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Abstract. Regular expressions (REs), because of their succinctness and clear syntax, are the common choice to represent regular languages. However, efficient pattern matching or word recognition depend on the size of the equivalent nondeterministic finite automata (NFA). We present the implementation of several algorithms for constructing small $\varepsilon$-free NFAs from REs within the FAdo system, and a comparison of regular expression measures and NFA sizes based on experimental results obtained from uniform random generated REs. For this analysis, nonredundant REs and reduced REs in star normal form were considered.

1 Introduction

Regular expressions (REs), because of their succinctness and clear syntax, are the common choice to represent regular languages. Equivalent deterministic finite automata (DFA) would be the preferred choice for pattern matching or word recognition as these problems can be solved efficiently by DFAs. However, minimal DFAs can be exponentially bigger than REs. Nondeterministic finite automata (NFA) obtained from REs can have the number of states linear with respect to (w.r.t) the size of the REs. Because NFA minimization is a PSPACE-complete problem other methods must be used in order to obtain small NFAs usable for practical purposes. Conversion methods from REs to equivalent NFAs can produce NFAs without or with transitions labelled with the empty word ($\varepsilon$-NFA). Here we consider several constructions of small $\varepsilon$-free NFAs that were recently developed or improved [Mir66,Ant96,CZ02,HSW01,IY03a,JMCZ07], and that are related with the one of Glushkov and McNaughton-Yamada [Glu61,MY60]. The NFA size can be reduced by merging equivalent states [IY03b,LSOY05]. Another solution is to simplify the REs before the conversion [EKSW05]. Gruber and Gulan [GG09] showed that REs in reduced star normal form (snf) achieve some conversion lower bounds. Our experimental results corroborate that REs must be converted to reduced snf. In this paper we present the implementation
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within the FAdo system [FAd10] of several algorithms for constructing small ε-free NFAs from REs, and a comparison of regular expression measures and NFA sizes based on experimental results obtained from uniform random generated REs. We consider nonredundant REs and REs in reduced snf in particular.

2 Regular Expressions and Finite Automata

Let $\Sigma$ be an alphabet (set of letters). A word $w$ over $\Sigma$ is any finite sequence of letters. The empty word is denoted by $\varepsilon$. Let $\Sigma^*$ be the set of all words over $\Sigma$. A language over $\Sigma$ is a subset of $\Sigma^*$. The set $R$ of regular expressions (RE) over $\Sigma$ is defined by:

$$\alpha := \emptyset \mid \varepsilon \mid \sigma \in \Sigma \mid (\alpha + \alpha) \mid (\alpha \cdot \alpha) \mid \alpha^*,$$

where the operator $\cdot$ (concatenation) is often omitted. The language $L(\alpha)$ associated to $\alpha \in R$ is inductively defined as follows: $L(\emptyset) = \emptyset$, $L(\varepsilon) = \{\varepsilon\}$, $L(\sigma) = \{\sigma\}$ for $\sigma \in \Sigma$, $L((\alpha + \beta)) = L(\alpha) \cup L(\beta)$, $L((\alpha \cdot \beta)) = L(\alpha) \cdot L(\beta)$, and $L(\alpha^*) = L(\alpha) \cdot L(\alpha)^*$. Two regular expressions $\alpha$ and $\beta$ are equivalent if $L(\alpha) = L(\beta)$, and we write $\alpha = \beta$. The algebraic structure $(R, +, \cdot, 0, \varepsilon)$ constitutes an idempotent semiring, and with the unary operator $\star$, a Kleene algebra. There are several ways to measure the size of a regular expression. The size (or ordinary length) $|\alpha|$ of $\alpha \in R$ is the number of symbols in $\alpha$, including parentheses (but not the operator $\cdot$); the alphabetic size $|\alpha|_\Sigma$ (or alph($\alpha$)) is its number of letters (multiplicities included); and the reverse polish notation size rpn($\alpha$) is the number of nodes in its syntactic tree. The alphabetic size is considered in the literature [EKSW05] the most useful measure, and will be the one we consider here for several RE measure comparisons. Moreover all these measures are identical up a constant factor if the regular expression is reduced [EKSW05, Th. 3]. Let $\varepsilon(\alpha) = \varepsilon$ if $\varepsilon \in L(\alpha)$, and $\emptyset$ otherwise. A regular expression $\alpha$ is reduced if it is normalised w.r.t the following equivalences (rules):

$$
\begin{align*}
\varepsilon \cdot \alpha &= \alpha \cdot \varepsilon &= \alpha \\
\emptyset \cdot \alpha &= \alpha \cdot \emptyset &= \emptyset \\
\emptyset + \alpha &= \alpha + \emptyset &= \alpha \\
\varepsilon + \alpha &= \alpha + \varepsilon &= \alpha, & \text{where } \varepsilon(\alpha) = \varepsilon \\
\alpha^* &= \alpha^{**} \\
\emptyset^* &= \varepsilon^* &= \varepsilon
\end{align*}
$$

A RE can be transformed into an equivalent reduced RE in linear time.

