

Time complexity for deterministic string machines

Ali Cataltepe*, Vanessa Kosoy†

May 13, 2024

Abstract

Algorithms which learn environments represented by automata in the past have had complexity scaling with the number of states in the automaton, which can be exponentially large even for automata recognizing regular expressions with a small description length. We thus formalize a compositional language that can construct automata as transformations between certain types of category, representable as string diagrams, which better reflects the description complexity of various automata. We define complexity constraints on this framework by having them operate on categories enriched over filtered sets, and using these constraints, we prove elementary results on the runtime and expressivity of a subset of these transformations which operate deterministically on finite state spaces. These string diagrams, or “string machines,” are themselves morphisms in a category, so it is possible for string machines to create other string machines in runtime to model computations which take more than constant memory. We prove sufficient conditions for polynomial runtime guarantees on these, which can help develop complexity constraints on string machines which also encapsulate runtime complexity.

1 Introduction

String machines [12] is a framework that aims to provide a generalization of transducers, modeling them as functors that take morphisms in one category to ensembles of “recipes” for constructing other morphisms in another category. We formalize and expand upon definitions for deterministic string machines sketched in the AI Alignment Forum post introducing the framework, with an eye towards introducing formalisms to help bound description complexity and runtime complexity. To this end, we introduce filtered transducers, which operate on categories where morphisms have “degrees” additive under composition, and prove some elementary runtime and expressivity properties for these transducers.

Acknowledgements

This project was supported by a grant from the Berkeley Existential Risk Initiative (BERI), as part of the ML Alignment & Theory Scholars (MATS) 5.0 research program.

1.1 Motivations

Theoretical reinforcement learning settings that utilize automata (usually as transducers operating on histories) [17] or Markov decision processes to model hypotheses about the environment often have time complexity scaling in the number of states of the environment [10]. However, parameterized families of automata with low description complexity can still grow exponentially in size with these parameters. For example, given a parameterized family of regular languages in some variable n , where the automaton recognizing a given language has $O(1)$ states, the product automaton, recognizing the intersection of the first n languages, will have $O(\exp(n))$ states, despite the fact that we could store this parameterized family of automata with linearly increasing space instead.

Frameworks such as Krohn-Rhodes theory [14] give decompositions of automata into algebraic structures in a way that avoids exponential growth of description length, but these frameworks as they

*MATS 5.0. Email: ali@cataltepe.com

†The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. Mentor for MATS 5.0. Email: vanessa.kosoy@intelligence.org

currently exist do not generalize to automata more expressive than deterministic finite state automata. Modeling compositions of Mealy/Moore machines with output alphabets that can themselves be interpreted as Mealy/Moore machines could tractably model some intermediate stages of expressivity between finite-state transducers and Turing machines. If an ML algorithm that operates on an environment clearly more complex than can be efficiently modeled by automata could be said to be “approximating” an RL algorithm that operates on hypothesis spaces populated by automata, then it must be taking advantage of some space-saving structure, as ML algorithms have resource bounds too tight to scale with an exponentially-growing number of states. It would also be helpful to have a better approximation for the Kolmogorov complexity of transducers for the purpose of frugal priors in theoretical RL settings similar to AIXI [9], as the actual Kolmogorov complexity is not computable in general.

1.2 Prior work

Category-theoretic generalizations of automata have been explored before, either making automata into algebras over certain structures [1] or morphisms in certain categories [16, 4], or having them operate on morphisms in a category [5, 6]. We are interested in the latter two cases, which would give us the ability to naturally model “building other automata in runtime” by modeling automata as morphisms between categories which themselves includes automata as morphisms. Work by Earnshaw et al. on monoidal languages [5, 6] focuses on generalizing classes of structures (string diagrams) beyond strings which can be recognized by automata, but is not immediately concerned with functions between classes of string diagrams. Work by Niu and Spivak [16] introduces modes of composing natural transformations between representable functors which induce families of maps that define automata and transducers, and work on generalizations of automata into morphisms in a category by Boccali et al. [4] provides an expressive framework for constructing a category of automata in a way technically compatible with recursive automaton-building. However, neither of these formalisms is especially focused on finding more frugal or tractable ways of representing existing computational processes.

2 Deterministic transducers

Here we provide necessary definitions for deterministic string machines. Monadic string machines, which model probabilistic behavior, are described in the AI Alignment Forum post [12], but the results in Section 3 are concerned solely with the deterministic case.

Definition 2.1. Given a copy-discard category $\mathcal{C}$, its corresponding **state category** $\mathcal{C}^S$ is the category where

- an object A is a tuple $(S(A), V_A)$, where:
 - **The state space of A** is a set $S(A)$.
 - **The variables of A** are a functor V_A from the discrete category corresponding to $S(A)$ to the discrete category formed by all finite ordered tuples of pairs of objects X, Y in $\mathcal{C}$. We call the tuple associated with a given $x \in S(A)$ **the variables at x** , or $V_A(x)$. Since variables implicitly denote morphism signatures, we will refer to a given variable $(X, Y) \in V_A(x)$ as $X \rightarrow Y$.
- a morphism $f : A \rightarrow B$ is a tuple $(S(f), V_f)$, where:
 - **The state transition $S(f)$** is a function $S(A) \rightarrow S(B)$.
 - **The output function at $x \in S(A)$** , denoted $V_f(x)$, is a collection of morphisms in a category freely-generated over $\mathcal{C}$, defined as follows:

For each variable $X'_j \rightarrow Y'_j$ at $S(f)(x)$, $V_f(x)$ defines a morphism $X'_j \rightarrow Y'_j$ in the freely-generated category over $\mathcal{C}$ with generators provided by the variables $X_i \rightarrow Y_i$ in $V_A(x)$. The function between hom-sets in $\mathcal{C}$ can then be expressed by substituting each generator with a $\mathcal{C}$ -morphism of the appropriate signature.

This induces a function between the product of the hom-sets $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(X_i, Y_i)$ for all variables $X_i \rightarrow Y_i$ at x and the product of the hom-sets $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(X'_j, Y'_j)$ for all variables $X'_j \rightarrow Y'_j$ at $S(f)(x)$, which can be obtained by replacing each generator corresponding to a variable at x with a morphism of $\mathcal{C}$ of the appropriate signature.

