

APPLICATION OF GENERALISED SEQUENTIAL CROSSOVER OF LANGUAGES TO GENERALISED SPLICING

L JEGANATHAN, R RAMA, AND RITABRATA SENGUPTA

ABSTRACT. This paper outlines an application of iterated version of generalised sequential crossover of two languages (which in some sense, an abstraction of the crossover of chromosomes in living organisms) in studying some classes of the newly proposed generalised splicing (*GS*) over two languages. It is proved that, for $X, Y \in \{FIN, REG, LIN, CF, CS, RE\}, \Sigma \in FIN$, the subclass of generalized splicing languages namely $GS(X, Y, \Sigma)$, (which is a subclass of the class $GS(X, Y, FIN)$) is always regular.

1. INTRODUCTION

Tom Head proposed [6] an operation called ‘splicing’, for describing the recombination of DNA sequences under the application of restriction enzymes and ligases. Given two strings $u\alpha\beta v$ and $u'\alpha'\beta'v'$ over some alphabet V and a splicing rule $\alpha\#\beta\$ \alpha'\#\beta'$, two strings $u\alpha\beta'v'$ and $u'\alpha'\beta v$ are produced. The splicing rule $\alpha\#\beta\$ \alpha'\#\beta'$ means that the first string is cut between α and β and the second string is cut between α' and β' , and the fragments recombine crosswise.

The splicing scheme (also written as H-scheme) is a pair $\sigma = (V, R)$ where V is an alphabet and $R \subseteq V^*\#V*\$V^*\#V^*$ is the set of splicing rules. Starting from a language, we generate a new language by the iterated application of splicing rules in R . Here R can be infinite. Thus R can be considered as a language over $V \cup \{\#, \$\}$. Splicing language (language generated by splicing) depends upon the class of the language (in the Chomskian hierarchy) to be spliced and the type of the splicing rules to be applied. The class of splicing language $H(FL_1, FL_2)$ is the set of strings generated by taking any two strings from FL_1 and splicing them by the strings of FL_2 . FL_1 and FL_2 can be any class of languages in the Chomskian hierarchy. Detailed investigations on computational power of splicing is found in [16].

Theory of splicing is an abstract model of the recombinant behaviour of the DNAs. In a splicing system, the two strings that are spliced, are taken from the same set and the splicing rule is from another set. The reason for taking two strings from the same set is, in the DNA recombination, both the objects that are spliced are DNAs. For example, the splicing language in the class $H(FIN, REG)$ is the language generated by taking two strings from a finite language and using strings from a regular language as the splicing rules. Any general ‘cut’ and ‘connection’ model should include the cutting of two strings taken from two different languages. The strings spliced and the splicing rules have an effect on the language generated by the splicing process. In short, we view a splicing model as having three languages as three components, two strings from two languages as the first two components, and a splicing rule as the third component. We proposed a generalised splicing model (GS: Generalised splicing) in [8], whose splicing scheme is defined as,

$$\sigma(L_1, L_2, L_3) := \{z_1, z_2 : (x, y) \models_r (z_1, z_2), x \in L_1, y \in L_2, r \in L_3\}.$$

Instead of taking two strings from same language, as being done in the theory of splicing, we take two strings from two different languages. We cut them by using rules from a third language. This means, taking an arbitrary word $w_1(\in L_1)$ and an arbitrary word from $w_2(\in L_2)$, we cut them by using an arbitrary rule of L_3 . If $L_1 = L_2$ in the generalised splicing model, we get the usual *H*-system.

Motivated by the chromosomal crossover in living organisms, an operation called *Generalized sequential crossover (GSCO) of words and languages* was introduced in the paper [9]. The $GSCO_x$ operation over two strings u_1xv_1 and u_2xv_2 overlap at the substring x generating the strings u_1xv_2 and u_2xv_1 .

This *GSCO* operation differs with the concept of crossover of the chromosomes in two aspects. First, in *GSCO*, words of different lengths can participate in a crossover, where as homologous chromosomes crossover with each other. Second, in *GSCO* crossing over occurs at only one site between the words, whereas chromosomal crossovers can occur at more than one site. Though the *GSCO* operation cannot be called as the exact

abstraction of the chromosomal crossover, the study of $GSCO$ over languages reveals many interesting results such as the iterative GSCO of any language is always regular.

