

CANONICAL DECOMPOSITION OF CATENATION OF FACTORIAL LANGUAGES

A. E. FRID

ABSTRACT. According to a previous result by S. V. Avgustinovich and the author, each factorial language admits a unique canonical decomposition to a catenation of factorial languages. In this paper, we analyze the appearance of the canonical decomposition of a catenation of two factorial languages whose canonical decompositions are given.

1. INTRODUCTION

This paper continues a research of decompositions of factorial languages started in [1, 2] and inspired by the field of language equations and algebraic operations on languages in general (see, e. g., [7, 8] and references therein). As the development of the theory shows, even language expressions where the only used operation is catenation prove very difficult to work with. It seems that nothing resembling the Makanin's algorithm for word equations (see, e. g., [4]) can appear for language equations with catenation. Even easiest questions tend to have very complicated answers. In particular, the maximal solution X of the commutation equation

$$LX = XL$$

may be arbitrarily complicated: as it was shown by Kunc [6], even if the language L is finite, the maximal language X commuting with it may be not recursively enumerable. This situation contrasts with that for words, since $xy = yx$ for some words x and y implies that $x = z^n$ and $y = z^m$ for some word z and $n, m \geq 0$. An analogous statement holds also for a class of languages called *codes* [5].

In some sense, the problems of catenation of languages are due to the fact that a unique factorization theorem is not valid for it: as it was shown by Salomaa and Yu [9], even a finite unary language can admit several essentially different decompositions to a catenation of smaller languages, and an infinite language may have no decomposition to *prime* languages and all; here a language L is called *prime* if $L = L_1L_2$ implies that $L_1 = \varepsilon$ or $L_2 = \varepsilon$, where ε is the empty word, and $L_2 = L$, or vice versa.

To avoid ambiguity of this kind, we restrict ourselves to *factorial* languages. This family is large and widely investigated since it includes, e. g., languages of factors of finite or infinite words and languages avoiding patterns (in the sense of [3]). We can also consider the factorial closure of an arbitrary language. Furthermore, the class of factorial languages is closed under taking catenation, unit, and intersection, and constitutes a monoid with respect to the catenation.

FRID, A. E., CATENATION OF FACTORIAL LANGUAGES.

© 2006 FRID A. E..

The work is supported by RFFI (grants 05-01-00364 and 06-01-00694).

In this research, we restrict ourselves to decompositions of factorial languages to a catenation of factorial languages. They also may be several: for example, $a \cdot b = (a + b) \cdot b = a \cdot (a + b)$ (here and below $(+)$ denotes unit). However, as it was proved in [1], we can define the notion of the *canonical* decomposition of a factorial language which always exists and is unique.

In this paper, we continue investigation of canonical decompositions of factorial languages and solve the following general problem: Given canonical decompositions of languages A and B , what is the canonical decomposition of their catenation AB ?

Besides the self-dependent interest, the answer to this question may help to solve equations on factorial languages. Indeed, equal languages have equal canonical decompositions, and these canonical decompositions may be compared as words. So, techniques valid for words, including the Makanin's algorithm, can be applied for them.

Thus, this paper may be considered as a description a tool helpful for solving equations on factorial languages. In particular, we hope that this tool can be used to investigate the commutation of factorial languages. At the moment, it is already clear that the situation for factorial languages is not as easy as for words or codes, but there is still a chance to characterize commuting factorial languages in some sense.

2. DEFINITIONS AND PREVIOUS RESULTS

Let Σ be a finite alphabet, and $L \subseteq \Sigma^*$ be a language on it. A word $u \in \Sigma^*$ is called a *factor* of a word $v \in \Sigma^*$ if $v = sut$ for some (possibly empty) words s and t . The set of all factors of words of a language L is denoted by $\text{Fac}(L)$. Clearly, $\text{Fac}(\text{Fac}(L)) = \text{Fac}(L)$, so that $\text{Fac}(L)$ may be called the *factorial closure* of L .

A language L is called *factorial* if $L = \text{Fac}(L)$. In particular, each factorial language contains the empty word denoted by ϵ . In what follows, we consider only factorial languages.

