

Deciding semantic finiteness of pushdown processes and first-order grammars w.r.t. bisimulation equivalence

Petr Jančar

Dept of Computer Science, Faculty of Science, Palacký Univ., Olomouc, Czechia

Abstract

The problem if a given configuration of a pushdown automaton (PDA) is bisimilar with some (unspecified) finite-state process is shown to be decidable. The decidability is proven in the framework of first-order grammars, which are given by finite sets of labelled rules that rewrite roots of first-order terms. The framework is equivalent to PDA where also deterministic (i.e. alternative-free) epsilon-steps are allowed, hence to the model for which Sénizergues showed an involved procedure deciding bisimilarity (1998, 2005). Such a procedure is here used as a black-box part of the algorithm.

The result extends the decidability of the regularity problem for deterministic PDA that was shown by Stearns (1967), and later improved by Valiant (1975) regarding the complexity. The decidability question for nondeterministic PDA, answered positively here, had been open (as indicated, e.g., by Broadbent and Göller, 2012).

1 Introduction

The question of deciding semantic equivalences of systems, like language equivalence, has been a frequent topic in computer science. A closely related question asks if a given system in a class \mathcal{C}_1 has an equivalent in a subclass \mathcal{C}_2 . Pushdown automata (PDA) constitute a well-known example; language equivalence and regularity are undecidable for PDA. In the case of deterministic PDA (DPDA), the decidability and complexity results for regularity [1, 2] preceded the famous decidability result for equivalence by Sénizergues [3].

In concurrency theory, logic, verification, and other areas, a finer equivalence, called *bisimulation equivalence* or *bisimilarity*, has emerged as another fundamental behavioural equivalence (cf., e.g., [4]); on deterministic systems it essentially coincides with language equivalence. An on-line survey of the results which study this equivalence in a specific area of process rewrite systems is maintained by Srba [5].

One of the most involved results in this area is the decidability of bisimilarity for pushdown processes generated by (nondeterministic) PDA in which ε -steps are restricted so that each ε -step has no alternative (and can be restricted to be popping); this result was shown by Sénizergues [6] who thus generalized his above mentioned result for DPDA. There is no known upper bound on the complexity of this decidable problem. The nonelementary lower bound established in [7] is, in fact, TOWER-hardness in the terminology of [8], and it holds even for real-time PDA, i.e. PDA with no ε -steps. For the above mentioned PDA with restricted ε -steps the bisimilarity problem is even not primitive recursive; its Ackermann-hardness is shown in [9]. In the deterministic case, the equivalence problem is known to be PTIME-hard, and has a primitive recursive upper bound shown by Stirling [10] (where a finer analysis places the problem in TOWER [9]).

Extrapolating the deterministic case, we might expect that for PDA the “regularity” problem w.r.t. bisimilarity (asking if a given PDA-configuration is bisimilar with a state in a finite-state system) is decidable as well, and that this problem might be easier than the equivalence problem solved in [6]; only EXPTIME-hardness is known here (see [11], and [5] for detailed references). Nevertheless, this decidability question has been open so far, as also indicated in [12] (besides [5]).

Contribution of this paper. We show that semantic finiteness of pushdown configurations w.r.t. bisimilarity is decidable. The decidability is proven in the framework of *first-order grammars*, i.e. of finite sets of labelled rules that rewrite roots of first-order terms. Though we do not use (explicit) ε -steps, the framework is equivalent to the model of PDA with restricted ε -steps for which Sénizergues’s general decidability proof [6] applies. (A simplified proof directly in the first-order grammar framework, hence an alternative to the proof in [6], is given in [13].)

The presented algorithm, answering if a given configuration, i.e. a first-order term E_0 in the labelled transition system generated by a first-order grammar, has a bisimilar finite-state system, uses the result of [6] (or of [13]) as a black-box procedure. By [9] we cannot get a primitive recursive upper bound via a black-box use of the decision procedure for bisimilarity.

Semidecidability of the semantic finiteness problem has been long clear, hence it is the existence of finite effectively verifiable witnesses of the negative case that is the crucial point here. It turns out that a witness of semantic infiniteness of a term (i.e., of a configuration) E_0 is a specific path $E_0 \xrightarrow{u} \xrightarrow{w}$ in the respective labelled transition system where the sequence w of actions can be repeated forever. The idea how to verify if the respective infinite path $E_0 \xrightarrow{u} \xrightarrow{w} \xrightarrow{w} \xrightarrow{w} \dots$, denoted $E_0 \xrightarrow{u} \xrightarrow{w^\omega}$, visits terms (configurations) from infinitely many equivalence classes is to consider the “limit term” LIM that is “reached” by $E_0 \xrightarrow{u} \xrightarrow{w^\omega}$; the term LIM is generally infinite but regular (i.e., it has only finitely many subterms). The (black-box) procedure deciding equivalence is used for computing a finite number e such that we are guaranteed that if $E_0 \xrightarrow{u} \xrightarrow{w^e}$ does not reach a term equivalent to LIM then $E_0 \xrightarrow{u} \xrightarrow{w^k}$ does not reach such a term for any $k \geq e$. In this case the path $E_0 \xrightarrow{u} \xrightarrow{w^\omega}$ indeed visits terms in infinitely many equivalence classes since the visited terms approach LIM syntactically and thus also semantically (by increasing the “equivalence-level” with LIM) but never belong to the equivalence class of LIM. To show the existence of a respective witness $E_0 \xrightarrow{u} \xrightarrow{w}$ for each semantically infinite E_0 is not trivial but it can be done by a detailed study of the paths $E_0 \xrightarrow{a_1} E_1 \xrightarrow{a_2} E_2 \xrightarrow{a_3} \dots$ where E_i are from pairwise different equivalence classes; here we also use the infinite Ramsey theorem for technical convenience.

Remark on the relation to other uses of first-order grammars. In this paper the first-order grammars are used for slightly different aims than in the works on higher-order grammars (or higher-order recursion schemes) and higher-order pushdown automata, where the first order is a particular case; we can exemplify such works by [14, 15], while many other references can be found, e.g., in the survey papers [16, 17]. There a grammar is used to describe an infinite labelled tree (the syntax tree of an infinite applicative term produced by a unique outermost derivation from an initial nonterminal), and the questions like, e.g., the decidability of monadic second-order (MSO) properties for such trees are studied. In this paper, a first-order grammar can be also seen as a tool describing an infinite tree, namely the tree-unfolding of a nondeterministic labelled transition system with an initial state. The question if this tree is regular (i.e., if it has only finitely many subtrees) would correspond to the regularity question studied in [1, 2]; but here we ask a different question, namely if identifying bisimilar

subtrees results in a regular tree.

We can also note that the question if a given first-order grammar generates a regular tree refers to a particular formalism (namely to the respective infinite applicative term) while the regularity question studied here is more “syntax-independent”.

Some further remarks are given at the end of Section 2 and in Section 4.

Organization of the paper. Section 2 explains the used notions, and states the result. The proof is then given in Section 3, and Section 4 adds a few additional remarks. Finally, there is an appendix with some technical constructions that are not crucial for the proof.

Remark. A preliminary version of this paper, with a sketch of the proof ideas, appeared in Proc. MFCS’16.

2 Basic Notions, and Result

In this section we define the basic notions and state the result in the form of a theorem. Some standard definitions are restricted when we do not need the full generality. We finish the section by a note about a transformation of pushdown automata to first-order grammars.

By \mathbb{N} and \mathbb{N}_+ we denote the sets of nonnegative integers and of positive integers, respectively. By $[i, j]$, for $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$, we denote the set $\{i, i+1, \dots, j\}$. For a set \mathcal{A} , by \mathcal{A}^* we denote the set of finite sequences of elements of \mathcal{A} , which are also called *words* (over \mathcal{A}). By $|w|$ we denote the *length* of $w \in \mathcal{A}^*$, and by ε the *empty sequence*; hence $|\varepsilon| = 0$. We put $\mathcal{A}^+ = \mathcal{A}^* \setminus \{\varepsilon\}$, $w^0 = \varepsilon$, and $w^{j+1} = ww^j$ for $j \in \mathbb{N}$; w^ω denotes the infinite sequence $www \dots$.

Labelled transition systems. A *labelled transition system*, an *LTS* for short, is a tuple $\mathcal{L} = (\mathcal{S}, \Sigma, (\xrightarrow{a})_{a \in \Sigma})$ where \mathcal{S} is a finite or countable set of *states*, Σ is a finite set of *actions* (or *letters*), and $\xrightarrow{a} \subseteq \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{S}$ is a set of *a-transitions* (for each $a \in \Sigma$). We say that \mathcal{L} is a *deterministic LTS* if for each pair $s \in \mathcal{S}$, $a \in \Sigma$ there is at most one s' such that $s \xrightarrow{a} s'$ (which stands for $(s, s') \in \xrightarrow{a}$). By $s \xrightarrow{w} s'$, where $w = a_1 a_2 \dots a_n \in \Sigma^*$, we denote that there is a *path* $s = s_0 \xrightarrow{a_1} s_1 \xrightarrow{a_2} s_2 \dots \xrightarrow{a_n} s_n = s'$; if $s \xrightarrow{w} s'$, then s' is *reachable from* s . By $s \xrightarrow{w}$ we denote that w is *enabled in* s , i.e., $s \xrightarrow{w} s'$ for some s' . If \mathcal{L} is deterministic, then $s \xrightarrow{w} s'$ and $s \xrightarrow{w}$ also denote a unique path.

Bisimilarity. Given $\mathcal{L} = (\mathcal{S}, \Sigma, (\xrightarrow{a})_{a \in \Sigma})$, a set $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{S}$ *covers* $(s, t) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{S}$ if for each $s \xrightarrow{a} s'$ there is $t \xrightarrow{a} t'$ such that $(s', t') \in \mathcal{B}$, and for each $t \xrightarrow{a} t'$ there is $s \xrightarrow{a} s'$ such that $(s', t') \in \mathcal{B}$. For $\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{B}' \subseteq \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{S}$ we say that \mathcal{B}' *covers* \mathcal{B} if \mathcal{B}' covers each $(s, t) \in \mathcal{B}$. A set $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{S}$ is a *bisimulation* if \mathcal{B} covers \mathcal{B} . States $s, t \in \mathcal{S}$ are *bisimilar*, written $s \sim t$, if there is a bisimulation \mathcal{B} containing (s, t) . A standard fact is that $\sim \subseteq \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{S}$ is an equivalence relation, and it is the largest bisimulation, namely the union of all bisimulations.

E.g., in the LTS $(\mathcal{S}, \Sigma, (\xrightarrow{a})_{a \in \Sigma})$ in Fig. 1 we have $s_3 \sim s_4$ and $s_1 \not\sim s_2$ (though s_1, s_2 are trace-equivalent, i.e., the sets $\{w \in \Sigma^* \mid s_1 \xrightarrow{w}\}$ and $\{w \in \Sigma^* \mid s_2 \xrightarrow{w}\}$ are the same).

Semantic finiteness. Given $\mathcal{L} = (\mathcal{S}, \Sigma, (\xrightarrow{a})_{a \in \Sigma})$, we say that $s_0 \in \mathcal{S}$ is *finite up to bisimilarity*, or *bisim-finite* for short, if there is some state f in some finite LTS such that $s_0 \sim f$; otherwise s_0 is *infinite up to bisimilarity*, or *bisim-infinite*. We should add that when comparing states from different LTSs, we implicitly refer to the disjoint union of these LTSs.




Figure 1: Example of a finite (nondeterministic) labelled transition system

First-order terms, regular terms, finite graph presentations. We will consider LTSs with countable sets of states in which the states are first-order regular terms. (In Fig. 1 the states are depicted as unstructured black dots; Fig. 5 depicts three states of an LTS with terms “inside the black dots”.)

The terms are built from *variables* taken from a fixed countable set

$$\text{VAR} = \{x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots\}$$

and from *function symbols*, also called (*ranked*) *nonterminals*, from some specified finite set \mathcal{N} ; each $A \in \mathcal{N}$ has $\text{arity}(A) \in \mathbb{N}$. We reserve symbols A, B, C, D to range over nonterminals, and E, F, G, H to range over terms.

E.g., on the left in Fig. 2 we can see the syntactic tree of a term E_1 , namely of $E_1 = A(D(x_5, C(x_2, B)), x_5, B)$, where the arities of nonterminals A, B, C, D are 3, 0, 2, 2, respectively. The numbers at the arcs just highlight the fact that the outgoing arcs of each node are ordered.




Figure 2: Finite terms E_1, E_2 , and a graph presenting a regular infinite term E_3

We identify terms with their syntactic trees. Thus a *term over \mathcal{N}* is (viewed as) a rooted, ordered, finite or infinite tree where each node has a label from $\mathcal{N} \cup \text{VAR}$; if the label of a node is $x_i \in \text{VAR}$, then the node has no successors, and if the label is $A \in \mathcal{N}$, then it has m (immediate) successor-nodes where $m = \text{arity}(A)$. A subtree of a term E is also called a *subterm* of E . We make no difference between isomorphic (sub)trees, and thus a subterm can have more (maybe infinitely many) *occurrences* in E . Each *subterm-occurrence* has its (nesting) *depth in E* , which is its (naturally defined) distance from the root of E .

E.g., $C(x_2, B)$ is a subterm of the term E_1 in Fig. 2, with one depth-2 occurrence. The term B has two occurrences in E_1 , one in depth 1 and another in depth 3.

We also use the standard notation for terms: we write $E = x$ or $E = A(G_1, \dots, G_m)$ with the obvious meaning; in the former case we have $x \in \text{VAR} = \{x_1, x_2, \dots\}$ and $\text{ROOT}(E) = x$, in the latter case we have $A \in \mathcal{N}$, $\text{ROOT}(E) = A$, $m = \text{arity}(A)$, and G_1, \dots, G_m are the ordered depth-1 occurrences of subterms of E , which are also called the *root-successors* in E .

A *term* is *finite* if the respective tree is finite. A (possibly infinite) *term* is *regular* if it has only finitely many subterms (though the subterms may be infinite and can have infinitely many occurrences). We note that any regular term has at least one *graph presentation*, i.e., a finite directed graph with a designated root where each node has a label from $\mathcal{N} \cup \text{VAR}$; if the label of a node is $x \in \text{VAR}$, then the node has no outgoing arcs, and if the label is $A \in \mathcal{N}$, then it has m ordered outgoing arcs where $m = \text{arity}(A)$. (A graph presentation of an infinite regular term E_3 is on the right in Fig. 2.)

The standard tree-unfolding of a graph presentation is the respective term, which is infinite if there are cycles in the graph. There is a bijection between the nodes in the *least* graph presentation of E and (the roots of) the subterms of E . (To get the least graph presentation of E_3 in Fig. 2, we should unify the roots of the same subterms, here the nodes labelled with B and the nodes labelled with x_5 .)

Convention. In what follows, by a “term” we mean a “regular term” unless the context makes clear that the term is finite. (We do not consider non-regular terms.) By $\text{TERMS}_{\mathcal{N}}$ we denote the set of all (regular) terms over a set \mathcal{N} of (ranked) nonterminals (and over the set VAR of variables). As already said, we reserve symbols A, B, C, D to range over nonterminals, and E, F, G, H to range over (regular) terms.