Incidentally, the words generated by the crossover of two strings over the substring x , is the same as the words generated by the generalised splicing of the strings u_1xv_1 and u_2xv_2 using the splicing rule. $x\#\$x\#$. The overlapping strings R in the GSCO has a correspondence with the set of splicing rules of the generalised splicing model. This correspondence motivated us to investigate the generalised splicing for some classes of languages in Chomskian hierarchy.

Though one can develop a theory of generalised splicing on the lines of H -system, in this paper we investigate a sub-class of the class $GS(X, Y, FIN)$, $X, Y \in \{FIN, REG, LIN, CF, CS, RE\}$. That is, we investigate the class (X, Y, R) where R is a finite set of words of length 1.

In [9], the GSCO of unary languages and its iterated versions were defined. For the purpose of our investigation, we define the iterated GSCO for two languages L_1 and L_2 without loosing the sense of the definition given in [9].

Section 2 gives the definition of $GSCO$ of languages along with some results of [9] which are required for our study and the definition of *generalised splicing* as introduced in [8]. Section 3 discusses the application of $GSCO$ in studying some sub classes of generalised splicing.

2. PRELIMINARIES

Throughout this paper, we assume that the reader is familiar with the fundamental concepts of formal language theory and automata, i.e. notations finite automata [7].

In this section we give the formal definition of generalised sequential crossover system system as defined in [9] along with some results, which are required for our investigation. We also give the formal definition of *generalised splicing* as in [8]

Definition 1. *Generalised sequential crossover scheme* $GSCO = (\Sigma, R)$, where Σ is the finite alphabet, $R \subseteq \Sigma^*$ be the set of overlapping strings; we write $GSCO = (\Sigma, R)$ as $GSCO_R$. $GSCO_R$ is also called a R -crossover. When R is singleton, say $R = \{x\}$, we write $GSCO_x$ instead of $GSCO_R$.

For a given $GSCO$ scheme $GSCO$ and two words $w_1 = u_1xv_1$ and $w_2 = u_2xv_2 \in \Sigma^*$, we define

$$GSCO_x(w_1, w_2) = \{u_1xv_2, u_2xv_1 \in \Sigma^* : w_1 = u_1xv_1, w_2 = u_2xv_2, \varepsilon \neq x \in R\}.$$

The scheme is shown in figure 1.




FIGURE 1. A scheme for crossover of two strings

Instead of writing $GSCO_x(u_1xv_1, u_2xv_2)$, we also write $u_1xv_1 \succ^x \prec u_2xv_2 = \{u_1xv_2, u_2xv_1\}$, which means that the two strings u_1xv_1 and u_2xv_2 crossover over the sub-string x to generate two new words u_1xv_2 and u_2xv_1 . We also write $u_1xv_1 \succ^x \prec u_2xv_2 = \{u_1xv_2, u_2xv_1\}$ instead of $(u_1xv_1, u_2xv_2) \succ^x \prec \{u_1xv_2, u_2xv_1\}$. Then

$$GSCO_R(w_1, w_2) = \bigcup_{x \in R} w_1 \succ^x \prec w_2.$$

Obviously R should contain words which are sub-words found in both w_1 and w_2 , otherwise $GSCO_R(w_1, w_2)$ will be empty. We call the operation $GSCO_x$, $x \in \Sigma$ as the symbol overlapping GSCO. Similarly we call $GSCO_x$, $x \in \Sigma^*$ as the string overlapping GSCO. Let $\text{sub}(w)$ be the set of all sub-words of w . If in a GSCO scheme $R = \text{sub}(w_1) \cap \text{sub}(w_2)$, we simply write $GSCO(w_1, w_2)$, i.e. $GSCO(w_1, w_2)$ is the set of all words that can be generated by the GSCO of w_1 and w_2 with all possible overlapping. In other words,

$$GSCO(w_1, w_2) = \bigcup_x GSCO_x(w_1, w_2), \quad x \in \text{sub}(w_1) \cap \text{sub}(w_2).$$

We extend the above definition to languages. Given any two languages L_1 and L_2 over the alphabet Σ_1 and Σ_2 respectively such that $\Sigma_1 \cap \Sigma_2 \neq \emptyset$, we define

$$GSCO_R(L_1, L_2) = \bigcup_{\substack{w_1 \in L_1 \\ w_2 \in L_2}} GSCO_R(w_1, w_2).$$

Here the underlying crossover scheme is $GSCO = (\Sigma_1 \cup \Sigma_2, R)$. As mentioned earlier, when $R = \text{sub}(L_1) \cap \text{sub}(L_2)$ (R is the set of all possible overlapping between a word of L_1 and a word of L_2).

$$GSCO_R(L_1, L_2) = \bigcup_{\substack{w_1 \in L_1 \\ w_2 \in L_2}} GSCO(w_1, w_2).$$

$GSCO(L, L)$ is written as just $GSCO(L)$.