A nondeterministic automaton (NFA) $A$ is a quintuple $(Q, \Sigma, \delta, q_0, F)$, where $Q$ is a finite set of states, $\Sigma$ is the alphabet, $\delta \subseteq Q \times \Sigma \times Q$ the transition relation, $q_0$ the initial state, and $F \subseteq Q$ the set of final states. The size of an NFA is $|Q| + |\delta|$. For $q \in Q$ and $\sigma \in \Sigma$, we denote by $\delta(q, \sigma) = \{p \mid (q, \sigma, p) \in \delta\}$, and we can extend this notation to $w \in \Sigma^*$, and to $R \subseteq Q$. The language accepted by $A$ is $L(A) = \{w \in \Sigma^* \mid \delta(q_0, w) \cap F \neq \emptyset\}$. Two NFAs are equivalent, if they accept the same language. If two NFAs $A$ and $B$ are isomorphic, and we write $A \simeq B$.

An NFA is deterministic (DFA) if for each pair $(q, \sigma) \in Q \times \Sigma$ there exists at most one $q'$ such that $(q, \sigma, q') \in \delta$. A DFA is minimal if there is no equivalent DFA with fewer states. Minimal DFA are unique up to isomorphism. Given an
equivalence relation \( E \) on \( Q \), for \( q \in Q \) let \([q]_E \) be the class of \( q \) w.r.t \( E \), and for \( T \subseteq Q \) let \( T/E = \{[q]_E \mid q \in T\} \). The equivalence relation \( E \) is right invariant w.r.t an NFA \( A \) if \( E \subseteq (Q \setminus F)^2 \cup F^2 \) and for any \( p, q \in Q, \sigma \in \Sigma \) if \( pE q \), then \( \delta(p, \sigma)/E = \delta(q, \sigma)/E \). The quotient automaton \( A/E = (Q/E, \Sigma, \delta_E, [q_0]_E, F/E) \), where \( \delta_E = \{(p, \sigma, [q]_E) \mid (p, \sigma, q) \in \delta\} \), satisfies \( \mathcal{L}(A) = \mathcal{L}(A/E) \). Given two equivalence relations over a set \( Q \), \( G \) and \( H \), we say that \( G \) is finer than \( H \) (and \( H \) coarser than \( G \)) if and only if \( G \subseteq H \).

3 Small NFAs from Regular Expressions

We consider three methods for constructing small NFAs \( A \) from a regular expression \( \alpha \) such that \( \mathcal{L}(A) = \mathcal{L}(\alpha) \), i.e., they are equivalent.

