

Quantitative Simulations by Matrices^{*}

Natsuki Urabe^a, Ichiro Hasuo^a

^a*Department of Computer Science, Graduate School of Information Science and Technology, the University of Tokyo, 7-3-1, Hongo, Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo, Japan*

Abstract

We introduce notions of simulation between semiring-weighted automata as models of quantitative systems. Our simulations are instances of the categorical/coalgebraic notions previously studied by Hasuo—hence soundness against language inclusion comes for free—but are concretely presented as matrices that are subject to linear inequality constraints. Pervasiveness of these formalisms allows us to exploit existing algorithms in: searching for a simulation, and hence verifying quantitative correctness that is formulated as language inclusion. Transformations of automata that aid search for simulations are introduced, too. This verification workflow is implemented for the plus-times and max-plus semirings. Furthermore, an extension to weighted *tree* automata is presented and implemented.

Keywords: Kleisli category, simulation, language inclusion, weighted automaton, tropical semiring

1. Introduction

Quantitative aspects of various systems are more and more emphasized in recent verification scenarios. Probabilities in randomized or fuzzy systems are a classic example; utility in economics and game theory is another. Furthermore, now that many computer systems are integrated into physical ambience—realizing so-called *cyber-physical systems*—physical quantities like energy consumption are necessarily taken into account.

1.1. Semiring-Weighted Automata

It is standard in the concurrency community to model such quantitative systems by state-transition systems in which *weights* are assigned to their states and/or transitions. The semantics of such systems varies, however, depending on the interpretation of weights. If they are probabilities, they are accumulated by \times along a path and summed across different paths; if weights are (worst-case) costs, they are summed up along a path and we would take max across different paths.

The algebraic structure of *semirings* then arises as a uniform mathematical language for different notions of “weight,” as is widely acknowledged in the community. The

^{*}An earlier version of this paper [1] has been presented at: *Concurrency Theory—25th International Conference (CONCUR 2014)*, September 2–5 2014, Rome, Italy.

Preprint submitted to Elsevier

November 19, 2018

subject of the current study is state-based systems with labeled transitions, in which each transition is assigned a weight from a prescribed semiring \mathcal{S} . We shall call them *\mathcal{S} -weighted automata*; and we are more specifically interested in the (weighted, finite) *language inclusion* problem and a *simulation-based* approach to it.

1.2. Language Inclusion

Let \mathcal{A} be an \mathcal{S} -weighted automaton with labels from an alphabet Σ . It assigns to each word $w \in \Sigma^*$ a weight taken from \mathcal{S} —this is much like a (purely) probabilistic automaton assigns a probability to each word. Let us denote this function by $L(\mathcal{A}): \Sigma^* \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$ and call it the (*weighted*) *language* of \mathcal{A} by analogy with classic automata theory. The *language inclusion* problem $L(\mathcal{A}) \sqsubseteq L(\mathcal{B})$ asks if: $L(\mathcal{A})(w) \sqsubseteq L(\mathcal{B})(w)$ for each word $w \in \Sigma^*$, where \sqsubseteq is a natural order on the semiring \mathcal{S} .

It is not hard to see that language inclusion $L(\mathcal{A}) \sqsubseteq L(\mathcal{B})$ has numerous applications in verification. In a typical scenario, one of \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} is a model of a *system* and the other expresses *specification*; and $L(\mathcal{A}) \sqsubseteq L(\mathcal{B})$ gives the definition of “the system meeting the specification.” More concrete examples are as follows.

- \mathcal{S} represents probabilities; \mathcal{A} models a system; and \mathcal{B} expresses the specification that certain bad behaviors—identified with words—occur with a certain probability. Then $L(\mathcal{A}) \sqsubseteq L(\mathcal{B})$ is a *safety* statement: each bad behavior occurs in \mathcal{A} at most as likely as in \mathcal{B} .
- \mathcal{S} represents profit, \mathcal{A} is a specification and \mathcal{B} is a system. Then $L(\mathcal{A}) \sqsubseteq L(\mathcal{B})$ guarantees the minimal profit yielded by the system \mathcal{B} .
- There are other properties reduced to language inclusion in a less trivial manner. An example is *probable innocence* [2], a quantitative notion of anonymity. See [3].

1.3. Simulation

Direct check of language inclusion is simply infeasible because there are infinitely many words $w \in \Sigma^*$. One finitary proof method—well-known for nondeterministic (i.e. possibilistic) systems—is by (*forward or backward*) *simulations*, whose systematic study is initiated in [4]. In the nondeterministic setting, a simulation R is a relation between states of \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} that witnesses “local language inclusion”; moreover, from the coinductive way in which it is defined, a simulation persistently witnesses local language inclusion—ultimately yielding (global) language inclusion. This property—existence of a simulation implies language inclusion—is called *soundness*.

1.4. Contribution: Weighted Forward/Backward Simulations by Matrices

In this paper we extend this simulation approach to language inclusion [4] to the quantitative setting of semiring-weighted automata. Our notions of (forward and backward) weighted simulation are not given by relations, but by *matrices* with entries from a semiring \mathcal{S} .

Use of matrices in automata theory is classic—in fact our framework instantiates to that in [4] when we take as \mathcal{S} the Boolean semiring. This is not how we arrived here; conversely, the current results are obtained as instances of a more general theory of *coalgebraic simulations* [5, 6, 7]. There various systems are identified with a categorical

construct of *coalgebras* in a Kleisli category; and forward and backward simulations are characterized as lax/oplax morphisms between coalgebras. A generic soundness result (with respect to language/trace inclusion) is also proved in the general categorical terms.

This paper is devoted to concrete presentations of these categorical notions by matrices, and to their application to actual verification of quantitative systems. Presentation by matrices turns out to be an advantage: a simulation is now a matrix X that satisfies certain *linear inequalities*; and existence of such X —i.e. feasibility of linear inequalities—is so common a problem in many fields that there is a large body of existing work that is waiting to be applied. For example *linear programming (LP)* can be exploited for the plus-times semiring for probabilities; and there are algorithms proposed for other semirings such as the max-plus (tropical) one.

Our (mostly semiring-independent) workflow is as follows. A verification goal is formulated as language inclusion $L(\mathcal{A}) \sqsubseteq L(\mathcal{B})$, which we aim to establish by finding a forward or backward simulation from \mathcal{A} to \mathcal{B} . Soundness of simulations follows from the general result in [5]. A simulation we seek for is a matrix subject to certain linear inequalities, existence of which is checked by various algorithms that exist for different semirings. We implemented this workflow for the plus-times and max-plus semirings.