- Given two morphisms $f : A \rightarrow B$ and $g : B \rightarrow C$, their composition $g \circ f : A \rightarrow C$ is a tuple $(S(g \circ f), V_{g \circ f})$ where:
 - The composite state transition $S(g \circ f)$ is defined as $S(g) \circ S(f)$.
 - The composite output function $V_{g \circ f}(x)$ is defined as follows: For each variable $X''_k \rightarrow Y''_k$ defined at $S(g \circ f)(x)$, $V_g(S(f)(x))$ defines a morphism in the category freely generated over $\mathcal{C}$ with generators corresponding to the variables $\{X'_j \rightarrow Y'_j\}_j$ at $S(f)(x)$. Now, $V_f(x)$ induces a functor from $\mathcal{C}[X'_1 \rightarrow Y'_1, \dots]$ to $\mathcal{C}[X_1 \rightarrow Y_1, \dots]$ (where $\{X_i \rightarrow Y_i\}_i$ denote the variables at x), which fixes $\mathcal{C}$ but replaces every free generator of the category freely generated over the variables at $S(f)(x)$ with the morphism associated with it by $V_f(x)$, in the category freely generated over the variables at x . Therefore, the output function $V_{g \circ f}(x)$ at x is simply the image of each of the morphisms generated by $V_g(x)$ under this functor defined by $V_f(x)$. The function between products of hom-sets induced by the composite output function is therefore just the composition of the functions induced by the individual morphisms' output functions.
- Given two objects A, B , their monoidal product $A \otimes B$ has state space $S(A \otimes B) = S(A) \times S(B)$ and variables $V_{A \otimes B} = V_A \times V_B$, in the sense that the variables at $(x, y) \in S(A \otimes B)$ are the concatenation of the variables lists $V_A(x)$ and $V_B(y)$. The monoidal identity is the single-element state space with no variables. There is a copy-discard (in fact, a Markov category, since a single-element state space with no variables can only have a single output function into it and is therefore a terminal object) structure on $\mathcal{C}^S$ provided by a morphism which is the copy map on the state space and for each variable $X_i \rightarrow Y_i$ in the output state space, generates a morphism solely consisting of the free generator of that same signature that that variable is a clone of.

The state category construction could be thought of as a functor on the category of small categories. Given a functor $F : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$, we can define a functor $F^S : \mathcal{C}^S \rightarrow \mathcal{D}^S$ with maps objects $(S(A), V_A)$ of $\mathcal{C}^S$ to objects $(S(F^S(A)), V_{F^S(A)})$ of $\mathcal{D}^S$ such that $S(F^S(A)) \simeq S(A)$ as sets with an isomorphism $\varphi_{F^S, A}$, and for every $x \in S(A)$, $V_{F^S(A)}(\varphi_{F^S, A}(x)) = F(V_A(x))$, in the sense that the signatures in $V_{F^S(A)}(\varphi_{F^S, A}(x))$ are simply the image under F of the signatures at $V_A(x)$. The image of a state-category morphism $A \rightarrow B$ $(S(f), V_f)$ in $\mathcal{C}^S$ under F^S is a morphism with an identical state transition such that the relations between the variable tuples provided by the isomorphism between sets commutes with this state transition, that is, $\varphi_{F^S, B} \circ S(f) = S(F^S(f)) \circ \varphi_{F^S, A}$. For every $x \in S(F^S(A))$, the morphisms generated by the output function $V_{F^S(f)}(x)$ are simply the images, under the natural extension of F to the appropriate freely-generated categories over $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{D}$, of the morphisms generated by the output function $V_f(\varphi_{F^S, A}^{-1}(x))$.

However, it is unclear if the state category construction actually provides a 2-functor. Given functors $F, G : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ and a natural transformation $\eta : F \rightarrow G$, we try defining a natural transformation $\eta^S : F^S \rightarrow G^S$ where, for an object A of $\mathcal{C}^S$, the morphism η_A^S has a bijection $S(F^S(A)) \rightarrow S(G^S(A))$ (we know this bijection exists, since $S(F^S(A))$ and $S(G^S(A))$ are bijective to the same set), which commutes with $\varphi_{F^S, A}$ and $\varphi_{G^S, A}$, as its state transition. An issue arises when trying to construct an output function for η_A^S . For a given $x \in S(A)$, where $V_A(x)$ consists of signatures $X_i \rightarrow Y_i$ and therefore $V_{F^S(A)}(\varphi_{F^S, A}(x))$ consists of signatures $F(X_i) \rightarrow F(Y_i)$ (and likewise for G^S), the morphisms provided by $\eta_{X_i} : F(X_i) \rightarrow G(X_i)$ and $\eta_{Y_i} : F(Y_i) \rightarrow G(Y_i)$ and the generators of signature $F(X_i) \rightarrow F(Y_i)$ do not guarantee a way to construct a morphism of signature $G(X_i) \rightarrow G(Y_i)$, since we are not provided with any natural choices for outgoing morphisms from $G(X_i)$.

With the state category defined, we can now define the primary building block of a string machine, the transducer.

Definition 2.2. A **deterministic transducer** is a collection of the of the following data:

- an **input category** $\mathcal{C}$ and **output category** $\mathcal{D}$, which are both copy-discard categories,
- a **primary input ($\mathcal{C}$ -)signature** $A \rightarrow B$,
- **auxiliary input ($\mathcal{D}$ -)signatures** $X_1 \rightarrow Y_1, \dots, X_n \rightarrow Y_n$,
- **output ($\mathcal{D}$ -)signatures** $X'_1 \rightarrow Y'_1, \dots, X'_m \rightarrow Y'_m$,
- a **structure functor** $F : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}^S$ satisfying the following properties:
 - F is strong monoidal.
 - For every $x \in S(F(A))$, the variables at $V_{F(A)}(x)$ are a prefix of $X_1 \rightarrow Y_1, \dots, X_n \rightarrow Y_n$.
 - For every $y \in S(F(B))$, $X'_1 \rightarrow Y'_1, \dots, X'_m \rightarrow Y'_m$ is a prefix of $V_{F(B)}(y)$.

The structure functor additionally induces an **input state space** $S(F(A))$ and **output state space** $S(F(B))$.

Thus, a deterministic transducer takes a morphism in $\mathcal{C}$ of signature $A \rightarrow B$ to a “finite state machine-controlled” way of constructing morphisms in $\mathcal{D}$, and outputs morphisms in $\mathcal{D}$ by substituting the free generators over $\mathcal{D}$ with the morphisms received in the auxiliary inputs.

2.1 Composition of transducers

If we consider a transducer to have incoming legs labeled with its input state space and primary-auxiliary input signatures, and outgoing legs labeled with its output state space and output signatures, we can contract incoming legs with outgoing legs of the same signature such that no cycles are formed if we interpret the transducer/leg complex as a directed graph. Now, given inputs to the remaining free input legs, the contracted input legs will receive the outputs generated at their contracted output legs. We can also take the “product” of two transducers (or compositions of transducers) and have them each process their inputs and produce their outputs independently.

Definition 2.3. The category **StrMach** of string machines is defined as follows:

- Objects are finite tuples of the form $((S(A_1), \dots, S(A_n)), (X_1 \rightarrow Y_1, \dots, X_m \rightarrow Y_m))$, where each $S(A_i)$ is a set and each $X_j \rightarrow Y_j$ is a morphism signature in some copy-discard category. The morphism signatures are not necessarily in the same category.
- Morphisms are **string machines**, which consist of transducers and finite compositions of transducers. The two objects that a string machine is a morphism between is determined by its total input and output signatures.
- There exists a monoidal product on **StrMach** defined as the concatenation of the tuples making up objects (with the identity given by an empty tuple), and a natural copy-discard structure provided by a string machine with two state spaces (the output being the self-product of the input) and a pre-loaded state transition that is the copy morphism in the state category.