3.1 Position Automata

The position automat construction was independently proposed by Glushkov, and McNaughton and Yamada [Glu61,MY60]. Let \( \text{Pos}(\alpha) = \{1, 2, \ldots, |\alpha|_\Sigma\} \) for \( \alpha \in \Theta \), and let \( \text{Pos}_0(\alpha) = \text{Pos}(\alpha) \cup \{0\} \). We consider the expression \( \overline{\alpha} \) obtained by marking each letter \( \sigma \) with its position \( i \) in \( \alpha, \sigma_i \). The same notation is used to remove the markings, i.e., \( \overline{\overline{\alpha}} = \alpha \). For \( \alpha \in \Theta \) and \( i \in \text{Pos}(\alpha) \), let \( \text{first}(\alpha) = \{j \mid \exists w \in \overline{\Sigma}^*, \sigma_j w \in \mathcal{L}(\overline{\alpha})\} \), \( \text{last}(\alpha) = \{j \mid \exists w \in \overline{\Sigma}^*, \sigma_j w \in \mathcal{L}(\overline{\alpha})\} \), and \( \text{follow}(\alpha, i) = \{j \mid \exists u, v \in \overline{\Sigma}^*, u\sigma_j v \in \mathcal{L}(\overline{\alpha})\} \). Let \( \text{follow}(\alpha, 0) = \text{first}(\alpha) \). The position automaton for \( \alpha \in \Theta \) is \( \mathcal{A}_{\text{pos}}(\alpha) = (\text{Pos}_0(\alpha), \Sigma, \delta_{\text{pos}}, 0, F) \), with \( \delta_{\text{pos}} = \{(i, \overline{\sigma_j}, j) \mid j \in \text{follow}(\alpha, i)\} \) and \( F = \text{last}(\alpha) \cup \{0\} \) if \( \varepsilon(\alpha) = \varepsilon \), and \( F = \text{last}(\alpha) \), otherwise. We note that the number of states of \( \mathcal{A}_{\text{pos}}(\alpha) \) is exactly \(|\alpha|_\Sigma + 1 \). Other interesting property is that \( \mathcal{A}_{\text{pos}} \) is homogeneous, i.e., all transitions arriving at a given state are labelled by the same letter. Brüggemann-Klein [BK93] showed that the construction of \( \mathcal{A}_{\text{pos}} \) can be obtained in \( O(n^2) \) \( (n = |\alpha|) \) if the regular expression \( \alpha \) is in the so called star normal form (snf), i.e., if for each subexpression \( \beta^* \) of \( \alpha, \forall x \in \text{last}(\beta), \text{follow}(\beta, x) \cap \text{first}(\beta) = \emptyset \) and \( \varepsilon(\beta) = \emptyset \). For every \( \alpha \in \Theta \) there is an equivalent RE in star normal form \( \alpha^* \) that can be computed in linear time and such that \( \mathcal{A}_{\text{pos}}(\alpha) \simeq \mathcal{A}_{\text{pos}}(\alpha^*) \).

3.2 Follow Automata

Ilie and Yu [IY03a] introduced the construction of the follow automaton from a RE. Their initial algorithm begins by converting \( \alpha \in \Theta \) into an equivalent \( \varepsilon \)-NFA from which the follow automaton \( \mathcal{A}_f(\alpha) \) is obtained. For efficiency reasons we implemented that method in the \texttt{FAdo} library. The follow automaton is a quotient of the position automaton w.r.t the right-invariant equivalence given by the follow relation \( \equiv_f \subseteq \text{Pos}_0^2 \) that is defined by:

\[
\forall x, y \in \text{Pos}_0(\alpha), x \equiv_f y \text{ if (i) both } x, y \text{ or none belong to last}(\alpha) \text{ and (ii) } \text{follow}(\alpha, x) = \text{follow}(\alpha, y)
\]

**Proposition 1** (Ilie and Yu, Thm. 23). \( \mathcal{A}_f(\alpha) \simeq \mathcal{A}_{\text{pos}}(\alpha)/\equiv_f \).
3.3 Partial Derivative Automata

Let $S \cup \{\beta\}$ be a set of regular expressions. Then $S \odot \beta = \{\alpha\beta | \alpha \in S\}$ if $\beta \neq \emptyset$ and $S \odot \emptyset = \emptyset$. For $\alpha \in R$ and $\sigma \in \Sigma$, the set $\partial_\sigma(\alpha)$ of partial derivatives of $\alpha$ w.r.t. $\sigma$ is defined inductively as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\partial_\sigma(\emptyset) &= \partial_\sigma(\varepsilon) = \emptyset \\
\partial_\sigma(\sigma') &= \begin{cases} 
\{\varepsilon\} & \text{if } \sigma' \equiv \sigma \\
\emptyset & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases} \\
\partial_\sigma(\alpha^*) &= \partial_\sigma(\alpha) \odot \alpha^*
\end{align*}
\]

This definition can be extended to sets of regular expressions, words, and languages. Given $\alpha \in R$ and $\sigma \in \Sigma$, $\partial_\sigma(S) = \cup_{\alpha \in S} \partial_\sigma(\alpha)$ for $S \subseteq R$, $\partial_\sigma(\alpha) = \{\alpha\}$, $\partial_{w\sigma}(\alpha) = \partial_\sigma(\partial_w(\alpha))$ for $w \in \Sigma^*$, and $\partial_L(\alpha) = \cup_{w \in L} \partial_w(\alpha)$ for $L \subseteq \Sigma^*$. The set of partial derivatives of $\alpha$ is denoted by $\text{PD}(\alpha) = \{\partial_w(\alpha) | w \in \Sigma^*\}$.