The catenation of languages is an associative operation defined by

$$X \cdot Y = \{xy \mid x \in X, y \in Y\}$$

Clearly, languages constitute a monoid with respect to the catenation, and its unit is the language $\{\epsilon\}$, where ϵ is the empty word. It is also clear that factorial languages form a submonoid of that monoid, since the catenation of two factorial languages is factorial.

A factorial language L is called *indecomposable* if $L = X \cdot Y$ implies $L = X$ or $L = Y$ for all factorial languages X and Y .

Lemma 1. [1] *For each subalphabet $\Sigma_0 \subseteq \Sigma$, the language Σ_0^* is indecomposable.*

Other examples of indecomposable languages discussed in [1] include languages of factors of recurrent infinite words, etc.

A decomposition $L = L_1 \cdot \dots \cdot L_n$ of factorial languages L_1, \dots, L_n is called *minimal* if

$$L = \{\epsilon\} \text{ implies } n = 1 \text{ and } L_1 = \{\epsilon\};$$

$$\text{If } L \neq \{\epsilon\}, \text{ then for } i = 1; \dots; n \text{ we have } L_i \neq \{\epsilon\} \text{ and } L \neq L_1 \cdot \dots \cdot L_{i-1} \cdot L_{i+1}^0 \cdot \dots \cdot L_n$$

$$\text{for any factorial language } L_i^0 \subseteq L_i.$$

A minimal decomposition to indecomposable factorial language is called *canonical*.

Theorem 1. [1] *A canonical decomposition of each factorial language L exists and is unique.*

In what follows, we shall denote the canonical decomposition of L by $C(L)$.

All examples of factorial languages we shall consider in this paper will be regular, just because regular languages are easy to deal with. Note that the factorial closure of a regular language is always regular (which is a classical exercise). We have proved also

Theorem 2. [2] *If L is a regular factorial language, then all entries of $C(L)$ are also regular.*

3. PRELIMINARY RESULTS

Suppose that we are given two factorial languages, A and B , on an alphabet Σ , and know their canonical decompositions $C(A)$ and $C(B)$. Our goal is to describe the canonical decomposition $C(AB)$, and the main result of the paper, Theorem 3, will give such a description. To state Theorem 3, we need to define two subalphabets of Σ , namely, Σ_A and Σ_B .

For a factorial language L , let us define

$$L_A = \{a \in L \mid \exists u, v \in L, uav \in L\};$$

and

$$L_B = \{a \in L \mid \exists u, v \in L, uav \in L\};$$

Thus, if we take any word $u \in L$, we can extend it to the left by any word from L_A and to the right by any word from L_B to get a word from L . In other words, $L = L_A L_B$, and L_A and L_B are defined as maximal languages with this property.

For the main result of this paper, we shall need to know the relationship between L_A (further denoted by Σ_A) and L_B (further denoted by Σ_B). The following lemmas explain the meaning of these subalphabets. Note that analogues of Lemmas 2–4' were proved in [1], but the lemmas are reproved here both for the sake of completeness and of more precise wording.

Lemma 2. *If $C(L) = L_1 \dots L_k$, then $L_A = L_{1A} \dots L_{kA}$ and $L_B = L_{1B} \dots L_{kB}$.*

PROOF. Let us prove the statement for L_A ; the statement for L_B is symmetric to it.

First, $L \in L_A$ implies that $L_A \subseteq L$ and thus $L = L_1 \dots L_k L_A = L_1 \dots L_k L$; so, $L_A \subseteq L$.

On the other hand, $L \in L_A$ means that $L_1 \dots L_k \subseteq L$ for all $v \in L_k$. Since L_k is a factor of the canonical decomposition of L , it cannot be contracted to a smaller factorial language L_k^0 such that $L_1 \dots L_k \subseteq L_k^0 = L$. It means that for each $v \in L_k$ and $g \in \Sigma$, there exists some word $w \in L$ such that $w \in L_1 \dots L_k$, $tv \in L_k$, and w is the longest prefix of wv belonging to $L_1 \dots L_k$. Since tv is not the empty word, w is also the longest prefix from $L_1 \dots L_k$ of the word $wv \in L$. We see that $tv \in L_k$ and thus $v \in L_k$ since L_k is factorial. Moreover, by the same reason $v \in L_k$, which means that $v \in L_k$ and thus $L_k \subseteq L_k$. So, $L \in L_A$ implies $L \subseteq L_A$, which was to be proved.