2.2 The meta-vertex and looping

Since **StrMach** is itself a copy-discard category, we can now have string machines which output other string machines. To lessen reliance on closed categories, we will define a hierarchy of categories corresponding to “levels of meta.”

Definition 2.4. Given objects X, Y in **StrMach**, we define the **meta-vertex** to be a special kind of string machine with input signature corresponding to the data in X ’s definition as an object in **StrMach** alongside $X \rightarrow Y$, and output signature corresponding to the data in Y ’s definition. The meta-vertex therefore takes a string machine with input signature X and output signature Y as well as the necessary input data for the string machine as input, and outputs that string machine’s output as its output. Fixing some partially-ordered set $(S, \leq)$, we define the category **StrMach**₀ = **StrMach** (which has no meta-vertices) for any element $0 \in S$ such that $k \leq 0 \implies k = 0$ for any $k \in S$, and recursively define the category **StrMach** _{k} for some $k \in S$ to be the category generated over **StrMach** by adding only meta vertices which accept string machines that are morphisms in **StrMach** _{k'} for $k' \leq k$.

We can thus have a string machine consisting of a transducer that builds transducers that themselves build transducers (and so on), and feeds this transducer into a meta-vertex, to create a loop which is guaranteed to terminate if we fix our ordinals to come from $\mathbb{N}$.

3 Parameterizing complexity in deterministic string machines

3.1 Filtered transducers

Definition 3.1. The category **FiltSet** of filtered sets is the category such that

- an object is a tuple $(S, \deg_S)$, where S is a set and $\deg_S : S \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ is a function,
- a morphism $f : (S, \deg_S) \rightarrow (T, \deg_T)$ is a function $S \rightarrow T$ such that $\deg_T(f(s)) \leq \deg_S(s)$ for all $s \in S$.

We will generally refer to objects in **FiltSet** solely by the symbol corresponding to the underlying set going forward. One can observe that the identity function on a set S by definition satisfies $\deg_S(\text{id}_S(s)) = \deg_S(s)$ for all $s \in S$ and is thus a morphism in **FiltSet**. One can also observe that given $f : S \rightarrow T$ and $g : T \rightarrow V$, $\deg_V(g(f(s))) \leq \deg_T(f(s)) \leq \deg_S(s)$ for all $s \in S$, and therefore $g \circ f$ is also a morphism in **FiltSet**. Therefore, **FiltSet** is indeed a category.

Definition 3.2. Given two objects $S, T \in \text{Ob}(\mathbf{FiltSet})$, we define their **filtered product** $S \otimes T$ to be the set $S \times T$ equipped with the function $\deg_{S \otimes T} : S \times T \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ satisfying $\deg_{S \otimes T}(s, t) = \deg_S(s) + \deg_T(t)$ for all $(s, t) \in S \times T$. Given a morphism $f : S \rightarrow U$ and a morphism $g : T \rightarrow V$, we define the morphism $f \otimes g : S \otimes T \rightarrow U \otimes V$ to be the function $f \times g$. Indeed, we have that $\deg_{U \otimes V}(f(s), g(t)) = \deg_U(f(s)) + \deg_V(g(t)) \leq \deg_S(s) + \deg_T(t) = \deg_{S \otimes T}(s, t)$, so $f \otimes g$ is a morphism in **FiltSet**.

Due to the associativity and commutativity of addition, as well as the natural associativity and commutativity (up to isomorphisms which are still isomorphisms in **FiltSet**) of the cartesian product, $- \otimes -$ is naturally associative and commutative up to isomorphism. Additionally, the one-element set **1** equipped with $\deg_1(\cdot) = 0$ and unitor maps which are the same as in **Set** (which are, by their definition, filtered morphisms) provides a left and right unit for $- \otimes -$, making **FiltSet** a symmetric monoidal category.

Remark. Suppose filtered sets S, T, U and filtered morphisms $f : S \rightarrow T$ and $g : S \rightarrow U$. Then, the unique factoring function $S \rightarrow T \times U$ defined by $s \mapsto (f(s), g(s))$ is only a filtered morphism $S \rightarrow T \otimes U$ if $\deg_T(f(s)) + \deg_U(g(s)) \leq \deg_S(s)$, which does not hold in general. Therefore, $- \otimes -$ does not provide a product except for when at least one of the sets has degree uniformly zero. However, **FiltSet** does have finite products $S \times T$ where $\deg_{S \times T}(s, t) := \max(\deg_S(s), \deg_T(t))$. We will not be using this construction.

Remark. The set-theoretic disjoint union, with its degree function being the canonical factoring map to $\mathbb{N}$ of its components' degree functions, provides all finite coproducts in **FiltSet**.

Definition 3.3. A **filtered-morphism category** $\mathcal{C}$ is a locally small symmetric monoidal category enriched over **FiltSet**, using **FiltSet**'s filtered product $- \otimes -$ as its monoidal structure.

This expresses the notion of morphisms having degrees which are subadditive under composition in a way that naturally extends to a complexity constraint on transducers. As the monoidal identity of **FiltSet** is the single-element set with degree zero, the arrows $I_{\mathbf{FiltSet}} \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(A, A)$ providing the identity morphism id_A in the enrichment construction will ensure that identity morphisms are degree zero.

One can generalize the construction of **Filtset** by replacing $\mathbb{N}$ with any partially-ordered symmetric monoid (where the partial order is, obviously, translation-invariant as it is with the usual definition of a partially-ordered group). We will make use of categories filtered over $\mathbb{N}^2$ (with the partial order given by $(a, b) \leq (c, d)$ if and only if $a \leq c$ and $b \leq d$) in our construction of the filtered state category, as follows:

Definition 3.4. Given a filtered-morphism category $\mathcal{C}$ and a list $\{(X_i \rightarrow Y_i, a_i x + b_i)\}_i$ of $\mathcal{C}$ -signatures (generators) and linear polynomials with coefficients in $\mathbb{N}$, the **freely-generated $\mathbb{N}^2$ -filtered category over $\mathcal{C}$** with this list of signatures, or $\mathcal{C}[X_1 \rightarrow Y_1, \dots, X_n \rightarrow Y_n]$, is the symmetric monoidal category where:

- objects are exactly the objects of $\mathcal{C}$.
- A morphism $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is either a morphism of $\mathcal{C}$, or obtained by composing morphisms of $\mathcal{C}$ with free generators added to $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(X_i, Y_i)$ for each $\mathcal{C}$ -signature $X_i \rightarrow Y_i$ in the list.
- The **$\mathbb{N}^2$ -degree** of a morphism f is a linear polynomial with coefficients in $\mathbb{N}$, which is either its degree in $\mathcal{C}$ (expressed as a constant) if it is a $\mathcal{C}$ -morphism, the polynomial $a_i x + b_i$ if it is one of the generators $X_i \rightarrow Y_i$ added when creating the category, or the sum of the degrees of all morphisms involved in its composition, with the degree contributions of composition-chains of $\mathcal{C}$ -morphisms being the degrees in $\mathcal{C}$ of the morphism they compose to, and these being strictly additive with each other and the degrees of any generator morphisms once all simplifications have been performed.