Given a regular expression $\alpha$, the partial derivative automaton $A_{pd}(\alpha)$, introduced by Mirkin and Antimirov [Mir66,Ant96], is defined by

\[
A_{pd}(\alpha) = (\text{PD}(\alpha), \Sigma, \delta_{pd}, \alpha, \{q \in \text{PD}(\alpha) | \varepsilon(q) = \varepsilon\}),
\]

where $\delta_{pd}(q, \sigma) = \partial_\sigma(q)$, for all $q \in \text{PD}(\alpha)$ and $\sigma \in \Sigma$.

**Proposition 2 (Mirkin and Antimirov).** $\mathcal{L}(A_{pd}(\alpha)) = \mathcal{L}(\alpha)$.

Champarnaud and Ziadi [CZ02] showed that the partial derivative automaton is also a quotient of the position automaton. Champarnaud et al. [JMCZ07] proved that for RE reduced and in star normal form the size of its partial derivative automaton $A_{pd}$ is always smaller than the one of its follow automaton $A_f$.

3.4 Complexity

The automata here presented $A_{pos}$, $A_f$ and $A_{pd}$ can in worst-case be constructed in time and space $O(n^2)$, and have, in worst-case, size $O(n^2)$, where $n$ is the size of the RE. Recently, Nicaud [Nic09] showed that on the average-case the size of the $A_{pos}$ automata is linear. The best worst case construction of $\varepsilon$-free NFAs from RE is the one presented by Hromkovic et al. [HSW01] that can be constructed and have size $O(n(\log n^2))$. However this construction is not considered here.

4 NFAs Reduction with Equivalences

It is possible to obtain in time $O(n \log n)$ a (unique) minimal DFA equivalent to a given one. However NFA state minimization is PSPACE-complete and, in general, minimal NFAs are not unique. Considering the exponential succinctness of NFAs w.r.t DFAs, it is important to have methods to obtain small NFAs. Any right-invariant equivalence relation over $Q$ w.r.t $A$ can be used to diminish the size of $A$ (by computing the quotient automaton). The coarsest right-invariant equivalence $\equiv_R$ can be computed by an algorithm similar to the one used to minimize DFAs [IY03b]. This coincides with the notion of (auto)-bisimulation,
widely applied to transition systems and which can be computed efficiently (in almost linear time) by the Paige and Tarjan algorithm [PT87]. A left-invariant equivalence relation on $Q$ w.r.t $A$ is any right-invariant equivalence relation on the reversed automaton of $A$, $A^r = (Q, \Sigma, \delta_r, F, \{q_0\})$, where $q \in \delta'(p, \sigma)$ if $p \in \delta(q, \sigma)$ (and we allow multiple initial states). The coarsest left-invariant equivalence on $Q$ w.r.t $A$, $\equiv_L$, is $\equiv_R$ of $A^r$.

5 FAdo Implementations

FAdo [FAd10,MR05,AAA+09] is an ongoing project that aims to provide a set of tools for symbolic manipulation of formal languages. To allow high-level programming with complex data structures, easy prototyping of algorithms, and portability are its main features. It is mainly developed in the Python programming language. In FAdo, regular expressions and finite automata are implemented as Python classes.

Figure 1 presents the classes for REs and the main methods described in this paper. The regexp class is the base class for all REs and the class position is the base class for marked REs. The methods first(), last() and followMap() (where $\text{follow}(\alpha, x) = \{ \beta \mid (x, \beta) \in \text{followMap()} \}$) are coded for each subclass. The method nfaPosition() implements a construction of the $A_{pos}$ automaton without reduction to snf. Brüggemann-Klein algorithm is implemented by the
nfaPSNF() method. The methods nfaFollowEpsilon() and nfaFollow() implement the construction of the $A_f$ via an $\varepsilon$-NFA. The exact text of all these algorithms is too long to present here. The method nfaPD() computes the $A_{pd}$ and uses the method linearForm(). This method implements the function $lf(\cdot)$ defined by Antimirov [Ant96] to compute the partial derivatives of a RE w.r.t all letters. Algorithm 1 presents the computation of the $A_{pd}$.