This simulation-based method is sound but not necessarily complete with respect to language inclusion. Therefore we introduce transformations of weighted automata—called (*forward/backward*) *partial execution*—that potentially create matrix simulations. Via our equivalence results between our matrix simulation and some known ones (including the one in [8]), the partial execution transformations potentially create those simulations, too.

Compared to the earlier version [1] of this paper, the current version additionally contains the following materials.

- Section 7 is added, where we exploit the coalgebraic theory behind and generalize matrix simulation from weighted (word) automata to weighted *tree* automata. We describe the definition of forward partial execution in categorical terms, too, so that it transfers to weighted tree automata. We also have a preliminary implementation.
- We now have more extensive discussions of related work, including [9, 10, 11] of which we were not aware before.
- We conducted experiments again with a faster machine, enlarging the size of problem instances that can be handled.
- We have some examples that were absent in the previous version [1].
- Concrete description of the procedure (forward/backward) partial execution is included.
- Some proofs were omitted in [1] for space reasons; they are present here.

1.5. Organization of the paper

In Section 2 that is devoted to preliminaries, we define semiring-weighted automata, characterize them in coalgebraic terms and recap the coalgebraic theory in [5]. These are combined to yield the notion of simulation matrix in Section 3. In Section 4 partial execution transformations of automata are described and proved correct. The framework

obtained so far is applied to the plus-times and max-plus semirings, in Section 5 and Section 6, respectively. There our proof-of-concept implementations [12] and relationship to other known simulation notions are discussed, too. In Section 7 we generalize the framework so far from words to trees: the generalization is straightforward—thanks to the coalgebraic backend—although linearity of constraints, as well as backward partial execution, is lost. In Section 8 (and in earlier sections) we discuss related work; in Section 9 we conclude.

2. Preliminaries

We review the generic theory of traces and simulations in [6, 5] that is based on (T, F) -systems, which will eventually lead to the notion of simulation matrix in Section 3.

2.1. Semiring-Weighted Automata

The notion of semiring-weighted automaton is parametrized by a semiring \mathcal{S} . For our purpose of applying coalgebraic theory in [5, 6], we impose the following properties. The notion seems to be new, though hardly original. Indeed, a similar notion called *complete ordered semiring* is introduced and used in [13, Chapter 1]. It is different from ours in that only countable additions are allowed in our definition while arbitrary additions are allowed in the notion in [13, Chapter 1].

Definition 2.1 A *commutative cppo-semiring* is a tuple $\mathcal{S} = (S, +_{\mathcal{S}}, 0_{\mathcal{S}}, \times_{\mathcal{S}}, 1_{\mathcal{S}}, \sqsubseteq)$ that satisfies the following conditions.

- $(S, +_{\mathcal{S}}, 0_{\mathcal{S}}, \times_{\mathcal{S}}, 1_{\mathcal{S}})$ is a semiring in which $\times_{\mathcal{S}}$, in addition to $+_{\mathcal{S}}$, is commutative.
- A relation \sqsubseteq is a partial order on S and (S, \sqsubseteq) is ω -complete, i.e. an increasing chain $s_0 \sqsubseteq s_1 \sqsubseteq \dots$ has a supremum.
- Any element $s \in S$ is *positive* in the sense that $0_{\mathcal{S}} \sqsubseteq s$.
- Addition $+_{\mathcal{S}}$ and multiplication $\times_{\mathcal{S}}$ are monotone with respect to \sqsubseteq .

It follows from positivity and ω -completeness that countable sum can be straightforwardly defined in a commutative cppo-semiring \mathcal{S} . We will use this fact throughout the paper.

Example 2.2 (semirings $\mathcal{S}_{+, \times}, \mathcal{S}_{\max, +}, \mathcal{B}$) The *plus-times semiring* $\mathcal{S}_{+, \times} = ([0, \infty], +, 0, \times, 1, \leq)$ is a commutative cppo-semiring, where $+$ and \times are usual addition and multiplication of real numbers. This is the semiring that we will use for modeling probabilistic branching. Specifically, probabilities of successive transitions are accumulated using \times , and those of different branches are combined with $+$.

The *max-plus semiring* $\mathcal{S}_{\max, +} = ([-\infty, \infty], \max, -\infty, +, 0, \leq)$ —also sometimes called the *tropical semiring* [14]—is also a commutative cppo-semiring. Here a number $r \in [-\infty, \infty]$ can be understood as (best-case) *profit*: they are summed up along a path, and an optimal one (\max) is chosen among different branches. Another possible understanding of r is as (worst-case) *cost*. The unit for the semiring addition \max is given by $-\infty$; since it must also be a zero element of the semiring multiplication $+$, we define

$(-\infty) + \infty = -\infty$. In the two examples $\mathcal{S}_{+, \times}$ and $\mathcal{S}_{\max, +}$ we added ∞ so that they become ω -complete.

Finally, the *Boolean semiring* $\mathcal{B} = (\{0, 1\}, \vee, 0, \wedge, 1, \leq)$ is an example that is qualitative rather than quantitative.

Definition 2.3 (\mathcal{S} -weighted automaton, weighted language) Let $\mathcal{S} = (S, +_{\mathcal{S}}, 0_{\mathcal{S}}, \times_{\mathcal{S}}, 1_{\mathcal{S}}, \sqsubseteq)$ be a commutative cppo-semiring. An \mathcal{S} -weighted automaton $\mathcal{A} = (Q, \Sigma, M, \alpha, \beta)$ consists of a countable state space Q , a countable alphabet Σ , transition matrices $M(a) \in S^{Q \times Q}$ for all $a \in \Sigma$, the initial row vector $\alpha \in S^Q$ and the final column vector $\beta \in S^Q$.

Let $x, y \in Q$ and $a \in \Sigma$. We write α_x and β_x for the x -th entry of α and β , respectively, and $M(a)_{x,y}$ for the (x, y) -entry of the matrix $M(a)$. Note that these entries are all elements of the semiring \mathcal{S} .

An \mathcal{S} -weighted automaton $\mathcal{A} = (Q, \Sigma, M, \alpha, \beta)$ yields a *weighted language* $L(\mathcal{A}): \Sigma^* \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$. It is given by the following multiplication of matrices and vectors.

$$L(\mathcal{A})(w) := \alpha \cdot M(a_1) \cdot \cdots \cdot M(a_k) \cdot \beta \quad \text{for each } w = a_1 \cdots a_k \in \Sigma^*. \quad (1)$$

Remark 2.4 (size of state space Q) In the above definition, differently from the usual definitions of weighted automata (e.g. [15]), we allow Q to be infinite. This is because in Theorem 2.11, such an infinite-state automaton arises as a final coalgebra that captures the trace semantics of weighted automata.