Given a factorial language A and a subalphabet Σ_A , let us define the factorial language $L(A) = \text{Fac}(A \cap \Sigma_A)$. So, $L(A)$ is the subset of A containing exactly

words starting with letters from Σ_n and their factors. Symmetrically, we define the subset $R_{\Sigma_n}(A)$ of A containing exactly words which end with letters from Σ_n and their factors: $R_{\Sigma_n}(A) = \text{Fac}(A n A_{\Sigma_n})$.

Lemma 3. *Let X and B be factorial languages on Σ . If there exists a factorial language A such that $X = AB$, then there exists a unique minimal one, and it is equal to $A^0 = R_{\Sigma(B)}(A)$.*

PROOF. First of all, let us prove that $A^0 B = X$. The inclusion $A^0 B \subseteq X$ is obvious: $A^0 \subseteq A$ and thus $A^0 B \subseteq AB = X$. To prove the reverse inclusion, consider a word $x \in X$, and let b be its longest suffix from B : since $X = AB$, we have $x = ab$ for some word $a \in A$. Suppose that a ends with a symbol $\alpha \in \Sigma(B)$; then $b \in B$ by the definition of $\Sigma(B)$, and b is not the longest suffix of x belonging to B . A contradiction. Thus, $x = ab \in (A n A_{\Sigma(B)})B = R_{\Sigma(B)}(A)B = A^0 B$, and since x was an arbitrary element of X , the inclusion (and thus the equality $X = A^0 B$) is proved.

It remains to prove that $A^0 \subseteq Y$ for every factorial language Y such that $YB = X$. Let us consider an arbitrary non-empty word $a^0 \in A^0$. Since $A^0 = R_{\Sigma(B)}(A)$, the word a^0 is a factor of some word $sa^0 t \in A n A_{\Sigma(B)}$. Let the last letter of the word $sa^0 t$ be equal to α ; then $\alpha \in \Sigma_n$, and $a^0 t = a^0 \in A$. So, $a^0 t B = AB = X = YB$.

For each $b \in B$, let us denote by $y(b)$ the longest prefix of $a^0 b = a^0 t b$ belonging to Y . Let the word b^0 be defined by the equality $a^0 b = y(b)b^0$; then $b^0 \in B$ since $a^0 b \in YB$.

Clearly, if $y(b)$ is not shorter than a^0 for some $b \in B$, then its prefix a^0 belongs to Y (since Y is factorial), and this is what we need. But if $y(b)$ is shorter than a^0 for all $b \in B$, then each word b^0 contains b as a suffix. So, $b^0 \in B$ for all $b \in B$ (since B is factorial), and $\alpha \in \Sigma(B)$ by the definition of $\Sigma(B)$. A contradiction. So, $a^0 \in Y$ for all $a^0 \in A^0$, and A^0 is indeed the minimal language such that $A^0 B = X$.

Symmetrically, we can prove

Lemma 3' *Let X and A be factorial languages on Σ . If there exists a factorial language B such that $X = AB$, then there exists a unique minimal one, and it is equal to $B^0 = L_{\Sigma(A)}(B)$.*

Lemma 4. *Let X and Y be factorial languages on Σ , and Σ' be a subalphabet such that $Y \star \Sigma'$. Then $R_{\Sigma'}(XY) = X R_{\Sigma'}(Y)$.*

PROOF. Consider a word $u \in X R_{\Sigma'}(Y)$. If $u \in X$, let us choose a symbol $y \in Y$ from Σ_n . Then $uy \in X Y n X Y = R_{\Sigma'}(XY)$, and thus $u \in R_{\Sigma'}(XY)$. If $u \notin X$, then $u = xu^0$, where x is the longest prefix of u belonging to X and $u^0 \in R_{\Sigma'}(Y)$ is a non-empty word. Let u^0 be a word from $Y n Y$ such that u^0 is its factor: $u^0 = su^0 t$ for some words s and t such that the last letter of t is from Σ_n . Then $u^0 t \in Y n Y$, and hence $ut = xu^0 t \in X Y n X Y = R_{\Sigma'}(XY)$. It follows that $u \in R_{\Sigma'}(XY)$, and the inclusion is proved.