In computing $GSCO(w_1, w_2)$, one has to first compute all the common sub-strings x and compute $\bigcup_x GSCO_x(w_1, w_2)$. For $GSCO(L)$ we have to compute $\bigcup_{w_1, w_2 \in L} GSCO(w_1, w_2)$. In short,

$$GSCO(L) = \bigcup_{w_1, w_2 \in L} \bigcup_x GSCO(w_1, w_2), \quad x \in \text{sub}(w_1) \cap \text{sub}(w_2),$$

which increases the complexity of the computation of GSCO. We have the following theorem to reduce this tedious calculation of finding all the common sub-strings of all the pairs of words of a given language L .

Theorem 1. *Let $w_1, w_2 \in \Sigma^*$.*

$$GSCO(w_1, w_2) = \bigcup_{a \in \Sigma_{w_1} \cap \Sigma_{w_2}} GSCO_a(w_1, w_2).$$

corollary 1. $GSCO(w_1, w_2) = \bigcup_{a \in \Sigma} GSCO_a(w_1, w_2)$.

corollary 2. $GSCO(L) = \bigcup_{w_1, w_2 \in L} \bigcup_{a \in \Sigma} GSCO_a(w_1, w_2)$.

This corollary tells us that to compute $GSCO(L)$ it is enough to compute the GSCO of w_1 and w_2 over the symbols of the alphabet Σ and take the union of all those $GSCO(w_1, w_2)$'s.

The operation GSCO is called 1-GSCO if in all the concerned overlapping, we consider the word which has the prefix of the first word and the suffix of the second word as the only word generated. So $1GSCO_x(u_1xv_1, u_2xv_2) = \{u_1xv_2\}$, i.e. the operation 1GSCO generates only one word. We denote 1GSCO by $\succ\prec$. The operation GSCO is called 2GSCO if in all the concerned overlapping we consider both the words generated. So the operation 2GSCO coincides with GSCO. It is proved that $1GSCO(L)$ is equal to $GSCO(L)$.

We define two types of iterated GSCO namely, unrestricted iterative closure of GSCO and the restricted iterative closure of GSCO.

Definition 2. *Given a language L , we define the language obtained from L by unrestricted iterated application of GSCO. This language, called the unrestricted GSCO closure of L , denoted by $uGSCO^*(L)$, is defined as*

$$\begin{aligned} uGSCO^0(L) &= L \\ uGSCO^{i+1}(L) &= uGSCO^i(L) \cup uGSCO(uGSCO^i(L)) \\ uGSCO^*(L) &= \bigcup_{i \geq 0} uGSCO^i(L) \end{aligned}$$

Definition 3. *The restricted closure of GSCO denoted by $rGSCO^*(L)$ is defined recursively as follows:-*

$$\begin{aligned} rGSCO^0(L) &= L \\ rGSCO^{i+1}(L) &= rGSCO(rGSCO^i(L), L) \quad i \geq 1 \\ rGSCO^*(L) &= \bigcup_{i \geq 0} rGSCO^i(L) \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 2. $r1GSCO^*(L) = u1GSCO^*(L)$.

Theorem 3. *For a language L , $GSCO^*(L)$ is a regular language.*

We give the definition of generalised splicing model.

Definition 4 (Generalised splicing scheme). *Generalised splicing scheme is defined as a 2-tuple $\sigma = (\Sigma, R)$, where Σ is an alphabet, and $R \subseteq \Sigma^* \# \Sigma^* \$ \Sigma^* \# \Sigma^*$. Here R can be infinite, and R is considered as a set of strings, hence a language. For a given σ , and languages $L_1 \subseteq \Sigma^*$ and $L_2 \subseteq \Sigma^*$, we define*

$$\sigma(L_1, L_2, R) = \{z_1, z_2 : (x, y) \models_r (z_1, z_2), \text{ for } x \in L_1, y \in L_2, r \in R\}.$$

We refer the generalised splicing scheme $\sigma = (\Sigma, R)$ as σ_R .

3. APPLICATION OF GSCO TO GENERALISED SPLICING

We give the definition of an iterative *GSCO* over two languages as well as give the iterated version of the generalised splicing for our purpose of investigation.