However, at the same time, we require Q to be at most countable. This is so that matrix multiplications in (1) are well-defined. In fact, it is possible to remove this restriction by instead requiring the support of each transition to be countable. We note that in this case, some definitions in the later sections become slightly complicated: for example, a forward or backward simulation matrix X in Definition 3.4 will be required to have only a countable number of non-zero elements in each its row. Therefore, mostly for simplicity of presentation, we stick to state spaces Q that are at most countable.

Our interest is in establishing language inclusion between two weighted automata.

Definition 2.5 (language inclusion) We write $L(\mathcal{A}) \sqsubseteq L(\mathcal{B})$ if, for each $w \in \Sigma^*$, $L(\mathcal{A})(w) \sqsubseteq L(\mathcal{B})(w)$. The last \sqsubseteq is the order of \mathcal{S} .

2.2. Coalgebraic Modeling of Semiring-Weighted Automata

Here we characterize semiring-weighted automata as instances of a generic coalgebraic model of branching systems—so-called (T, F) -systems with parameters T, F [6, 5].

Definition 2.6 ((T, F) -system) Let T be a monad and F be a functor, both on the category **Sets** of sets and functions. A (T, F) -system is a triple

$$\mathcal{X} = (X, s: \{\bullet\} \rightarrow TX, c: X \rightarrow TFX)$$

of a set X (the *state space*), and functions s (the *initial states*) and c (the *dynamics*).

This modeling is coalgebraic [16] in the sense that c is so-called a TF -coalgebra. More precisely, a (T, F) -system (X, s, c) is a *pointed coalgebra* in a Kleisli category $\mathcal{Kl}(T)$ though what is “pointed” by $s : \{\bullet\} \rightarrow TX$ is not necessarily an element in X but a distribution over X . In the definition we have two parameters T and F . Let us forget about their categorical structures (a *monad* or a *functor*) for a moment and think of them simply as constructions on sets. Intuitively speaking, T specifies what kind of *branching* the systems in question exhibit; and F specifies a type of *linear-time behaviors*. Here are some examples; in the example $F = 1 + \Sigma \times (_)$ the only element of 1 is denoted by \checkmark (i.e. $1 = \{\checkmark\}$).

T	“branching”	F	“linear-time behavior”
\mathcal{P}	nondeterministic	$1 + \Sigma \times (_)$	$\rightarrow \checkmark$ or \xrightarrow{a} (where $a \in \Sigma$)
\mathcal{D}	probabilistic	$(\Sigma + (_))^*$	words over terminals ($a \in \Sigma$)
$\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{S}}$	\mathcal{S} -weighted		& nonterminals, suited for CFG [17]

The above examples of a monad T —the *powerset monad* \mathcal{P} , the *subdistribution monad* \mathcal{D} , and the \mathcal{S} -*multiset monad* $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{S}}$ for \mathcal{S} —are described as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}X &= \{X' \mid X' \subseteq X\} & \mathcal{D}X &= \{f : X \rightarrow [0, 1] \mid \sum_{x \in X} f(x) \leq 1\} \\ \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{S}}X &= \{f : X \rightarrow \mathcal{S} \mid \text{supp}(f) \text{ is countable}\} \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

Here $\text{supp}(f) = \{x \in X \mid f(x) \neq 0_{\mathcal{S}}\}$. Countable support in $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{S}}$ is a technical requirement so that the multiplication of $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{S}}$ is well-defined and therefore we can define composition \odot of Kleisli arrows (Definition 2.9).

Remark 2.7 In Definition 2.1, we required the semiring \mathcal{S} to be ω -complete. In fact, it is possible to strengthen this restriction by requiring κ -completeness where κ is an arbitrary ordinal, or even directed completeness (that essentially amounts to κ -completeness for any κ ; see e.g. [18, §2.2.4]). This allows us to define $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{S}}$ so that $f \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{S}}X$ (and transitions of weighted automata) can have an uncountable support. However, weighted automata have many applications even if we require their transitions to have countable supports. Hence in many cases it suffices to assume ω -completeness; we shall do so also for the sake of simplicity of presentation.

It should not be hard to see that a (T, F) -system models a state-based system with T -branching and F -linear-time behaviors. For example, when $T = \mathcal{P}$ and $F = 1 + \Sigma \times (_)$, $s : \{\bullet\} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}X$ represents the set of initial states and $c : X \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(1 + \Sigma \times X)$ represents one-step transitions—that $\checkmark \in c(x)$ means x is accepting ($x \rightarrow \checkmark$), and $(a, x') \in c(x)$ means there is a transition $x \xrightarrow{a} x'$. Overall, a $(\mathcal{P}, 1 + \Sigma \times (_))$ -system is nothing but a nondeterministic automaton.

Analogously we obtain the following, by the definition of $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{S}}$ in (2).

Proposition 2.8 (weighted automata as (T, F) -systems) *Let \mathcal{S} be a commutative cppo-semiring. There is a bijective correspondence between: 1) \mathcal{S} -weighted automata (Definition 2.3); and 2) $(\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{S}}, 1 + \Sigma \times (_))$ -systems whose state spaces are at most countably infinite.*

Concretely, an \mathcal{S} -weighted automaton $\mathcal{A} = (Q, \Sigma, M, \alpha, \beta)$ gives rise to an $(\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{S}}, 1 + \Sigma \times (_))$ -system $\mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{A}} = (Q, s_{\mathcal{A}}, c_{\mathcal{A}})$ defined as follows. $s_{\mathcal{A}} : \{\bullet\} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{S}}Q$ is given by

$s_{\mathcal{A}}(\bullet)(x) = \alpha_x$; and $c_{\mathcal{A}}: Q \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{S}}(1 + \Sigma \times Q)$ is given by $c_{\mathcal{A}}(x)(\checkmark) = \beta_x$ and $c_{\mathcal{A}}(x)(a, y) = M(a)_{x,y}$. \square

2.3. Coalgebraic Theory of Traces and Simulations

We review the theory of traces and simulations in [6, 5] that is based on (T, F) -systems. In presentation we restrict to $T = \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{S}}$ and $F = 1 + \Sigma \times (_)$ for simplicity.

2.3.1. Kleisli Arrows

One notable success of coalgebra was a uniform characterization, in terms of the same categorical diagram, of *bisimulations* for various kinds of systems (nondeterministic, probabilistic, etc.) [16]. This works quite well for branching-time process semantics. For linear-time semantics—i.e. trace semantics—it is noticed in [19] that so-called a *Kleisli category*, in place of the category **Sets**, gives a suitable base category for coalgebraic treatment. This idea—replacing functions $X \rightarrow Y$ with *Kleisli arrows* $X \multimap Y$ and drawing the same diagrams—led to the development in [6, 5, 7] of an extensive theory of traces and simulations. The notion of Kleisli arrow is parametrized by a monad T : a T -Kleisli arrow $X \multimap_T Y$ (or simply $X \multimap Y$) is defined to be a function $X \rightarrow TY$, hence represents a “ T -branching function from X to Y .”