**Algorithm 1** Computation of $A_{pd}$

1. $Q \leftarrow \{\alpha\}$
2. $\delta \leftarrow \emptyset$
3. $F \leftarrow \emptyset$
4. stack $\leftarrow \{\alpha\}$
5. while pd $\leftarrow$ POP(stack) do
   6.   for (head,tail) $\in$ lf(pd) do
      7.     if $\neg$ tail $\in$ Q then
         8.       Q $\leftarrow$ Q $\cup$ {tail}
         9.       PUSH(stack,pd)
      10.   end if
         11.   $\delta$(pd,head) $\leftarrow$ $\delta$(pd,head) $\cup$ {tail}
   12. end for
   13. if $\varepsilon$(pd) then
      14.   F $\leftarrow$ F $\cup$ {pd}
   15. end if
6. end while

Figure 2 presents the classes for finite automata. FA is the abstract class for finite automata. The class NFAr includes the inverse of the transition relation, that is not included in the NFA class for efficiency reasons. In the NFA class the method autobisimulation() implements a na¨ıve version for compute $\equiv_R$, as presented in Algorithm 2. Given an equivalence relation the method equivReduced() builds the quotient automaton. Given an NFA $A$, $A.rEquiv()$ corresponds to $A/_{\equiv_R}$, $A.lEquiv()$ to $A/_{\equiv_L}$ and $A.lrEquiv()$ to $(A/_{\equiv_L})/_{\equiv_R}$. We refer the reader to Gouveia [Gou09] and to FAdo webpage [FAd10] for more implementation details.

**Algorithm 2** Computation of the set $R$ corresponding to $\equiv_R$

1. $\mathcal{P} \leftarrow \emptyset$
2. for $(p,q) \in Q \times Q$ do
   3.   if $p \in F \not\Leftrightarrow q \in F$ then
      4.     $\mathcal{P} \leftarrow \mathcal{P} \cup \{(p,q)\}$
   5. end if
7. end for
8. while $\exists(x,y) \notin \mathcal{P}$: $\exists \sigma \in \Sigma$: $\exists z \in \delta(x,\sigma)$: $\forall w \in \delta(y,\sigma)$: $z \mathcal{P} w$ do
   9.   $\mathcal{P} \leftarrow \mathcal{P} \cup \{(x,y),(y,x)\}$
10. end while
11. R $\leftarrow$ (Q $\times$ Q) \ $\mathcal{P}$
12. Return R
Uniform random generators are essential to obtain reliable experimental results that can provide information about the average-case analysis of both computational and descriptional complexity. For general regular expressions, the task is somehow simplified because they can be described by small unambiguous context-free grammars from which it is possible to build uniform random generators [Mai94]. In the FAdo system we implemented the method described by Mairson [Mai94] for the generation of context-free languages. The method accepts as input a context-free grammar and the size of the words to be uniformly random generated.

The random samples need to be consistent and large enough to ensure statistically significant results. To have these samples readily available, the FAdo system includes a dataset of random RE, that can be accessed online. The current dataset was obtained using a grammar for REs given by Lee and Shallit [LS05], and that is presented in Figure 3. This grammar generates REs normalized by rules that define reduced REs, except for certain cases of the rule: $\varepsilon + \alpha$, where $\varepsilon(\alpha) = \varepsilon$. The database makes available random samples of REs with different sizes between 10 and 500 and with alphabet sizes between 2 and 50.

### 7 Experimental Results

In order to experiment with several properties of REs and NFAs we developed a generic program to ease to add/remove the methods to be applied and to specify...
Fig. 3. Grammar for almost reduced REs. The start symbol is S.

the data, from the database, to be used. Here we are interested in the comparison of several REs descriptive measures with measures of the NFAs obtained using the methods earlier described.

For REs we considered the following properties: the alphabetic size (alph); the rpn size (rpn); test if it is in snf (snf); if not in snf, compute the snf and its measures (alph,rpn); test if it is reduced; if not reduced, reduce it and compute its measures (alph,rpn); the number of states (sc) and number of transitions (tc) of the equivalent minimal DFA.

For each NFA ($A_{pos}$, $A_f$, and $A_{pd}$) we considered the following properties: the number of states ($|Q|$); the number of transitions ($|\delta|$); if it is deterministic (det); and if it is homogeneous (hom). All these properties were also considered for the case where the REs are in snf, and for the NFAs obtained after applying the invariant equivalences $\equiv_R$, $\equiv_L$, and their composition.

All tests were performed on samples of 10,000 uniformly random generated REs. Each sample contains REs of size 50, 100, 200 and 300, respectively.