Substitutions, associative composition, “iterated” substitutions.

A *substitution* σ is a mapping $\sigma : \text{VAR} \rightarrow \text{TERMS}_{\mathcal{N}}$ whose *support*

$$\text{SUPP}(\sigma) = \{x \in \text{VAR} \mid \sigma(x) \neq x\}$$

is *finite*; we reserve the symbol σ for substitutions. By $[x_{i_1}/E_1, x_{i_2}/E_2, \dots, x_{i_k}/E_k]$, where $i_j \neq i_{j'}$ when $j \neq j'$, we denote the substitution σ such that $\sigma(x_{i_j}) = E_j$ for all $j \in [1, k]$ and $\sigma(x) = x$ for all $x \in \text{VAR} \setminus \{x_{i_1}, x_{i_2}, \dots, x_{i_k}\}$.

By *applying a substitution* σ to a term E we get the term $E\sigma$ that arises from E by replacing each occurrence of $x \in \text{VAR}$ with $\sigma(x)$. (Given graph presentations, in the graph of E we just redirect each arc leading to x towards the root of $\sigma(x)$, which also includes the special “root-designating arc” when $E = x$.) Hence $E = x$ implies $E\sigma = x\sigma = \sigma(x)$. (E.g., for the terms in Fig. 2 we have $E_2 = E_1[x_2/E_1]$.)

The natural *composition of substitutions*, where $\sigma = \sigma_1\sigma_2$ is defined by $x\sigma = (x\sigma_1)\sigma_2$, can be easily verified to be associative. We thus write simply $E\sigma_1\sigma_2$ when meaning $(E\sigma_1)\sigma_2$ or $E(\sigma_1\sigma_2)$. We let σ^0 be the empty-support substitution, and we put $\sigma^{i+1} = \sigma\sigma^i$ for $i \in \mathbb{N}$. We will also use the limit substitution

$$\sigma^\omega = \sigma\sigma\sigma \dots$$

when this is well-defined, i.e., when there is no “unguarded cycle” $x_{i_1}\sigma = x_{i_2}$, $x_{i_2}\sigma = x_{i_3}$, \dots , $x_{i_{k-1}}\sigma = x_{i_k}$, $x_{i_k}\sigma = x_{i_1}$ where $x_{i_1} \neq x_{i_2}$. In this case we can formally define σ^ω as the unique substitution satisfying the following conditions for each $x \in \text{VAR}$: if $x\sigma^k \in \text{VAR}$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, then $x\sigma^\omega = x'$ for $x' \in \text{VAR}$ where $x\sigma^k = x'$ and $x'\sigma = x'$ for some k (such unique x' must exist since $\text{SUPP}(\sigma)$ is finite and there is no “unguarded cycle”); if there is the least $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $x\sigma^k = E \notin \text{VAR}$ (hence E has a nonterminal root), then $x\sigma^\omega = E\sigma^\omega$.

(E.g., in Fig. 2 we have $E_3 = E_1\sigma^\omega$ for $\sigma = [x_2/E_1]$.) In fact, we will use σ^ω only for special “colour-idempotent” substitutions σ defined later.

First-order grammars. The set $\text{TERMS}_{\mathcal{N}}$ (of regular terms over a finite set \mathcal{N} of nonterminals) will serve us as the set of states of an LTS. The transitions will be determined by a finite set of (schematic) *root-rewriting* rules, illustrated in Fig. 3. This is now defined formally.

A *first-order grammar*, or just a *grammar* for short, is a tuple $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{N}, \Sigma, \mathcal{R})$ where \mathcal{N} is a finite set of ranked *nonterminals* (viewed as function symbols with arities), Σ is a finite set of *actions* (or letters), and \mathcal{R} is a finite set of *rules* of the form

$$A(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m) \xrightarrow{a} E \quad (1)$$

where $A \in \mathcal{N}$, $\text{arity}(A) = m$, $a \in \Sigma$, and E is a finite term over \mathcal{N} in which each occurring variable is from the set $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m\}$.

Example. Fig. 3 shows a rule $A(x_1, x_2, x_3) \xrightarrow{b} C(A(x_2, x_1, B), x_2)$, and a rule $A(x_1, x_2, x_3) \xrightarrow{b} x_3$. The depiction stresses that the variables x_1, x_2, x_3 serve as the “placeholders” for the root-successors (RS), i.e. the depth-1 occurrences of subterms of a term with the root A ; the (root of the) term might be rewritten by performing action b (as defined below).




Figure 3: Depiction of rules $A(x_1, x_2, x_3) \xrightarrow{b} C(A(x_2, x_1, B), x_2)$ and $A(x_1, x_2, x_3) \xrightarrow{b} x_3$

LTSs generated by grammars. Given $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{N}, \Sigma, \mathcal{R})$, by $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{G}}^{\mathcal{R}}$ we denote the (*rule-based*) LTS $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{G}}^{\mathcal{R}} = (\text{TERMS}_{\mathcal{N}}, \mathcal{R}, (\xrightarrow{r})_{r \in \mathcal{R}})$ where each rule r of the form $A(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m) \xrightarrow{a} E$ induces transitions $A(x_1, \dots, x_m)\sigma \xrightarrow{r} E\sigma$ for all substitutions σ . (In fact, only the restrictions of substitutions σ to the domain $\{x_1, \dots, x_m\}$ matter.) The transition induced by σ with $\text{SUPP}(\sigma) = \emptyset$ is $A(x_1, \dots, x_m) \xrightarrow{r} E$.

Example. To continue the example from Fig. 3, in Fig. 4 we can see another depiction of the rule $A(x_1, x_2, x_3) \xrightarrow{b} C(A(x_2, x_1, B), x_2)$, denoted r_1 . This makes more explicit that the application of the same substitution to both sides yields a transition; it also highlights the fact that RS_3 “disappears” by applying the rule since it loses the connection with the root. Fig. 5 shows two examples of transitions in $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{G}}^{\mathcal{R}}$. One is generated by the rule r_1 of the form $A(x_1, x_2, x_3) \xrightarrow{b} C(A(x_2, x_1, B), x_2)$ (depicted in Figures 3 and 4), and the other by the rule r_2 of the form $A(x_1, x_2, x_3) \xrightarrow{b} x_3$; in both cases we apply the substitution




Figure 4: Another presentation of the rule $r_1 : A(x_1, x_2, x_3) \xrightarrow{b} C(A(x_2, x_1, B), x_2)$

$\sigma = [x_1/D(x_5, C(x_2, B)), x_2/x_5, x_3/x_1]$ to (the both sides of) the respective rule. The small symbols x_1, x_2, x_3 in Fig. 5 are only auxiliary, highlighting the use of our rules, and they are no part of the respective terms. The middle term is here given by an (acyclic) graph presentation of its syntactic tree (and the node with label x_1 is no part of it). Fig. 6 shows the transitions resulting by the applications of two rules to a graph presenting an infinite regular term. (The small symbols x_1, x_2, x_3 are again just auxiliary.)

Remark. Since the rhs (right-hand sides) E in the rules (1) are finite, all terms reachable from a finite term are finite. It is technically convenient to have the rhs finite while including regular terms into our LTSs. We just remark that this is not crucial, since the “regular rhs” version can be easily “mimicked” by the “finite rhs” version.

By definition the LTS $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{G}}^R$ is deterministic (for each F and r there is at most one H such that $F \xrightarrow{r} H$). We note that *variables* are *dead* (have no outgoing transitions). We also note that $F \xrightarrow{w} H$ implies that each variable occurring in H also occurs in F (but not necessarily vice versa).

The deterministic rule-based LTS $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{G}}^R$ is helpful technically, but we are primarily interested in the (generally nondeterministic) *action-based* LTS $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{G}}^A = (\text{TERMS}_{\mathcal{N}}, \Sigma, (\xrightarrow{a})_{a \in \Sigma})$ where each rule $A(x_1, \dots, x_m) \xrightarrow{a} E$ induces the transitions $A(x_1, \dots, x_m)\sigma \xrightarrow{a} E\sigma$ for all substitutions σ . (Figures 5 and 6 also show transitions in $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{G}}^A$, when we ignore the symbols r_1, r_2, r_3 and consider the “labels” b, a instead. Figure 5 also exemplifies nondeterminism in $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{G}}^A$, since there are two different outgoing b -transitions from a state.)

Given a grammar $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{N}, \Sigma, \mathcal{R})$, two *terms* from $\text{TERMS}_{\mathcal{N}}$ are *bisimilar* if they are bisimilar as states in the action-based LTS $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{G}}^A$. By our definitions all variables are bisimilar, since they are dead terms. The variables serve us primarily as “place-holders for subterm-occurrences” in terms (which might themselves be variable-free); such a use of variables as place-holders has been already exemplified in the rules (1).

Main result, and its relation to pushdown automata. We now state the theorem, to be proven in the next section, and we mention why the result also applies to pushdown automata (PDA) with deterministic popping ε -steps.




Figure 5: One r_1 -transition and one r_2 -transition in $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{G}}^R$ (both are b -transitions in $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{G}}^A$)

Theorem 1. *There is an algorithm that, given a grammar $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{N}, \Sigma, \mathcal{R})$ and (a finite graph presentation of) a term $E_0 \in \text{TERMS}(\mathcal{N})$, decides if E_0 is bisim-finite (i.e., if $E_0 \sim f$ for a state f in some finite LTS).*

A transformation of (nondeterministic) PDA in which deterministic popping ε -steps are allowed to first-order grammars (with no ε -steps) is recalled in the appendix. It makes clear that the semantic finiteness (w.r.t. bisimilarity) of PDA with deterministic popping ε -steps is also decidable. In fact, the problems are interreducible; the close relationship between (D)PDA and first-order schemes has been long known (see, e.g., [18]). The proof of Theorem 1 presented here uses the fact that bisimilarity of first-order grammars is decidable; this was shown for the above mentioned PDA model by Sénizergues [6], and a direct proof in the first-order-term framework was presented in [13].

We note that for PDA where popping ε -steps can be in conflict with “visible” steps bisimilarity is already undecidable [19]; hence the proof presented here does not yield the decidability of semantic finiteness in this more general model. The decidability status of semantic finiteness is also unclear for *second-order* PDA (that operate on a stack of stacks; besides the standard work on the topmost stack, they can also push a copy of the topmost stack or to pop the topmost stack in one move). Bisimilarity is undecidable for second-order PDA even without any use of ε -steps [12] (some remarks are also added in [20]).

3 Proof of Theorem 1

3.1 Computability of eq-levels, and semidecidability of bisim-finiteness

We will soon note that the semidecidability of bisim-finiteness is clear, but we first recall the computability of eq-levels, which is one crucial ingredient in our proof of semidecidability of bisim-infiniteness.




Figure 6: Applying $r_1 : A(x_1, x_2, x_3) \xrightarrow{b} C(A(x_2, x_1, B), x_2)$ and $r_3 : A(x_1, x_2, x_3) \xrightarrow{a} x_1$ to a graph of an (infinite regular) term

Stratified equivalence, and eq-levels. Assuming an LTS $\mathcal{L} = (\mathcal{S}, \Sigma, (\xrightarrow{a})_{a \in \Sigma})$, we put $\sim_0 = \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{S}$, and define $\sim_{k+1} \subseteq \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{S}$ (for $k \in \mathbb{N}$) as the set of pairs covered by \sim_k . (Hence $s \sim_{k+1} t$ iff for each $s \xrightarrow{a} s'$ there is $t \xrightarrow{a} t'$ such that $s' \sim_k t'$ and for each $t \xrightarrow{a} t'$ there is $s \xrightarrow{a} s'$ such that $s' \sim_k t'$.)

We easily verify that \sim_k are equivalence relations, and that $\sim_0 \supseteq \sim_1 \supseteq \sim_2 \supseteq \dots \supseteq \sim$. For the (first infinite) ordinal ω we put $s \sim_\omega t$ if $s \sim_k t$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$; hence $\sim_\omega = \bigcap_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \sim_k$. We do not need to consider ordinals bigger than ω , due to the following restriction. An LTS $\mathcal{L} = (\mathcal{S}, \Sigma, (\xrightarrow{a})_{a \in \Sigma})$ is *image-finite* if the set $\{s' \in \mathcal{S} \mid s \xrightarrow{a} s'\}$ is finite for each pair $s \in \mathcal{S}$, $a \in \Sigma$. Our grammar-generated LTSs $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{G}}^A$ are obviously image-finite (while $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{G}}^R$ are even deterministic). We thus further restrict ourselves to image-finite LTSs. In fact, since we consider LTSs with finite sets of actions, we are thus even restricted to *finitely branching* LTSs, where the set $\{s' \in \mathcal{S} \mid s \xrightarrow{a} s' \text{ for some } a \in \Sigma\}$ is finite for each $s \in \mathcal{S}$.

It is a standard fact that

$$\sim = \sim_\omega = \bigcap_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \sim_k$$

in image-finite LTSs (as also mentioned, e.g., in [4]); indeed, it is straightforward to check that in such an LTS the set $\bigcap_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \sim_k$ is covered by itself, hence \sim_ω is a bisimulation (which entails $\sim_\omega \subseteq \sim$, and thus $\sim_\omega = \sim$).

Given a (finitely branching) LTS $\mathcal{L} = (\mathcal{S}, \Sigma, (\xrightarrow{a})_{a \in \Sigma})$, to each (unordered) pair s, t of states we attach their *equivalence level* (eq-level):

$$\text{EqLv}(s, t) = \max \{k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\omega\} \mid s \sim_k t\}.$$

(In Fig. 1 we have $\text{EqLv}(s_3, s_4) = \omega$, $\text{EqLv}(s_1, s_3) = \text{EqLv}(s_1, s_4) = 0$, $\text{EqLv}(s_1, s_2) = 1$.) It is useful to observe:

Proposition 2. *If $s \sim s'$ then $\text{EqLv}(s, t) = \text{EqLv}(s', t)$, for all states s, s', t .*

Proof. Suppose $s \sim s'$, i.e., $s \sim_k s'$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. For each $k \in \mathbb{N}$ we then have that $s \sim_k t$ implies $s' \sim_k t$ and $s \not\sim_k t$ implies $s' \not\sim_k t$, since \sim_k are equivalence relations. \square

Eq-levels are computable for first-order grammars. We now recall a variant of the fundamental decidability theorem shown by Sénizergues in [6]; it will be used as an important ingredient in the proof of Theorem 1.

Theorem 3. [6] *There is an algorithm that, given $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{N}, \Sigma, \mathcal{R})$ and $E_0, F_0 \in \text{TERMS}(\mathcal{N})$, computes $\text{EQLV}(E_0, F_0)$ in $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{G}}^{\Lambda}$ (and thus also decides if $E_0 \sim F_0$).*

The crucial thing is that we can decide if $E_0 \sim F_0$ (by the algorithm from [6], or by the alternative algorithm presented in [13] directly in the framework of first-order grammars). If $E_0 \not\sim F_0$, then a straightforward brute-force algorithm finds the least $k+1 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $E_0 \not\sim_{k+1} F_0$, thus finding that $\text{EQLV}(E_0, F_0) = k$.