We restrict to $T = \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{S}}$ for simplicity of presentation. An $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{S}}$ -Kleisli arrow $f: X \multimap Y$ below is “an \mathcal{S} -weighted function from X to Y .” In particular, for each $x \in X$ and $y \in Y$ it assigns a *weight* $f(x)(y) \in \mathcal{S}$.

Definition 2.9 (Kleisli arrow) Let X, Y be sets. An $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{S}}$ -Kleisli arrow (or simply a *Kleisli arrow*) from X to Y , denoted by $X \multimap Y$, is a function from X to $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{S}}Y$.

We list some special Kleisli arrows: η_X , $g \odot f$ and Jf .

- For each set X , the *unit arrow* $\eta_X: X \multimap X$ is given by: $\eta(x)(x) = 1_{\mathcal{S}}$; and $\eta(x)(x') = 0_{\mathcal{S}}$ for $x' \neq x$. Here $0_{\mathcal{S}}$ and $1_{\mathcal{S}}$ are units in the semiring \mathcal{S} .
- For consecutive Kleisli arrows $f: X \multimap Y$ and $g: Y \multimap Z$, their *composition* $g \odot f: X \multimap Z$ is given as follows:

$$(g \odot f)(x)(z) := \sum_{y \in \text{supp}(f(x))} f(x)(y) \times_{\mathcal{S}} g(y)(z) .$$

Since $\text{supp}(f(x))$ is countable, the above sum in a cppo-semiring \mathcal{S} is well-defined.

- For a (usual) function $f: X \rightarrow Y$, its *lifting* to a Kleisli arrow $Jf: X \multimap Y$ is given by $Jf = \eta_Y \circ f$. Here we identified $\eta_Y: Y \multimap Y$ with a function $\eta_Y: Y \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{S}}Y$.

Categorically speaking: the first two (η and \odot) organize Kleisli arrows as a category (the *Kleisli category* $\mathcal{Kl}(\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{S}})$); and the third gives a functor $J: \mathbf{Sets} \rightarrow \mathcal{Kl}(\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{S}})$ that is identity on objects.

In Proposition 2.8 we characterized an \mathcal{S} -weighted automaton \mathcal{A} in coalgebraic terms. Using Kleisli arrows it is presented as a triple

$$\mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{A}} = (Q, s_{\mathcal{A}}: \{\bullet\} \multimap Q, c_{\mathcal{A}}: Q \multimap 1 + \Sigma \times Q) . \quad (3)$$

2.3.2. Generic Trace Semantics

In [6], for monads T with a suitable order, a final coalgebra in $\mathcal{Kl}(T)$ is identified. It (somehow interestingly) coincides with an initial algebra in **Sets**. Moreover, the universality of this final coalgebra is shown to capture natural notions of (finite) *trace semantics* for a variety of branching systems—i.e. for different T and F . What is important for the current work is the fact that the weighted language $L(\mathcal{A})$ in (1) is an instance of this generic trace semantics, as we will show in Theorem 2.13.

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 1 + \Sigma \times X & \xrightarrow{1 + \Sigma \times (\text{tr}(c))} & 1 + \Sigma \times \Sigma^* \\
 \uparrow c & = & \text{final} \uparrow J([\text{nil}, \text{cons}]^{-1}) \\
 X & \xrightarrow{\text{tr}(c)} & \Sigma^* \\
 \uparrow s & & \uparrow \text{tr}(\mathcal{X}) \\
 \{\bullet\} & &
 \end{array} \tag{4}$$

We shall state the results in [6] on coalgebraic traces, restricting again to $T = \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{S}}$ and $F = 1 + \Sigma \times (_)$ for simplicity. In the diagram (4) above, composition of Kleisli arrows are given by \odot in Definition 2.9; J on the right is the lifting in Definition 2.9; and nil and cons are the obvious constructors of words in Σ^* . The top arrow $1 + \Sigma \times (\text{tr}(c))$ is the functor $1 + \Sigma \times (_)$ on **Sets**, lifted to the Kleisli category $\mathcal{Kl}(\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{S}})$, and applied to the Kleisli arrow $\text{tr}(c)$; its concrete description is as follows. See [6] for more details.

Definition 2.10 For a Kleisli arrow $f: X \rightarrow Y$, its lifting $1 + \Sigma \times f: 1 + \Sigma \times X \rightarrow 1 + \Sigma \times Y$ is defined as follows:

$$(1 + \Sigma \times f)(*)(t) = \begin{cases} 1_{\mathcal{S}} & (t = *) \\ 0_{\mathcal{S}} & (\text{otherwise}) \end{cases} \quad (1 + \Sigma \times f)(a, x)(t) = \begin{cases} f(x)(y) & (t = (a, y)) \\ 0_{\mathcal{S}} & (\text{otherwise}) \end{cases}$$

Theorem 2.11 (final coalgebra in $\mathcal{Kl}(\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{S}})$) *Given any set X and any Kleisli arrow $c: X \rightarrow 1 + \Sigma \times X$, there exists a unique Kleisli arrow $\text{tr}(c)$ that makes the top square in the diagram (4) commute.* \square

Definition 2.12 ($\text{tr}(\mathcal{X})$) Given an $(\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{S}}, 1 + \Sigma \times (_))$ -system $\mathcal{X} = (X, s, c)$ (this is on the left in the diagram (4)), its component c induces an arrow $\text{tr}(c): X \rightarrow \Sigma^*$ by Theorem 2.11. We define $\text{tr}(\mathcal{X})$ to be the composite $\text{tr}(c) \odot s$ (the bottom triangle in the diagram (4)), and call it the *trace semantics* of \mathcal{X} .

Theorem 2.13 (weighted language as trace semantics) *Let \mathcal{A} be an \mathcal{S} -weighted automaton. For $\mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{A}} = (Q, s_{\mathcal{A}}, c_{\mathcal{A}})$ induced by \mathcal{A} in (3), its trace semantics $\text{tr}(\mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{A}}): \{\bullet\} \rightarrow \Sigma^*$ —identified with a function $\{\bullet\} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{S}}\Sigma^*$, hence with a function $\Sigma^* \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$ —coincides with the weighted language $L(\mathcal{A}): \Sigma^* \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$ in (1).* \square

In the last theorem we need that Σ^* is countable; this is why we assumed that Σ is countable in Definition 2.3. Henceforth we do not distinguish $L(\mathcal{A})$ and $\text{tr}(\mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{A}}): \{\bullet\} \rightarrow \Sigma^*$.

