A CENSUS OF FINITE AUTOMATA

by

Michael A. Harrison

This research was initiated at the University of Michigan, under support of the Aeronautical Systems Division, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base (Contract No. AF 33(657)-7611), and was completed at the University of California, under support of the Air Force Office of Scientific Research of the Office of Aerospace Research, the Dept. of the Army, Army Research Office, and the Dept. of the Navy, Office of Naval Research (Grant No. AF-AFOSR-62-349).
A CENSUS OF FINITE AUTOMATA*

by

Michael A. Harrison**

ABSTRACT

The enumeration of finite automata is carried out under a variety of definitions of equivalence. In order to carry out the enumeration, it is necessary to count the number of equivalence classes of functions under the symmetric group defined on a subset of the domain of the functions. New results in this direction are obtained and some numerical results are given along with a convenient lower bound.

*This research was initiated at the University of Michigan, under support of the Aeronautical Systems Division, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base (Contract No. AF 33(657)-7811), and was completed at the University of California, under support of the Air Force Office of Scientific Research of the Office of Aerospace Research, the Dept. of the Army, Army Research Office, and the Dept. of the Navy, Office of Naval Research (Grant No. AF-AFOSR-63-340), 139-63

**Dept. of Electrical Engineering and Electronics Research Laboratory, University of California, Berkeley.
I. BACKGROUND AND NOTATION

Both Harary and Ginsburg have focused attention on the previously unsolved problem of counting the number of equivalence classes of finite automata. In the present paper, this problem is completely solved by proving a variety of theorems about the enumeration of functions.

Let \( \Sigma_k = \{\sigma_0, \ldots, \sigma_{k-1}\} \) be the input alphabet and \( \mathcal{P}_p = \{\pi_0, \ldots, \pi_{p-1}\} \) be the output alphabet.

**Definition 1.1.** A finite automaton is defined as a system \( S = <S, f, g> \) where \( S = \{s_0, \ldots, s_{n-1}\} \) is a nonvoid set of internal states, \( f \) is the direct transition function which maps \( S \times \Sigma_k \rightarrow S \), while \( g \) is output function which maps \( S \times \Sigma_k \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_p \).

It is convenient to represent a finite automaton by a directed graph whose nodes represent internal states and whose labeled branches denote transitions. An example is indicated in Fig. 1 along with the matrix representative of \( f \) and \( g \) which is an equivalent definition of the automaton.

**Definition 1.2.** Two automata \( S = <S, f_1, g_1> \) and \( T = <T, f_2, g_2> \) are said to be isomorphic if there exists a one-to-one mapping \( \alpha \) from \( S \) onto \( T \) such that

\[
\alpha(f_1(s, \sigma)) = f_2(\alpha(s), \sigma)
\]

and

\[
g_1(s, \sigma) = g_2(\alpha(s), \sigma)
\]
Clearly, isomorphism of automata is an equivalence relation and hence decomposes the family of all machines into equivalence classes.

There are further refinements which can be made on the concept of equivalence. For instance, the machines in Fig. 2 are not isomorphic, but differ only by a permutation of the inputs. This suggests widening our definition by allowing arbitrary permutations of the letters of $\sum_k$. For similar reasons, one might allow any arbitrary permutation of the elements of $\prod_p$.

More formally, we have the following definitions.

Definition 1.3. Two automata $S = \langle S, f_1, g_1 \rangle$ and $T = \langle T, f_2, g_2 \rangle$ are said to be equivalent with respect to an input permutation if there exists $a \in \mathfrak{S}_n$, $\beta \in \mathfrak{S}_k$ such that

\[ a f_1(s, \sigma) = f_2(a(s), \beta(\sigma)) \]
\[ g_1(s, \sigma) = g_2(a(s), \beta(\sigma)) \]

Definition 1.4. Two automata $S = \langle S, f_1, g_1 \rangle$ and $T = \langle T, f_2, g_2 \rangle$ are said to be equivalent with respect to input and output permutations if there exist $a \in \mathfrak{S}_n$, $\beta \in \mathfrak{S}_k$ and $\gamma \in \mathfrak{S}_p$ such that

\[ a f_1(s, \sigma) = f_2(a(s), \beta(\sigma)) \]
\[ g_1(s, \sigma) = \gamma(g_2(a(s), \beta(\sigma)). \]

Before proceeding to the enumeration, the background material from the literature is assembled.