The monoidal product of a morphism with generators in its composition-chain and a $\mathcal{C}$ -morphism is taken to have the sum of their $\mathbb{N}^2$ -degrees.

We can now introduce filtered state categories.

Definition 3.5. Given a filtered-morphism category $\mathcal{C}$, its corresponding **filtered state category** $\mathcal{C}^S$ is the category where

- an object A is a tuple $(S(A), V_A, \deg_A)$, where:
 - **The state space of A** is a set $S(A)$.
 - **The variables of A** are a functor V_A from the discrete category corresponding to $S(A)$ to the discrete category formed by all finite ordered tuples of pairs of objects X, Y in $\mathcal{C}$. We call the tuple associated with a given $x \in S(A)$ **the variables at x** , or $V_A(x)$. Since variables implicitly denote morphism signatures, we will refer to a given variable $(X, Y) \in V_A(x)$ as $X \rightarrow Y$.
 - **The degree of a variable $X \rightarrow Y \in V_A(x)$** for some $x \in S(A)$, denoted $\deg_{A,x}(X \rightarrow Y)$ (or simply $\deg_A(X \rightarrow Y)$ if x can be inferred from context) is a tuple $(a, b) \in \mathbb{N}^2$. We impose the same partial ordering $\leq$ on these tuples as we do with degrees in the freely-generated $\mathbb{N}^2$ -filtered categories.
- a morphism $f : A \rightarrow B$ of degree ℓ , where $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$, is a tuple $(S(f), V_f)$, where:
 - **The state transition $S(f)$** is a function $S(A) \rightarrow S(B)$.
 - **The output function at $x \in S(A)$** , denoted $V_f(x)$, is a collection of morphisms in a freely-generated $\mathbb{N}^2$ -filtered category over $\mathcal{C}$, defined as follows:

For each variable $X'_j \rightarrow Y'_j$ of degree $a'_j x + b'_j$, at $S(f)(x)$, $V_f(x)$ defines a morphism $X'_j \rightarrow Y'_j$ of degree at most $a'_j(x + \ell) + b'_j = a'_j x + (a'_j \ell + b'_j)$ (that is, the degree of the morphism cannot exceed this polynomial in either of its terms) in the freely-generated $\mathbb{N}^2$ -filtered category over $\mathcal{C}$ with generators and the degrees of those generators provided by the variables $X_i \rightarrow Y_i$ of degrees $a_i x + b_i$ in $V_A(x)$. The function between hom-sets in $\mathcal{C}$ can then be expressed by substituting each generator with a $\mathcal{C}$ -morphism of the appropriate signature.

This induces a function (but not a filtered one!) between the product of the hom-sets $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(X_i, Y_i)$ for all variables $X_i \rightarrow Y_i$ at x and the product of the hom-sets $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(X'_j, Y'_j)$ for all variables $X'_j \rightarrow Y'_j$ at $S(f)(x)$, which can be obtained by replacing each generator corresponding to a variable at x with a morphism of $\mathcal{C}$ of the appropriate signature.

- Given two morphisms $f : A \rightarrow B$ of degree ℓ and $g : B \rightarrow C$ of degree ℓ' , their composition $g \circ f : A \rightarrow C$ is a tuple $(S(g \circ f), V_{g \circ f})$ where:

- The composite state transition $S(g \circ f)$ is defined as $S(g) \circ S(f)$.
- The composite output function $V_{g \circ f}(x)$ is defined as follows: For each variable $X_k'' \rightarrow Y_k''$ defined at $S(g \circ f)(x)$, of degree $a_k''x + b_k''$, $V_g(S(f)(x))$ defines a morphism of degree at most $a_k''(x + \ell') + b_k'' = a_k''x + (a_k''\ell' + b_k'')$ in the category freely generated over $\mathcal{C}$ with generators corresponding to the variables $\{X_j' \rightarrow Y_j'\}_j$ at $S(f)(x)$ and their degrees. Now, $V_f(x)$ induces a functor from $\mathcal{C}[X_1' \rightarrow Y_1', \dots]$ to $\mathcal{C}[X_1 \rightarrow Y_1, \dots]$ (where $\{X_i \rightarrow Y_i\}_i$ denote the variables at x), which fixes $\mathcal{C}$ but replaces every free generator of the category freely generated over the variables at $S(f)(x)$ with the morphism associated with it by $V_f(x)$, in the category freely generated over the variables at x . Therefore, the output function $V_{g \circ f}(x)$ at x is simply the image of each of the morphisms generated by $V_g(x)$ under this functor defined by $V_f(x)$. The function between products of hom-sets induced by the composite output function is therefore just the composition of the functions induced by the individual morphisms' output functions.

Now, for a given variable $X_k'' \rightarrow Y_k''$ at $S(f \circ g)(x)$ of degree $a_k''x + b_k''$, every generator of some degree $a_j'x + b_j'$ involved in the morphism of (initial) degree $a_k''x + a_k''\ell' + b_k''$ defined by $V_g(x)$ has been replaced with one of degree $a_j'x + a_j'\ell + b_j'$. Suppose each generator $X_j' \rightarrow Y_j'$ appears with multiplicity m_j' in the morphism corresponding to $X_k'' \rightarrow Y_k''$. Then, we have it that $\sum_j m_j a_j' \leq a_k''$, and since $a_j'\ell$ worth of degree has been added to the morphism for every generator appearing in it, we have that the degree of the morphism generated by $V_{g \circ f}(x)$ must be $a_k'' + a_k''\ell' + b_k'' + \sum_j m_j a_j'\ell \leq a_k'' + a_k''(\ell + \ell') + b_k''$. So, the degree of $g \circ f$ is $\ell + \ell'$.

Remark. $\mathcal{C}^S$ is a filtered-morphism category with the degrees of morphisms being defined as in the definition of the category, as the identity morphism of each object A has an output function that outputs a variable of degree $ax + b$ (the generator corresponding to the variable itself) for any variable of degree $ax + b$ and is thus of degree zero. Additionally, as also demonstrated in the definition, degree is subadditive with composition, meaning that the composition arrow is indeed a morphism in **FiltSet**.

Definition 3.6. A **filtered functor** $F : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ is an enriched functor between filtered-morphism categories.

Given a filtered functor $F : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$, since the definition of an enriched functor requires the functor's action on morphisms to be provided by a morphism between hom-objects within the category, it automatically holds that $\deg_{\mathcal{D}} F(\alpha) \leq \deg_{\mathcal{C}}(\alpha)$ for all morphisms α in $\mathcal{C}$.

Definition 3.7. A **filtered deterministic transducer** is a deterministic transducer where the input and output categories, $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{D}$, are filtered-morphism categories, and the functor $F : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}^S$ affording the transducer structure is a filtered functor to the filtered state category of the output category.