2.3.3. Forward and Backward Kleisli simulations

In [5], the classic results in [4] on forward and backward simulations—for (nondeterministic) labeled transition systems—are generalized to (T, F) -systems. Specifically, forward and backward simulations are characterized as *lax/oplax coalgebra homomorphisms* in a Kleisli category; and *soundness*—their existence witnesses trace inclusion—is proved once for all in a general categorical setting.

As before, we present those notions and results in [5] restricting to $T = \mathcal{M}_S$ and $F = 1 + \Sigma \times (-)$. If $T = \mathcal{P}$ and $F = 1 + \Sigma \times (-)$ they instantiate to the results in [4].

Definition 2.14 (Kleisli simulation) Let $\mathcal{X} = (X, s, c)$ and $\mathcal{Y} = (Y, t, d)$ be $(\mathcal{M}_S, 1 + \Sigma \times (-))$ -systems (cf. Definition 2.6, Proposition 2.8 and (3)).

1. A *forward (Kleisli) simulation* from \mathcal{X} to \mathcal{Y} is a Kleisli arrow $f : Y \rightarrow X$ such that $s \sqsubseteq f \odot t$ and $c \odot f \sqsubseteq (1 + \Sigma \times f) \odot d$. See Figure 1.
2. A *backward simulation* from \mathcal{X} to \mathcal{Y} is a Kleisli arrow $b : X \rightarrow Y$ such that $s \odot b \sqsubseteq t$ and $(1 + \Sigma \times b) \odot c \sqsubseteq d \odot b$.
3. A *forward-backward simulation* from \mathcal{X} to \mathcal{Y} consists of: a (T, F) -system \mathcal{Z} ; a forward simulation f from \mathcal{X} to \mathcal{Z} ; and a backward simulation b from \mathcal{Z} to \mathcal{Y} .
4. A *backward-forward simulation* from \mathcal{X} to \mathcal{Y} consists of: a (T, F) -system \mathcal{Z} ; a backward simulation b from \mathcal{X} to \mathcal{Z} ; and a forward simulation f from \mathcal{Z} to \mathcal{Y} .




Figure 1: Kleisli simulations (here $F = 1 + \Sigma \times (-)$)

We write $\mathcal{X} \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{F}} \mathcal{Y}$, $\mathcal{X} \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{B}} \mathcal{Y}$, $\mathcal{X} \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{FB}} \mathcal{Y}$ or $\mathcal{X} \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{BF}} \mathcal{Y}$ if there exists a forward, backward, forward-backward, or backward-forward simulation, respectively.

(Generic) soundness is proved using the maximality of $\text{tr}(c)$ in (4) among (op)lax coalgebra homomorphisms, arguing in the language of enriched category theory [5].

Theorem 2.15 (soundness) *Let \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} be $(\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{S}}, 1 + \Sigma \times (_))$ -systems. Each of the following yields $\text{tr}(\mathcal{X}) \sqsubseteq \text{tr}(\mathcal{Y}) : \{\bullet\} \rightarrow \Sigma^*$ (cf. Definition 2.12).*

1. $\mathcal{X} \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{F}} \mathcal{Y}$
2. $\mathcal{X} \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{B}} \mathcal{Y}$
3. $\mathcal{X} \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{FB}} \mathcal{Y}$
4. $\mathcal{X} \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{BF}} \mathcal{Y}$ □

Theorem 2.16 (completeness) *The converse of soundness holds for backward-forward simulations. That is: $\text{tr}(\mathcal{X}) \sqsubseteq \text{tr}(\mathcal{Y})$ implies $\mathcal{X} \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{BF}} \mathcal{Y}$.* □

3. Simulation Matrices for Semiring-Weighted Automata

In this section we fix parameters $T = \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{S}}$ and $F = 1 + \Sigma \times (_)$ in the generic theory in Section 2.3 and rephrase the coalgebraic framework in terms of matrices (whose entries are taken from \mathcal{S}). Specifically: Kleisli arrows become matrices; and Kleisli simulations become matrices subject to certain linear inequalities. Such matrix representations ease implementation, a feature we will exploit in later sections.

Recall that a Kleisli arrow $A \rightarrow B$ is a function $A \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{S}}B$ (Definition 2.9).

Definition 3.1 (matrix representation M_f) Given a Kleisli arrow $f : A \rightarrow B$, its matrix representation $M_f \in \mathcal{S}^{A \times B}$ is given by $(M_f)_{x,y} = f(x)(y)$.

In what follows we shall use the notations f and M_f interchangeably.

Lemma 3.2 *Let $f, f' : A \rightarrow B$ and $g : B \rightarrow C$ be Kleisli arrows.*

1. $f \sqsubseteq f'$ if and only if $M_f \sqsubseteq M_{f'}$. Here the former \sqsubseteq is between $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{S}}$ -Kleisli arrows, and the latter order \sqsubseteq is between matrices, both defined entrywise: namely, $f \sqsubseteq f' \stackrel{\text{def.}}{\iff} \forall x \in A. \forall y \in B. f(x)(y) \sqsubseteq f'(x)(y)$, and $M \sqsubseteq M' \stackrel{\text{def.}}{\iff} \forall x \in A. \forall y \in B. M_{x,y} \sqsubseteq M'_{x,y}$.
2. $M_{g \circ f} = M_f M_g$, computed by matrix multiplication. □

The correspondence from $A \xrightarrow{f} B$ to $1 + \Sigma \times A \xrightarrow{1 + \Sigma \times f} 1 + \Sigma \times B$ —used in (4) and in Figure 1—can be described using matrices, too.

Lemma 3.3 *Let $f : A \rightarrow B$ be a Kleisli arrow and M_f be its matrix representation. Then the matrix representation $M_{1 + \Sigma \times f}$ is given by*

$$I_1 \oplus (I_{\Sigma} \otimes M_f) \in \mathcal{S}^{(1 + \Sigma \times A) \times (1 + \Sigma \times B)},$$

where \oplus and \otimes denote coproduct and the Kronecker product of matrices:

$$X \oplus Y = \begin{pmatrix} \boxed{X} & O \\ O & \boxed{Y} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \begin{pmatrix} \vdots & & \\ \cdots & x_{i,j} & \cdots \\ \vdots & & \end{pmatrix} \otimes \boxed{Y} = \begin{pmatrix} \vdots & & \\ \cdots & \boxed{x_{i,j}Y} & \cdots \\ \vdots & & \end{pmatrix}. \quad \square$$

This description of M_{Ff} generalizes from $F = 1 + \Sigma \times (_)$ to any polynomial functor F , inductively on the construction of F . In this paper the generality is not needed.