*As usual, denote the symmetric group of degree $n$ by $\mathfrak{S}_n$. 
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In this section, the pertinent combinatorial background will be presented. Let \( \mathcal{G} \) be a permutation group defined on a set \( S \). Let the order of \( \mathcal{G} \) be \( g \) and the degree of \( \mathcal{G} \) be \( n \). Two elements \( s_i \) and \( s_j \) in \( S \) are called equivalent if there exists a permutation \( \alpha \) in \( \mathcal{G} \) such that \( \alpha(s_i) = s_j \). The number of transitivity classes is given by a theorem of Burnside.

**Theorem 2.1.** Let \( \mathcal{G} \) be a permutation group of order \( g \) acting on a set \( S \). The number of equivalence classes induced by \( \mathcal{G} \) is

\[
\frac{1}{g} \sum_{c} n_c I(c)
\]

where the sum is over all conjugate classes \( c \), \( n_c \) is the cardinality of \( c \) and \( I(c) \) is the number of fixed points of \( s \) under any permutation in \( c \).

For the purposes of the present paper, the only group to be considered will be the symmetric group, but the generalization to arbitrary groups is immediate.

Let \( \alpha \in S_n \) have cycle structure \((j_1, \ldots, j_n)\); that is, \( j_i \) cycles of length \( i \) for \( i = 1, \ldots, n \). Clearly

\[
\sum_{i=1}^{n} i j_i = n
\]

Conjugate elements of \( S_n \) have the same cycle structure and conversely.

**Corollary 2.2.** Let \( S_n \) act on a set \( S \). The number of equivalence classes induced by \( S_n \) is

\[
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\[
\frac{1}{n!} \sum_{(j)} \frac{n!}{\prod_{i=1}^{n} j_i^{i_i}} I(j)
\]

where the sum is over all nonnegative integral solutions of Eq. (1) and \( I(j) \) denotes the number of elements of \( S \) fixed by any permutation of \( S_n \) with cycle structure \((j_1, \ldots, j_n)\).

The coefficient in Eq. (2) which is the number of permutations having cycle structure \((j_1, \ldots, j_n)\) will henceforth be denoted by \( c_{(j)} \); that is, let

\[
c_{(j)} = \frac{n!}{\prod_{i=1}^{n} j_i^{i_i}}
\]

There will be an occasion to use a new and powerful theorem of De Bruijn. For this theorem it is convenient to develop the concept of the cycle index polynomial.

Let \( G \) be a permutation group of order \( g \) acting on a set \( D \) of cardinality \( s \) while \( H \) is a permutation group of order \( h \) acting on a set \( R \) of cardinality \( r \). Consider the class of functions from \( D \) into \( R \) and call two functions \( f_1 \) and \( f_2 \) equivalent if there exists an \( a \in G \) and a permutation \( \beta \in H \) such that for every \( d \in D \), \( f_1(a(d)) = \beta f_2(d) \). The number of equivalence classes of
functions is desired. In order to state the theorem of De Bruijn which solves this problem, the following definition must be introduced.

Definition 2.3. If \( G \) is a permutation group of order \( g \) acting on a set \( S \) of cardinality \( s \) and if \( f_1, \ldots, f_s \) are \( s \) indeterminates, then the cycle index polynomial of \( G \) is defined as

\[
Z_G(f_1, \ldots, f_s) = \frac{1}{g} \sum_{(j)} g(j) f_1^{j_1} \cdots f_s^{j_s}
\]

where the equation is summed over all partitions of \( s \) and \( g(j) \) is the number of elements having cycle structure \((j_1, \ldots, j_s)\).

Theorem 2.4. (De Bruijn) The number of classes of functions \( f: D \rightarrow R \) with a permutation group \( G \) of degree \( s \) and order \( g \) acting on \( D \) and a group \( H \) of degree \( r \) and order \( h \) acting on \( R \) is given by

\[
Z_G \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial z_1}, \ldots, \frac{\partial}{\partial z_s} \right) Z_H(h_1, \ldots, h_r)
\]

evaluated at \( z_1 = \ldots = z_s = 0 \) where \( h_i = \exp \left( \sum_{k=1}^{s_k} i z_{k_i} \right) \) for \( i = 1, \ldots, r \).

Theorem 4 is generally applied in actual problems through the use of the following lemma.