To prove the reverse inclusion, consider a word $u \in R_{\Sigma'}(XY)$. Let $u^0 = sut$ be a word from $X Y n X Y$ whose factor is u , so that its last letter is from Σ_n . Then $ut \in X Y n X Y$. Let $ut = xy$, where $x \in X$ and $y \in Y$; then $y \in Y n Y$ and $ut \in X Y n Y$. So, either $u \in X$, or $u = xy^0$ for some prefix y^0 of y : since $y^0 \in R_{\Sigma'}(Y)$, in both cases we have $u \in X R_{\Sigma'}(Y)$, and the inclusion is proved.

Symmetrically, we prove

Lemma 4' Let X and Y be factorial languages on Σ , and $\Sigma' \subseteq \Sigma$ be a subalphabet such that $X \cap \Sigma' = \emptyset$. Then $L(X \circ Y) = L(X) \circ Y$.

Lemma 5. Let X be a factorial language, $\Sigma' \subseteq \Sigma$ be a subalphabet, and $(X \cap \Sigma') \cap \Sigma' = \emptyset$; \therefore Then $L(X) = X$.

PROOF. Let $a \in \Sigma'$ be a symbol from $(X \cap \Sigma')$; then each word u from X can be extended to $ua \in X$ by the definition of $(X \cap \Sigma')$. So, $u \in \text{Fac}(u) \cap \text{Fac}(X \cap \Sigma') = L(X)$. Since u was chosen arbitrarily, and $L(X) \subseteq X$, we get the equality: $L(X) = X$.

The symmetric lemma is

Lemma 5' Let X be a factorial language, $\Sigma' \subseteq \Sigma$ be a subalphabet, and $(X \cap \Sigma') \cap \Sigma' = \emptyset$; \therefore Then $R(X) = X$.

4. MAIN RESULT

Theorem 3. Let A and B be factorial languages with $C(A) = A_1 \circ \dots \circ A_k$ and $C(B) = B_1 \circ \dots \circ B_m$. Let us denote $\mathcal{A} = (A)$ and $\mathcal{B} = (B)$. Then the canonical decomposition of the catenation AB can be found as follows:

- (1) If $n \in \Sigma'$; and $n \in \Sigma'$; then $C(AB) = C(A)C(B)$.
- (2) If $\Sigma' = \emptyset$, and $A_k \in \Sigma'$, $B_1 \in \Sigma'$, then $C(AB) = C(A)C(B)$.
- (3) If $\Sigma' = \emptyset$ and $A_k = \emptyset$, then $C(AB) = A_1 \circ \dots \circ A_k \circ \mathcal{A} \circ C(B)$. Symmetrically, if $\Sigma' = \emptyset$ and $B_1 = \emptyset$, then $C(AB) = C(A) \circ B_1 \circ \dots \circ B_m$.
- (4) If $\Sigma' \neq \emptyset$, then $C(AB) = C(R(\mathcal{A}))C(B)$. Symmetrically, if $\Sigma' \neq \emptyset$, then $C(AB) = C(A)C(L(\mathcal{B}))$.

PROOF. In **Case (1)**, we have $A = R(\mathcal{A})$ and $B = L(\mathcal{B})$ due to Lemmas 5 and 5'. So, due to Lemma 3, A is the minimal among languages Y such that $YB = AB$. Since $A = A_1 \circ \dots \circ A_k$ is the canonical decomposition, for each A_i (A_i , $i = 1; \dots; k$), we get $A_1 \circ \dots \circ A_i \circ A_{i+1} \circ \dots \circ A_k \circ A$, and thus $A_1 \circ \dots \circ A_i \circ A_{i+1} \circ \dots \circ A_k \circ \mathcal{A} \circ C(B)$. Symmetrically, by Lemma 3', $AB_1 \circ \dots \circ B_j \circ B_{j+1} \circ \dots \circ B_m \circ B$ for any B_j (B_j , $j = 1; \dots; m$). So, the decomposition $AB = A_1 \circ \dots \circ A_k \circ \mathcal{A} \circ B_1 \circ \dots \circ B_m \circ \mathcal{B} \circ C(B)$ is minimal. Since each of the languages A_i , B_j is indecomposable (because it occurs in the canonical decomposition of A or B), this decomposition of AB is also canonical, which was to be proved.