Using Lemma 3.2–3.3, we can present Kleisli simulations (Definition 2.14) as matrices. Recall that a state space of a weighted automaton is assumed to be countable (Definition 2.3); hence all the matrix multiplications in the definition below make sense.

Definition 3.4 (forward/backward simulation matrix) Let $\mathcal{A} = (Q_{\mathcal{A}}, \Sigma, M_{\mathcal{A}}, \alpha_{\mathcal{A}}, \beta_{\mathcal{A}})$ and $\mathcal{B} = (Q_{\mathcal{B}}, \Sigma, M_{\mathcal{B}}, \alpha_{\mathcal{B}}, \beta_{\mathcal{B}})$ be \mathcal{S} -weighted automata.

- A matrix $X \in S^{Q_{\mathcal{B}} \times Q_{\mathcal{A}}}$ is a *forward simulation matrix* from \mathcal{A} to \mathcal{B} if

$$\alpha_{\mathcal{A}} \sqsubseteq \alpha_{\mathcal{B}} X \quad , \quad X \cdot M_{\mathcal{A}}(a) \sqsubseteq M_{\mathcal{B}}(a) \cdot X \quad (\forall a \in \Sigma) \quad , \quad \text{and} \quad X \beta_{\mathcal{A}} \sqsubseteq \beta_{\mathcal{B}} \quad . \quad (5)$$

- A matrix $X \in S^{Q_{\mathcal{A}} \times Q_{\mathcal{B}}}$ is a *backward simulation matrix* from \mathcal{A} to \mathcal{B} if

$$\alpha_{\mathcal{A}} X \sqsubseteq \alpha_{\mathcal{B}} \quad , \quad M_{\mathcal{A}}(a) \cdot X \sqsubseteq X \cdot M_{\mathcal{B}}(a) \quad (\forall a \in \Sigma) \quad , \quad \text{and} \quad \beta_{\mathcal{A}} \sqsubseteq X \beta_{\mathcal{B}} \quad . \quad (6)$$

The requirements on X are obtained by first translating Figure 1 into matrices, and then breaking them up into smaller matrices using Lemma 3.3. It is notable that the requirements are given in the form of *linear inequalities*, a format often used in constraint solvers. Solving them is a topic of extensive research efforts that include [20, 21]. This fact becomes an advantage in implementing search algorithms, as we see later.

We also note that *forward* and *backward* simulation matrices have different dimensions. This difference comes from the different directions of arrows in Figure 1.

Remark 3.5 The *opposite* of an \mathcal{S} -weighted automaton $\mathcal{A} = (Q, \Sigma, M, \alpha, \beta)$ —obtained by reversing transitions and swapping initial/final states—can be naturally defined by matrix transpose, that is, ${}^t\mathcal{A} := (Q, \Sigma, {}^tM, {}^t\beta, {}^t\alpha)$. It is easy to see that: if X is a forward simulation matrix from \mathcal{A} to \mathcal{B} , then tX is a backward simulation matrix from ${}^t\mathcal{A}$ to ${}^t\mathcal{B}$.

This characterization of backward simulation matrices—by matrix transposes—does not seem to generalize easily, however, to weighted *tree* automata (that are discussed in Section 7). The reason is simply that: a word reversed is another word; but a tree, with its parent-child relationship reversed, is not a tree any more.

Recently a (co)algebraic reincarnation of *Brzozowski’s minimization algorithm* [22] is presented in [23]. The algorithm essentially relies on reversing word automata; its relationship to the current work is yet to be seen.

Theorem 3.6 *Let \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} be \mathcal{S} -weighted automata. There is a bijective correspondence between: 1) forward simulation matrices from \mathcal{A} to \mathcal{B} ; and 2) forward Kleisli simulations from $\mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{A}}$ to $\mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{B}}$. The same holds for the backward variants.* \square

In what follows we write $\sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{F}}, \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{B}}$ also between \mathcal{S} -weighted automata. Theorem 3.6 yields: $\mathcal{A} \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{F}} \mathcal{B}$ if and only if there is a forward simulation matrix.

Here is our core result; the rest of the paper is devoted to its application.

Corollary 3.7 (soundness of simulation matrices) *Let \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} be \mathcal{S} -weighted automata. Existence of a forward (or backward) simulation matrix from \mathcal{A} to \mathcal{B} —i.e. $\mathcal{A} \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{F}} \mathcal{B}$ or $\mathcal{A} \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{B}} \mathcal{B}$ —witnesses language inclusion $L(\mathcal{A}) \sqsubseteq L(\mathcal{B})$.*

PROOF. \exists (fwd./bwd. simulation matrix from \mathcal{A} to \mathcal{B})

$$\xLeftrightarrow{\text{Thm. 3.6}} \exists \text{ (fwd./bwd. Kleisli simulation from } \mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{A}} \text{ to } \mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{B}})$$

$$\xRightarrow{\text{Thm. 2.15}} \text{tr}(\mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{A}}) \sqsubseteq \text{tr}(\mathcal{X}_{\mathcal{B}}) \xLeftrightarrow{\text{Thm. 2.13}} L(\mathcal{A}) \sqsubseteq L(\mathcal{B}) \quad . \quad \square$$

It is classic to represent nondeterministic automata by Boolean matrices. This corresponds to the special case $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{B}$ (the Boolean semiring) of the current framework; and a simulation matrix becomes the same thing as a (relational) simulation in [4].

4. Forward and Backward Partial Execution

In this section we introduce for semiring-weighted automata their transformations—called *forward* and *backward partial execution*—that increase the number of forward or backward simulation matrices. We also prove some correctness results.


4.1. Incompleteness of Matrix Simulations

We have four different notions of simulation (Definition 2.14): forward, backward, forward-backward, and backward-forward. Our view on these is as (possibly finitary) witnesses of language inclusion.

The combined ones (forward-backward and backward-forward) subsume the one-direction ones (forward and backward)—simply take the identity arrow as one of the two simulations required. Moreover, backward-forward is complete (Theorem 2.16). Despite these theoretical advantages, the combined simulations are generally harder to find: in addition to two simulations, we have to find an intermediate system too (\mathcal{Z} in Definition 2.14). Furthermore, since language inclusion for finite $\mathcal{S}_{+,\times}$ -weighted automata—models of probabilistic systems—is known to be undecidable [24], existence of a backward-forward simulation is undecidable too.

Therefore in what follows we focus on the one-directional (i.e. forward or backward) simulations as proof methods for language inclusion. They have convenient matrix presentations, too, as we saw in Section 3. However, it is easy to see that the classic one-directional simulations—introduced in [4] for *nondeterministic* automata—are not necessarily complete. This incompleteness is carried over to the current quantitative setting. We can see it from the following counterexample.