Lemma 2.5. A term \( h_1^{j_1} \cdots h_r^{j_r} \) in \( Z_H \) gives rise to

\[
Z_G \left( \sum_{t \mid I} t^{j_1}, \ldots, \sum_{t \mid S} t_{j_r} \right)
\]

There is a convenient product of permutation groups which was defined and used by Harary in his study of bi-colored graphs.
Let $\mathcal{G}$ and $\mathcal{H}$ be permutation groups of order $m$ and $n$ operating on disjoint object sets $X$ and $Y$ of cardinality $a$ and $b$ respectively. The Cartesian product of $\mathcal{G}$ and $\mathcal{H}$, denoted by $\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{H}$, is defined on $X \times Y$ as

$$(a, \beta)(x, y) = (a(x), \beta(y))$$

It is important to be able to compute the cycle index of $\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{H}$ from the cycle indices of $\mathcal{G}$ and of $\mathcal{H}$. This is accomplished by defining a cross operation on cycle index polynomials. The pertinent result of Harary is the following

**Theorem 2.6.** (Harary)

If

$$Z_\mathcal{G} = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{a} g^i_r$$

and

$$Z_\mathcal{H} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{b} h^j_s$$

then

$$Z_{\mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{H}} = Z_\mathcal{G} \times Z_\mathcal{H} = \frac{1}{m} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{a} \sum_{j=1}^{b} \frac{a}{i} \frac{b}{j} \sum_{r,s} l^r_s(r,s)$$

where $<r, s>$ is the least common multiple of $r$ and $s$, while $(r, s)$ is the greatest common divisor of $r$ and $s$.

It is often convenient to use these theorems for terms of the cycle index polynomials rather than the entire polynomial. Such a procedure often results in elegant symbolic proofs and is easily verified to be a valid method of proof (Cf. 8).
III. PRINCIPLE FOR COUNTING AUTOMATA

The following restatement of Theorem 2.1 enables the enumeration of automata to be carried out by enumerating classes of functions.

**Theorem 3.1.** The number of classes of non-isomorphic finite automata with \( n \) internal states defined over input alphabet \( \sum_k \) and output alphabet \( \prod_p \) is

\[
\frac{1}{n!} \sum_{(j)} \frac{n!}{\prod_{j_i} j_i} F(j) G(j)
\]

where the sum is over all partitions of \( n \) and \( F(j) \) denotes the number of functions \( f: S \times \sum_k \rightarrow S \) left invariant by a permutation \( \alpha \) having cycle structure \((j_1, \ldots, j_n)\) applied to both domain and range. Similarly, \( G(j) \) is the number of functions from \( S \times \sum_k \rightarrow \prod_p \) invariant under \( \alpha \).

The result of Theorem 3.1 becomes slightly more complicated when one allows arbitrary permutations in \( \mathcal{G}_k \) over \( \sum_k \) or in \( \mathcal{G}_p \) over \( \prod_p \).

**Theorem 3.2.** The number of equivalence classes of finite automata with \( n \) internal states and allowing arbitrary permutations of \( \mathcal{G}_k \) is

\[
\frac{1}{n!} \frac{1}{k!} \sum_{(j)} \sum_{(\ell)} \frac{n!}{\prod_{j_i} j_i} \frac{k!}{\prod_{\ell_i} \ell_i} \frac{F(j, \ell) G(j, \ell)}{i=1}
\]
where $F(j, \ell)$ is the number of transition functions which are fixed by a permutation of the states with cycle structure $(j) = (j_1, \ldots, j_n)$ and a permutation of the inputs with cycle structure $(\ell) = (\ell_1, \ldots, \ell_k)$.

**Theorem 3.3.** The number of equivalence classes of finite automata with $n$ internal states allowing $G_k$ on $\sum_k$ while $G_p$ permutes $\prod_p$ is given by

$$\frac{1}{n!} \frac{1}{k!} \frac{1}{\ell!} \sum_{(j)} \sum_{(\ell)} \sum_{(m)} \frac{n!}{\ell_1! \ell_2! \cdots \ell_k!} \frac{k!}{j_1! j_2! \cdots j_n!} \frac{\ell!}{p_1! p_2! \cdots p_m!} F(j, \ell) G(j, \ell, m)$$

where $G(j, \ell, m)$ is the number of output functions invariant under permutations $\alpha \in G_n$, $\beta \in G_k$, $\gamma \in G_p$ such that $\alpha$ has cycle structure $(j_1, \ldots, j_n)$, $\beta$ has cycle structure $(\ell_1, \ldots, \ell_k)$ and $\gamma$ has cycle structure $(m_1, \ldots, m_p)$.