3.2 Finite-state string machines

For the following section, we assume a filtered deterministic transducer T with input category $\mathcal{C}$, output category $\mathcal{D}$, structure functor F , input state space $S(A)$, output state space $S(B)$, primary input $\mathcal{C}$ -signature $X \rightarrow Y$, auxiliary input $\mathcal{D}$ -signatures $(X_i \rightarrow Y_i)_{1 \leq i \leq n}$, and output $\mathcal{D}$ -signatures $(X_j' \rightarrow Y_j')_{1 \leq j \leq m}$. We will now demonstrate that requiring a finite output state space on a transducer provides us with certain output size and runtime guarantees.

Proposition 3.1. *If $S(B)$ is finite, and, for every $x \in S(A)$, the linear term of the degree of every variable in $V_A(x)$ is nonzero, then, for every $x \in S(A)$ and every primary input $\mathcal{C}$ -morphism α , the number of copies of the generator corresponding to each auxiliary input $X_i \rightarrow Y_i$ appearing in each morphism corresponding to each output signature $X_j' \rightarrow Y_j'$ in $V_{F(\alpha)}(S(F(\alpha))(x))$ is bounded by a fixed integer k , which does not depend on $\deg(\alpha)$.*

Proof. Since $S(B)$ is finite, and the number of variables which exist at any state is finite, there exists a variable with maximal linear degree $a'_{\max}$ across all variables in all states in $S(B)$, in some state in $S(B)$. No morphism in $\mathcal{D}^S$ can generate a morphism in the appropriate $\mathbb{N}^2$ -graded free category over $\mathcal{D}$ with linear degree greater than that of its corresponding variable. Therefore, given any starting state $x \in S(A)$, no morphism $f : A \rightarrow B$ in $\mathcal{D}^S$ exists where any component of the output function

has more than $a'_{\max}$ copies of any of the generators corresponding to the variables at x , since each of these will have sizes with linear term at least 1. $\square$

Proposition 3.2. *Suppose $S(B)$ is finite, and every variable in every state in $S(A)$ has a linear term of 1 or greater in its degree. Denote the primary input morphism of T as α and its tuple of auxiliary input morphisms as $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n$, and define $\deg_m(\beta) := \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} (\deg(\beta_i))$. Then, for every output signature $X'_j \rightarrow Y'_j$, there exist fixed integers a_j^T, b_j^T, c_j^T such that, for the morphism γ_j outputted for this signature given these inputs, $\deg(\gamma_j) \leq a_j^T \deg(\alpha) + b_j^T \deg_m(\beta) + c_j^T$.*

Proof. For every output signature $X'_j \rightarrow Y'_j$, there exists a state $y \in S(B)$ such that $\deg_{B,y}(X'_j \rightarrow Y'_j)$ attains some maximal linear coefficient $a'_{\max}$, the generators corresponding to auxiliary inputs of T can appear in $X'_j \rightarrow Y'_j$ at most some fixed $a'_{\max}$ number of times. Additionally, a similar maximum $b'_{\max}$ can be found for the constant term of $\deg_{B,y}(X'_j \rightarrow Y'_j)$. Since, by the definition of a filtered functor, $\deg(F(\alpha)) \leq \deg(\alpha)$, and by the definition of the state category, the $\mathbb{N}^2$ -degree of the output at $X'_j \rightarrow Y'_j$ can be at most $a'_j x + a'_j \deg(F(\alpha)) + b'_j$, then $\deg(\gamma_j) \leq a'_{\max} \deg_m(\beta) + a'_{\max} \deg(\alpha) + b'_{\max}$. $\square$

Corollary 3.2.1. *Suppose a string machine composed only of a finite set of filtered transducers $\{T_k\}_{1 \leq k \leq N}$, where each transducer T_k has input state space $S(A_k)$ and output state space $S(B_k)$ such that every variable at every state in $S(A_k)$ has a degree with 1 or greater linear term, and $S(B_k)$ is finite. Denote by α'_k the morphism that T_k will receive as its primary input morphism, given overall input morphisms $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$ and input states $x_1, \dots, x_m$ to the string machine. Then, $\sum_{k=1}^N \deg(\alpha'_k) = O(\sum_{i=1}^n \deg(\alpha_i))$.*

Proof. Suppose two transducers T_1, T_2 , where T_1 receives a primary input morphism α and auxiliary input morphisms $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_m$. Therefore, by Proposition 3.2, there exist integers a_1, b_1, c_1 such that, for a given output γ produced by T_1 , the degree of γ satisfies $\deg(\gamma) \leq a_1 \deg(\alpha) + b_1 \deg_m(\beta) + c_1$. Now, if the primary input of T_2 is not connected to an output of T_1 , then the string machine composed of these transducers satisfies the proposition, as the inputs of T_2 are now included in the overall inputs of the string machine. If γ is composed into the primary input of T_2 , however, then $\deg(\alpha'_2) \leq a_1 \deg(\alpha) + b_1 \deg_m(\beta) + c_1$. Given similar coefficients a_2, b_2, c_2 for a given output γ_2 of T_2 , we can see that $\deg(\gamma_2) \leq a_2(\deg(\alpha'_2)) + b_2 \deg_m(\beta_2) + c_2$, where $\deg_m(\beta_2)$ is bounded from above by either the same kind of linear sum as the one for γ (if the greatest degree among the auxiliary inputs comes from an output of T_1), or the degree of yet another additional input to the overall string machine. Therefore, any further composition of transducers $T_3, \dots$ will result in $\alpha'_3, \dots$ also being bounded by a linear sum of the degrees of the overall inputs of the string machine, meaning that the sum $\sum_{k=1}^N \deg(\alpha'_k)$ is also bounded by a linear sum of these degrees. $\square$

Corollary 3.2.1 can be used to bound the runtime of string machines, if, fixing some model of computation, we have a bound on the time it takes to run a single transducer as a function of its inputs. We note that the coefficients bounding output size are multiplied together upon composition into either an auxiliary input or a primary input, but only composition into a primary input ties the degree of the state transition that will occur in the second transducer to the primary input degree of the first transducer. We define the sum bounded in the corollary as follows:

Definition 3.8. Take a string machine K with input signatures $X_1 \rightarrow Y_1, \dots, X_n \rightarrow Y_n$ and input state spaces $S(A_1), \dots, S(A_m)$, where the transducers forming K form the set $\{T_k\}_{1 \leq k \leq N}$. Denote by α'_k the morphism that the transducer T_k will receive as its primary input morphism, given inputs $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$ ($\overline{\alpha}$ for short) and $x_1, \dots, x_m$ ($\overline{x}$ for short) to K . We define the **internal total primary input degree** of K to be $\text{IPD}_K(\overline{\alpha}, \overline{x}) := \sum_{k=1}^N \deg(\alpha'_k)$.

