even if A is non-deterministic...

Example

Automaton with $\text{Final}(A) = \{q_f\}$ and :

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon &\xrightarrow{c} q & q &\xrightarrow{b} q_b & q &\xrightarrow{b} q \\ q_b &\xrightarrow{b} q_f & (q, q) &\xrightarrow{a} q \end{aligned}$$



Implementing Validation

Membership Checking

Given a tree automaton A and a tree t , does $t \in \text{Language}(A)$?


Remark

We can implement even if A is non-deterministic...

Example

Automaton with $\text{Final}(A) = \{q_f\}$ and :

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon &\xrightarrow{c} q & q &\xrightarrow{b} q_b & q &\xrightarrow{b} q \\ q_b &\xrightarrow{b} q_f & (q, q) &\xrightarrow{a} q \end{aligned}$$



Implementing Validation

Membership Checking

Given a tree automaton A and a tree t , does $t \in \text{Language}(A)$?


Remark

We can implement even if A is non-deterministic...

Example

Automaton with $\text{Final}(A) = \{q_f\}$ and :

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon &\xrightarrow{c} q & q &\xrightarrow{b} q_b & q &\xrightarrow{b} q \\ q_b &\xrightarrow{b} q_f & (q, q) &\xrightarrow{a} q \end{aligned}$$



Implementing Validation

Membership Checking

Given a tree automaton A and a tree t , does $t \in \text{Language}(A)$?


Remark

We can implement even if A is non-deterministic...

Example

Automaton with $\text{Final}(A) = \{q_f\}$ and :

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon &\xrightarrow{c} q & q &\xrightarrow{b} q_b & q &\xrightarrow{b} q \\ q_b &\xrightarrow{b} q_f & (q, q) &\xrightarrow{a} q \end{aligned}$$



Implementing Validation

Membership Checking

Given a tree automaton A and a tree t , does $t \in \text{Language}(A)$?


Remark

We can implement even if A is non-deterministic...

Example

Automaton with $\text{Final}(A) = \{q_f\}$ and :

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon &\xrightarrow{c} q & q &\xrightarrow{b} q_b & q &\xrightarrow{b} q \\ q_b &\xrightarrow{b} q_f & (q, q) &\xrightarrow{a} q \end{aligned}$$



Implementing Validation

Membership Checking

Given a tree automaton A and a tree t , does $t \in \text{Language}(A)$?


Remark

We can implement even if A is non-deterministic...

Example

Automaton with $\text{Final}(A) = \{q_f\}$ and :

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon &\xrightarrow{c} q & q &\xrightarrow{b} q_b & q &\xrightarrow{b} q \\ q_b &\xrightarrow{b} q_f & (q, q) &\xrightarrow{a} q \end{aligned}$$



Implementing Validation

Membership Checking

Given a tree automaton A and a tree t , does $t \in \text{Language}(A)$?


Remark

We can implement even if A is non-deterministic...

Example

Automaton with $\text{Final}(A) = \{q_f\}$ and :

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon &\xrightarrow{c} q & q &\xrightarrow{b} q_b & q &\xrightarrow{b} q \\ q_b &\xrightarrow{b} q_f & (q, q) &\xrightarrow{a} q \end{aligned}$$



Implementing Validation

Membership Checking

Given a tree automaton A and a tree t , does $t \in \text{Language}(A)$?


Remark

We can implement even if A is non-deterministic...

Example

Automaton with $\text{Final}(A) = \{q_f\}$ and :

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon &\xrightarrow{c} q & q &\xrightarrow{b} q_b & q &\xrightarrow{b} q \\ q_b &\xrightarrow{b} q_f & (q, q) &\xrightarrow{a} q \end{aligned}$$



Complexity

Membership-Checking is in PTIME (time linear in the size of the tree)

Set-Theoretic Operations

Recall

- We have seen that neither local tree grammars nor single-type tree grammars are closed under boolean operations (e.g. union)
- What about tree automata?

Closure under Union and Intersection...