Semidecidability of bisim-finiteness. Given \mathcal{G} and E_0 , we can systematically generate all finite LTSs, presenting them by first-order grammars with nullary nonterminals (which then coincide with states); for each state f of each generated system we can check if $E_0 \sim f$ by Theorem 3. In fact, Theorem 3 is not crucial here, since the decidability of $E_0 \sim f$ can be shown in a much simpler way (see, e.g., [11]).

3.2 Semidecidability of bisim-infiniteness

In Section 3.2.1 we note a few simple general facts on bisim-infiniteness, and also note the obvious compositionality (congruence properties) of bisimulation equivalence in our framework of first-order terms.

In Section 3.2.2 we describe some finite structures that are candidates for witnessing bisim-infiniteness of a given term E_0 ; such a candidate is, in fact, a rule sequence uw such that the infinite (ultimately periodic) word uw^ω is performable from E_0 in $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{G}}^{\mathbb{R}}$. Then we show an algorithm checking if a candidate is indeed a witness, i.e., if the respective infinite path $E_0 \xrightarrow{u} \xrightarrow{w} \xrightarrow{u} \xrightarrow{w} \dots$ visits terms from infinitely many equivalence classes. The crucial idea is that we can naturally define a (regular) term, called the *limit* $\text{LIM} = E_\omega$, that could be viewed as “reached” from E_0 by performing the infinite word uw^ω . The terms E_j such that $E_0 \xrightarrow{u} \xrightarrow{w^j} E_j$ will approach E_ω syntactically with increasing j (E_j coincides with E_ω up to depth j at least), which also entails that $\text{EQLV}(E_j, E_\omega)$ will grow above any bound. If we can verify that $\text{EQLV}(E_j, E_\omega)$ are finite for infinitely many j , in particular if $\text{EQLV}(E_j, E_\omega)$ never reaches ω (hence $E_j \not\sim E_\omega$ for all j), then uw is indeed a witness of bisim-infiniteness of E_0 ; Theorem 3 will play an important role in such a verification.

In Section 3.2.3 we show that each bisim-infinite term has a witness of the above form. Here we will also use the infinite Ramsey theorem for a technical simplification. By this a proof of Theorem 1 will be finished.

3.2.1 Some general facts on bisim-infiniteness, and compositionality of terms

Bisimilarity quotient. Given an LTS $\mathcal{L} = (\mathcal{S}, \Sigma, (\xrightarrow{a})_{a \in \Sigma})$, the *quotient-LTS* \mathcal{L}_\sim is the tuple $(\{[s]_\sim \mid s \in \mathcal{S}\}, \Sigma, (\xrightarrow{a})_{a \in \Sigma})$ where $[s]_\sim = \{s' \mid s' \sim s\}$, and $[s]_\sim \xrightarrow{a} [t]_\sim$ if $s' \xrightarrow{a} t'$ for some $s' \in [s]_\sim$ and $t' \in [t]_\sim$; in fact, $[s]_\sim \xrightarrow{a} [t]_\sim$ implies that for each $s' \in [s]_\sim$ there is $t' \in [t]_\sim$ such that $s' \xrightarrow{a} t'$. We have $s \sim [s]_\sim$, since $\{(s, [s]_\sim) \mid s \in \mathcal{S}\}$ is a bisimulation (in the union of \mathcal{L} and \mathcal{L}_\sim). We refer to the states of \mathcal{L}_\sim as to the *bisim-classes* (of \mathcal{L}).

A sufficient condition for bisim-infiniteness. We recall that $s_0 \in \mathcal{S}$ is bisim-finite if there is some state f in a finite LTS such that $s_0 \sim f$; otherwise s_0 is bisim-infinite. We observe that s_0 is bisim-infinite in \mathcal{L} iff the reachability set of $[s_0]_{\sim}$ in \mathcal{L}_{\sim} , i.e. the set of states reachable from $[s_0]_{\sim}$ in \mathcal{L}_{\sim} , is infinite.

We also recall our restriction to finitely branching LTSs ($\{s' \mid s \xrightarrow{a} s' \text{ for some } a\}$ is finite for each s), and note the following:

Proposition 4. *A state s_0 of a finitely branching LTS $\mathcal{L} = (\mathcal{S}, \Sigma, (\xrightarrow{a})_{a \in \Sigma})$ is bisim-infinite iff there is an infinite path $s_0 \xrightarrow{a_1} s_1 \xrightarrow{a_2} s_2 \xrightarrow{a_3} \dots$ where $s_i \not\sim s_j$ for all $i \neq j$.*

Proof. The “if” direction is trivial; our goal is thus to show the “only if” direction. Let s_0 be a bisim-infinite state in a finitely branching LTS \mathcal{L} . In the quotient-LTS \mathcal{L}_{\sim} we consider the set \mathcal{P} of all finite paths $C_0 \xrightarrow{a_1} C_1 \xrightarrow{a_2} C_2 \dots \xrightarrow{a_k} C_k$ where $C_0 = [s_0]_{\sim}$ and $C_i \neq C_j$ for all $i, j \in [0, k]$, $i \neq j$. We present \mathcal{P} as a tree: the paths in \mathcal{P} are the nodes, the trivial path C_0 being the root, and each node $C_0 \xrightarrow{a_1} C_1 \xrightarrow{a_2} C_2 \dots \xrightarrow{a_{k+1}} C_{k+1}$ is a child of the node $C_0 \xrightarrow{a_1} C_1 \xrightarrow{a_2} C_2 \dots \xrightarrow{a_k} C_k$. This tree is finitely branching (each node has a finite set of children). If all branches were finite (in which case each leaf $C_0 \xrightarrow{a_1} C_1 \xrightarrow{a_2} C_2 \dots \xrightarrow{a_k} C_k$ would satisfy that $C_k \xrightarrow{a} C$ implies $C = C_i$ for some $i \in [0, k]$), then the tree would be finite (by König’s lemma), and thus the set of states in \mathcal{L}_{\sim} that are reachable from $[s_0]_{\sim}$ would be also finite; this would contradict with the assumption that s_0 is bisim-infinite. Hence there is an infinite path $C_0 \xrightarrow{a_1} C_1 \xrightarrow{a_2} C_2 \xrightarrow{a_3} \dots$ in \mathcal{L}_{\sim} where $C_0 = [s_0]_{\sim}$ and $C_i \neq C_j$ for all $i \neq j$. Since $s_0 \sim C_0$ (in the union of \mathcal{L} and \mathcal{L}_{\sim}), there must be a path $s_0 \xrightarrow{a_1} s_1 \xrightarrow{a_2} s_2 \xrightarrow{a_3} \dots$ in \mathcal{L} where $s_i \sim C_i$, i.e. $[s_i]_{\sim} = C_i$, for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$; for $i \neq j$ we thus have $[s_i]_{\sim} \neq [s_j]_{\sim}$, i.e., $s_i \not\sim s_j$. \square

To demonstrate that s_0 is bisim-infinite, it suffices to show that its reachability set contains states with arbitrarily large *finite* eq-levels w.r.t. a “test state” t ; we now formalize this observation.

Proposition 5. *Given $\mathcal{L} = (\mathcal{S}, \Sigma, (\xrightarrow{a})_{a \in \Sigma})$ and states s_0, t , if for every $e \in \mathbb{N}$ there is s' that is reachable from s_0 and satisfies $e < \text{EqLV}(s', t) < \omega$, then s_0 is bisim-infinite.*

Proof. If s_0, t satisfy the assumption, then there are $e_1 < e_2 < e_3 < \dots$ and states s_1, s_2, s_3, \dots reachable from s_0 such that $\text{EqLV}(s_i, t) = e_i$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}_+$. By Proposition 2 we thus get that $s_i \not\sim s_j$ for all $i, j \in \mathbb{N}_+$, $i \neq j$. Hence from s_0 we can reach states from infinitely many bisim-classes, which entails that s_0 is bisim-infinite. \square

Eq-levels yielded by states in a bounded region and test states. Our final general observation (tailored to a later use) is also straightforward: if two states of an LTS are bisimilar, then the states in their equally bounded reachability regions must yield the same eq-levels when compared with states from a fixed (test) set. This observation is informally depicted in Fig. 7, and formalized in what follows. (Despite the depiction in Fig. 7, the test states can be also inside the regions.)

Given $\mathcal{L} = (\mathcal{S}, \Sigma, (\xrightarrow{a})_{a \in \Sigma})$, for any $s \in \mathcal{S}$ and $d \in \mathbb{N}$ (a distance, or a “radius”) we put

$$\text{REGION}(s, d) = \{s' \mid s \xrightarrow{w} s' \text{ for some } w \in \Sigma^* \text{ where } |w| \leq d\}. \quad (2)$$

For any $s \in \mathcal{S}$, $d \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ (a test set), we define the following subset of \mathbb{N} (*finite TestEqLevels*):

$$\text{TEL}(s, d, \mathcal{T}) = \{e \in \mathbb{N} \mid e = \text{EqLV}(s', t) \text{ for some } s' \in \text{REGION}(s, d) \text{ and } t \in \mathcal{T}\}. \quad (3)$$




Figure 7: Bounded regions of bisimilar states yield the same eq-levels w.r.t. test states

For $X \subseteq \mathbb{N}$, by the supremum $\sup(X)$ we mean -1 if $X = \emptyset$, $\max(X)$ if X is finite and nonempty, and ω if X is infinite. (The next proposition will be later applied to the LTSs $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{G}}^{\Delta}$ with finite test sets, hence the sets $\text{REGION}(s, d)$ and $\text{TEL}(s, d, \mathcal{T})$ will be finite.)

Proposition 6. *If $s_1 \sim s_2$, then $\text{TEL}(s_1, d, \mathcal{T}) = \text{TEL}(s_2, d, \mathcal{T})$ for all $d \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$, which also entails that $\sup(\text{TEL}(s_1, d, \mathcal{T})) = \sup(\text{TEL}(s_2, d, \mathcal{T}))$.*

Proof. (Recall Figure 7.) Suppose $s_1 \sim s_2$ and $s_1' \in \text{REGION}(s_1, d)$; let $s_1 \xrightarrow{w} s_1'$ where $|w| \leq d$. From the definition of bisimilarity we deduce that $s_2 \xrightarrow{w} s_2'$ for some s_2' such that $s_1' \sim s_2'$; we have $s_2' \in \text{REGION}(s_2, d)$. Since $s_1' \sim s_2'$ implies $\text{EqLv}(s_1', t) = \text{EqLv}(s_2', t)$ for every t (by Proposition 2), the claim is clear. \square

Remark. The fact that $s_1 \sim s_2$ and $s_1 \xrightarrow{a} s_1'$ implies that there is s_2' such that $s_2 \xrightarrow{a} s_2'$ and $s_1' \sim s_2'$ is a crucial property of bisimilarity that we use for our decision procedure. Hence our approach does not apply to trace equivalence or simulation equivalence. (E.g., the states s_1, s_2 in Fig. 1 are trace equivalent but their a -successors are from pairwise different trace equivalence classes.) On the other hand, the below mentioned compositionality of bisimilarity holds for other equivalences as well.

Compositionality of states in grammar-generated LTSs. We assume a grammar $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{N}, \Sigma, \mathcal{R})$, generating the LTS $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{G}}^{\Delta} = (\text{TERMS}_{\mathcal{N}}, \Sigma, (\xrightarrow{a})_{a \in \Sigma})$ where \sim is bisimulation equivalence on $\text{TERMS}_{\mathcal{N}}$. Regarding the congruence properties, in principle it suffices for us to observe the fact depicted in Fig. 8: if in a term E we replace a subterm F with F' such that $F' \sim F$ then the resulting term E' satisfies $E' \sim E$.




Figure 8: Replacing a subterm with an equivalent term does not change the bisim-class

Hence we also have that $A(G_1, \dots, G_m) \not\sim A(G'_1, \dots, G'_m)$ implies $G_i \not\sim G'_i$ for some $i \in [1, m]$. Formally, we put $\sigma \sim \sigma'$ if $x\sigma \sim x\sigma'$ for each $x \in \text{VAR}$, and we note:

Proposition 7. *If $\sigma \sim \sigma'$, then $E\sigma \sim E\sigma'$.
(Hence $E\sigma \not\sim E\sigma'$ implies that $x\sigma \not\sim x\sigma'$ for some x occurring in E .)*

Proof. We show that the set $\mathcal{B} = \sim \cup \{(E\sigma, E\sigma') \mid E \in \text{TERMS}_{\mathcal{N}}, \sigma \sim \sigma'\}$ is a bisimulation (hence $\mathcal{B} = \sim$). It suffices to consider a pair $(E\sigma, E\sigma')$ where $\sigma \sim \sigma'$ and show that it is

covered by \mathcal{B} . If $E = x \in \text{VAR}$, then $(E\sigma, E\sigma') = (x\sigma, x\sigma')$, which entails $E\sigma \sim E\sigma'$ and $(E\sigma, E\sigma')$ is thus covered by the bisimulation \sim (included in \mathcal{B}). If $\text{ROOT}(E) \in \mathcal{N}$, then each transition $E\sigma \xrightarrow{a} G$ can be written as $E\sigma \xrightarrow{a} E'\sigma$ where $E \xrightarrow{a} E'$; it has the matching transition $E\sigma' \xrightarrow{a} E'\sigma'$, and we have $(E'\sigma, E'\sigma') \in \mathcal{B}$. \square

Conventions.

- To make some later discussions easier, we further consider only the *normalized* grammars $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{N}, \Sigma, \mathcal{R})$, i.e. those satisfying the following condition: for each $A \in \mathcal{N}$ and each $i \in [1, m]$ where $m = \text{arity}(A)$ there is a word $w_{(A,i)} \in \mathcal{R}^+$ such that $A(x_1, \dots, x_m) \xrightarrow{w_{(A,i)}} x_i$ (in $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{G}}^{\text{R}}$). Hence for each $E \in \text{TERMS}_{\mathcal{N}}$ it is possible to “sink” to each of its subterm-occurrences by applying a sequence of the grammar-rules. (E.g., in the middle term in Fig. 6 we can “sink” to the root-successor term with the root A by applying some rule sequence u_1 , then “to D ” by applying some u_2 , then to C by some u_3 , then to A by some u_4, \dots)

Such a normalization can be efficiently achieved by harmless modifications of the non-terminal arities and of the rules in \mathcal{R} , while the bisimilarity quotient of the LTS $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{G}}^{\text{A}}$ remains the same (up to isomorphism). Now we simply assume this, the details are given in the appendix.

- In our notation we use m as the arity of all nonterminals in the considered grammar, though m is deemed to denote the *maximum* arity, in fact. Formally we could replace our expressions of the form $A(G_1, \dots, G_m)$ with $A(G_1, \dots, G_{m_A})$ where $m_A = \text{arity}(A)$, and adjust the respective discussions accordingly, but it would be unnecessarily cumbersome. In fact, such uniformity of arities can be even achieved by a construction while keeping the previously discussed normalization condition, when a slight problem with arity 0 is handled. The details are also given in the appendix.
- For technical convenience we further view the expressions like $G \xrightarrow{w} H$ as referring to the deterministic LTS $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{G}}^{\text{R}}$ (hence $w \in \mathcal{R}^*$ and any expression $G \xrightarrow{w}$ refers to a unique path in $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{G}}^{\text{R}}$), while \sim_k, \sim , and the eq-levels are always considered w.r.t. the action-based LTS $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{G}}^{\text{A}}$.