Table 1 shows some results concerning REs. The ratio of alphabetic size to rpn size is almost constant for all samples. Almost all REs are in snf, so we do not presented the measures after transforming into snf. This fact is relevant as the REs were generated only almost reduced. The column snfr contains the percentage of REs for which their snf are reduced. It is interesting to note that the average number of states of the minimal DFA (sc) is near alph (i.e., near the number of states of $A_{pos}$). The standard deviation is here very high. For the sample of size 300, however, 99% of the REs have $160 \leq \text{sc} \leq 300$. More theoretical work is needed for a deeper understanding of these results.

**Table 1.** Statistical values for RE measures, where (avg) is the average and (std) the standard deviation.

| size | alph avg | alph std | rpn avg | rpn std | snf avg | snf std | snfr | sc avg | sc std | tc avg | tc std | sc alph | sc alph std | tc alph | tc alph std |
|------|----------|----------|---------|---------|---------|---------|------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|-------------|-------------|--------|-------------|
| 50   | 42       | 6.39     | 85      | 10.80   | 2.04    | 97%     | 99%  | 38     | 9.42   | 44     | 6.39   | 0.92   | 1.05        |             |        |             |
| 100  | 77       | 10.26    | 161     | 17.41   | 2.08    | 93%     | 98%  | 69     | 20.00  | 89     | 37.47  | 0.89   | 1.15        |             |        |             |
| 200  | 165      | 25.75    | 340     | 43.83   | 2.06    | 90%     | 97%  | 160    | 91.58  | 203    | 186.10 | 0.97   | 1.24        |             |        |             |
| 300  | 247      | 38.06    | 511     | 64.96   | 2.06    | 87%     | 95%  | 258    | 300.01 | 343    | 617.51 | 1.04   | 1.4         |             |        |             |
Table 2 and Table 3 show some results concerning the NFAs obtained from REs. In Table 2 the values not in percentage are average values. If $A_{pos}$ is deterministic then the REs is unambiguous (and strong unambiguous, if in snf) [BK93]. The results obtained suggest that perhaps 25% of the reduced REs are strong unambiguous. Note that if $A_{pos}$ is not deterministic, almost certainly, neither $A_{pd}$ nor $A_f$ are. For reasonable sized REs, although $A_{pos}$ are homogeneous it is unlikely that either $A_{pd}$ or $A_f$ will be so. It is not significant the difference between $|Q_f|$ and $|Q_{pd}|$. On average $|\delta_{pos}|$ seems linear in the size of the RE, and that fact was recently proved by Nicaud [Nic09].

Table 2. NFA measures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>size</th>
<th>$A_{pos}$</th>
<th>$A_f$</th>
<th>$A_{pd}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>Q_{pos}</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>\delta_{pos}</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51.49%</td>
<td>49.3%</td>
<td>49.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>104.6%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>211.27%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>317.23%</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Ratios of NFA measures.

| size | $|\delta_{pos}|/\alpha_{f+1}$ | $|\delta_f|/\alpha_{f+1}$ | $|\delta_{pd}|/\alpha_{f+1}$ |
|------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 50   | 1.18                        | 1.02                     | 1.02                        |
|      | 0.90                        | 0.89                     | 0.89                        |
| 100  | 1.33                        | 1.07                     | 1.05                        |
|      | 0.85                        | 0.84                     | 0.84                        |
| 200  | 1.27                        | 1.06                     | 1.05                        |
|      | 0.89                        | 0.88                     | 0.88                        |
| 300  | 1.28                        | 1.06                     | 1.05                        |
|      | 0.89                        | 0.88                     | 0.88                        |

Reductions by $\equiv_R$ and $\equiv_L$ (or $\equiv_R \circ \equiv_L$) decrease by less than 2% the size of the considered NFAs ($A_{pos}$, $A_f$, and $A_{pd}$). In particular the quotient automata of $A_{pos}$ are less than 1% smaller than $A_{pd}$. In general, we can hypothesize that reductions by the coarsest invariant equivalences are not significant when REs are reduced (and/or are in snf).

8 Conclusion

We presented a set of tools within the FAdo system to uniformly random generate REs, to convert REs into $\varepsilon$-free NFAs and to simplify both REs and NFAs. These tools can be used to obtain experimental results about the relative descriptional complexity of regular language representations on the average case. Our experimental data corrobo rate some previous experimental and theoretical results, and suggest some new hypotheses to be theoretically proved. We highlight the two following conjectures. Reduced REs have high probability of being in snf. And the $A_{pd}$ obtained from REs in reduced snf seems to almost coincide with quotient automata of $A_{pos}$ by $\equiv_R \circ \equiv_L$.
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