Example

- Automaton A: even number of a's
 - (even, even) \xrightarrow{a} odd
- Automaton B: even number of b's
 - (even, even) \xrightarrow{a} even

Closure under Union and Intersection...

Example


- Automaton A: even number of a's
 - (even, even) \xrightarrow{a} odd
- Automaton B: even number of b's
 - (even, even) \xrightarrow{a} even



Closure under Union and Intersection...

Example

- Automaton A: even number of a's
 - $(\text{even}, \text{even}) \xrightarrow{a} \text{odd}$
- Automaton B: even number of b's
 - $(\text{even}, \text{even}) \xrightarrow{a} \text{even}$



$$((\text{even}, \text{even}), (\text{even}, \text{even})) \xrightarrow{a} (\text{odd}, \text{even})$$

Product Construction

Given A and B , build $A \times B$

- $\text{Alphabet}(A \times B) = \text{Alphabet}(A) \cup \text{Alphabet}(B)$
- $\text{States}(A \times B) = \text{States}(A) \times \text{States}(B)$
- $\text{Final}(A \times B) = \{(q_a, q_b) \mid q_a \in \text{Final}(A) \wedge q_b \in \text{Final}(B)\}$
- $\text{Rules}(A \times B) =$

$$\left\{ \left((q_a^1, q_b^1), \dots, (q_a^k, q_b^k) \right) \xrightarrow{a^{(k)}} (q_a, q_b) \mid \begin{array}{l} q_a^1, \dots, q_a^k \xrightarrow{a^{(k)}} q_a \in \text{Rules}(A) \\ q_b^1, \dots, q_b^k \xrightarrow{a^{(k)}} q_b \in \text{Rules}(B) \end{array} \right\}$$

Closure under Union

Given A and B , build $A \cup B$

- $\text{Alphabet}(A \cup B) = \text{Alphabet}(A) \cup \text{Alphabet}(B)$
- $\text{States}(A \cup B) = \text{States}(A) \times \text{States}(B)$
- $\text{Rules}(A \cup B) =$

$$\left\{ \left((q_a^1, q_b^1), \dots, (q_a^k, q_b^k) \right) \xrightarrow{a^{(k)}} (q_a, q_b) \left| \begin{array}{l} q_a^1, \dots, q_a^k \xrightarrow{a^{(k)}} q_a \in \text{Rules}(A) \\ q_b^1, \dots, q_b^k \xrightarrow{a^{(k)}} q_b \in \text{Rules}(B) \end{array} \right. \right\}$$

- $\text{Final}(A \cup B) = \{(q_a, q_b) \mid q_a \in \text{Final}(A) \vee q_b \in \text{Final}(B)\}$

Closure under intersection

Given A and B , build $A \cap B$

- $\text{Alphabet}(A \cap B) = \text{Alphabet}(A) \cup \text{Alphabet}(B)$
- $\text{States}(A \cap B) = \text{States}(A) \times \text{States}(B)$
- $\text{Rules}(A \cap B) =$

$$\left\{ \left((q_a^1, q_b^1), \dots, (q_a^k, q_b^k) \right) \xrightarrow{a^{(k)}} (q_a, q_b) \left| \begin{array}{l} q_a^1, \dots, q_a^k \xrightarrow{a^{(k)}} q_a \in \text{Rules}(A) \\ q_b^1, \dots, q_b^k \xrightarrow{a^{(k)}} q_b \in \text{Rules}(B) \end{array} \right. \right\}$$

- $\text{Final}(A \cap B) = \{(q_a, q_b) \mid q_a \in \text{Final}(A) \wedge q_b \in \text{Final}(B)\}$

Complexity of the Product

Size of the Result Automaton

- $|\text{States}(A \times B)| = |\text{States}(A)| \cdot |\text{States}(B)|$
- $|\text{Rules}(A \times B)| \leq |\text{Rules}(A)| \cdot |\text{Rules}(B)|$

Quadratic increase in size

Closure under Negation: Completion

Definition : Complete Tree Automaton

For each $a^{(k)} \in \text{Alphabet}(A)$ and $q_1, \dots, q_k \in \text{States}(A)$, there exists a rule

$$(q_1, \dots, q_k) \xrightarrow{a} q$$

with some q

Intuition

At least one transition at a given node...