**Proofs.** The above theorems are restatements of Theorem 2.1. the only additional observation that must be made is that the number of automata left invariant by $\alpha$ is the product of the number of transition functions and the number of output functions left invariant by $\alpha$. 
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IV. THE NUMBER OF OUTPUT FUNCTIONS

First, we determine $G(j) = G(j_1, \ldots, j_n)$ in the case of no permutations on $\sum_k$ or on $\prod_p$.

**Theorem 4.1.** The number of functions $g: S \times \sum_k \rightarrow \prod_p$ left invariant by a permutation of $\mathfrak{S}_n$ with cycle structure $(j_1, \ldots, j_n)$ is

$$G(j) = p^{k \sum_{i=1}^n j_i}$$

**Proof.** There are $p$ choices for each element of the range, and there are $k j_i$ choices for elements of $S$ in cycles of length $1, \ldots, k j_n$. Thus there are

$$\sum_{i=1}^n k j_i = p^{k \sum_{i=1}^n j_i}$$

such functions.

The immediate generalization to arbitrary permutations of $\sum_k$ is now indicated.

**Theorem 4.2.** The number of output functions $g: S \times \sum_k \rightarrow \prod_p$ which are fixed by a permutation $\alpha \in \mathfrak{S}_n$ having cycle structure $(j_1, \ldots, j_n)$ and $\beta \in \mathfrak{S}_k$ with cycle structure $(\ell_1, \ldots, \ell_k)$ is

$$G(j, \ell) = p^{\sum_{r=1}^n j_r \ell_s(r, s)}$$

where $(r, s)$ denotes the greatest common divisor of $r$ and $s$.

**Proof.** The cycle structure of $\alpha \in \mathfrak{S}_n$ is denoted by $\prod g_r^{j_r}$ and the
cycle structure of $\beta \in \mathcal{S}_k$ by $\prod_{s=1}^{k} h_s$. Therefore the cycle structure
induced on $S \times \sum_{k}$ is given as:

\[
\left( \prod_{r=1}^{n} g_r \right) \times \left( \prod_{s=1}^{k} h_s \right) = \prod_{r=1}^{n} \prod_{s=1}^{k} f(r,s)
\]

There are $p$ choices in the range for each and every one of domain
elements, so the total number of invariant functions is

\[
\prod_{r=1}^{n} \prod_{s=1}^{k} j_r l_s(r,s) = \sum_{r=1}^{n} \sum_{s=1}^{k} j_r l_s(r,s)
\]

The last generalization to be allowed is the case when arbitrary
permutations of $\sum_{k}$ and of $\prod_{p}$ are allowed.

**Theorem 4.3.** The number of output functions $g: S \times \sum_{k} \rightarrow \prod_{p}$ left
invariant by $\alpha \in \mathcal{S}_n$, $\beta \in \mathcal{S}_k$, and $\gamma \in \mathcal{S}_p$ having cycle structure $(i_1, \ldots, i_n)\,$
$(l_1, \ldots, l_k)$, and $(m_1, \ldots, m_p)$ respectively is

\[
G(j, l, m) = \prod_{r=1}^{n} \prod_{s=1}^{k} \left( \sum_{t \mid <r,s>} t \right)^{j_r l_s(r,s)}
\]

where $<r,s>$ and $(r,s)$ denote the least common multiple and greatest
common divisor of $r$ and $s$ respectively.

**Proof.** The desired number is given by the De Bruijn result specialized
to the case where

\[
Z_j = \prod_{r=1}^{n} \prod_{s=1}^{k} f(r,s)
\]

and

\[
Z_j = \prod_{t=1}^{p} s_t
\]

One application of lemma 2.5 gives the result.
V. THE NUMBER OF TRANSITION FUNCTIONS

The enumeration of finite automata will be completed by enumerating the number of non-isomorphic functions $f: S \times \sum_k \rightarrow S$. The present problem of determining the $F(j)$ is more complicated than the corresponding problem for output functions. The reason for the added complication is that the permutation $\alpha$ with cycle structure $(j_1, \ldots, j_n)$ acts on the range of the transition function as well as on part of the domain of the function.