While we have established that, lacking a meta-vertex, IPD_K will be linearly bounded by the total degree of its inputs, its scaling properties as a function of the number of transducers composed has no such guarantees. One can observe that composing more and more transducers that double their input size together causes exponential growth in IPD_K . As we are interested in the runtime properties of both string machines that incorporate a meta-vertex and of parameterized families of string machines, we must obtain some sufficient conditions for IPD_K to grow polynomially in the number of transducers in our string machine. To help determine these conditions, we will define the output-degree-bounding parameters referenced in Proposition 3.2:

Definition 3.9. Take a filtered deterministic transducer T with a finite output state space $S(B)$ and an output signature $X \rightarrow Y$ of T . Given an input state x , primary input morphism α , and auxiliary input morphisms $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_m$ to T , denote by γ the output morphism produced for $X \rightarrow Y$. We define the **output degree** $\deg_o^T(X \rightarrow Y)$ of the output $X \rightarrow Y$ of T to be the integer triple (a, b, c) such that the relation described in Proposition 3.2, $\deg(\gamma) \leq a \deg(\alpha) + b \deg_m(\beta) + c$, holds for all possible α and $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_m$ (and the γ produced by these inputs). Given the minimal linear term $a_{\min}$ (at least 1) that the degree of any variable in any state in the input state space of T , and the maximal linear term $a'_{\max}$ and constant term $b'_{\max}$ for the degree of the variable in the output state space corresponding to $X \rightarrow Y$, we can unambiguously define $\deg_o^T(X \rightarrow Y) = (a'_{\max}, \lfloor a'_{\max}/a_{\min} \rfloor, b'_{\max})$.

We can now prove some elementary sufficient conditions for IPD_{K_N} for a family $\{K_N\}_{N \leq 1}$ of string machines to grow polynomially in N .

Proposition 3.3. Suppose a family of string machines $\{K_N\}_{N \geq 1}$, where K_1 is composed of a single filtered deterministic transducer with a finite output state space, and for $N > 1$, K_N is created by composing some of the outputs of K_{N-1} into the inputs of a new filtered deterministic transducer with a finite output state space, such that the remaining uncomposed input legs of each K_N are the same for all N . Given the output $X_N \rightarrow Y_N$ of K_{N-1} composed into the primary input of the new transducer added to obtain K_N , we designate the transducer that that output is produced from as T'_N , and write $\deg_o^{T'_N}(X_N \rightarrow Y_N) = (a_N, b_N, c_N)$. Now, fixing any input states and morphisms, $\text{IPD}_{K_N} = O(N^h)$ for some h , regardless of the value of the inputs fixed, if the following conditions are met:

- We have that $c_N = O(N^k)$, for some fixed k .
- We have that $a_N + b_N = O(1)$.
- The number of times that $a_N + b_N > 1$ is $O(\log N)$.

Proof. Omitting our input morphisms and states, we have that $\text{IPD}_{K_N} = \text{IPD}_{K_{N-1}} + \gamma_N$, where γ_N is the output of K_{N-1} composed into the new transducer's primary input. IPD_{K_1} is obviously simply the degree of our initial primary input. T'_N either adds $O(N^k)$ degrees' worth of material to the new transducer's primary input compared to $\text{IPD}_{K_{N-1}}$, or at most multiplies $\text{IPD}_{K_{N-1}}$ by some fixed amount and then adds this extra degree. Since subsequent multiplications of this sum can be bounded from above by doing all the additions first and then multiplying the result by the cumulative multiplication thus far, the function bounding IPD_{K_N} can be expressed as a sum

$$\sum_{i=1}^N O(1)^{O(\log i)} (n + iO(i^k)) \leq N(N^{O(1)}(n + O(N^{k+1}))) = N^{\ell+1}n + O(N^{\ell+k+2})$$

where ℓ is the constant coefficient affording the $O(\log i)$ bound, and n is the total degree of the input morphisms to K_N . $\square$

Remark. We have thus far only considered filtered transducers where the linear term of every variable in the input state space is non-vanishing. If we change this condition to only require that the constant term of the variable be non-vanishing, then the total number of generators in the $\mathbb{N}^2$ -filtered category over the output category produced in the output is still bounded by a linear function of the primary input signature. So, the degree of the output function is now linear in the *product* of the degrees of the primary and auxiliary inputs. One can observe, however, that any composition of transducers will only cause outputs to be multiplied with each other a fixed number of times, so IPD will now be bounded by a polynomial in the total inputs of the string machine.

3.2.1 String machine description length

As string machines can themselves be thought of as morphisms in a category, and we are interested in extending our complexity constraints to the case where the meta-vertex is involved, we must imbue the category that string machines are morphisms in with a filtered category structure itself. While this could be accomplished by setting the degree of a string machine to just be the number of transducers involved (where a no-transducer string machine is just the identity and has degree zero), this obviously fails to capture the internal complexity of a transducer.




Figure 1: Assuming the runtime of a state-category morphism is proportional to its degree, we must impose either a constant or logarithmic bound on the number of primary-input compositions where the output is multiplied to preserve runtime that is polynomial in the total number of transducers. In the figure, vertical arrows go to a transducer’s primary input, while horizontal ones go to its auxiliary input.

If we require that the input category of every non-meta-vertex transducer be finitely-generated, then we could make reference to the size of some fixed graph representation of a transducer’s transition table and output functions corresponding to generators, and then have this size be additive when transducers are composed. However, as discussed in the previous section, this description size does not constrain runtime for transducers which build other transducers and then run them. We discuss possible approaches in Section 4.1.1.

3.3 The expressivity of finite-state string machines

Now that we have obtained guarantees for the scaling of IPD, which can be thought of as an analogue to the runtime of a string machine, in both the number of transducers in a string machine and in input size, we focus on characterizing the expressivity of string machines consisting of **finite-state deterministic transducers**, that is, filtered deterministic transducers where the state space corresponding to every element of the input category (not only the output state space) is finite.

In the following section, we will assume that all transducers have an input category that is of a form described as follows:

Definition 3.10. A **tape category** is a filtered-morphism copy-discard category $\mathcal{X}$ freely generated over a single object X and a finite number of morphisms of the form $X^m \rightarrow X^n$ (where superscripts denote monoidal self-products), where every generator morphism has positive degree. If all our generator morphisms are of signature $X^m \rightarrow X$, then a tape category is the copy-discard category freely generated over the symmetric monoidal category freely generated from the multicategory with one object freely generated from those generators, by way of the functor from multicategories to monoidal categories proven by Hermida [8] to be an adjoint to the forgetful functor in the other direction.

We can treat tapes as a special case of tape category, where all generators are endomorphisms of the generating object.

3.3.1 Without a meta-vertex

Finite-state string machines, even without a meta-vertex, can prepend to their output, which is not something the traditional definition of finite-state transducer can do. It is natural to investigate if this makes the framework more expressive than a deterministic finite automaton, e.g., having it recognize palindromes by reversing a string and then feeding the product of these two (their overlaying) into a transducer that then checks if each character matches up.