Example

Incomplete (deterministic) tree automaton

Tree automaton A for $\{a(b, b)\}$:

$$\epsilon \xrightarrow{b} q_b$$

$$(q_b, q_b) \xrightarrow{a} q_a$$

with $\text{Final}(A) = \{q_a\}$

Completion of A

Add a sink state q_p

$$\epsilon \xrightarrow{b} q_b$$

$$\epsilon \xrightarrow{a} q_p$$

$$(q_b, q_b) \xrightarrow{a} q_a$$

$$(q_b, q_a) \xrightarrow{a} q_p$$

$$(q_a, q_b) \xrightarrow{a} q_p$$

$$(q_a, q_a) \xrightarrow{a} q_p$$

$$(q_b, q_b) \xrightarrow{b} q_p$$

$$(q_b, q_a) \xrightarrow{b} q_p$$

$$(q_a, q_b) \xrightarrow{b} q_p$$

$$(q_a, q_a) \xrightarrow{b} q_p$$

$$(q_p, q) \xrightarrow{\sigma} q_p \quad \text{for all } q \in \{q_a, q_b, q_p\} \text{ and } \sigma \in \{a, b\}$$

$$(q, q_p) \xrightarrow{\sigma} q_p \quad \text{for all } q \in \{q_a, q_b, q_p\} \text{ and } \sigma \in \{a, b\}$$

with $\text{Final}(A) = \{q_a\}$

Example

Incomplete (deterministic) tree automaton

Tree automaton A for $\{a(b, b)\}$:

$$\epsilon \xrightarrow{b} q_b$$

$$(q_b, q_b) \xrightarrow{a} q_a$$

with $\text{Final}(A) = \{q_a\}$

Completion of A , Complementation of A

Add a sink state q_p

$$\epsilon \xrightarrow{b} q_b$$

$$\epsilon \xrightarrow{a} q_p$$

$$(q_b, q_b) \xrightarrow{a} q_a$$

$$(q_b, q_a) \xrightarrow{a} q_p$$

$$(q_a, q_b) \xrightarrow{a} q_p$$

$$(q_a, q_a) \xrightarrow{a} q_p$$

$$(q_b, q_b) \xrightarrow{b} q_p$$

$$(q_b, q_a) \xrightarrow{b} q_p$$

$$(q_a, q_b) \xrightarrow{b} q_p$$

$$(q_a, q_a) \xrightarrow{b} q_p$$

$$(q_p, q) \xrightarrow{\sigma} q_p \quad \text{for all } q \in \{q_a, q_b, q_p\} \text{ and } \sigma \in \{a, b\}$$

$$(q, q_p) \xrightarrow{\sigma} q_p \quad \text{for all } q \in \{q_a, q_b, q_p\} \text{ and } \sigma \in \{a, b\}$$

with $\text{Final}(\bar{A}) = \{q_b, q_p\}$

Closure under Negation: Summary

Building the Complement of A

- Make A deterministic
- Complete the result
- Switch final \leftrightarrow non-final states

Complexity

- Determinization of A : exponential explosion (states: $2^{\text{States}(A)}$)
- Completion of the result: exponential explosion of the number of rules:
 $|\text{Alphabet}(A)| \cdot \left(2^{\text{States}(A)}\right)^k$ where k is the maximal rank
- Switching final \leftrightarrow non-final states: linear

Total: exponential explosion

Emptiness Test

Given a tree automaton A , is $\text{Language}(A) \neq \emptyset$?

Principle

Compute the set of reachable states and then see if any of them are in the final set

Complexity

PTIME (time proportional to $|A|$)

Application for Checking Type Inclusion

Type Inclusion

Given two tree automata A_1 and A_2 , is $\text{Language}(A_1) \subseteq \text{Language}(A_2)$?