Definition 5. *Let L_1 and L_2 be any two languages. The iterated GSCO of L_1 and L_2 is defined as follows.*

$$\begin{aligned} GSCO^0(L_1, L_2) &= (L_1 \cup L_2); \\ GSCO^1(L_1, L_2) &= \cup_{w_1 \in L_1, w_2 \in L_2} GSCO^1(w_1, w_2); \\ GSCO^{i+1}(L_1, L_2) &= GSCO^i(L_1, L_2) \cup GSCO(GSCO^i(L_1), GSCO^i(L_2)) \\ GSCO^*(L_1, L_2) &= \cup_{i \geq 0} GSCO^i(L_1, L_2) \end{aligned}$$

$GSCO^*(L, L)$ is written as $GSCO(L)$ itself. The above definition of *iterated GSCO* over two languages is more logical in the sense that, when $L_1 = L_2$, the above iterative definition reduces to $GSCO^*(L)$

We define the iterated generalized splicing as follows. Let $\sigma_R = (\Sigma, R)$ be the generalised splicing scheme.

Definition 6. *Let L_1 and L_2 be any two languages. For a given generalised splicing scheme σ_R , the iterated generalised splicing of L_1 and L_2 is defined as follows.*

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_R^0(L_1, L_2) &= L_1 \cup L_2 \\ \sigma_R^1(L_1, L_2) &= \{z | (w_1, w_2) \vdash_r z, w_1 \in L_1, w_2 \in L_2, r \in R\} \\ \sigma_R^2(L_1, L_2) &= \sigma_R^1(L_1, L_2) \cup \sigma_R(\sigma_R^1(L_1), \sigma_R^1(L_2)) \\ \sigma_R^{i+1}(L_1, L_2) &= \sigma_R^i(L_1, L_2) \cup \sigma_R(\sigma_R^i(L_1), \sigma_R^i(L_2)) \\ \sigma_R^*(L_1, L_2) &= \cup_{i \geq 0} \sigma_R^i(L_1, L_2) \end{aligned}$$

The language of the generalised splicing of L_1, L_2 and R is defined as

$$GS(L_1, L_2, R) = \sigma_R^*(L_1, L_2)$$

$\sigma_R(L, L)$ is written as $\sigma_R(L)$.

We have the following lemma whose proof is immediate.

Lemma 1. *For any two languages L_1, L_2 , $GSCO_R(L_1, L_2) = \sigma_R(L_1, L_2)$; For any language L , $GSCO_R(L) = \sigma_R(L)$*

Theorem 4. *For any language L , $GSCO_R^i(L) = \sigma_R^i(L)$, for $i \geq 0$.*

Proof. We prove by the method of induction on i . When $i = 0$, the result is trivially true. When $i = 1$ also, it is true. Assume that the result is true for $i = 0, 1, 2, \dots, n$. We have $GSCO_R^n(L) = \sigma_R^n(L)$. $GSCO_R^{n+1}(L) = GSCO(GSCO_R^n(L)) \cup GSCO_R^n(L) = \sigma_R(\sigma_R^n(L)) \cup \sigma_R^n(L) = \sigma_R^{n+1}(L)$. Hence the proof. \square

Theorem 5. *Let L_1 and L_2 be any two languages. Let V_{L_1} and V_{L_2} be the alphabets of L_1 and L_2 respectively. Let $R = V_{L_1} \cap V_{L_2}$. Then*

$$GSCO^*(L_1, L_2) = GS(L_1, L_2, R)$$

Proof. We claim $GSCO_R^i(L_1, L_2) = \sigma_R^i(L_1, L_2)$, $i \geq 0$. We follow the method of induction. For, $i = 0, 1$ it is true. Assume that the result is true for $i = 2, 3, \dots, n$. Consider $GSCO_R^{n+1}(L_1, L_2) = GSCO(GSCO_R^n(L_1), GSCO_R^n(L_2)) \cup GSCO_R^n(L_1, L_2) = GSCO(\sigma_R^n(L_1), \sigma_R^n(L_2)) \cup \sigma_R^n(L_1, L_2)$ (by induction) $= \sigma(\sigma_R^n(L_1), \sigma_R^n(L_2)) \cup \sigma_R^n(L_1, L_2) = \sigma_R^{n+1}(L_1, L_2)$. Consider $GSCO_R^i(L_1, L_2) = GSCO(GSCO_R^{i-1}(L_1), GSCO_R^{i-1}(L_2)) \cup GSCO_R^{i-1}(L_1, L_2) = \sigma(\sigma_R^{i-1}(L_1), \sigma_R^{i-1}(L_2)) \cup \sigma_R^{i-1}(L_1, L_2) = \sigma_R^i(L_1, L_2)$. Thus we have, $GSCO_R^i(L_1, L_2) = \sigma_R^i(L_1, L_2)$, for every $i \geq 0$. This implies, $GSCO^*(L_1, L_2) = \sigma_R^*(L_1, L_2) = GS(L_1, L_2, R)$ \square