3.2.2 Witnesses of bisim-infiniteness

Assuming a grammar $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{N}, \Sigma, \mathcal{R})$, we now describe candidates for witnesses of bisim-infiniteness of terms. A witness of bisim-infiniteness of E_0 will be a pair (u, w) , $u \in \mathcal{R}^*$ and $w \in \mathcal{R}^+$, for which there is the infinite path $E_0 \xrightarrow{u} \xrightarrow{w} \xrightarrow{w} \xrightarrow{w} \dots$ and it visits infinitely many bisim-classes. We first put a technically convenient restriction on the considered “iterated” words w , and then define candidates for witnesses formally.

Stairs, stair substitutions, colour-idempotent substitutions and stairs.

A nonempty sequence $w = r_1 r_2 \dots r_\ell \in \mathcal{R}^+$ of rules is a *stair* if we have $A(x_1, \dots, x_m) \xrightarrow{w} F$ where $A(x_1, \dots, x_m)$ is the left-hand side of the rule r_1 and $\text{ROOT}(F) \in \mathcal{N}$ (i.e., $F \notin \text{VAR}$).

E.g., for the rules $r_1 : A(x_1, x_2) \xrightarrow{a} C(C(x_2, B(x_2, x_1)), x_2)$, $r_2 : C(x_1, x_2) \xrightarrow{b} x_1$, $r_3 : C(x_1, x_2) \xrightarrow{c} x_2$ we have that r_1 , $r_1 r_2$, and $r_1 r_2 r_3$ are stairs, since $A(x_1, x_2) \xrightarrow{r_1} C(C(x_2, B(x_2, x_1)), x_2) \xrightarrow{r_2} C(x_2, B(x_2, x_1)) \xrightarrow{r_3} B(x_2, x_1)$, $r_1 r_2 r_2$ is no stair, since

$A(x_1, x_2) \xrightarrow{r_1 r_2 r_2} x_2$, and $r_1 r_2 r_1$ is no stair since $A(x_1, x_2) \xrightarrow{r_1 r_2} C(x_2, B(x_2, x_1))$ and r_1 is not enabled in $C(\dots)$.

We put $\text{VAR}(E) = \{x \in \text{VAR} \mid x \text{ occurs in } E\}$. A substitution σ is called a *stair substitution* if the sets $\text{SUPP}(\sigma)$ and $\text{VAR}(x_i \sigma)$, $i \in [1, m]$, are subsets of $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m\}$. We note that each stair $w \in \mathcal{R}^+$ determines a path $A(x_1, \dots, x_m) \xrightarrow{w} B(x_1, \dots, x_m) \sigma$ where σ is a stair substitution. (E.g., $A(x_1, x_2) \xrightarrow{r_1 r_2} C(x_2, B(x_2, x_1))$ can be written as $A(x_1, x_2) \xrightarrow{r_1 r_2} C(x_1, x_2) \sigma$ where $\sigma = [x_1/x_2, x_2/B(x_2, x_1)]$.) In fact, the above defined stair substitutions are more general; e.g., the empty-support substitution is also a stair substitution.

For a stair substitution σ we define:

- $\text{SURV}(\sigma) = \{x_i \mid x_i \text{ occurs in } x_j \sigma \text{ for some } j \in [1, m]\}$, and
- $\text{RSTICK}(\sigma) = \{x_i \mid x_i = x_j \sigma \text{ for some } j \in [1, m]\}$.

Hence $\text{RSTICK}(\sigma) \subseteq \text{SURV}(\sigma) \subseteq \{x_1, \dots, x_m\}$. We note that $x_i \in \text{SURV}(\sigma)$ iff x_i “survives” applying σ to $A(x_1, \dots, x_m)$, i.e., x_i occurs in $A(x_1, \dots, x_m) \sigma$; we have $x_i \in \text{RSTICK}(\sigma)$ iff x_i “sticks to the root”, i.e., is a root-successor in $A(x_1, \dots, x_m) \sigma$.

A *stair substitution* σ is *colour-idempotent* if for all $i, j \in [1, m]$ we have:

1. $x_i \in \text{RSTICK}(\sigma)$ entails that $x_i \sigma = x_i$, and
2. $x_i \in \text{SURV}(\sigma)$ entails that x_i occurs in $x_j \sigma$ for some $x_j \in \text{SURV}(\sigma)$.

Remark. The word “colour” anticipates a later use of Ramsey’s theorem. The word “idempotent” refers to the fact (shown below) that the above conditions 1 and 2 are sufficient to guarantee that $\text{SURV}(\sigma\sigma) = \text{SURV}(\sigma)$ and $\text{RSTICK}(\sigma\sigma) = \text{RSTICK}(\sigma)$. We could explicitly build a concrete finite semigroup of colours (of stair substitutions) but this is not necessary for our proof. We only remark that for technical reasons the colour associated with σ before Proposition 14 is finer than $(\text{SURV}(\sigma), \text{RSTICK}(\sigma))$.

Example. Fig. 9 (top-left) depicts a stair substitution

$$\sigma = [x_1/F_1, x_3/F_3, x_4/F_4, x_6/F_6, x_7/F_7];$$

we assume $m = 7$ but we also use nonterminals with smaller arities for simplicity. We have $F_1 = B(C(x_4, x_2), x_3)$, $F_3 = C(x_1, A(C(x_4, x_2), B(x_3, x_5), x_3, B(x_3, x_5), x_4))$, $F_4 = x_2$, $F_6 = B(x_3, x_5)$, $F_7 = C(x_4, x_5)$. It is also depicted explicitly that $x_2 \sigma = x_2$ and $x_5 \sigma = x_5$; each dashed line connects a variable x_i (above the bar) with the root of the term $x_i \sigma$.

We can easily check that $\text{SURV}(\sigma) = \{x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, x_5\}$ and $\text{RSTICK}(\sigma) = \{x_2, x_5\}$, and that σ is colour-idempotent ($x_2 \sigma = x_2$, $x_5 \sigma = x_5$, x_1 occurs in $x_3 \sigma$, and both x_3, x_4 occur, e.g., in $x_1 \sigma$).

Fig. 9 also depicts the substitution $\sigma\sigma$ (bottom-left) and the substitution σ^ω (right). Here we use an auxiliary device, namely some “fictitious” nodes that are not labelled with nonterminals or variables. Such a node can be called a *collector node*: it might “collect” several incoming arcs that are in reality deemed to proceed to the target specified by the (precisely one) outgoing arc of the collector node.

Fig. 9 can also serve for illustrating the next proposition.

Proposition 8. *If σ is a colour-idempotent stair substitution, then the following conditions hold:*




Figure 9: A colour-idempotent stair substitution σ , and its limit σ^ω

1. $\text{SURV}(\sigma^k) = \text{SURV}(\sigma)$ and $\text{RSTICK}(\sigma^k) = \text{RSTICK}(\sigma)$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}_+$;
2. for each $x_i \in \text{SURV}(\sigma) \setminus \text{RSTICK}(\sigma)$, all occurrences of x_i in $x_j \sigma^k$, for $j \in [1, m]$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}_+$, have depths at least k (if there are any such occurrences).
3. $\text{SURV}(\sigma^\omega) = \text{RSTICK}(\sigma^\omega) = \text{RSTICK}(\sigma)$.

Proof. 1. By induction on k , the case $k = 1$ being trivial. We note that $x_i \in \text{SURV}(\sigma^{k+1})$ iff x_i occurs in $x_j \sigma$ for some $x_j \in \text{SURV}(\sigma^k)$, and $\text{SURV}(\sigma^k) = \text{SURV}(\sigma)$ by the induction hypothesis. Since σ is colour-idempotent, the condition “ x_i occurs in $x_j \sigma$ for some $x_j \in \text{SURV}(\sigma)$ ” is equivalent to “ $x_i \in \text{SURV}(\sigma)$ ”. Hence $\text{SURV}(\sigma^{k+1}) = \text{SURV}(\sigma)$.

Similarly, $x_i \in \text{RSTICK}(\sigma^{k+1})$ iff $x_j \sigma = x_i$ for some $x_j \in \text{RSTICK}(\sigma^k) = \text{RSTICK}(\sigma)$. The condition “ $x_j \sigma = x_i$ for some $x_j \in \text{RSTICK}(\sigma)$ ” is equivalent to “ $x_i \in \text{RSTICK}(\sigma)$ ” (since σ is colour-idempotent). Hence $\text{RSTICK}(\sigma^{k+1}) = \text{RSTICK}(\sigma)$.

2. For $k = 1$ the claim is trivial (by the definition of $\text{RSTICK}(\sigma)$). The depth of any respective occurrence of x_i in $x_j \sigma^{k+1}$ is the sum of the depth of an occurrence of x_ℓ in $x_j \sigma^k$ and the depth of x_i in $x_\ell \sigma$ (for some $\ell \in [1, m]$). The second depth is at least 1 (since $x_\ell \sigma = x_i$

would entail $x_i \in \text{RSTICK}(\sigma)$); the first depth is at least k by the induction hypothesis, since $x_\ell \in \text{SURV}(\sigma^k) = \text{SURV}(\sigma)$ and $x_\ell \notin \text{RSTICK}(\sigma)$ (otherwise $x_\ell \sigma = x_\ell$ due to the colour-idempotency of σ). Hence the depth of the respective occurrence of x_i in $x_j \sigma^{k+1}$ is at least $k+1$.

3. Due to the (colour-idempotency) condition “ $x_i \in \text{RSTICK}(\sigma)$ entails $x_i \sigma = x_i$ ” (i.e., $x_j \sigma = x_i$ entails $x_i \sigma = x_i$), the substitution σ^ω is clearly well-defined: if $x_j \sigma = x_i$, then $x_j \sigma^\omega = x_i$. Hence each variable $x_i \in \text{RSTICK}(\sigma)$ “survives” the application of σ^ω to $A(x_1, \dots, x_m)$, having one occurrence as the i th root-successor in $A(x_1, \dots, x_m) \sigma^\omega$. No other variables “survive”, as can be easily deduced from Points 1, 2. (Suppose x_i occurs in $A(x_1, \dots, x_m) \sigma^\omega$ in depth k , and write $A(x_1, \dots, x_m) \sigma^\omega$ as $A(x_1, \dots, x_m) \sigma^{k+1} \sigma^\omega$; hence x_i occurs in $x_j \sigma^\omega$ for some x_j occurring in $A(x_1, \dots, x_m) \sigma^{k+1}$ in depth at most k . Points 1, 2 imply that $x_j \in \text{RSTICK}(\sigma)$; hence $x_j \sigma^\omega = x_j$, and thus $x_i = x_j \in \text{RSTICK}(\sigma)$.) \square

We say that a *stair* $w \in \mathcal{R}^+$ is *colour-idempotent* if $A(x_1, \dots, x_m) \xrightarrow{w} A(x_1, \dots, x_m) \sigma$ for some $A \in \mathcal{N}$ and some colour-idempotent stair substitution σ . For such w we have the infinite path

$$A(x_1, \dots, x_m) \xrightarrow{w} A(x_1, \dots, x_m) \sigma \xrightarrow{w} A(x_1, \dots, x_m) \sigma^2 \xrightarrow{w} A(x_1, \dots, x_m) \sigma^3 \xrightarrow{w} \dots$$

The term $A(x_1, \dots, x_m) \sigma^\omega$ can be naturally seen as the respective “limit”.

Candidates for witnesses of bisim-infiniteness. Given a grammar $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{N}, \Sigma, \mathcal{R})$, by a *candidate for a witness of bisim-infiniteness of a term E_0* , or by a *candidate for E_0* for short, we mean a pair (u, w) where $u \in \mathcal{R}^*$, $w \in \mathcal{R}^+$, $E_0 \xrightarrow{uw}$, and w is a colour-idempotent stair.

For a candidate (u, w) for E_0 we thus have $E_0 \xrightarrow{u} A(x_1, \dots, x_m) \sigma_0$ and $A(x_1, \dots, x_m) \xrightarrow{w} A(x_1, \dots, x_m) \sigma$ for some nonterminal A and some substitutions σ_0, σ , where σ is colour-idempotent; moreover, there is the corresponding infinite path

$$E_0 \xrightarrow{u} A(x_1, \dots, x_m) \sigma_0 \xrightarrow{w} A(x_1, \dots, x_m) \sigma \sigma_0 \xrightarrow{w} A(x_1, \dots, x_m) \sigma^2 \sigma_0 \xrightarrow{w} \dots$$

An example is depicted in Fig. 10. Fig. 11 then depicts $A(x_1, \dots, x_m) \sigma^j \sigma_0$ for some $j \geq 3$ (left) and the limit $A(x_1, \dots, x_m) \sigma^\omega \sigma_0$ (right); some of the auxiliary collector nodes have special labels (p_{ij}, q_i) that we now ignore (they serve for a later discussion).

We will now note in more detail how the terms $A(x_1, \dots, x_m) \sigma^j \sigma_0$ converge (syntactically and semantically) to the term $A(x_1, \dots, x_m) \sigma^\omega \sigma_0$.

Tops of terms $A(x_1, \dots, x_m) \sigma^k \sigma_0$ converge to $A(x_1, \dots, x_m) \sigma^\omega \sigma_0$. For a term H and $d \in \mathbb{N}$, by $\text{TOP}_d(H)$ (the *d-top of H*) we refer to the tree corresponding to H up to depth d . Hence $\text{TOP}_0(H)$ is the tree consisting solely of the root labelled with $\text{ROOT}(H)$. For $d > 0$, we have $\text{TOP}_d(x_i) = \text{TOP}_0(x_i)$, and $\text{TOP}_d(A(G_1, \dots, G_m)) = A(\text{TOP}_{d-1}(G_1), \dots, \text{TOP}_{d-1}(G_m))$, which denotes the (ordered labelled) tree with the A -labelled root and with the (ordered) depth-1 subtrees $\text{TOP}_{d-1}(G_1), \dots, \text{TOP}_{d-1}(G_m)$. (Hence $\text{TOP}_d(H)$ is not a term in general, since it arises by “cutting-off” the depth- $(d+1)$ subterm-occurrences.) We also define $\text{TOP}_{-1}(H)$ as the “empty tree”, and use the consequence that $\text{TOP}_{-1}(H_1) = \text{TOP}_{-1}(H_2)$ for all H_1, H_2 .

The next observation is trivial, due to the root-rewriting form of the transitions in the grammar-generated labelled transition systems.




Figure 10: Candidate (u, w) induces the path $E_0 \xrightarrow{u} A(x_1, \dots, x_m)\sigma_0 \xrightarrow{w} A(x_1, \dots, x_m)\sigma\sigma_0 \xrightarrow{w} \dots$

Proposition 9. For any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, if $\text{TOP}_{k-1}(H_1) = \text{TOP}_{k-1}(H_2)$, then $H_1 \sim_k H_2$.