Theorem

Containment for non-deterministic tree automata can be decided in exponential time

Principle

- $\text{Language}(A_1 \cap \overline{A_2}) \stackrel{?}{=} \emptyset$
 - For this purpose, we must make A_2 deterministic (size: $O(2^{|A_2|})$)
- EXPTIME
- Essentially no better solution [Seidl, 1990]

Application for Checking Type Inclusion

Type Inclusion

Given two tree automata A_1 and A_2 , is $\text{Language}(A_1) \subseteq \text{Language}(A_2)$?

Theorem

Containment for non-deterministic tree automata can be decided in exponential time

Principle

- $\text{Language}(A_1 \cap \overline{A_2}) \stackrel{?}{=} \emptyset$
 - For this purpose, we must make A_2 deterministic (size: $O(2^{|A_2|})$)
- EXPTIME
- Essentially no better solution [Seidl, 1990]

Top-Down Tree Automata


Is that useful?...

Example: Connection with Strings

abcd = a(b(c(d))) = $\begin{array}{c} a \\ | \\ b \\ | \\ c \\ | \\ d \end{array}$

Reading strings from left to right = reading trees top-down (→ e.g. streaming validation...)

Top-Down Tree Automata: Example




Principle

- starting from the root, guess correct values
- check at leaves
- 3 states: q_0, q_1, acc
- initial state at the root: q_1
- accepting if all leaves labeled acc

Transitions

$$\begin{array}{ll} q_1 \xrightarrow{\wedge} (q_1, q_1) & q_1 \xrightarrow{\vee} (q_0, q_1) \\ q_0 \xrightarrow{\wedge} (q_0, q_1) & q_1 \xrightarrow{\vee} (q_1, q_0) \\ q_0 \xrightarrow{\wedge} (q_1, q_0) & q_1 \xrightarrow{\vee} (q_1, q_1) \\ q_0 \xrightarrow{\wedge} (q_0, q_0) & q_0 \xrightarrow{\vee} (q_0, q_0) \\ q_1 \xrightarrow{1} acc & q_0 \xrightarrow{0} acc \end{array}$$

Top-Down Tree Automata: Example




Principle

- starting from the root, guess correct values
- check at leaves
- 3 states: q_0, q_1, acc
- initial state at the root: q_1
- accepting if all leaves labeled acc

Transitions

$$\begin{array}{ll} q_1 \xrightarrow{\wedge} (q_1, q_1) & q_1 \xrightarrow{\vee} (q_0, q_1) \\ q_0 \xrightarrow{\wedge} (q_0, q_1) & q_1 \xrightarrow{\vee} (q_1, q_0) \\ q_0 \xrightarrow{\wedge} (q_1, q_0) & q_1 \xrightarrow{\vee} (q_1, q_1) \\ q_0 \xrightarrow{\wedge} (q_0, q_0) & q_0 \xrightarrow{\vee} (q_0, q_0) \\ q_1 \xrightarrow{1} acc & q_0 \xrightarrow{0} acc \end{array}$$

Top-Down Tree Automata: Example



Principle

- starting from the root, guess correct values
- check at leaves
- 3 states: q_0, q_1, acc
- initial state at the root: q_1
- accepting if all leaves labeled acc

Transitions

$$\begin{array}{ll}
 q_1 \xrightarrow{\wedge} (q_1, q_1) & q_1 \xrightarrow{\vee} (q_0, q_1) \\
 q_0 \xrightarrow{\wedge} (q_0, q_1) & q_1 \xrightarrow{\vee} (q_1, q_0) \\
 q_0 \xrightarrow{\wedge} (q_1, q_0) & q_1 \xrightarrow{\vee} (q_1, q_1) \\
 q_0 \xrightarrow{\wedge} (q_0, q_0) & q_0 \xrightarrow{\vee} (q_0, q_0) \\
 q_1 \xrightarrow{1} acc & q_0 \xrightarrow{0} acc
 \end{array}$$

Top-Down Tree Automata

A top-down tree automaton A consists in:

Alphabet(A): finite alphabet of symbols

States(A): finite set of states

Rules(A): finite set of transition rules

Initial(A): finite set of initial states (\subseteq States(A))

where:

Rules(A) are of the form $q \xrightarrow{a^{(k)}} (q_1, \dots, q_k)$

Top-down tree automata also recognize all regular tree languages

Top-Down Tree Automata

A top-down tree automaton A consists in:

Alphabet(A): finite alphabet of symbols

States(A): finite set of states

Rules(A): finite set of transition rules

Initial(A): finite set of initial states (\subseteq States(A))

where:

Rules(A) are of the form $q \xrightarrow{a^{(k)}} (q_1, \dots, q_k)$

Top-down tree automata also recognize all regular tree languages

Top-down Determinism

Deterministic Top-Down Tree Automaton

- for each $q \in \text{States}(A)$ and $a \in \text{Alphabet}(A)$ there is at most one rule

$$q \xrightarrow{a^{(k)}} (q_1, \dots, q_k)$$

- there is at most one initial state

Top-down Determinism

Deterministic Top-Down Tree Automaton

- for each $q \in \text{States}(A)$ and $a \in \text{Alphabet}(A)$ there is at most one rule

$$q \xrightarrow{a^{(k)}} (q_1, \dots, q_k)$$

- there is at most one initial state

Can We Make Top-Down Automata Deterministic?

- (a) Yes (b) No (c) Maybe...

Can We Make Top-Down Automata Deterministic?

Maybe !

Can We Make Top-Down Automata Deterministic?

Maybe !

Deterministic top-down tree automata do **not** recognize all regular tree languages

Example



Can We Make Top-Down Automata Deterministic?

Maybe !

Deterministic top-down tree automata do **not** recognize all regular tree languages

Example



$\text{Initial}(A) = q_0$

Can We Make Top-Down Automata Deterministic?

Maybe !

Deterministic top-down tree automata do **not** recognize all regular tree languages

Example



$\text{Initial}(A) = q_0$

$q_0 \xrightarrow{a} (q, q)$

Can We Make Top-Down Automata Deterministic?

Maybe !

Deterministic top-down tree automata do **not** recognize all regular tree languages

Example



$\text{Initial}(A) = q_0$

$q_0 \xrightarrow{a} (q, q)$

$q \xrightarrow{b} \epsilon$

Can We Make Top-Down Automata Deterministic?

Maybe !

Deterministic top-down tree automata do **not** recognize all regular tree languages

Example



$\text{Initial}(A) = q_0$

$q_0 \xrightarrow{a} (q, q)$

$q \xrightarrow{b} \epsilon$

$q \xrightarrow{c} \epsilon$

Can We Make Top-Down Automata Deterministic?

Maybe !

Deterministic top-down tree automata do **not** recognize all regular tree languages

Example




$\text{Initial}(A) = q_0$

$q_0 \xrightarrow{a} (q, q)$

$q \xrightarrow{b} \epsilon$

$q \xrightarrow{c} \epsilon$

also accepts...



Expressive Power of Tree Automata: Summary

Theorem

The following properties are equivalent for a tree language L :


- (a) L is recognized by a bottom-up non-deterministic tree automaton
- (b) L is recognized by a bottom-up deterministic tree automaton
- (c) L is recognized by a top-down non-deterministic tree automaton
- (d) L is generated by a regular tree grammar

Proof Idea


- (a) \Rightarrow (b): determinization (see [Comon et al., 1997])
- (a) \Leftrightarrow (c): same thing seen from 2 different ways
- (d) \Leftrightarrow (a) : ? (horizontal recursion a^* ?)

Unranked Trees


String
as Tree



Ranked Tree



Unranked Tree



Unranked Tree Automata?


1. either we adapt ranked tree automata
2. or we encode unranked trees as ranked trees...

Unranked Tree Automata


Ranked Trees

Transitions can be described by finite sets:

$$\delta(\sigma, q) = \{(q_1, q_2), (q_3, q_4), \dots\}$$



Unranked Trees



q_1	q_2	q_n
-------	-------	-------	-------


 $\in \delta(\sigma, q)?$

$\delta(\sigma, q)$

- For unranked trees, $\delta(\sigma, q)$ is a regular tree language
- $\delta(\sigma, q)$ may be specified by a regular expression or by a finite word automaton [Murata, 1999]



Second Option

Can we encode unranked trees as ranked trees?