**Theorem 5.1.** The number of transition functions $f: S \times \sum_k \rightarrow S$ fixed under a permutation of $S$ with cycle structure $(j_1, \ldots, j_n)$ is

$$F(j) = \frac{\prod}{i=1} \left( \sum_{d|d_i}^{j_i} d_{j_i}^{k_{j_i}} \right)$$

**Proof.** When $k=1$, this theorem reduces to theorem 6 of Davis.²

To prove the result, let $\alpha$ be a permutation with cycle structure $f_1^i \ldots f_n^i$. Since permutations of $\sum_k$ are not allowed, the cycle index of the group on $\sum_k$ is $f_1^k$. The entire group on the domain is

$$f_1^j \ldots f_n^j \times f_1^k = f_1^{k_1} f_2^{k_2} \ldots f_n^{k_n}$$

Using De. Bruijn's theorem with $Z_{f_1^j} = f_1^{k_1} \ldots f_n^{k_n}$ and $Z_{f_1^j} = f_1^j \ldots f_n^j$, we get

$$\frac{\prod}{i=1} \left( \sum_{d|d_i}^{j_i} d_{j_i} d_j \right)^{k_{j_i}}$$

It is also easy to give a direct proof.
Now the generalization to arbitrary permutations in $G_k$ is given.

**Theorem 5.2.** The number of transition functions $f: S \times \sum_k \rightarrow S$ fixed under $\alpha \in G_n$ and $\beta \in G_k$ where $\alpha$ has cycle structure $(j_1, \ldots, j_n)$ and $\beta$ has cycle structure $(\ell_1, \ldots, \ell_k)$ is

$$F(j, \ell) = \prod_{r=1}^{n} \prod_{s=1}^{k} \left( \sum_{t \in \langle r, s \rangle} t_{j_t} \right)^{j_r \ell_s(r, s)}$$

**Proof.** We use the De Bruijn theorem with

$$Z_{\gamma} = \prod_{r=1}^{n} g_r^j r \times \prod_{s=1}^{k} h_s^\ell s = \prod_{r \neq 1} \prod_{s=1}^{r} f_r^j l_s(r, s)$$

and

$$Z_{\beta} = \prod_{i=1}^{n} f_i^j i$$

An application of lemma 2.5 yields

$$F(j, \ell) = \prod_{r=1}^{n} \prod_{s=1}^{k} \left( \sum_{d \in \langle r, s \rangle} d_{j_d} \right)^{j_r \ell_s(r, s)}$$
VI. THE MAIN THEOREMS

Collecting the results of the previous sections gives the formulas for the number of finite automata.

**Theorem 6.1.** The number of classes of non-isomorphic finite automata \( S = <S, f, g> \) with \( S = \{s_0, \ldots, s_{n-1}\} \) over input alphabet \( \sum_k \) and output alphabet \( \prod_p \) is

\[
\frac{1}{n!} \sum_{(j)} \frac{n!}{\prod_{i=1}^{n} j_i !^j} \prod_{i=1}^{n} (p \sum_{d_i} d_j^i)^{k_j i}
\]

**Proof.** Cf. Theorems 3.1, 4.1, and 5.1.

**Theorem 6.2.** The number of classes of finite automata \( S = <s, f, g> \) with \( S = \{s_0, \ldots, s_{n-1}\} \) over input alphabet \( \sum_k \) with \( G_k \) acting on \( \sum_k \) and with output alphabet \( \prod_p \) is given by

\[
\frac{1}{n!} \sum_{(j)} \sum_{(f)} \frac{n!}{\prod_{i=1}^{n} j_i !^j} \frac{k!}{\prod_{i=1}^{k} f_i !^k} \prod_{r=1}^{n} \prod_{s=1}^{k} (p \sum_{t_j} t_j)^{r \ell_s(r, s)}
\]

**Proof.** Cf. Theorems 3.2, 4.2, and 5.2.

**Theorem 6.3.** The number of classes of finite automata \( S = <S, f, g> \) with \( S = \{s_0, \ldots, s_{n-1}\} \) and \( G_k \) operating on \( \sum_k \) with \( G_p \) operating on \( \prod_p \) is given by
\[
\frac{1}{n!} \frac{1}{k!} \frac{1}{p!} \sum_{(j)} \sum_{(k)} \sum_{(m)} \frac{n!}{i!} \frac{k!}{l!} \frac{p!}{m!} \prod_{r=1}^{n} \prod_{s=1}^{k} \prod_{r=1}^{l} \prod_{s=1}^{m}
\]

\[
\left( \sum_{t} t^{j} \right) \left( \sum_{d} d^{m} \right) \left( r^{l} \right) \left( s^{m} \right)
\]

Proof. Cf. Theorems 3.3, 4.3, and 5.2.