Proof. We proceed by induction on k ; for $k = 0$ the claim is trivial. We assume $\text{TOP}_k(H_1) = \text{TOP}_k(H_2)$ for $k \geq 0$; hence $\text{ROOT}(H_1) = \text{ROOT}(H_2)$ and thus the rules r enabled in H_1 in the LTS \mathcal{L}_G^R are the same as the rules enabled in H_2 . If a transition $H_1 \xrightarrow{a} H'_1$ in \mathcal{L}_G^A arises from $H_1 \xrightarrow{r} H'_1$ in \mathcal{L}_G^R , then $H_2 \xrightarrow{r} H'_2$ in \mathcal{L}_G^R gives rise to $H_2 \xrightarrow{a} H'_2$ in \mathcal{L}_G^A ; we obviously have $\text{TOP}_{k-1}(H'_1) = \text{TOP}_{k-1}(H'_2)$, and thus $H'_1 \sim_k H'_2$ by the induction hypothesis. Hence $\text{TOP}_k(H_1) = \text{TOP}_k(H_2)$ implies $H_1 \sim_{k+1} H_2$. \square

We now derive an easy consequence (for which Fig. 11 can be useful).

Proposition 10. Let σ be a colour-idempotent substitution, and σ_0 a substitution (with $\text{SUPP}(\sigma_0) \subseteq \{x_1, \dots, x_m\}$). For all $j \in [1, m]$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}_+$ we have $x_j\sigma^k\sigma_0 \sim_k x_j\sigma^\omega\sigma_0$. Hence for all $A \in \mathcal{N}$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}_+$ we have $A(x_1, \dots, x_m)\sigma^k\sigma_0 \sim_{k+1} A(x_1, \dots, x_m)\sigma^\omega\sigma_0$.

Proof. Assuming σ and σ_0 , we fix $j \in [1, m]$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}_+$, and show that $\text{TOP}_{k-1}(x_j\sigma^k\sigma_0) = \text{TOP}_{k-1}(x_j\sigma^\omega\sigma_0)$. We write $x_j\sigma^\omega\sigma_0$ as $x_j\sigma^k\sigma^\omega\sigma_0$, and recall that the variables x_i occurring in $x_j\sigma^k$ are from $\text{SURV}(\sigma^k) = \text{SURV}(\sigma)$ and all occurrences of $x_i \in \text{SURV}(\sigma) \setminus \text{RSTICK}(\sigma)$ in $x_j\sigma^k$ are in depth k at least (by Proposition 8). Moreover, for each $x_i \in \text{RSTICK}(\sigma)$ we have $x_i\sigma^\omega = x_i$ and thus $x_i\sigma_0 = x_i\sigma^\omega\sigma_0$. Hence we indeed have $\text{TOP}_{k-1}(x_j\sigma^k\sigma_0) = \text{TOP}_{k-1}(x_j\sigma^\omega\sigma_0)$. We thus also get that $\text{TOP}_k(A(x_1, \dots, x_m)\sigma^k\sigma_0) = \text{TOP}_k(A(x_1, \dots, x_m)\sigma^\omega\sigma_0)$. The claim thus follows by Proposition 9. \square

Checking if a candidate is a witness. A candidate (u, w) for E_0 , yielding the path $E_0 \xrightarrow{u} A(x_1, \dots, x_m)\sigma_0 \xrightarrow{w} A(x_1, \dots, x_m)\sigma\sigma_0 \xrightarrow{w} A(x_1, \dots, x_m)\sigma^2\sigma_0 \xrightarrow{w} \dots$, and the term $\text{LIM} = A(x_1, \dots, x_m)\sigma^\omega\sigma_0$, is a *witness* (of bisim-infiniteness) for E_0 if $A(x_1, \dots, x_m)\sigma^k\sigma_0 \not\sim \text{LIM}$ for infinitely many $k \in \mathbb{N}$.




Figure 11: $A(x_1, \dots, x_m)\sigma^j\sigma_0$ (left) and $A(x_1, \dots, x_m)\sigma^\omega\sigma_0$ (right)

Since $\text{EQLV}(A(x_1, \dots, x_m)\sigma^k\sigma_0, \text{LIM}) > k$ (as follows from Prop. 10), we then have that for each $e \in \mathbb{N}$ there is $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$e < \text{EQLV}(A(x_1, \dots, x_m)\sigma^k\sigma_0, \text{LIM}) < \omega,$$

and Prop. 5 thus confirms that E_0 is indeed bisim-infinite if it has a witness.

The existence of an algorithm checking if a candidate is a witness follows from the next lemma (which we prove by using the fundamental fact captured by Theorem 3, also using the “labelled collector nodes” in Fig. 11 for illustration).

Lemma 11. *Given $A \in \mathcal{N}$, a colour-idempotent substitution σ , and a substitution $\bar{\sigma}_0$ with $\text{SUPP}(\bar{\sigma}_0) \subseteq \text{RSTICK}(\sigma)$, there is a computable number $e \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for the term $\text{LIM} =$*

$A(x_1, \dots, x_m)\sigma^\omega\bar{\sigma}_0$ and any substitution σ_0 coinciding with $\bar{\sigma}_0$ on $\text{RSTICK}(\sigma)$ one of the following conditions holds:

1. $A(x_1, \dots, x_m)\sigma^k\sigma_0 \not\sim \text{LIM}$ for all integers $k \geq e$, or
2. $A(x_1, \dots, x_m)\sigma^k\sigma_0 \sim \text{LIM}$ for all integers $k \geq e$.

To verify that a candidate (u, w) , where $E_0 \xrightarrow{u} A(x_1, \dots, x_m)\sigma_0 \xrightarrow{w} A(x_1, \dots, x_m)\sigma\sigma_0$, is a witness for E_0 , it thus suffices to compute e for $A, \sigma, \bar{\sigma}_0$ where $\bar{\sigma}_0$ is the restriction of σ_0 to $\text{RSTICK}(\sigma)$, and show that $A(x_1, \dots, x_m)\sigma^e\sigma_0 \not\sim A(x_1, \dots, x_m)\sigma^\omega\bar{\sigma}_0$.

Now we prove the lemma.

Proof. We assume $A \in \mathcal{N}$, a colour-idempotent substitution σ , and a substitution σ_0 ; we define $\bar{\sigma}_0$ as the restriction of σ_0 to $\text{RSTICK}(\sigma)$ and put $\text{LIM} = A(x_1, \dots, x_m)\sigma^\omega\bar{\sigma}_0$ (hence $\text{LIM} = A(x_1, \dots, x_m)\sigma^\omega\sigma_0$ since only $x_i \in \text{RSTICK}(\sigma)$ occur in $A(x_1, \dots, x_m)\sigma^\omega$).

We can surely compute a number $d \in \mathbb{N}$ such that each $x_i \in \text{SURV}(\sigma)$ belongs to both of the (reachability) regions $\text{REGION}(A(x_1, \dots, x_m)\sigma, d)$ and $\text{REGION}(A(x_1, \dots, x_m)\sigma\sigma, d)$ (recall (2)). (In Fig. 11 it means that the terms whose roots are determined by the collector nodes labelled p_{11}, \dots, p_{24} are reachable within d moves from the term $A(x_1, \dots, x_m)\sigma^j\sigma_0$.)

We define the test set $\mathcal{T} = \{x_j\sigma^\omega\bar{\sigma}_0 \mid x_j \in \text{SURV}(\sigma)\}$, and put

$$\text{MAX}_{\text{TEL}} = \sup(\text{TEL}(\text{LIM}, d, \mathcal{T}))$$

(recalling (3)). The set $\text{REGION}(\text{LIM}, d)$ and its subset \mathcal{T} are finite, and easily constructible. (In Fig. 11, the roots of the terms in \mathcal{T} are determined by the collector nodes labelled q_1, \dots, q_4 .) Hence the number MAX_{TEL} is finite, i.e., $\text{MAX}_{\text{TEL}} \in \{-1\} \cup \mathbb{N}$, and computable by Theorem 3. We now put

$$e = \text{MAX}_{\text{TEL}} + 2$$

and show that this e (computed from $A, \sigma, \bar{\sigma}_0$) satisfies the claim.

In fact, it suffices to show that for each $k \geq e$ we have:

$$A(x_1, \dots, x_m)\sigma^k\sigma_0 \not\sim \text{LIM} \text{ iff } A(x_1, \dots, x_m)\sigma^{k+1}\sigma_0 \not\sim \text{LIM}.$$

We start with assuming $k \geq e$ and $A(x_1, \dots, x_m)\sigma^k\sigma_0 \not\sim \text{LIM}$. Written in another form, we thus have $(A(x_1, \dots, x_m)\sigma)\sigma^{k-1}\sigma_0 \not\sim (A(x_1, \dots, x_m)\sigma)\sigma^\omega\sigma_0$.

By compositionality (Prop. 7) we then have $x_j\sigma^{k-1}\sigma_0 \not\sim x_j\sigma^\omega\sigma_0$ for some x_j occurring in $A(x_1, \dots, x_m)\sigma$, i.e., for some $x_j \in \text{SURV}(\sigma)$; in fact, $x_j \in \text{SURV}(\sigma) \setminus \text{RSTICK}(\sigma)$ (since $x_i\sigma^{k-1} = x_i\sigma^\omega = x_i$ for $x_i \in \text{RSTICK}(\sigma)$). We fix such x_j and recall that it also occurs in $A(x_1, \dots, x_m)\sigma\sigma$ (since $\text{SURV}(\sigma\sigma) = \text{SURV}(\sigma)$).

Since $\text{EqLV}(x_j\sigma^{k-1}\sigma_0, x_j\sigma^\omega\sigma_0) \geq k-1$ (by Prop. 10) and $k \geq e$, we have

$$\text{MAX}_{\text{TEL}} < \text{EqLV}(x_j\sigma^{k-1}\sigma_0, x_j\sigma^\omega\sigma_0) < \omega; \quad (4)$$

we recall that $x_j\sigma^\omega\sigma_0$ belongs to the test set \mathcal{T} . Our choice of d guarantees that x_j belongs to $\text{REGION}(A(x_1, \dots, x_m)\sigma\sigma, d)$, and thus

$$x_j\sigma^{k-1}\sigma_0 \text{ belongs to } \text{REGION}(A(x_1, \dots, x_m)\sigma^{k+1}\sigma_0, d).$$

This implies that $A(x_1, \dots, x_m)\sigma^{k+1}\sigma_0 \not\sim \text{LIM}$ (by Prop. 6).

Similarly, if $A(x_1, \dots, x_m)\sigma^{k+1}\sigma_0 \not\sim \text{LIM}$ (for $k \geq e$), i.e., $(A(x_1, \dots, x_m)\sigma\sigma)\sigma^{k-1}\sigma_0 \not\sim (A(x_1, \dots, x_m)\sigma\sigma)\sigma^\omega\sigma_0$, there is $x_j \in \text{SURV}(\sigma\sigma) = \text{SURV}(\sigma)$ for which (4) holds. Since x_j is in $\text{REGION}(A(x_1, \dots, x_m)\sigma, d)$, the term $x_j\sigma^{k-1}\sigma_0$ belongs to $\text{REGION}(A(x_1, \dots, x_m)\sigma^k\sigma_0, d)$, and thus $A(x_1, \dots, x_m)\sigma^k\sigma_0 \not\sim \text{LIM}$. \square




Figure 12: Depiction of $H_0 \xrightarrow{w_1} H_1 \xrightarrow{w_2} H_2 \xrightarrow{w_3} \dots$

3.2.3 Each bisim-infinite term has a witness

The last ingredient of the proof of Theorem 1 is Lemma 15 formulated and proven at the end of this section. The rough idea is that for each bisim-infinite term E_0 there is an infinite path

$$E_0 \xrightarrow{u} H_0 \xrightarrow{w_1} H_1 \xrightarrow{w_2} H_2 \xrightarrow{w_3} \dots$$

where $H_i \not\sim H_j$ for all $i \neq j$, and w_i are stairs (for all $i \in \mathbb{N}_+$) that might be even chosen from a finite set of “simple” stairs. The infinite Ramsey theorem will easily yield that infinitely many sequences $w_i w_{i+1} \dots w_j$ are colour-idempotent stairs (with the same “colour”). By a more detailed analysis (and another use of Lemma 11) we will derive a contradiction when assuming that E_0 has no witness.

We assume a fixed grammar $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{N}, \Sigma, \mathcal{R})$ and first define a few notions.

Canonical (witness) sequences.

- For each rule $r : A(x_1, \dots, x_m) \xrightarrow{a} E$ in \mathcal{R} and each subterm F of E with $\text{ROOT}(F) \in \mathcal{N}$ (i.e., $F \notin \text{VAR}$) we fix a shortest sequence $u_{(r,F)} = r_1 r_2 \dots r_k \in \mathcal{R}^+$ such that $r_1 = r$ and $A(x_1, \dots, x_m) \xrightarrow{r_1} E \xrightarrow{r_2 \dots r_k} F$. Sequences $u_{(r,F)}$ are obviously stairs, and we call them the *canonical simple stairs*.
- A stair $w \in \mathcal{R}^+$ is a *canonical stair* if $w = u_1 u_2 \dots u_\ell$ where $\ell \in \mathbb{N}_+$ and $u_i, i \in [1, \ell]$, are canonical simple stairs.
- An infinite sequence $H_0, w_1, H_1, w_2, H_2, w_3, \dots$ (where $H_i \in \text{TERMS}_{\mathcal{N}}$ and $w_i \in \mathcal{R}^+$) is a *canonical sequence* if $H_i \xrightarrow{w_{i+1}} H_{i+1}$ and w_{i+1} is a canonical stair, for each $i \in \mathbb{N}$. (In Fig. 12 we can see a depiction of such a sequence.)
- A canonical sequence $H_0, w_1, H_1, w_2, H_2, w_3, \dots$ is a *witness sequence* if $H_i \not\sim H_j$ for all $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$ where $i \neq j$.

- Given a canonical sequence $\text{SEQ} = H_0, w_1, H_1, w_2, H_2, w_3, \dots$, we say that a sequence $\text{SEQ}' = H'_0, w'_1, H'_1, w'_2, H'_2, w'_3, \dots$ is a *subsequence* of SEQ if there are $0 \leq i_0 < i_1 < i_2 < \dots$ such that $H'_j = H_{i_j}$ and $w'_{j+1} = w_{i_{j+1}}w_{i_{j+2}} \dots w_{i_{j+1}}$, for each $j \in \mathbb{N}$.
- A *canonical sequence* $\text{SEQ} = H_0, w_1, H_1, w_2, H_2, w_3, \dots$, is *reachable* from a term E_0 if $E_0 \xrightarrow{u} H_0$ for some $u \in \mathcal{R}^*$.

Proposition 12. *Let SEQ' be a subsequence of a canonical sequence SEQ . Then SEQ' is a canonical sequence; moreover, if SEQ is a witness sequence, then SEQ' is a witness sequence, and if SEQ is reachable from E_0 , then SEQ' is reachable from E_0 .*

Proof. It is obvious, once we note that if $H \xrightarrow{w} H' \xrightarrow{w'} H''$ where w and w' are canonical stairs, then ww' is a canonical stair. \square

Proposition 13. *If a term E_0 is bisim-infinite, then there is a witness sequence SEQ that is reachable from E_0 . Moreover, there is such $\text{SEQ} = H_0, w_1, H_1, w_2, H_2, w_3, \dots$ where $w_i, i \in \mathbb{N}_+$, are canonical simple stairs.*

Proof. We assume a bisim-infinite term E_0 and fix an infinite path

$$E_0 \xrightarrow{r_1} E_1 \xrightarrow{r_2} E_2 \xrightarrow{r_3} \dots \quad (5)$$

in the LTS $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{G}}^{\mathbb{R}}$ such that $E_i \not\sim E_j$ (in $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{G}}^{\mathbb{A}}$) for all $i \neq j$; the existence of such a path follows from Prop. 4.