?

Encoding Unranked Trees As Binary Trees



Bijjective Encoding

- “first child; next sibling” encoding
- Allows to focus on binary trees without loss of generality
- Results for ranked trees hold for unranked trees as well

Tree Automata: Summary

Definition

A tree language is regular iff it is recognized by a non-deterministic tree automaton

Advantages

- Closure, decidable operations
- General tool (theoretical and algorithmic)

Limitations


- $a^n b^n$

Application for Static Type-Checking

Recall: The XML Static Type-Checking Problem

- Given the following:
 - Source code of some program f (in e.g. XQuery)
 - A type T_{in} for **input** documents
 - A type T_{out} for **expected** output documents
- Problem: Does $f(t) \in T_{\text{out}}$ for all $t \in T_{\text{in}}$?

Static Type-Checking for XQuery: Principles



Approach in two steps:

1. Compute $T_{inf} = \{f(t) | t \in T_{in}\}$
2. Check whether $T_{inf} \subseteq T_{out}$ holds

→ In case $T_{inf} \subseteq T_{out}$ holds, then we know that for any $t \in T_{in}$, $f(t) \in T_{out}$

Static Type-Checking Using Tree Automata

- Many research papers
- XQuery's standard type system inspired from advances in PLs, e.g.:
 - XDuce [Hosoya and Pierce, 2003]: a domain specific language
 - Sound static type system based on an implementation of tree automata containment optimized for practical cases
 - Use pattern-matching for selection (no support for XPath)

XQuery's standard type system

- As defined in the spec:
 - Sound
 - PTIME
- Sound and more precise type systems in EXPTIME


XQuery and Static Type-Checking

Open Issues

- Type inference requires a balance between precision and complexity
 - Sound approximations can be more or less imprecise
 - Poor precision (e.g. type approximation) in type inference yields more false alarms
 - XQuery's standard type system is limited:
 - Currently: no or poor support of XPath (e.g. only `child` and `descendant` axes are – poorly – supported)
 - Support for typing XPath has been open for years (in particular for backward axes)
- Can you guess why is that difficult?
- 2015 ICFP paper with elements of answers for this issue (based on advances in tree logics)

Concluding Remarks on Tree Automata

- Tree automata are part of the theoretical tools that provide the underlying guiding principles for XML (like the relational algebra provides the underlying principles for relational databases)
- Important research challenges still remain



For those who want to learn more

Pointers to related research results:

- [1] XQuery and Static Typing: Tackling the Problem of Backward Axes.

Pierre Genevès and Nils Gesbert.

In ICFP'15: Proceedings of the ACM SIGPLAN International Conference on Functional Programming (ICFP), Sept. 2015.

<http://tyrex.inria.fr/publications/icfp15.pdf>



Comon, H., Dauchet, M., Gilleron, R., Jacquemard, F., Lugiez, D., Tison, S., and Tommasi, M. (1997).

Tree automata techniques and applications.

Available on: <http://www.grappa.univ-lille3.fr/tata>.
release October, 1st 2002.



Doner, J. (1970).

Tree acceptors and some of their applications.

Journal of Computer and System Sciences, 4:406–451.



Hosoya, H. and Pierce, B. C. (2003).

XDuce: A statically typed XML processing language.

ACM Trans. Inter. Tech., 3(2):117–148.



Murata, M. (1999).

Hedge automata: a formal model for XML schemata.

http://www.xml.gr.jp/relax/hedge_nice.html.



Seidl, H. (1990).

Deciding equivalence of finite tree automata.

SIAM J. Comput., 19(3):424–437.



Thatcher, J. W. and Wright, J. B. (1968).

Generalized finite automata theory with an application to a decision problem of second-order logic.

Mathematical Systems Theory, 2(1):57–81.