Theorem 6. For any two languages L_1 and L_2 , $GSCO^*(L_1, L_2) = GSCO(GSCO^*(L_1), GSCO^*(L_2))$

Proof. Let $w \in GSCO^*(L_1, L_2)$. This implies $w \in GSCO^i(L_1, L_2)$, for some i . Then, there exist $w_1 \in GSCO^{i-1}(L_1), w_2 \in GSCO^{i-1}(L_2)$ such that $w \in GSCO(GSCO^{i-1}(L_1), GSCO^{i-1}(L_2)) \Rightarrow w \in GSCO(GSCO^*(L_1), GSCO^*(L_2)) \Rightarrow GSCO^*(L_1, L_2) \subseteq GSCO(GSCO^*(L_1), GSCO^*(L_2))$.

Let $w \in GSCO(GSCO^*(L_1), GSCO^*(L_2))$. That is, there exist $w_1 \in GSCO^*(L_1)$ and $w_2 \in GSCO^*(L_2)$ such that $w \in GSCO(w_1, w_2)$. Without any loss of generality, we suppose that $w_1 \in GSCO^i(L_1)$ and $w_2 \in GSCO^j(L_2)$ such that $i < j$. Since $GSCO^i(L_1) \subseteq GSCO^j(L_1)$, we have, $w_1 \in GSCO^j(L_1)$ and $w_2 \in GSCO^j(L_2)$. That is, $w \in GSCO(GSCO^j(L_1), GSCO^j(L_2))$. This implies, $w \in GSCO(GSCO^j(L_1), GSCO^j(L_2)) \cup GSCO^j(L_1, L_2) \Rightarrow w \in GSCO^*(L_1, L_2) \Rightarrow GSCO(GSCO^*(L_1), GSCO^*(L_2)) \subseteq GSCO^*(L_1, L_2)$. Hence the proof. \square

corollary 3. $GS(L_1, L_2, R) = GSCO_R(GSCO_R^*(L_1), GSCO_R^*(L_2))$

Remark 1. The above corollary can be used to compute $GS(L_1, L_2, R)$

Theorem 7. Let L_1 and L_2 be any two regular languages. Then, $GSCO(L_1, L_2)$ is regular.

Proof. Here L_1, L_2 are two regular languages. We have two finite automata $M_1 = (Q_1, V_1, \delta_1, q_1, f_1)$, $M_2 = (Q_2, V_2, \delta_2, q_2, f_2)$ such that $L(M_1) = L_1$ and $L(M_2) = L_2$ respectively. If $V_1 \cap V_2$ is empty, the result is trivial. Assume that $\emptyset \neq V_1 \cap V_2 = \{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n\}$. We group the transitions of δ_1 as δ_{1,a_i} , for every i , $1 \leq i \leq n$ as follows. δ_{1,a_i} is the set of all transitions of δ_1 of the form $\delta_1(p, a_i) = q$, where $p, q \in Q_1, a_i \in V_1 \cap V_2$. That is δ_{1,a_i} is the set of all transitions of M_1 which corresponds to an edge with label a_i in the transition graph of M_1 . We order the transitions in δ_{1,a_i} in any way. We call the first transition in δ_{1,a_i} as δ_{1,a_i}^1 and the second transition as δ_{1,a_i}^2 and so on. A transition of the form $\delta_1(p, a_1) = q, p, q \in Q_1, a_1 \in V_1 \cap V_2$ will be referred as δ_{1,a_i}^j , for some j . Similarly, we compute the set δ_{2,a_i} for every $a_i \in V_1 \cap V_2$ and identify the transitions δ_{2,a_i}^j , for some j .

We construct finite automata, B_{i,j,a_k} , for $1 \leq k \leq n$ and for all possible i and j , as follows. *Construction of FA : B_{i,j,a_k} :*




FIGURE 2. Model of the automata : B_{i,j,a_k}

We define automata B_{i,j,a_k} for every possible i and j .