We show that there is the least $i_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $r_{i_0+1}r_{i_0+2} \dots r_{i_0+\ell}$ is a stair for each $\ell \in \mathbb{N}_+$. If there was no such i_0 , we would have an infinite sequence $0 = j_0 < j_1 < j_2 < \dots$ where $E_{j_{k+1}}$ is a depth-1 subterm of E_{j_k} for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$ (since $E_{j_k} \xrightarrow{r_{j_k+1}r_{j_k+2} \dots r_{j_{k+1}}} E_{j_{k+1}}$ sinks to a root-successor in E_{j_k}); since E_0 is a regular term, it has only finitely many subterms, and we would thus have $E_i = E_j$ (hence $E_i \sim E_j$) for some $i \neq j$.

Having defined i_0, i_1, \dots, i_j (for some $j \geq 0$), we define i_{j+1} as the least number i such that $i_j < i$ and $r_{i+1}r_{i+2} \dots r_{i+\ell}$ is a stair for each $\ell \in \mathbb{N}_+$. There must be such i , since otherwise $E_{i_j} \xrightarrow{r_{i_j+1}r_{i_j+2} \dots r_{i_j+\ell}}$ would sink to a root-successor in E_{i_j} for some $\ell \in \mathbb{N}_+$, which contradicts with the choice of i_j .

For each $j \in \mathbb{N}$ we put $H_j = E_{i_j}$ and $w_{j+1} = r_{i_{j+1}}r_{i_{j+2}} \dots r_{i_{j+1}}$; hence the (infinite) suffix of the path (5) that starts with E_{i_0} can be presented as

$$H_0 \xrightarrow{w_1} H_1 \xrightarrow{w_2} H_2 \xrightarrow{w_3} \dots$$

By the choice of (5) we have $H_i \not\sim H_j$ for $i \neq j$. By the definition of i_0, i_1, i_2, \dots , all $w_j \in \mathcal{R}^+$ are stairs, but they might not be canonical (simple) stairs. For each $j \in \mathbb{N}$ we can write $H_j \xrightarrow{w_{j+1}} H_{j+1}$ in the form $A(x_1, \dots, x_m)\sigma \xrightarrow{w_{j+1}} F\sigma$ where $A = \text{ROOT}(H_j)$ and $A(x_1, \dots, x_m) \xrightarrow{w_{j+1}} F$; in more detail, we have $A(x_1, \dots, x_m) \xrightarrow{r_{i_{j+1}}} E \xrightarrow{r_{i_{j+2}} \dots r_{i_{j+1}}} F$ where the rule $r_{i_{j+1}} \in \mathcal{R}$ is of the form $A(x_1, \dots, x_m) \xrightarrow{a} E$. Moreover, by the definition of i_j and i_{j+1} we must have that F is a subterm of E and $F \notin \text{VAR}$ (i.e., $\text{ROOT}(F) \in \mathcal{N}$). Hence we have $H_j \xrightarrow{w'_{j+1}} H_{j+1}$ for the respective canonical simple stair $w'_{j+1} = u_{(r,F)}$ where $r = r_{i_{j+1}}$. By replacing all w_{j+1} with the respective canonical simple stairs w'_{j+1} we get the desired sequence SEQ . \square

(Strong) monochromatic canonical sequences. We now build on the notions $\text{RSTICK}(\sigma) \subseteq \text{SURV}(\sigma) \subseteq \{x_1, \dots, x_m\}$ that we introduced for stair substitutions σ earlier. (We recall that $\text{SURV}(\sigma)$ consists of the variables occurring in $A(x_1, \dots, x_m)\sigma$, while $x_i \in \text{RSTICK}(\sigma)$ are even root-successors in $A(x_1, \dots, x_m)\sigma$.)

- For a stair substitution σ we define its colour as

$$\text{COL}(\sigma) = (\text{SURV}(\sigma), (\mathbf{R}_1, \mathbf{R}_2, \dots, \mathbf{R}_m))$$

where $\mathbf{R}_i = \{x_j \mid x_j\sigma = x_i\}$, for $i \in [1, m]$. Hence $\text{RSTICK}(\sigma) = \{x_i \mid \mathbf{R}_i \neq \emptyset\}$.

- For a stair $w \in \mathcal{R}^+$ where $A(x_1, \dots, x_m) \xrightarrow{w} B(x_1, \dots, x_m)\sigma$ (with $\text{SUPP}(\sigma) \subseteq \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m\}$) we define its colour as

$$\text{COL}(w) = (A, B, \text{COL}(\sigma)) .$$

- If $\text{SEQ} = H_0, w_1, H_1, w_2, H_2, w_3, \dots$ is a canonical sequence, then for $i < j$ ($i, j \in \mathbb{N}$) we put $\text{COL}_{\text{SEQ}}(i, j) = \text{COL}(w_{i+1}w_{i+2} \cdots w_j)$.
- A canonical sequence SEQ is a *monochromatic sequence* if there is a “colour” $\mathbf{C} = (A, A, (\mathbf{S}, (\mathbf{R}_1, \dots, \mathbf{R}_m)))$ such that $\text{COL}_{\text{SEQ}}(i, j) = \mathbf{C}$ for all $i < j$. (This could not hold for $\mathbf{C} = (A, B, \dots)$ where $A \neq B$.) In this case we put $\text{SURV}_{\text{SEQ}} = \mathbf{S}$ and $\text{RSTICK}_{\text{SEQ}} = \{x_i \mid \mathbf{R}_i \neq \emptyset\}$.
- If SEQ is a monochromatic sequence $H_0, w_1, H_1, w_2, H_2, w_3, \dots$, presented as

$$A(x_1, \dots, x_m)\sigma_0, w_1, A(x_1, \dots, x_m)\sigma_1, w_2, A(x_1, \dots, x_m)\sigma_2, w_3, \dots,$$

and we have $x_i\sigma_0 \sim x_i\sigma_1 \sim x_i\sigma_2 \sim \dots$ for each $x_i \in \text{SURV}_{\text{SEQ}}$, then SEQ is a *strong monochromatic sequence*. (For each $x_i \in \text{SURV}_{\text{SEQ}}$ there is a fixed bisim-class such that the i th root-successor in H_j is from this fixed class, for each $j \in \mathbb{N}$.)

Proposition 14. *If a bisim-infinite term E_0 has no witness and SEQ is a canonical sequence reachable from E_0 , then SEQ has a strong monochromatic subsequence.*

Proof. We fix a bisim-infinite term E_0 that has no witness (assuming such E_0 exists); we further fix a canonical sequence SEQ reachable from E_0 . By the infinite Ramsey theorem there is a monochromatic subsequence SEQ' of SEQ . We will thus immediately assume that $\text{SEQ} = H_0, w_1, H_1, w_2, H_2, w_3, \dots$ is monochromatic, that $E_0 \xrightarrow{u} H_0$, and that

$$\text{COL}_{\text{SEQ}}(i, j) = \mathbf{C} = (A, A, (\text{SURV}_{\text{SEQ}}, (\mathbf{R}_1, \dots, \mathbf{R}_m))) \text{ for all } i < j \text{ } (i, j \in \mathbb{N}).$$

Hence $\text{COL}(w_j w_{j+1} \cdots w_{j+\ell}) = \mathbf{C}$ for all $j \in \mathbb{N}_+$ and $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$.

Let us write $H_j = A(x_1, \dots, x_m)\sigma_j$ for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$. In more detail, $\sigma_{j+1} = \sigma'_{j+1}\sigma_j$ where $A(x_1, \dots, x_m) \xrightarrow{w_{j+1}} A(x_1, \dots, x_m)\sigma'_{j+1}$, for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$; hence $\sigma_j = \sigma'_j \sigma'_{j-1} \cdots \sigma'_1 \sigma_0$. We thus also have

$$\text{COL}(\sigma'_\ell \sigma'_{\ell-1} \cdots \sigma'_j) = (\text{SURV}_{\text{SEQ}}, (\mathbf{R}_1, \dots, \mathbf{R}_m)) \text{ for all } \ell \geq j \geq 1,$$

which also entails that $\text{RSTICK}(\sigma'_\ell \sigma'_{\ell-1} \cdots \sigma'_j) = \text{RSTICK}_{\text{SEQ}} = \{x_i \mid \mathbf{R}_i \neq \emptyset\}$.

We now verify that σ'_1 is colour-idempotent; the definition requires two conditions:

1. $(x_i \in \text{RSTICK}(\sigma'_1))$ entails that $x_i\sigma'_1 = x_i$
 Suppose $x_i \in \text{RSTICK}(\sigma'_1) = \text{RSTICK}_{\text{SEQ}}$, hence $x_j\sigma'_1 = x_i$ for some $j \in [1, m]$, and thus $x_j \in R_i$. Since $\text{COL}(\sigma'_1) = \text{COL}(\sigma'_2) = \text{COL}(\sigma'_2\sigma'_1)$, we also have $x_j\sigma'_2 = x_i$ and $x_j\sigma'_2\sigma'_1 = x_i$, which entails $x_i\sigma'_1 = x_i$.
2. $(x_i \in \text{SURV}(\sigma'_1))$ entails that x_i occurs in $x_j\sigma'_1$ for some $x_j \in \text{SURV}(\sigma'_1)$
 For $x_i \in \text{SURV}(\sigma'_1)$ we also have $x_i \in \text{SURV}(\sigma'_2\sigma'_1)$ (since $\text{SURV}(\sigma'_1) = \text{SURV}(\sigma'_2\sigma'_1) = \text{SURV}_{\text{SEQ}}$), hence there is $x_j \in \text{SURV}(\sigma'_2)$ such that x_i occurs in $x_j\sigma'_1$; since $\text{SURV}(\sigma'_2) = \text{SURV}(\sigma'_1)$, we have that x_i occurs in $x_j\sigma'_1$ for some $x_j \in \text{SURV}(\sigma'_1)$.

The colour-idempotency claim on σ'_1 can be obviously generalized, but it suffices for us to note that each nonempty R_i (in the colour C) contains x_i , hence $x_i\sigma'_j = x_i$ for all $x_i \in \text{RSTICK}_{\text{SEQ}}$ and $j \in \mathbb{N}_+$.

Let $w = w_1$, $\sigma = \sigma'_1$, and $j \in \mathbb{N}$. We have shown that w is a colour-idempotent stair, hence the pair $(uw_1w_2 \cdots w_j, w)$ is a candidate for a witness of bisim-infiniteness of E_0 . We consider the path

$$E_0 \xrightarrow{uw_1w_2 \cdots w_j} A(x_1, \dots, x_m)\sigma_j \xrightarrow{w} A(x_1, \dots, x_m)\sigma\sigma_j \xrightarrow{w} A(x_1, \dots, x_m)\sigma\sigma\sigma_j \xrightarrow{w} \cdots$$

and the corresponding limit $\text{LIM}_j = A(x_1, \dots, x_m)\sigma^\omega\sigma_j$.

The set of variables occurring in the term $A(x_1, \dots, x_m)\sigma^\omega$ is $\text{RSTICK}(\sigma) = \text{RSTICK}_{\text{SEQ}}$ (recall Proposition 8). Since $x_i\sigma'_j\sigma'_{j-1} \cdots \sigma'_1 = x_i$ for each $x_i \in \text{RSTICK}_{\text{SEQ}}$, we have

$$\text{LIM}_j = A(x_1, \dots, x_m)\sigma^\omega\sigma_j = A(x_1, \dots, x_m)\sigma^\omega\sigma'_j\sigma'_{j-1} \cdots \sigma'_1\sigma_0 = A(x_1, \dots, x_m)\sigma^\omega\sigma_0,$$

or $\text{LIM}_j = A(x_1, \dots, x_m)\sigma^\omega\bar{\sigma}_0$ where $\bar{\sigma}_0$ is the restriction of σ_0 to $\text{RSTICK}_{\text{SEQ}}$. Hence $\text{LIM}_0 = \text{LIM}_1 = \text{LIM}_2 = \cdots$, and we thus write just LIM instead of LIM_j .

Let $e \in \mathbb{N}$ be the value related to A , σ , and $\bar{\sigma}_0$ as in Lemma 11. Since we assume that E_0 has no witness, we have $A(x_1, \dots, x_m)\sigma^e\sigma_j \sim \text{LIM}$; this holds for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$.

Each $x_i \in \text{SURV}_{\text{SEQ}}$ occurs in $A(x_1, \dots, x_m)\sigma^e$ (by Proposition 8, since σ is colour-idempotent), and there is thus a (“sinking”) path $A(x_1, \dots, x_m)\sigma^e \xrightarrow{v} x_i$. Hence there is a bound, independent of j , such that all terms $x_i\sigma_j$ where $x_i \in \text{SURV}_{\text{SEQ}}$ (and $j \in \mathbb{N}$), are in a bounded (reachability) distance from $A(x_1, \dots, x_m)\sigma^e\sigma_j$. Since $A(x_1, \dots, x_m)\sigma^e\sigma_j \sim \text{LIM}$, every path $A(x_1, \dots, x_m)\sigma^e\sigma_j \xrightarrow{v'} x_i\sigma_j$ must be matched by a path $\text{LIM} \xrightarrow{v'} G$ where $|v'| = |v|$ and $x_i\sigma_j \sim G$. Hence the equivalence classes $[x_i\sigma_j]_\sim$, for $x_i \in \text{SURV}_{\text{SEQ}}$ and $j \in \mathbb{N}$, are in a bounded distance from the class $[\text{LIM}]_\sim$ (in the quotient LTS related to $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{G}}^A$); due to finite branching, the respective set \mathcal{F} of classes in this bounded distance from $[\text{LIM}]_\sim$ is finite. The pigeonhole principle thus yields that SEQ indeed has a strong monochromatic subsequence. \square

Lemma 15. *For each grammar \mathcal{G} and each bisim-infinite term E_0 there is a witness (satisfying the condition 1, namely $A(x_1, \dots, x_m)\sigma^e\sigma_0 \not\sim \text{LIM}$, in Lemma 11).*

Proof. Given a grammar $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{N}, \Sigma, \mathcal{R})$, let E_0 be a bisim-infinite term; for the sake of contradiction we assume that E_0 has no witness. We fix a witness sequence

$$\text{SEQ} = H_0, w_1, H_1, w_2, H_2, w_3, \dots$$

where H_0 is reachable from E_0 ; it exists by Proposition 13. We recall that $H_j \not\sim H_{j'}$ for $j \neq j'$ (since SEQ is a witness sequence), and w_j , for each $j \in \mathbb{N}_+$, is a nonempty finite sequence of canonical simple stairs for which $H_{j-1} \xrightarrow{w_j} H_j$; this entails $H_0 \xrightarrow{w_1} \cdots \xrightarrow{w_j} H_j$.