In **Case (2)**, due to Lemma 2, we have $(A_k) = (A) = \emptyset$, and in particular, $A_k = \emptyset$. Due to Lemma 4, $R(\mathcal{A}) = A_1 \circ \dots \circ A_k \circ \mathcal{A} \circ R(\mathcal{A}_k)$. By the definitions, $A_k = R(\mathcal{A}_k)$. But the language A_k is indecomposable and not equal to \emptyset , so, it is equal to $R(\mathcal{A}_k)$. We see that $R(\mathcal{A}) = A_1 \circ \dots \circ A_k \circ \mathcal{A} \circ R(\mathcal{A}_k) = A$. Symmetrically, due to Lemmas 2 and 4', $L(\mathcal{B}) = B$. As in the previous case, this implies that the decomposition $AB = C(A)C(B)$ is minimal and thus canonical.

In **Case (3)**, if $A_k = \emptyset$, by the definition of \mathcal{A} , we have $B_1 = \emptyset$ (this decomposition is not canonical). So, $AB = A_1 \circ \dots \circ A_k \circ \mathcal{A} \circ B_1 \circ \dots \circ B_m \circ \mathcal{B} \circ C(B)$. It remains to show that this decomposition is minimal.

Let us denote the language $A_1 \circ \dots \circ A_k \circ \mathcal{A}$ by E . Then $C(E) = A_1 \circ \dots \circ A_k \circ \mathcal{A}$: indeed, if some A_i could be reduced to A_i^0 without changing E , then $A = A_1 \circ \dots \circ A_i^0 \circ A_{i+1} \circ \dots \circ A_k \circ \mathcal{A}$ would be a decomposition of A smaller than the canonical one, a contradiction.

So, due to Lemma 2, $(E) = (A_{k+1})$. Suppose that (A_{k+1}) contains Σ' as a subset. Then $A_{k+1} = A_{k+1} \cap \Sigma'$, and $A = A_1 \circ \dots \circ A_k \circ \mathcal{A} \circ A_{k+1} \cap \Sigma' = A_1 \circ \dots \circ A_k \circ \mathcal{A}$, and the language A admits a decomposition shorter than $C(A)$, a contradiction. So,

$n(A_{k-1}) \notin \mathcal{F}$; and we may apply Lemma 5 to get $L_{(A_{k-1})}(B) = B$. As above, we cannot substitute any of B_j , $j = 1; \dots; m$, without changing the product AB .

At the same time, due to Lemma 3, $E^0 = R_{(E)}$ is the minimal language such that $E^0 = A$; from the canonical decomposition of A , we see that $E^0 = E$. Since reducing any of A_i , $i = 1; \dots; k-1$, to its proper subset A_i^0 reduces E , it reduces $EB = AB$. We have proved that the decomposition $AB = A_1 \dots_k A_{k-1} B_1 \dots_m B_m$ is minimal and thus canonical.

The situation with $B_1 =$ is symmetric.

At last, in **Case (4)** the inclusion $($ immediately implies $B = L_{(B)}$ due to Lemma 5. So, neither of the languages B_i can be decreased without changing the product AB . And as above, the same can be said about the entries of $C(R_{(A)})$, since $R_{(A)}$ is the minimal language giving AB when catenated with B .

Corollary 1. *The canonical decomposition of AB either begins with $C(A)$, or ends with $C(B)$, so that only one of the languages A and B can give canonical factors of AB different from the canonical factors of the language itself.*

Example 1. If $A = fa;bg$ and $B = fa;cg$, then $(A) = fa;bg$, $(B) = fa;cg$, and the canonical decomposition of AB is just $fa;bg \quad fa;cg$ (Case (1)).

Example 2. If $A = Facfa;abg$ and $B = Facfa;acg$, then $(A) = (B) = fag$, and the canonical decomposition of AB is just $Facfa;abg \quad Facfa;acg$ (Case (2)).

Here A is the language of all words on $fa;bg$ which do not contain two successive bs , and B is the language of all words on $fa;cg$ which do not contain two successive cs .