$B_{i,j,a_k} = (Q_1 \cup Q_2 \cup \{q_{s,i,j,a_k}, q_{f,i,j,a_k}\}_{i,j}^1, \Sigma_1 \cup \Sigma_2 \cup \{\varepsilon\}, \delta_{i,j,a_k}, q_{s,i,j,a_k}, f_2)$ where δ_{i,j,a_k} is defined as follows.

- (1) $\delta_{i,j,a_k}(q_{s,i,j,a_k}, \varepsilon) = q_1$

¹By $\{q_{s,i,j,a_k}, q_{f,i,j,a_k}\}_{i,j}$, we mean the set $\{q_{s,1,1,a_k}, q_{f,1,1,a_k}\} \cup \{q_{s,1,2,a_k}, q_{f,1,2,a_k}\} \cup \dots \cup \{q_{s,i,j,a_k}, q_{f,i,j,a_k} \dots\}$. It is clear that $\{q_{s,i,j,a_k}, q_{f,i,j,a_k}\}_{i,j}$ is finite

- (2) All the transitions of δ_1
- (3) All the transitions of δ_2
- (4) If $\delta_{1,k}^i$ is the transition $\delta_1(p, a_k) = q$, for some $p, q \in Q_1$ and if $\delta_{2,k}^j$ is the transition $\delta_2(p', a_k) = q'$, for some $p', q' \in Q_2$, include $\delta_{i,j,a_k}(q, \varepsilon) = q'$
- (5) $\delta_{i,j,a_k}(q_2, \varepsilon) = q_{f,i,j,a_k}$

B_{i,j,a_k} for every possible i, j , stands for the collection of automata viz., $B_{1,1,a_k}, B_{1,2,a_k}, \dots, B_{2,1,a_k}, B_{2,2,a_k}, \dots, \dots, B_{i,1,a_k}, B_{i,2,a_k}, \dots$. We have the result

$$GSCO(L_1, L_2) = \cup_{w_1 \in L_1, w_2 \in L_2} GSCO(w_1, w_2) = \cup_{w_1 \in L_1, w_2 \in L_2} \cup_{a \in \Sigma_1 \cap \Sigma_2} GSCO_a(w_1, w_2).$$

If $w_1 \in L_1, w_2 \in L_2$ has a common symbol a_k (which may occur more than once in w_1 and w_2) in them, w_1 and w_2 could crossover at a_k . The first occurrence of a_k in w_1 may crossover with the first occurrence of w_2 or the first occurrence of a_k in w_1 may crossover with the second occurrence of w_2 and so on. If the word w_1 and w_2 crossover at the symbol a_k such that the *first* occurrence of a_k in w_1 overlaps with the *second* occurrence of a_k in w_2 generating a word w , then w will be accepted by the automaton $B_{1,2,a_k}$. We claim that the union of the languages accepted by the automata B_{i,j,a_k} , for every possible i, j , is $GSCO_{a_k}(L_1, L_2)$

Claim : $\bigcup_{i,j} L(B_{i,j,a_k}) = GSCO_{a_k}(L_1, L_2)$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Suppose } w \in \bigcup_{i,j} L(B_{i,j,a_k}) &\Rightarrow w \in L(B_{i,j,a_k}) \\ &\Rightarrow w \in Pref(L_1).a_k.Suff(L_2), a_k \in V_1 \cap V_2 \\ &\Rightarrow w \in Pref(w_1).a_k.Suff(w_2), w_1 \in L_1, w_2 \in L_2 \\ &\Rightarrow w \in w_1 \succ\prec w_2 \\ &\Rightarrow w \in GSCO_{a_k}(w_1, w_2), w_1 \in L_1, w_2 \in L_2 \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $\bigcup_{i,j} L(B_{i,j,a_k}) \subseteq GSCO_{a_k}(L_1, L_2)$.