One can obtain a lower bound on the number of automata from the theorems of this section.

**Corollary 6.4.** The number of classes of non-isomorphic automata with \( n \) internal states over input alphabet \( \sum_{k} \) and output alphabet \( \prod_{p} \) is not smaller than

\[
\frac{1}{n!} (pn)^{kn}
\]

**Corollary 6.5.** The number of equivalence classes of \( n \) state automata with \( \mathcal{C}_{k} \) on \( \sum_{k} \) is not smaller than

\[
\frac{1}{n!} \frac{1}{k!} (pn)^{kn}
\]

**Corollary 6.6.** The number of equivalence classes of \( n \) state automata and \( \mathcal{C}_{k} \) on \( \sum_{k} \) and \( \mathcal{C}_{p} \) on \( \prod_{p} \) is not less than

\[
\frac{1}{n!} \frac{1}{k!} \frac{1}{p!} (pn)^{kn}
\]

Proofs. In every case, replace the sum by the first term.
VII. CONNECTED MACHINES

For many purposes, it is convenient to consider machines which are connected. We enumerate the connected machines in this section.

**Definition 7.1.** An automaton is connected if and only if its graph is connected.

Let \( a_{n, k, p} \) be the number of equivalence classes of automata with \( n \) internal states defined over \( \sum_k \) and \( \prod_p \). Let \( A(x, y, z) \) be the generating function for \( a_{n, k, p} \) that is

\[
A(x, y, z) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sum_{p=1}^{\infty} a_{n, k, p} x^ny^pz^p
\]

Let \( C(x, y, z) \) be the corresponding series for the number of connected automata.

**Theorem 7.2.** The generating function \( C(x, y, z) \) for the number of classes of connected automata is obtained from the generating function \( A(x, y, z) \) of the total number of classes of automata by the relation

\[
\log (1 + A(x, y, z)) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{i} C(x^i, y^i, z^i)
\]

**Proof.** This theorem is a restatement of Pólya's result on the number of connected graphs. The result is derived in Harary's paper.
VIII. NUMERICAL RESULTS

Numerical calculations are presented for modest values of $n$, $k$, and $p$. Since it is easy to prove that binary inputs are completely general, the enumeration is restricted to the case $k=2$.

In table 1, the number of non-isomorphic binary machines without outputs is given, along with the number of connected non-isomorphic machines.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>$a_{n,2,1}$</th>
<th>$c_{n,2,1}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1
The Number of Non-isomorphic Binary Automata

In table 2, input permutations are permitted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>$a_{n,2,1}$</th>
<th>$c_{n,2,1}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2
The Number of Non-isomorphic Binary Automata
Under Input Permutations

In Fig. 3, the 10 classes of automata are shown. It is clear that there is only one disconnected machine. Furthermore, input permutation causes i and ii, vi and vii, viii and ix, to become equivalent.

The remaining calculations are presented in Tables 3 through 5.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>$a_n, 2, 2$</th>
<th>$c_n, 2, 2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7860</td>
<td>7336</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3

The Number of Non-isomorphic Automata with Binary Input and Output.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>$a_n, 2, 2$</th>
<th>$c_n, 2, 2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4003</td>
<td>3783</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4

The Number of Equivalence Classes of Automata with $\mathcal{G}_2$ on $\sum_2$ and Binary Output.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>$a_n, 2, 2$</th>
<th>$c_{n2}, 2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1905</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5

The Number of Equivalence Classes of Automata with $\mathcal{G}_2$ on $\sum_2$ and $\mathcal{G}_2$ on $\prod_2$.  
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IX. COMMENTS AND UNSOLVED PROBLEMS

Loosely speaking, an automaton $S = \langle S, f, g \rangle$ is said to be **strongly connected** if for every pair of states $s, t \in S$, there exists a sequence of inputs which causes $S$ to leave state $s$ and go into state $t$. Thus strongly connected machines correspond to strongly connected digraphs. The general enumeration problem for strongly connected digraphs (automata) is still unsolved.\(^6\)

In the present context, the automata did not have a designated initial state. The enumeration problem in this case has been studied by Vyssotsky\(^10\) in unpublished work. The rooted case follows from our results by employing the same device used in enumerating rooted graphs, namely the number of classes of rooted $n$-state machines is given by the expression for the $n-1$ state machines with $j_1$ replaced by $j_1 + 1$. The details are in the paper by Harary.\(^7\)
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