Example 4.1 ($\sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{F}}$ and $\sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{B}}$ are not complete) The following $\mathcal{S}_{+,\times}$ -weighted automata exhibit $L(\mathcal{A}) \sqsubseteq L(\mathcal{B})$ (in fact $L(\mathcal{A}) = L(\mathcal{B})$).



Indeed, for each word $w \in \Sigma^*$, we have

$$L(\mathcal{A})(w) = L(\mathcal{B})(w) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{4} \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^n & (w = aaa^{2n} \text{ or } baa^{2n}) \\ 0 & (\text{otherwise}) \end{cases}.$$

However there is no forward or backward simulation from \mathcal{A} to \mathcal{B} : one can show by direct calculation that there is no X that satisfies the requirements in Definition 3.4. Hence this pair is a counterexample for the completeness of $\sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{F}}$ and that of $\sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{B}}$.

It turns out that a simulation in the sense of Jonsson and Larsen [25] does exist from \mathcal{A} to \mathcal{B} . See also Section 5.1 later, where we systematically compare our current notions of simulation with existing ones.

The incompleteness of forward and backward simulations can be also deduced from complexity arguments. See Section 5.1.

4.2. Forward and Backward Partial Execution for Semiring-weighted Automata

We shall define transformations, called FPE and BPE, that increase matrix simulations for semiring-weighted automata. We prove some of its properties, too.

Definition 4.2 (FPE, BPE) *Forward partial execution (FPE)* is a transformation of a weighted automaton that “replaces some states with their one-step behaviors.” Concretely, given an \mathcal{S} -weighted automaton $\mathcal{A} = (Q, \Sigma, M, \alpha, \beta)$ and a parameter $P \subseteq Q$, the resulting automaton $\mathcal{A}_{\text{FPE}, P} = (Q', \Sigma, M', \alpha', \beta')$ has a state space

$$Q' = \{\checkmark \mid \exists x \in P. \beta_x \neq 0_{\mathcal{S}}\} + \{(a, y) \mid \exists x \in P. M(a)_{x,y} \neq 0_{\mathcal{S}}\} + (Q \setminus P), \quad (7)$$

replacing each $p \in P$ with its one-step behaviors (\checkmark or (a, q)) as new states. The other data M', α', β' are defined as follows. For the transition matrices M' :

$$\begin{aligned} M'(a)_{(a,x),\checkmark} &= \beta_x & M'(a)_{(a,x),(a',y)} &= M(a')_{x,y} & M'(a)_{(a,x),x} &= 1_{\mathcal{S}} \\ M'(a)_{x,\checkmark} &= (M(a)\beta)_x & M'(a)_{x,(a',y)} &= (M(a)M(a'))_{x,y} & M'(a)_{x,y} &= M(a)_{x,y} \end{aligned}$$

where $a, a' \in \Sigma, x, y \in Q$. For all the other cases we define $M'(a)_{u,v} = 0_{\mathcal{S}}$, where $u, v \in Q'$. For the initial and final vectors α' and β' , the definition is shown below.

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha'_{\checkmark} &= \alpha\beta & \alpha'_{(a,x)} &= (\alpha M(a))_x & \alpha'_x &= \alpha_x \\ \beta'_{\checkmark} &= 1_{\mathcal{S}} & \beta'_{(a,x)} &= 0_{\mathcal{S}} & \beta'_x &= \beta_x \end{aligned}$$

Backward partial execution (BPE) in contrast “replaces states in a parameter $P \subseteq Q$ with their backward one-step behaviors.” For the same \mathcal{A} as above, the resulting automaton $\mathcal{A}_{\text{BPE}, P} = (Q', \Sigma, M', \alpha', \beta')$ has a state space

$$Q' = \{\bullet \mid \exists x \in P. \alpha_x \neq 0_{\mathcal{S}}\} + \{(a, y) \mid \exists x \in P. M(a)_{y,x} \neq 0_{\mathcal{S}}\} + (Q \setminus P), \quad (8)$$


replacing each $p \in P$ with its backward one-step behaviors— (a, q) with $q \xrightarrow{a} p$, and \bullet if p is initial—as new states. The other data M', α', β' are defined as follows. For the transition matrices M' :

$$\begin{aligned} M'(a)_{\bullet,(a,y)} &= \alpha_y & M'(a)_{(a',x),(a,y)} &= M(a')_{x,y} & M'(a)_{x,(a,x)} &= 1_{\mathcal{S}} \\ M'(a)_{\bullet,y} &= (\alpha M(a))_y & M'(a)_{(a',x),y} &= (M(a')M(a))_{x,y} & M'(a)_{x,y} &= M(a)_{x,y} \end{aligned}$$

where $a, a' \in \Sigma, x, y \in Q$. For all the other cases we define $M'(a)_{u,v} = 0_{\mathcal{S}}$, where $u, v \in Q'$. For the initial and final vectors α' and β' , the definition is shown below.

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha'_{\bullet} &= 1_{\mathcal{S}} & \alpha'_{(a,x)} &= 0_{\mathcal{S}} & \alpha'_x &= \alpha_x \\ \beta'_{\bullet} &= \alpha\beta & \beta'_{(a,x)} &= (M(a)\beta)_x & \beta'_x &= \beta_x \end{aligned}$$

Pictorially, the actions of FPE and BPE can be illustrated as in Figure 2. Roughly speaking, FPE replaces a *concrete* state $p \in P$ with an *abstract* state, such as (a, q) in Q' of (7) that is thought of as a description “a state that makes an a -transition to q .” The idea comes from *partial evaluation* of a program; hence the name.

Figure 2: Fwd./bwd. partial execution (FPE, BPE), pictorially. Black nodes need to be in P

4.3. Correctness of FPE and BPE

The use of FPE/BPE is as follows: we aim to establish $L(\mathcal{A}) \sqsubseteq L(\mathcal{B})$; depending on whether we search for a forward or backward simulation matrix, we apply one of FPE and BPE to each of \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} , according to the table (9) below.

goal: $L(\mathcal{A}) \sqsubseteq L(\mathcal{B})$	\mathcal{A}	\mathcal{B}	
by $\sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{F}}$	FPE	BPE	(9)
by $\sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{B}}$	BPE	FPE	

We shall now state correctness properties of this strategy. *Soundness* means that discovery of a simulation after transformation indeed witnesses the language inclusion for the *original* automata. The second property—we call it *adequacy*—states that simulations that are already there are preserved by partial execution.