For the other way, suppose $w \in GSCO_{a_k}(L_1, L_2)$. Then, there exists $w_1 \in L_1, w_2 \in L_2$ such that $w \in GSCO_{a_k}(w_1, w_2)$. a_k occurs in both w_1 and w_2 . That is, $w_1 = u_1 a_k u_2; w_2 = v_1 a_k v_2$, for some u_1, u_2, v_1 and v_2 . We have the *accepting configuration sequence* for $w_1 \in M_1$ as $q_1 u_1 p a_k q u_2 f_1$ and an *accepting configuration sequence* for $w_2 \in M_2$ as $q_1 u_1 p a_k q u_2 f_1$. This implies that there is an *accepting configuration sequence* $q_s, i, j, a_k \varepsilon q_1 u_1 p a_k q' v_2 \varepsilon q_f, i, j, a_k$ in B_{i,j,a_k} such that $u_1 a_k v_2 \in L(B_{i,j,a_k})$, for some i, j . In the sequence for M_1 , a_k can occur more than once. Similar is the case with M_2 . Hence, $u_1 a_k v_2 \in \bigcup_{i,j} L(B_{i,j,a_k})$. That is, $w \in \bigcup_{i,j} L(B_{i,j,a_k})$. Thus, $GSCO_{a_k}(L_1, L_2) \subseteq \bigcup_{i,j} L(B_{i,j,a_k})$, which proves our claim.

So far, we have constructed an automata which will accept the $GSCO_{a_k}(L_1, L_2)$, for a given a_k . For $GSCO(L_1, L_2)$, we have to consider the union of all such $GSCO_{a_k}(L_1, L_2)$'s. So, we construct an automaton whose language will be the union of the languages accepted by the automata B_{i,j,a_k} , which will ultimately accept the language $GSCO(L_1, L_2)$. We construct an automaton $M = (\{q_s, q_f\} \cup \{q_s, i, j, a_k, q_f, i, j, a_k\}_{i,j,k} \cup Q_1 \cup Q_2, \Sigma_1 \cup \Sigma_2 \cup \{\varepsilon\}, \delta, q_s, q_f)$, where δ is defined as follows.

- (1) $\delta(q_s, \varepsilon) = \{q_s, i, j, a_k\}$ for every i, j and $a_k \in V_1 \cap V_2$.
- (2) All the transitions of δ_{i,j,a_k} , for every i, j and a_k .
- (3) $\delta(q_f, i, j, a_k, \varepsilon) = q_f$.

We claim $L(M) = GSCO(L_1, L_2)$. Let $w \in L(M)$. That is, $w \in \bigcup_{a_k \in V_1 \cap V_2} \bigcup_{i,j} L(B_{i,j,a_k})$. $w \in \bigcup_{a_k} GSCO_{a_k}(L_1, L_2)$. This implies $w \in GSCO(L_1, L_2)$. Hence $L(M) \subseteq GSCO(L_1, L_2)$.

For the other way, let $w \in GSCO(L_1, L_2)$. Then, $w \in \bigcup_{a_k} GSCO_{a_k}(L_1, L_2)$. That is $w \in \bigcup_{a_k} \bigcup_{i,j} L(B_{i,j,a_k})$. Thus, $w \in L(M)$, which implies $GSCO(L_1, L_2) \subseteq L(M)$. Thus, we have constructed a finite automaton M which accepts $GSCO(L_1, L_2)$. Hence, $GSCO(L_1, L_2)$ is regular. \square

Theorem 8. *Let L_1 and L_2 be any two languages. Then, $GSCO^*(L_1, L_2)$ is also regular.*

Proof. We have $GSCO^*(L_1, L_2) = GSCO(GSCO^*(L_1), GSCO^*(L_2))$. $GSCO^*(L_1)$ and $GSCO^*(L_2)$ are regular. By theorem 7, $GSCO^*(L_1, L_2)$ is regular for any L_1 and L_2 . \square




FIGURE 3. Model of the automaton M

Though one can investigate the theory of generalised splicing on the lines of H -System, we attempt to investigate a subclass of the class of generalised splicing languages $GS(X, Y, FIN)$, where $X, Y \in \{FIN, REG, LIN, CF, CS, RE\}$. That is, we investigate the sub class $GS(X, Y, R)$, where R is the alphabet of the languages in the class X and Y , which is finite. The following theorem tells that $GSCO^*(X, Y, R)$ are always regular.

Theorem 9. $GS(X, Y, R)$, where $X, Y \in \{FIN, REG, LIN, CF, CS, RE\}$, R is the common symbols of the languages in X and Y , is regular.

Proof. We have, for any two languages L_1, L_2 , $GS(L_1, L_2, R) = GSCO(GSCO^*(L_1), GSCO^*(L_2))$, where R is the common symbols between the alphabets of L_1 and L_2 . By theorems 7, 8, we have the result $GS(X, Y, R)$ is regular. \square

Thus, we have found that the class of generalised splicing languages $GS(X, Y, R)$ where X, Y, R are as mentioned above, are regular. We note that $GS(X, Y, R) = GSCO(GSCO^*(L_1), GSCO^*(L_2))$, where R is the set of common symbols between the alphabets of L_1 and L_2 .