Unfortunately, given morphisms $f : A \rightarrow B$ and $g : C \rightarrow D$ in an input category (not necessarily a tape category) $\mathcal{C}$, and their product $f \otimes g$, we can see that, since $F(f \otimes g) = F(f \otimes \text{id}_D) \circ F(\text{id}_A \otimes g) = F(\text{id}_B \otimes g) \circ F(f \otimes \text{id}_C)$, a state transition on a collection of finite state spaces induced by the product of two morphisms can only capture the same sort of information that could be captured by independently running two finite-state transducers on both morphisms and comparing their states at the very end.

Thus, “per-character” comparisons of the sort that would require conditions analogous to aligning characters on tape would require infinite state spaces to represent the equivalent memory operations being performed. However, due to the nature of the auxiliary input, as well as the aforementioned prepending capabilities, we are clearly able to model functions that finite state transducers cannot, even without a meta-vertex.

To characterize the class of decision problems computable by non-meta-vertex finite-state string machines, we first prove the following lemma:

Lemma 3.4. *Suppose some finite-state transducer T with primary input signature $X \rightarrow X$ in a tape category $\mathcal{X}$, structure functor F , and output state space $S(A)$, such that these are its only inputs and outputs. Fix a finite set of morphisms $\{g_1, \dots, g_n : X \rightarrow X\}$ in the freely-generated $\mathbb{N}^2$ -filtered category over $\mathcal{X}$ with a single generating signature $X \rightarrow X$ of degree x , such that the linear coefficient of the degree of each g_i is at most 1 (that is, the generator corresponding to $X \rightarrow X$ appears at most once). Suppose we are able to construct a primary input morphism $g : X \rightarrow X$ for this transducer in the following way:*

- *Our starting value for g is id_X .*
- *We can replace g with one of the previously-given g_i , with g substituted for the generator morphism. We can perform this step a finite of times.*

Then, given some state transition reached as a result of some such g , the amount of memory required to compute the output state of the transducer is $O(1)$ in the degree of g .

Proof. We will assume that one “computational step” involves performing one of the operations involved in constructing g described above. We will demonstrate that computing the next state after any of the operations performed requires storing an amount of information that is $O(1)$ in the degree of g .

- If one of the g_i does not have the generator morphism appear at all, then $S(A)$ after this g_i has replaced g depends solely on the g_i used, and since the set of such g_i is finite, it takes a finite amount of space to store the state reached from the starting state when one of these g_i are evaluated.
- If one of the g_i only involves post-composing an endomorphism of X into the generator, then storing the state reached from a given state after any of these endomorphisms is post-composed takes a fixed amount of memory, since the set of g_i is finite.
- If one of the g_i involves only pre-composing and post-composing endomorphisms of T into g , then computing the resultant state after the action of one of these g_i only requires us to store $|S(A)|$ extra “possible current states.” That is, if we know what state we would be in after the evaluation of g had we started at any other one of the $|S(A)|$ states of the transducer, then after computing which new starting state we would have started at (which, since the set of endomorphisms we pre-compose is finite, is equivalent to storing a fixed-size transition table), we can then pick the state that the copy of the transducer that started at that state would be at after the action of g . This is therefore equivalent to running $|S(A)|$ copies of a finite state automaton, where each copy starts at a different state .
- Suppose one of the g_i is obtained by taking a morphism $\alpha : X \rightarrow X^n$, post-composing morphisms into each branch (such that one branch includes the generator), and then finally post-composing a morphism $\beta : X^n \rightarrow X$. Even if multiple “branchings” occur, since the generator where g will be substituted appears only once, we can still decompose this into a morphism obtained by first taking the monoidal product of g with a number of fixed morphisms such that the

overall signature of their product is $X^n \rightarrow X^n$, and then composing in α and β . Now, we only need $O(1)$ space to store the functions $S(F(X)) \rightarrow S(F(X^n))$ and $S(F(X^n)) \rightarrow S(F(X))$ induced by α and β , since these are functions between finite sets. Additionally, for the function $S(F(X^n)) \rightarrow S(F(X^n))$ induced by the monoid product of g with a fixed morphism γ of signature $X^{n-1} \rightarrow X^{n-1}$, by the property discussed at the start of this section, we only need to be keeping track of the action of $F(g \otimes \text{id}_{X^{n-1}})$ on $S(F(X^n))$ (which, since there are a finite number of g_i , only requires keeping an absolutely bounded number of automata running), and then compute the action of $F(\text{id}_X \otimes \gamma)$ on the result, which, as a function with a finite domain and codomain, takes finite space to store.

Therefore, to compute the state transition induced by g , we only need to keep $|S(A)|$ copies of the finite state automaton running, as well as some fixed number of finite-state automata with input and output state spaces corresponding to $S(F(X^n))$ for some fixed n . $\square$

With this lemma, it now remains to show, roughly speaking, that for any string machine made out of finite-state deterministic transducers which decides some language (represented by morphisms in a tape category), the computation performed at every input morphism can be broken into a constant-bounded number of transitions of the type described in the lemma. We present a conjecture that finite-state string machines without a meta-vertex can only recognize regular languages, followed by a sketch for a proof of this conjecture.

Conjecture. *Suppose a string machine composed only of finite-state transducers, where the input and output categories of each transducer are tape categories. Suppose this string machine has only one free input $X \rightarrow X$ in some tape category $\mathcal{X}$ where all generating morphisms (which form a set Σ) are endomorphisms of the generating object X , and has as its sole output a state space $S(A)$, with some subset of $S(A)$ designated as accepting. Then, taking an endomorphism $X \rightarrow X$ in $\mathcal{X}$ which does not include any instances of the copy morphism to be a string over the alphabet Σ , any language over Σ accepted by this string machine is regular.*

Proof sketch. It suffices to prove that the computation involved in deciding this language takes constant space as a function of input size, as $\text{DSpace}(O(1)) = \text{REG}$. More precisely, given any input morphism $g : X \rightarrow X$ and a finite set of possible character strings that we can post-compose into g , we desire to show that there is a constant-bounded amount of information (independent of the size of g) that we need to store, which will allow us to calculate the output state after any of these character strings are added to g . By Proposition 3.1, each transducer involved in the string machine can create a constant-bounded number of duplicates of its auxiliary inputs within each of its outputs. This means that to predict the state of a given transducer after one of the operations described in Lemma 3.4 done to an auxiliary input, we need to store a constant amount of information. Moreover, due to the limitation caused by the size of a variable on the number of transitions one can make before we run out of variable space and must either limit ourselves to Lemma 3.4-like operations or reset, the number of “shapes” auxiliary inputs can exist in is absolutely bounded. The hope is that if we back-propagate until reaching the primary input of the first transducer, we will still have a constant-bounded amount of information to keep track of to predict the output state after the next character is reached.