For each $j \in \mathbb{N}_+$ we fix a shortest canonical stair w'_j for which there is H'_j such that $H_0 \xrightarrow{w'_j} H'_j$ and $H'_j \sim H_j$. All w'_j ($j \in \mathbb{N}_+$) are pairwise different finite sequences of canonical simple stairs. (We have $w'_j \neq w'_{j'}$ for $j \neq j'$ since $H'_j \not\sim H'_{j'}$.) By König's lemma we can thus easily derive that we can fix an infinite sequence $u_1 u_2 u_3 \cdots$ of canonical simple stairs such that each sequence $u_1 u_2 \cdots u_\ell$ (for $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$) is a prefix of w'_j for infinitely many $j \in \mathbb{N}_+$.

We now consider the canonical sequence $H_0, u_1, G_1, u_2, G_2, \dots$, which is reachable from E_0 (since H_0 is reachable from E_0); we also write H_0 as $A(x_1, \dots, x_m)\sigma_0$. Since E_0 has no witness, by Proposition 14 this sequence has a strong monochromatic subsequence

$$\text{SEQ}' = G_{i_0}, v_1, G_{i_1}, v_2, G_{i_2}, v_3, \dots,$$

where $v_{j+1} = u_{i_j+1} u_{i_j+2} \cdots u_{i_{j+1}}$, for each $j \in \mathbb{N}$; we also put $v_0 = u_1 u_2 \cdots u_{i_0}$. (We do not exclude that $G_{i_j} \sim G_{i_{j'}}$ for $j \neq j'$.) Hence there are $B \in \mathcal{N}$ and stair substitutions $\bar{\sigma}_0, \bar{\sigma}_1, \bar{\sigma}_2, \dots$ such that $A(x_1, \dots, x_m) \xrightarrow{v_0} B(x_1, \dots, x_m)\bar{\sigma}_0$ and $B(x_1, \dots, x_m) \xrightarrow{v_{j+1}} B(x_1, \dots, x_m)\bar{\sigma}_{j+1}$ (for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$); the infinite path $H_0 \xrightarrow{v_0} G_{i_0} \xrightarrow{v_1} G_{i_1} \xrightarrow{v_2} \cdots$ can be thus written as

$$A(x_1, \dots, x_m)\sigma_0 \xrightarrow{v_0} B(x_1, \dots, x_m)\bar{\sigma}_0\sigma_0 \xrightarrow{v_1} B(x_1, \dots, x_m)\bar{\sigma}_1\bar{\sigma}_0\sigma_0 \xrightarrow{v_2} \cdots \quad (6)$$

We have $\text{SURV}(\bar{\sigma}_j) = \text{SURV}_{\text{SEQ}'}$ for all $j \in \mathbb{N}_+$, and for each $x \in \text{SURV}_{\text{SEQ}'}$ the bisim-class of the term $x\bar{\sigma}_j\bar{\sigma}_{j-1} \cdots \bar{\sigma}_0\sigma_0$ ($j \in \mathbb{N}$) is independent of j (since SEQ' is strong monochromatic).

By our choice of the sequence $u_1 u_2 u_3 \dots$, we can fix some j such that $w'_j = v_0 v_1 v_2 w$ for a (canonical) stair w . Hence $H_0 \xrightarrow{w'_j} H'_j$ can be written as

$$A(x_1, \dots, x_m)\sigma_0 \xrightarrow{v_0} B(x_1, \dots, x_m)\bar{\sigma}_0\sigma_0 \xrightarrow{v_1 v_2} B(x_1, \dots, x_m)\bar{\sigma}_2\bar{\sigma}_1\bar{\sigma}_0\sigma_0 \xrightarrow{w} H'_j$$

where $B(x_1, \dots, x_m) \xrightarrow{w} C(x_1, \dots, x_m)\sigma$ and $H'_j = C(x_1, \dots, x_m)\sigma\bar{\sigma}_2\bar{\sigma}_1\bar{\sigma}_0\sigma_0$.

We finish the proof by showing that $w' = v_0 v_2 w$ (arising from w'_j by omitting v_1) contradicts the length-minimality condition put on w'_j . We obviously have $H_0 \xrightarrow{w'} H'$ where $H' = C(x_1, \dots, x_m)\sigma\bar{\sigma}_2\bar{\sigma}_0\sigma_0$, and it is thus sufficient to show that $H'_j \sim H'$, i.e.,

$$C(x_1, \dots, x_m)\sigma\bar{\sigma}_2\bar{\sigma}_1\bar{\sigma}_0\sigma_0 \sim C(x_1, \dots, x_m)\sigma\bar{\sigma}_2\bar{\sigma}_0\sigma_0. \quad (7)$$

Since $\text{VAR}(C(x_1, \dots, x_m)\sigma) \subseteq \{x_1, \dots, x_m\}$ and $\text{SURV}(\bar{\sigma}_2) = \bigcup_{i \in [1, m]} \text{VAR}(x_i \bar{\sigma}_2) = \text{SURV}_{\text{SEQ}'}$, we derive that $\text{VAR}(C(x_1, \dots, x_m)\sigma\bar{\sigma}_2) \subseteq \text{SURV}_{\text{SEQ}'}$. For each $x \in \text{VAR}(C(x_1, \dots, x_m)\sigma\bar{\sigma}_2)$ we thus have $x\bar{\sigma}_1\bar{\sigma}_0\sigma_0 \sim x\bar{\sigma}_0\sigma_0$ (recall reasoning around (6)); hence the claim (7) follows due to compositionality captured by Proposition 7. \square

4 Additional Remarks

The idea of decision procedures for bisim-finiteness (or language regularity) in the deterministic case studied in [1, 2] could be roughly explained in our framework as follows. For a deterministic grammar (with at most one rule $A(x_1, \dots, x_m) \xrightarrow{a} ..$ for each nonterminal A and each action a), if we have

$$E_0 \xrightarrow{u} A(x_1, \dots, x_m)\sigma_0 \xrightarrow{w} A(x_1, \dots, x_m)\sigma\sigma_0$$

where w is a colour-idempotent stair, then either $A(x_1, \dots, x_m)\sigma_0 \sim A(x_1, \dots, x_m)\sigma\sigma_0$ (in which case $A(x_1, \dots, x_m)\sigma\sigma_0$ can be always safely replaced with the smaller $A(x_1, \dots, x_m)\sigma_0$), or $A(x_1, \dots, x_m)\sigma_0 \not\sim A(x_1, \dots, x_m)\sigma\sigma_0$ and E_0 is bisim-infinite. This allows to derive a bound on the size of the potential equivalent finite system, and thus the decidability of the full equivalence (Theorem 3) is not needed here.

In the case equivalent to *normed* pushdown processes, the regularity problem essentially coincides with the boundedness problem, and is thus much simpler. (See, e.g., [5] for a further discussion.)

Appendix

At the ends of Sections 2 and 3.2.1 the issues of transforming pushdown automata to first-order grammars, of normalizing the grammars, and of unifying the nonterminal arities were mentioned. We now deal with these issues in more detail.

Transforming pushdown automata to first-order grammars

A *pushdown automaton* (PDA) is a tuple $M = (Q, \Sigma, \Gamma, \Delta)$ of finite sets where the elements of Q, Σ, Γ are called *control states*, *actions* (or *terminal letters*), and *stack symbols*, respectively; Δ contains *transition rules* of the form $pY \xrightarrow{a} q\alpha$ where $p, q \in Q$, $Y \in \Gamma$, $a \in \Sigma \cup \{\varepsilon\}$, and $\alpha \in \Gamma^*$. (We assume $\varepsilon \notin \Sigma$.) A PDA $M = (Q, \Sigma, \Gamma, \Delta)$ generates the labelled transition system

$$\mathcal{L}_M = (Q \times \Gamma^*, \Sigma \cup \{\varepsilon\}, (\xrightarrow{a})_{a \in \Sigma \cup \{\varepsilon\}})$$

where each rule $pY \xrightarrow{a} q\alpha$ induces transitions $pY\beta \xrightarrow{a} q\alpha\beta$ for all $\beta \in \Gamma^*$.




Figure 13: PDA configuration as a term (left), and transforming a rule (right)

Fig. 13 (left) presents a PDA-configuration (i.e. a state in \mathcal{L}_M) $pACB$ as a term; here we assume that $Q = \{q_1, q_2, q_3\}$. (The string $pACB$, depicted on the left in a convenient vertical

form, is transformed into a term presented by an acyclic graph in the figure.) On the right in Fig. 13 we can see a transformation of a PDA-rule $pA \xrightarrow{a} qCA$ into a grammar-rule.

Formally, for a PDA $M = (Q, \Sigma, \Gamma, \Delta)$, where $Q = \{q_1, q_2, \dots, q_m\}$, we can define the first-order grammar $\mathcal{G}_M = (\mathcal{N}, \Sigma \cup \{\varepsilon\}, \mathcal{R})$ where $\mathcal{N} = Q \cup (Q \times \Gamma)$, with $\text{arity}(q) = 0$ and $\text{arity}((q, X)) = m$; the set \mathcal{R} is defined below. We write $[q]$ and $[qY]$ for nonterminals q and (q, Y) , respectively, and we map each configuration $p\alpha$ to the term $\mathcal{T}(p\alpha)$ by structural induction: $\mathcal{T}(p\varepsilon) = [p]$, and $\mathcal{T}(pY\alpha) = [pY](\mathcal{T}(q_1\alpha), \mathcal{T}(q_2\alpha), \dots, \mathcal{T}(q_m\alpha))$.

For a smooth transformation of rules we introduce a special “stack variable” x , and we put $\mathcal{T}(q_i x) = x_i$ (for all $i \in [1, m]$). A PDA-rule $pY \xrightarrow{a} q\alpha$ in Δ is transformed to the grammar rule $\mathcal{T}(pYx) \xrightarrow{a} \mathcal{T}(q\alpha x)$ in \mathcal{R} . (Hence $pY \xrightarrow{a} q_i$ is transformed to $[pY](x_1, \dots, x_m) \xrightarrow{a} x_i$, and $pY \xrightarrow{a} qZ\alpha$ is transformed to $[pY](x_1, \dots, x_m) \xrightarrow{a} [qZ](\mathcal{T}(q_1\alpha x), \dots, \mathcal{T}(q_m\alpha x))$.)

It is obvious that the LTS \mathcal{L}_M is isomorphic with the restriction of the LTS $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{G}_M}^A$ to the states $\mathcal{T}(p\alpha)$ where $p\alpha$ are configurations of M ; moreover, the set $\{\mathcal{T}(p\alpha) \mid p \in Q, \alpha \in \Gamma^*\}$ is closed w.r.t. reachability in $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{G}_M}^A$ (if $\mathcal{T}(p\alpha) \xrightarrow{a} F$ in $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{G}_M}^A$, then $F = \mathcal{T}(q\beta)$ where $p\alpha \xrightarrow{a} q\beta$ in \mathcal{L}_M).

In fact, we have not allowed ε -rules $A(x_1, \dots, x_m) \xrightarrow{\varepsilon} E$ in our definition of first-order grammars. We would consider a variant of so called *weak bisimilarity* in such a case, which is undecidable in general (see, e.g., [19] for a further discussion).

At the end of Section 2 we mention *restricted PDAs* where ε -rules $pY \xrightarrow{\varepsilon} q\alpha$ can be only *popping*, i.e. $\alpha = \varepsilon$ in such rules, and *deterministic* (or *having no alternative*), which means that if there is a rule $pY \xrightarrow{\varepsilon} q$ in Δ then there is no other rule with the left-hand side pY (of the form $pY \xrightarrow{a} q'\alpha$ where $a \in \Sigma \cup \{\varepsilon\}$). We define the *stable configurations* as $p\varepsilon$ and $pY\alpha$ where there is no rule $pY \xrightarrow{\varepsilon} ..$ in Δ ; for the restricted PDAs we have that any unstable configuration $p\alpha$ only allows to perform a finite sequence of ε -transitions that reaches a stable configuration. Hence it is natural to restrict the attention to the “visible” transitions $p\alpha \xrightarrow{a} q\beta$ ($a \in \Sigma$) between stable configurations; such transitions might encompass sequences of ε -steps. In defining the grammar \mathcal{G}_M we can naturally avoid the explicit use of deterministic popping ε -transitions, by “preprocessing” them: in our inductive definition of $\mathcal{T}(p\alpha)$ (and $\mathcal{T}(p\alpha x)$) we add the following item: if pY is unstable, since there is a rule $pY \xrightarrow{\varepsilon} q$, then $\mathcal{T}(pY\alpha) = \mathcal{T}(q\alpha)$. Fig. 14 (right) shows the grammar-rule $\mathcal{T}(pAx) \xrightarrow{a} \mathcal{T}(qCAx)$ (arising




Figure 14: Deterministic popping ε -transitions are “preprocessed”

from the PDA-rule $pA \xrightarrow{a} qCA$), when $Q = \{q_1, q_2, q_3\}$ and there is a PDA-rule $q_2A \xrightarrow{\varepsilon} q_3$, while q_1A, q_3A are stable. Such preprocessing causes that the term $\mathcal{T}(p\alpha)$ can have branches of varying lengths.

Normalization of grammars

We call a grammar $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{N}, \Sigma, \mathcal{R})$ *normalized* if for each $A \in \mathcal{N}$ and each $i \in [1, \text{arity}(A)]$ there is a (“sink”) word $w_{(A,i)} \in \mathcal{R}^+$ such that $A(x_1, \dots, x_{\text{arity}(A)}) \xrightarrow{w_{(A,i)}} x_i$.

For any grammar $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{N}, \Sigma, \mathcal{R})$ we can find some words $w_{(A,i)}$ or find out their non-existence, for all $A \in \mathcal{N}$ and $i \in [1, \text{arity}(A)]$, as shown below. For technical convenience we will also find some words $w_{(E',x_i)} \in \mathcal{R}^*$ satisfying $E' \xrightarrow{w_{(E',x_i)}} x_i$ for subterms E' of the rhs (right-hand sides) E of the rules $A(x_1, \dots, x_m) \xrightarrow{a} E$ in \mathcal{R} .

We put $w_{(x_i,x_i)} = \varepsilon$ (for subterms x_i of the rhs), while all other $w_{(E',x_i)}$ and all $w_{(A,i)}$ are undefined in the beginning. Then we repeatedly define *so far undefined* $w_{(A,i)}$ or $w_{(E',x_i)}$ by applying the following constructions, as long as possible:

- put $w_{(A,i)} = r w_{(E,x_i)}$ if there is a rule $r : A(x_1, \dots, x_m) \xrightarrow{a} E$ and $w_{(E,x_i)}$ is defined;
- put $w_{(E',x_i)} = w_{(A,j)} w_{(E'',x_i)}$ if $\text{ROOT}(E') = A$, E'' is the j th root-successor in E' , and $w_{(A,j)}$, $w_{(E'',x_i)}$ are defined.

The correctness is obvious. The process could be modified to find some *shortest* $w_{(A,i)}$ (and $w_{(E',x_i)}$) that exist but this is not important here. For any pair (A, i) for which $w_{(A,i)}$ has remained undefined such word obviously does not exist, hence the i th root-successor G_i of any term $A(G_1, \dots, G_m)$ is “non-exposable” and thus plays “no role” (not affecting the bisim-class of $A(G_1, \dots, G_m)$). We will now show a safe removal of such non-exposable root-successors.