Example 3. If $A = a$ and $B = Facfa;abg$, then $= = fag$, and $AB = B$ (Case (3)).

Example 4. Note that when $=$ and $A_k = B_1 =$, Case (3) may be applied in any of the two directions. For example, if $A = a \quad b$ and $B = b \quad a$, then $C(AB) = a \quad b \quad a$, and it does not matter which of the occurrences of b was removed.

Before giving examples for Case (4), we will specify the form of the canonical decomposition of $A^0 = R_{(A)}$. Recall that A is a factorial language with the canonical decomposition $C(A) = A_1 \dots_k A_k$, and \mathcal{F} is a subalphabet of Σ .

Let us define languages A_i^0 , $i = k; \dots; 1$, as obtained by the following iterative procedure: starting from $A_k =$, we put for each i from k to 1

$$\begin{aligned} A_i^0 &= R_{(A_i)} \text{ and } A_{i-1} = (A_i^0); \text{ if } A_i \neq \mathcal{F}; \\ A_i^0 &= \mathcal{F} \quad g \text{ and } A_{i-1} = A_i; \text{ otherwise:} \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 6. *The canonical decomposition of $A^0 = R_{(A)}$ can be obtained by deleting extra $\mathcal{F} \quad g$ entries from the decomposition $A^0 = C(A_1^0)C(A_2^0) \dots_k C(A_k^0)$.*

PROOF. First of all, note that due to Lemma 4 applied iteratively, $A^0 = A_1 \dots_k A_k^0 = A_1 \dots_k A_k^0 A_{k-1}^0 A_{k-1}^0 = \dots = A_1^0 \dots_k A_k^0$. Some of the languages A_i^0 can be equal to $\mathcal{F} \quad g$; in particular, if $A =$, then $A^0 = \mathcal{F} \quad g$, as well as all its factors. However, if $A^0 \notin \mathcal{F} \quad g$, then we can canonically decompose factors A_i^0 not equal to $\mathcal{F} \quad g$ and erase the others.

Clearly, if we substitute any of canonical factors of A_i^0 by its proper subset, we get a new language $A_i^0 \subset A_i^0$. So, to prove the lemma, we should just show that $A^0 \notin A_1^0 \dots_k A_i^0 A_{i+1}^0 \dots_k A_k^0$ for any $A_i^0 \subset A_i^0$.

For all $i = 1; \dots; k$, let us define $D_i = A_1^0 \dots A_i^0$ and $E_{i-1} = A_1 \dots A_{i-1}$. We also define $D_0 = \varepsilon$. Note that by the definition and Lemma 3, for all $i \geq 1$, D_i is the minimal language such that $D_i A_{i+1}^0 = A^0$. So, it remains to prove only that $A_i^0 = A_i^\infty$, where A_i^∞ is the minimal language such that $D_{i-1} A_i^\infty = D_i$. By Lemma 3', we have $A_i^\infty = L_{(D_{i-1})}(A_i^0)$.

First, suppose that $D_{i-1} \notin E_{i-1}$. We knew that $D_i = D_{i-1} A_i^0 = E_{i-1} A_i^0$, and D_{i-1} is the minimal language giving D_i when catenated with A_i^0 . So, by Corollary 1, in the canonical decomposition of D_i the factors corresponding to $C(A_i^0)$ do not change, and $A_i^0 = A_i^\infty$, which was to be proved.

Now suppose that $D_{i-1} = E_{i-1}$. Then $(D_{i-1}) = (E_{i-1}) = (A_{i-1})$. From now on, we denote this subalphabet just by A_i^0 . We knew that A_i was equal to $L_{(A_i)}(A_i^0)$ since it was the minimal factorial language giving E_i when catenated with E_{i-1} . Assume by contrary that $A_i^\infty = L_{(A_i^0)}(A_i^0) \notin A_i^\infty$.