Remark. This conjecture is already suggested by the combination of Corollary 3.2.1 and classical results by Kobayashi [11] and Hennie [7] which together imply that any one-tape Turing machine that runs in $o(n \log n)$ time decides a regular language. The reason the proposition is not trivially implied by these results is that a naive simulation of the string machine in question on a single-tape Turing machine will cross the last cell of its initial input a guaranteed $O(n)$ times (when going back and forth to read the next cell to write the inputs to feed to the next automaton in line). The conjecture would also automatically be implied if we prove that the composition of two finite-state transducers can be equivalently modeled by a single finite-state transducer.

3.3.2 With a meta-vertex

The meta-vertex, even at meta-level one, can clearly be seen to increase the expressivity of finite-state string machines. We construct a string machine which can recognize palindromes as follows:

Given a tape category $\mathcal{X}$ where all generating morphisms are endomorphisms of the generating object

X , mark a special generating endomorphism r . Given a generating endomorphism $\alpha \neq r$ of X , we define T_α to be the filtered deterministic transducer with input and output category $\mathcal{X}$, with input and output signatures $X \rightarrow X$ and three states, a fixed one of which is the starting state. When in the starting state, T_α will transition to the “accepting state” and store id_X in the sole variable at that state if it encounters α , and transition to the “rejecting state” and store r if any other generating morphism is encountered. When in the rejecting state, all morphisms are mapped to the identity on the rejecting state. When in the accepting state, all morphisms transition back to the accepting state, but this time append the current primary input generator morphism to the output. The end result is that when given an endomorphism $s : X \rightarrow X$, the transducer T_α will output s with its first “character” removed if and only if it starts with α , and output r otherwise. As a morphism, it is of signature $(X \rightarrow X)_{\mathcal{X}} \rightarrow (X \rightarrow X)_{\mathcal{X}}$.

Now, we define a filtered deterministic transducer T with input category $\mathcal{X}$, which outputs a filtered deterministic transducer without meta vertices. This transducer has input signature $X \rightarrow X$ and only one state, with one variable of signature $(X \rightarrow X) \rightarrow (X \rightarrow X)$, and it is assumed that no morphism $X \rightarrow X$ fed to T will include r . Given a generator morphism α of $\mathcal{X}$, the transducer T will prepend T_α to the current variable’s stored string machine. If we compose a meta vertex that takes the output of T and takes the same input morphism as T and passes it on to the string machine formed by T , then we obtain a string machine that outputs id_X if it is given a palindrome, and r if it is fed anything else.

4 Conclusions

Thus far, we have proven results about the runtime and expressivity of finite-state deterministic transducers in the string machines framework. This framework allows us to model the compositionality of transducers in a way that allows for more compression of description length. For example, we are able to implement the trivial time-space tradeoff of recognizing a regular language that is the intersection of several regular languages by running several automata in sequence instead of the product automaton, or the cascade product in Krohn-Rhodes theory [14] by having a transducer “shuffle” its primary input using its ability to prepend.

Additionally, our runtime scaling guarantees in the number of transducers in a string machine translate to sufficient conditions for transducers which build and run other transducers in runtime to run in polynomial time. This will allow us to take advantage of the additional compression opportunities the meta-vertex presents. These results are valuable for developing string machines into a framework that can be used to model hypothesis spaces representable by automata.

4.1 Further work

4.1.1 Description complexity that encapsulates runtime

As exemplified by Definition 3.4, the construction of filtered sets can be extended to a partially-ordered monoid that is not $\mathbb{N}$. Since a string machine without a meta-vertex will have the degrees of its outputs be bounded by a linear function of the degrees of its inputs, we can assign a degree $ax + b$ to finite-state filtered transducers, where a and b are the maximal values for some sum of the coefficients appearing in the output degree in Definition 3.9, where the partial order is the same as in Definition 3.4. However, in this case, the monoid operation imposed on the polynomials is composition, due to how the linear relations bounding output size get composed when transducers are composed, and the filtered-set category is no longer symmetric monoidal since this operation is not commutative.

Now, the variables in our state categories would have their degrees be of the form $ay + bx + c$, where a morphism of degree $dx + e$ can compose in a transducer of at most that degree, meaning the output variable is of degree $a(y + (dx + e)) + bx + c = ay + (dx + e)^a \circ bx + c$ by abuse of notation. where the superscript indicates a -fold self-composition. At further meta-levels, we keep adding terms, though it is unclear how we would disambiguate which variable to compose into for the monoid operation.

4.1.2 Characterizing the expressivity of transducers with a meta-vertex and monadic transducers

We have not yet established bounds on the expressivity of finite-state deterministic transducers which incorporate the meta-vertex, but, due to the bounding on levels of meta, it is likely that the languages they decide are some subset of context-free languages. The runtime guarantees also need to be translated to monadic transducers. Work on bounding the expressivity of monadic string machines may involve defining equivalents for string machines of various properties [15, 2, 13, 3] which characterize determinizable weighted transducers, which may in turn allow us to bound the computational complexity of computing the distribution on output morphisms given by a monadic transducer.

References

- [1] J. Adamek and V. Trnkova. *Automata and Algebras in Categories*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, Netherlands, 1990.
- [2] C. Allauzen and M. Mohri. An optimal pre-determinization algorithm for weighted transducers. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 328(1-2):3–18, 2004.
- [3] J. P. Bell and D. Smertnig. Computing the linear hull: Deciding Deterministic? and Unambiguous? for weighted automata over fields. In *2023 38th Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (LICS)*, pages 1–13. IEEE, 2023.
- [4] G. Boccali, A. Laretto, F. Loregian, and S. Luneia. Completeness for categories of generalized automata, 2023.
- [5] M. Earnshaw and P. Sobociński. Regular monoidal languages, 2022.
- [6] M. Earnshaw and P. Sobociński. String diagrammatic trace theory, 2023.
- [7] F. Hennie. One-tape, off-line turing machine computations. *Information and Control*, 8(6):553–578, 1965.
- [8] C. Hermida. Representable multicategories. *Advances in Mathematics*, 151(2):164–225, 2000.
- [9] M. Hutter. A theory of universal artificial intelligence based on algorithmic complexity, 2000.
- [10] M. J. Kearns and U. V. Vazirani. Computational learning theory. *ACM SIGACT News*, 26(1):43–45, 1995.
- [11] K. Kobayashi. On the structure of one-tape nondeterministic turing machine time hierarchy. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 40:175–193, 1985. Eleventh International Colloquium on Automata, Languages and Programming.
- [12] V. Kosoy. Compositional language for hypotheses about computations. AI Alignment Forum, March 2023.
- [13] P. Kostolanyi. Determinisability of unary weighted automata over the rational numbers. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 898:110–131, 2022.
- [14] K. Krohn and J. Rhodes. Algebraic theory of machines. I. Prime decomposition theorem for finite semigroups and machines. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 116:450–464, 1965.
- [15] M. Mohri. *Weighted Finite-State Transducer Algorithms. An Overview*, pages 551–563. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2004.
- [16] N. Niu and D. I. Spivak. Polynomial functors: A mathematical theory of interaction, 2023.
- [17] A. Ronca and G. D. Giacomo. Efficient PAC reinforcement learning in regular decision processes, 2022.