Figure 15: Modifying (cutting) a rule r , when $w_{(A,1)}$, $w_{(C,1)}$, and $w_{(D,2)}$ do not exist

For $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{N}, \Sigma, \mathcal{R})$ we put $\mathcal{G}' = (\mathcal{N}', \Sigma, \mathcal{R}')$ where the sets $\mathcal{N}' = \{A' \mid A \in \mathcal{N}\}$ and $\mathcal{R}' = \{r' \mid r \in \mathcal{R}\}$ are defined below. For $A \in \mathcal{N}$, we put

$$\text{SINK}(A) = \{i \in [1, \text{arity}(A)] \mid \text{there is some } w_{(A,i)}\}, \text{ and } \text{arity}(A') = |\text{SINK}(A)|.$$

We define the mapping $\text{CUT} : \text{TERMS}_{\mathcal{N}} \rightarrow \text{TERMS}_{\mathcal{N}'}$ by the following structural induction:

1. $\text{CUT}(x_i) = x_i$;
2. $\text{CUT}(A(G_1, G_2, \dots, G_m)) = A'(\text{CUT}(G_{i_1}), \text{CUT}(G_{i_2}), \dots, \text{CUT}(G_{i_{m'}}))$,
where $1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_{m'} \leq m$ and $\{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_{m'}\} = \text{SINK}(A)$.

The set of rules $\mathcal{R}' = \{r' \mid r \in \mathcal{R}\}$ is defined as follows:

$$\text{for } r : A(x_1, \dots, x_m) \xrightarrow{a} E \text{ we put } r' : \text{CUT}(A(x_1, \dots, x_m))\sigma \xrightarrow{a} \text{CUT}(E)\sigma$$

where $\sigma = \{(x_{i_1}, x_1), (x_{i_2}, x_2), \dots, (x_{i_{m'}}, x_{m'})\}$ for $\{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_{m'}\} = \text{SINK}(A)$. (Fig. 15 depicts the transformation of $r : A(x_1, x_2, x_3) \xrightarrow{b} C(A(x_2, x_1, B), D(x_2, x_3))$ to $r' : A'(x_2, x_3)\sigma \xrightarrow{b} C'(D'(x_2))\sigma$ where $\sigma = \{(x_2, x_1), (x_3, x_2)\}$.) We note that for each variable x_i occurring in $\text{CUT}(E)$ we must have $i \in \text{SINK}(A) = \{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_{m'}\}$; hence σ yields a one-to-one renaming of “place-holders” in $\text{CUT}(A(x_1, \dots, x_m)) \xrightarrow{a} \text{CUT}(E)$.

It is easy to check that CUT maps $\text{TERMS}_{\mathcal{N}}$ onto $\text{TERMS}_{\mathcal{N}'}$, and that $G \xrightarrow{r} H$ in $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{G}}^{\text{R}}$ implies $\text{CUT}(G) \xrightarrow{r'} \text{CUT}(H)$ in $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{G}'}$; moreover, if $G' \xrightarrow{r'} H'$ in $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{G}'}$ and $G \in \text{CUT}^{-1}(G')$, then there is $H \in \text{CUT}^{-1}(H')$ such that $G \xrightarrow{r} H$ in $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{G}}^{\text{R}}$.

Grammar \mathcal{G}' is normalized: if $\text{SINK}(A) = \{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_{m'}\}$ then for each $j \in [1, m']$ we have $A(x_1, \dots, x_m) \xrightarrow{w(A, i_j)} x_{i_j}$, and thus $\text{CUT}(A(x_1, \dots, x_m)) \xrightarrow{(w(A, i_j))'}$ $\text{CUT}(x_{i_j})$, i.e. $A'(x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_{m'}}) \xrightarrow{(w(A, i_j))'}$ x_{i_j} , where w' arises from w by replacing each element r with r' .

We also have that the set $\{(F, \text{CUT}(F)) \mid F \in \text{TERMS}_{\mathcal{N}}\}$ is a bisimulation in the union of $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{G}}^{\text{A}}$ and $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{G}'}^{\text{A}}$; hence $F \sim \text{CUT}(F)$, and E_0 is bisim-finite in $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{G}}^{\text{A}}$ iff $\text{CUT}(E_0)$ is bisim-finite in $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{G}'}^{\text{A}}$. (We can also note that the quotient-LTS $(\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{G}}^{\text{A}})_{\equiv_{\text{CUT}}}$ is isomorphic with $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{G}'}^{\text{A}}$, and that the bisimilarity quotients of $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{G}}^{\text{A}}$ and $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{G}'}^{\text{A}}$ are the same, up to isomorphism.)

Unification of nonterminal arities

In the proof of Theorem 1 we used m for denoting the arity of each nonterminal in the considered normalized grammar, instead of using m_A for $\text{arity}(A)$. This was not crucial, since it would be straightforward to modify the relevant arguments in the proof, but we also mentioned that we could “harmlessly” achieve the uniformity of nonterminal arities by a construction, while keeping the adjusted grammar normalized. We now sketch such a construction.

Suppose $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{N}, \Sigma, \mathcal{R})$ is normalized and the arities of nonterminals are not all the same; let m be the maximum arity. If there are no nullary nonterminals, then the arities can be unified to m by a straightforward “padding with superfluous copies of root-successors”. But we will pad with a special (infinite regular) term, which handles the case of nullary nonterminals as well. (This is illustrated in Figures 16 and 17.)




Figure 16: Padding a rule in \mathcal{R} (left) with x_4 , when $m = 3$

We define the grammar $\mathcal{G}' = (\mathcal{N}', \Sigma', \mathcal{R}')$ where $\mathcal{N}' = \{A' \mid A \in \mathcal{N}\} \cup \{A_{\text{SP}}\}$, $\Sigma' = \Sigma \cup \{a_{\text{SP}}\}$, and $\mathcal{R}' = \{r' \mid r \in \mathcal{R}\} \cup \mathcal{R}_{\text{SP}}$ as defined below. Each nonterminal in \mathcal{N}' , including the special nonterminal A_{SP} , has arity $m+1$. The set \mathcal{R}_{SP} (of the rules with the special added action a_{SP}) contains the following rules:




Figure 17: A term $F \in \text{TERMS}_{\mathcal{N}}$ (left) and $\text{PAD}_{\text{SP}}(F)$ (right), when $m = 2$

- $A_{\text{SP}}(x_1, \dots, x_{m+1}) \xrightarrow{a_{\text{SP}}} x_i$, for all $i \in [1, m+1]$;
- $A'(x_1, \dots, x_{m+1}) \xrightarrow{a_{\text{SP}}} x_i$, for all $A \in \mathcal{N}$ and $i \in [\text{arity}(A)+1, m+1]$.

The definition of $\mathcal{R}' = \mathcal{R}_{\text{SP}} \cup \{r' \mid r \in \mathcal{R}\}$ is finished by the following point (see Fig. 16):

- for $r : A(x_1, \dots, x_{\text{arity}(A)}) \xrightarrow{a} E$ we put $r' : A'(x_1, \dots, x_{m+1}) \xrightarrow{a} \text{PAD}(E, x_{m+1})$.

The expression $\text{PAD}(E, x_{m+1})$ is clarified by the following inductive definition of $\text{PAD}(F, H)$ (padding $F \in \text{TERMS}_{\mathcal{N}}$ with certain H):

1. $\text{PAD}(x_i, H) = x_i$;
2. $\text{PAD}(A(G_1, \dots, G_{m'}), H) = A'(\text{PAD}(G_1, H), \dots, \text{PAD}(G_{m'}, H), H, \dots, H)$,
where $m' = \text{arity}(A)$, and $m+1-m'$ copies of H are used to “fill” the arity $m+1$ of A' .

Besides the above case $\text{PAD}(E, x_{m+1})$ we use the definition of $\text{PAD}(F, H)$ also for $H = E_{\text{SP}}$, i.e., for the special (infinite regular) term

$$E_{\text{SP}} = A_{\text{SP}}(x_1, \dots, x_{m+1})\sigma^\omega \text{ where } x_i\sigma = A_{\text{SP}}(x_1, \dots, x_{m+1}) \text{ for all } i \in [1, m+1].$$

(In Fig. 17 there are several copies of the least presentation of E_{SP} when $m = 2$.) The behaviour of E_{SP} is trivial: its only outgoing transition in $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{G}'}^A$ is the loop $E_{\text{SP}} \xrightarrow{a_{\text{SP}}} E_{\text{SP}}$.

We define the mapping $\text{PAD}_{\text{SP}} : \text{TERMS}_{\mathcal{N}} \rightarrow \text{TERMS}_{\mathcal{N}'}$ by $\text{PAD}_{\text{SP}}(F) = \text{PAD}(F, E_{\text{SP}})\sigma_{\text{SP}}$ where $x_i\sigma_{\text{SP}} = E_{\text{SP}}$ for each variable x_i . (The support of σ_{SP} is infinite but this causes no problem.) Hence there are no variables in $\text{PAD}_{\text{SP}}(F)$. (Fig. 17 shows an example. We note that if the nullary nonterminal B happens to be dead in $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{G}'}^A$, then $B' \sim E_{\text{SP}}$ in $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{G}'}^A$; this is the reason for replacing the variables with E_{SP} .)

The mapping PAD_{SP} is injective (but not onto $\text{TERMS}_{\mathcal{N}'}$) and the following conditions obviously hold:

- if $G \xrightarrow{r} H$ (in $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{G}}^R$) then $\text{PAD}_{\text{SP}}(G) \xrightarrow{r'} \text{PAD}_{\text{SP}}(H)$ (in $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{G}'}^R$);

- if $\text{PAD}_{\text{SP}}(G) \xrightarrow{r'} H'$ then there is H such that $\text{PAD}_{\text{SP}}(H) = H'$ and $G \xrightarrow{r} H$.

The rules in \mathcal{R}_{SP} guarantee that \mathcal{G}' is normalized (if \mathcal{G} is normalized), and they also induce that the special action a_{SP} is enabled in any term $\text{PAD}_{\text{SP}}(G)$ (in $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{G}'}^{\text{A}}$); moreover, $\text{PAD}_{\text{SP}}(G) \xrightarrow{a_{\text{SP}}} H'$ entails that $H' = E_{\text{SP}}$.

We now note that any set $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \text{TERMS}_{\mathcal{N}} \times \text{TERMS}_{\mathcal{N}}$ is a bisimulation in $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{G}}^{\text{A}}$ iff $\mathcal{B}' = \{(E_{\text{SP}}, E_{\text{SP}})\} \cup \{(\text{PAD}_{\text{SP}}(F), \text{PAD}_{\text{SP}}(G)) \mid (F, G) \in \mathcal{B}\}$ is a bisimulation in $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{G}'}^{\text{A}}$. We deduce that $E \sim F$ in $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{G}}^{\text{A}}$ iff $\text{PAD}_{\text{SP}}(E) \sim \text{PAD}_{\text{SP}}(F)$ in $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{G}'}^{\text{A}}$, and E_0 is bisim-finite in $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{G}}^{\text{A}}$ iff $\text{PAD}_{\text{SP}}(E_0)$ is bisim-finite in $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{G}'}^{\text{A}}$.

Author’s acknowledgements. This research was mostly carried out when I was affiliated with Techn. Univ. Ostrava and supported by the Grant Agency of the Czech Rep., project GAČR:15-13784S. I also thank Stefan Göller for drawing my attention to the decidability question for regularity of pushdown processes, for discussions about some related works (like [2]), and for detailed comments on a previous version of this paper. My thanks also go to anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments that have also prompted me to further simplifications of the proof.

References

- [1] R. E. Stearns, A regularity test for pushdown machines, *Information and Control* 11 (3) (1967) 323–340.
- [2] L. G. Valiant, Regularity and related problems for deterministic pushdown automata, *J. ACM* 22 (1) (1975) 1–10.
- [3] G. Sénizergues, L(A)=L(B)? Decidability results from complete formal systems, *Theoretical Computer Science* 251 (1–2) (2001) 1–166.
- [4] R. Milner, *Communication and Concurrency*, Prentice-Hall, Inc., Upper Saddle River, NJ, USA, 1989.
- [5] J. Srba, Roadmap of infinite results, in: *Current Trends In Theoretical Computer Science, The Challenge of the New Century*, Vol. 2, World Scientific Publishing Co., 2004, pp. 337–350, updated version at <http://users-cs.au.dk/srba/roadmap/>.
- [6] G. Sénizergues, The bisimulation problem for equational graphs of finite out-degree, *SIAM J. Comput.* 34 (5) (2005) 1025–1106.
- [7] M. Benedikt, S. Göller, S. Kiefer, A. S. Murawski, Bisimilarity of pushdown automata is nonelementary, in: *Proc. LICS 2013*, IEEE Computer Society, 2013, pp. 488–498.
- [8] S. Schmitz, Complexity hierarchies beyond elementary, *TOCT* 8 (1) (2016) 3.
- [9] P. Jančar, Equivalences of pushdown systems are hard, in: *Proc. FOSSACS 2014*, Vol. 8412 of LNCS, Springer, 2014, pp. 1–28.
- [10] C. Stirling, Deciding DPDA equivalence is primitive recursive, in: *Proc. ICALP’02*, Vol. 2380 of LNCS, Springer, 2002, pp. 821–832.

- [11] A. Kučera, R. Mayr, On the complexity of checking semantic equivalences between pushdown processes and finite-state processes, *Inf. Comput.* 208 (7) (2010) 772–796.
- [12] C. H. Broadbent, S. Göller, On bisimilarity of higher-order pushdown automata: Undecidability at order two, in: *FSTTCS 2012*, Vol. 18 of LIPIcs, Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2012, pp. 160–172.
- [13] P. Jančar, Bisimulation equivalence of first-order grammars, in: *Proc. ICALP'14 (II)*, Vol. 8573 of LNCS, Springer, 2014, pp. 232–243.
- [14] B. Courcelle, The monadic second-order logic of graphs IX: machines and their behaviours, *Theor. Comput. Sci.* 151 (1) (1995) 125–162.
- [15] T. Knapik, D. Niwinski, P. Urzyczyn, Higher-order pushdown trees are easy, in: *Proc. FOSSACS 2002*, Vol. 2303 of LNCS, Springer, 2002, pp. 205–222.
- [16] L. Ong, Higher-order model checking: An overview, in: *Proc. LICS 2015*, IEEE Computer Society, 2015, pp. 1–15.
- [17] I. Walukiewicz, Automata theory and higher-order model-checking, *ACM SIGLOG News* 3 (4) (2016) 13–31.
- [18] B. Courcelle, Recursive applicative program schemes, in: J. van Leeuwen (Ed.), *Handbook of Theoretical Computer Science*, vol. B, Elsevier, MIT Press, 1990, pp. 459–492.
- [19] P. Jančar, J. Srba, Undecidability of bisimilarity by defender’s forcing, *J. ACM* 55 (1).
- [20] P. Jančar, J. Srba, Note on undecidability of bisimilarity for second-order pushdown processes, *CoRR* abs/1303.0780.