Let us consider a word $u \in A_i^\infty \setminus A_i^\infty$. It does not belong to A_i^∞ , which means that $su \in A_i^\infty$ implies $su \in A_i^0$ for all $s \in A_i^0$ (in particular, u starts with a letter from A_i^0). On the other hand, $u \in A_i^\infty$, which means that $ut \in A_i \setminus A_i^0$ for some $t \in A_i^0$. By the definition, $ut \in A_i^\infty$, and the set of non-empty left extensions of ut to elements of A_i is a subset of that for u :

$$\{s \mid su \in A_i^\infty\} \subseteq \{s \mid sut \in A_i^\infty\} \subseteq \{s \mid sut \in A_i^\infty\} : A_i^0.$$

Since we already know that $u \in A_i^0$, we see that $ut \notin L_{(A_i)}(A_i^0)$. So, $A_i \notin L_{(A_i)}(A_i^0)$, contradicting to the fact that the decomposition $E_i = A_1 \dots A_i$ was minimal. We have found a contradiction to the assumption that $A_i^\infty \notin A_i^\infty$.

So, $A_i^0 = A_i^\infty$, and the decomposition obtained from $A^0 = A_1^0 \dots A_k^0$ by deleting ε entries is minimal, which was to be proved.

To make the description complete, we state the symmetric lemma, for the case of (A, B) . Let B be a factorial language with $C(B) = B_1 \dots B_m$ and A be a subalphabet; we start from $B_1 = A$ and successively define for each $j = 1; \dots; m$

$$\begin{aligned} B_j^0 &= L_{(B_j)}(A) \text{ and } B_{j+1} = B_j^0; \text{ if } B_j \neq A; \\ B_j^0 &= \varepsilon \text{ and } B_{j+1} = B_j; \text{ otherwise:} \end{aligned}$$

The lemma symmetric to Lemma 6 is

Lemma 6' *The canonical decomposition of $B^0 = L_{(B)}(A)$ can be obtained by deleting ε entries from the decomposition $B^0 = C(B_1^0)C(B_2^0) \dots C(B_m^0)$.*

The following easy example for Case (4) of Theorem 3 illustrates Lemma 6.

Example 5. The canonical decomposition of $A = (a b)^k + (b a)^k$ is $C(A) = (a + b)^{2k}$ with $A_1 = \varepsilon$. $A = (a + b)^{2k}$ (here $+$ denotes the unit). If we catenate it with $B = a$, we get $A_{2k}^0 = b$, $A_{2k-1}^0 = a$, and so on, and at last obtain $A^0 = (a b)^k$ and $C(AB) = (a b)^k a$.

REFERENCES

- [1] S. V. Avgustinovich, A. E. Frid, *A unique decomposition theorem for factorial languages*, Internat. J. Algebra Comput. **15** (2005), 149–160.
- [2] S. V. Avgustinovich, A. E. Frid, *Canonical decomposition of a regular factorial language*, in: D. Grigoriev, J. Harrison, E. Hirsch (Eds.), Computer Science - Theory and Applications, Springer, 2006 (LNCS 3967), 18–22.
- [3] J. Cassaigne, *Unavoidable patterns*, in: M. Lothaire, Algebraic Combinatorics on Words, Cambridge Univ. Press, 2002. Pp. 111–134.

- [4] V. Diekert, *Makanin's Algorithm*, in: M. Lothaire, Algebraic Combinatorics on Words, Cambridge Univ. Press, 2002. Pp. 387–442.
- [5] J. Karhumäki, M. Latteux, I. Petre, *Commutation with codes*, Theoret. Comput. Sci. **340** (2005), 322–333.
- [6] M. Kunc, *The power of commuting with finite sets of words*, in: Theoretical Aspects of Computer Science (STACS'05), Springer, 2005 (LNCS 3404), 569–580.
- [7] M. Kunc, *Simple language equations*, Bull. EATCS 85 (2005), 81–102.
- [8] A. Okhotin, *Decision problems for language equations with Boolean operations*, in: Automata, Languages and Programming, Spriger, 2003 (LNCS 2719), 239–251.
- [9] A. Salomaa, S. Yu, *On the decomposition of finite languages*, in: Developments of Language Theory. Foundations, Applications, Perspectives, World Scientific, 2000, 22–31.

ANNA E. FRID
SOBOLEV INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS,
PR. KOPTYUGA, 4,
630090, NOVOSIBIRSK, RUSSIA
E-mail address: `frid@math.nsc.ru`