This result holds for any set R' (which has only symbols: words of length 1) such that $R \subseteq R'$. The elements in the set $R' - R$ will not be the common symbols of the languages in X and Y . In that case, $GS(X, Y, R')$ will be equal to $GS(X, Y, R)$ since, the symbols which are participating in the crossover operation not common to the languages, will yield only empty sets. In a more general sense, we have the result that, for $X, Y \in \{FIN, REG, LIN, CF, CS, RE\}$, $\Sigma \in FIN$ such that Σ contains only words of length 1, the subclass of generalised splicing languages namely $GS(X, Y, \Sigma)$, (which is a subclass of the class $GS(X, Y, FIN)$) is always regular.

4. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we have applied an operation namely $GSCO$ over languages to study some sub classes of generalised splicing languages. Using the $GSCO$ operation, it is proved that, for $X, Y \in \{FIN, REG, LIN, CF, CS, RE\}$, $\Sigma \in FIN$ such that Σ contains only words of length 1, the subclass of generalized splicing languages namely $GS(X, Y, \Sigma)$, (which is a subclass of the class $GS(X, Y, FIN)$) is always regular.

This paper gives a scope for developing the whole theory of generalised splicing in similar lines to the theory of H -system, which in some sense, is a journey from two dimensions to three dimensions. The extensive study of generalised splicing can help both in H -system as well as generalised splicing (if $L_1 = L_2$ in generalised splicing, we get back H -system).

This study can be extended to study the other classes of generalised splicing languages.

REFERENCES

- [1] L. Adleman; Molecular computations of solutions to combinatorial problems, *Science*, **266**, 1021-1024, 1994.
- [2] Arto Saloma; Formal Languages, Academic Press Inc. 1973.
- [3] Karel Culik II, Tero Harju; Splicing semi-groups of dominoes and DNA, *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, **31 (3)**, 261-277, 1991.
- [4] Al Căărăsu, Gh Păun; String intersection and short concatenation, *Rev. Mod. Math. Pures. Appl.*, **26**, 713-726, 1981.
- [5] G Dassow, H Hornig; Conditional grammars with sub-regular conditions, *Words, language, combinatorics II*, ed. M Ito and H Jürgensen, 71-86, World Scientific, Singapore, 1994.
- [6] Tom Head; Formal language theory and DNA : An analysis of the generative capacity of specific recombinant behaviours, *Bull. Math. Biology*, **49**, 737-759, 1987.
- [7] John Hopcroft, Rajeev Motwani, Jeffrey Ullman; Introduction to automata theory, languages, and computation (2e), Pearson Indian reprint, 2001.
- [8] L Jeganathan, R Rama, Ritabrata Sengupta; A proposal to a generalised theory of splicing with a self assembly approach, In: A. Goel, F.C. Simmel, P. Sosk (Eds.), *DNA Computing, 14th Int. Workshop on DNA Computing, DNA 14. Silesian University, Opava*, 184-185, 2008.
- [9] L Jeganathan, R Rama, Ritabrata Sengupta; Generalised sequential crossover of words and languages, arXiv:0902.3503v1 [cs.DM]
- [10] R McNaughton, S Papert; Counter free automata, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1971.
- [11] A Matesscu, Gh Păun, A Salomaa; Simple splicing systems, *Disc. App. Math.*, **44**, 300-319, 1980.
- [12] L.Llie, V.Mitrana; Crossing-over on languages: A formal representation of the recombination of genes in a chromosome.
- [13] V.Mitrana; Crossover systems : a language theoretic approach to DNA recombinations, *Proc. First IEEE symp. Intelligence in Neural and Biological systems*, washington, 1995.
- [14] Gh. Păun; On the Splicing operation, *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, **70**, 57-79, 1996.
- [15] Gh.Păun, Grzegorz Rozenberg, Arto Salomaa; Computing by Splicing, *Theoretical Computer Science*, **168(2)**, 321-336, 1996.
- [16] Gh. Păun, Grzegorz Rozenberg, Arto Salomaa; DNA Computing : New Computing Paradigms, Springer-Verlag, 1998.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, CHENNAI 600 036, INDIA.

E-mail address: lj, ramar, rits@iitm.ac.in