Theorem 4.3 (soundness of FPE/BPE) *Let P and P' be arbitrary subsets of the state spaces of \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} , respectively. Each of the following implies $L(\mathcal{A}) \sqsubseteq L(\mathcal{B})$.*

1. $\mathcal{A}_{\text{FPE},P} \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{F}} \mathcal{B}_{\text{BPE},P'}$
2. $\mathcal{A}_{\text{BPE},P} \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{B}} \mathcal{B}_{\text{FPE},P'}$ □

Theorem 4.4 (adequacy of FPE/BPE) *Let P and P' be arbitrary subsets of the state spaces of \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} , respectively. We have:*

1. $\mathcal{A} \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{F}} \mathcal{B} \Rightarrow \mathcal{A}_{\text{FPE},P} \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{F}} \mathcal{B}_{\text{BPE},P'}$
2. $\mathcal{A} \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{B}} \mathcal{B} \Rightarrow \mathcal{A}_{\text{BPE},P} \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{B}} \mathcal{B}_{\text{FPE},P'}$ □

To prove these two theorems, we should first prove the following lemma.

Lemma 4.5 For each subset P , we have the following.

1. $\mathcal{A} \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{B}} \mathcal{A}_{\text{FPE},P}$
2. $\mathcal{A}_{\text{FPE},P} \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{F}} \mathcal{A}$
3. $\mathcal{A} \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{F}} \mathcal{A}_{\text{BPE},P}$
4. $\mathcal{A}_{\text{BPE},P} \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{B}} \mathcal{A}$

PROOF. 1. Let $\mathcal{A} = (Q, \Sigma, M, \alpha, \beta)$ and $\mathcal{A}_{\text{FPE},P} = (Q', \Sigma, M', \alpha', \beta')$. We define $X \in S^{Q \times Q'}$ as follows:

$$\begin{array}{ll} X_{x,\checkmark} = \beta_x & (x \in P), & X_{x,(y,a)} = M(a)_{x,y} & (x \in P), \\ X_{x,x} = 1_S & (x \notin P), & X_{u,v} = 0_S & (\text{otherwise}) \end{array}$$

Then, this X is a backward simulation matrix from \mathcal{A} to $\mathcal{A}_{\text{FPE},P}$

The items 2., 3. and 4. are proved similarly. \square

PROOF OF THEOREM 4.3. 1. From Proposition 4.5.1, $\mathcal{A} \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{B}} \mathcal{A}_{\text{FPE},P} \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{F}} \mathcal{B}_{\text{BPE},P'} \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{B}} \mathcal{B}$. Hence from Corollary 3.7, $L(\mathcal{A}) \sqsubseteq L(\mathcal{A}_{\text{FPE},P}) \sqsubseteq L(\mathcal{B}_{\text{BPE},P'}) \sqsubseteq L(\mathcal{B})$ holds.

The item 2. is proved similarly. \square

PROOF OF THEOREM 4.4. 1. From Proposition 4.5.2, $\mathcal{A}_{\text{FPE},P} \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{F}} \mathcal{A} \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{F}} \mathcal{B} \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{F}} \mathcal{B}_{\text{BPE},P'}$. Because $\sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{F}}$ is transitive (see the diagram below where $F = 1 + \Sigma \times (_)$), this implies $\mathcal{A}_{\text{FPE},P} \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{F}} \mathcal{B}_{\text{BPE},P'}$.

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} FX & \xleftarrow{Ff'} & FX' & \xleftarrow{Ff} & FY \\ \uparrow c & \sqsubseteq & \uparrow c' & \sqsubseteq & \uparrow d \\ X & \xleftarrow{f'} & X & \xleftarrow{f} & Y \\ \uparrow s & \sqsubseteq & \uparrow s' & \sqsubseteq & \uparrow t \\ \underbrace{\hspace{10em}} & & \{\bullet\} & & \end{array}$$

The item 2. is proved similarly. \square

We also show that a bigger parameter P yields a greater number of simulations. In implementation, however, a bigger P generally gives us a bigger state space which slows down search for a simulation. Hence we are in a trade-off situation.

Proposition 4.6 (monotonicity) Assume $P_1 \subseteq P'_1$ and $P_2 \subseteq P'_2$. We have:


1. $\mathcal{A}_{\text{FPE},P_1} \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{F}} \mathcal{B}_{\text{BPE},P_2} \Rightarrow \mathcal{A}_{\text{FPE},P'_1} \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{F}} \mathcal{B}_{\text{BPE},P'_2}$,
2. $\mathcal{A}_{\text{BPE},P_1} \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{B}} \mathcal{B}_{\text{FPE},P_2} \Rightarrow \mathcal{A}_{\text{BPE},P'_1} \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{B}} \mathcal{B}_{\text{FPE},P'_2}$.

\square

For $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}_{+, \times}$ or $\mathcal{S}_{\max, +}$, we can easily see that the complement problem of language inclusion between finite \mathcal{S} -weighted automata is semi-decidable. Since language inclusion itself is undecidable [24, 26], language inclusion is not even semidecidable. Because existence of a simulation matrix is decidable, it can be the case that however many times we apply FPE or BPE, simulation matrices do not exist while language inclusion holds. A concrete example is found in the following example.

Example 4.7 (limitation of FPE) The following $\mathcal{S}_{+, \times}$ -weighted automata exhibit $L(\mathcal{A}) \sqsubseteq L(\mathcal{B})$, but a forward simulation does not exist no matter how many times FPE is applied

to \mathcal{A} .




Remark 4.8 We have concluded that language inclusion for $\mathcal{S}_{+, \times}$ -weighted automata is not even semi-decidable, from the fact that its complement problem is semi-decidable. The same type of arguments are applicable to general commutative cppo-semirings whose addition, multiplication, and order relation are all computable. See e.g. [27].

It is possible to describe FPE on the coalgebraic level of abstraction. Besides providing an insight into the essence of the construction, it also allows for the application of FPE to quantitative tree automata. In contrast, the definition of BPE seems to rely on the fact that we can “reverse” word automata, and hence is hard to generalize e.g. to tree automata. See Section 7.

5. Simulation Matrices for Probabilistic Systems by $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}_{+, \times}$

In this section we focus on $\mathcal{S}_{+, \times}$ -weighted automata which we identify as (purely) probabilistic automata (cf. Example 2.2). In Section 5.1 our method by simulation matrices is compared with other notions of probabilistic simulation; in Section 5.3 we discuss our implementation.

5.1. Other Simulation Notions for Probabilistic Systems



Various simulation notions have been introduced for probabilistic systems, either as a behavioral order by itself or as a proof method for language inclusion. Jonsson and Larsen’s one [25] (denoted by $\sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{JL}}$) is well-known; it is shown in [7] to be a special case of Hughes and Jacobs’ coalgebraic notion of simulation [28] ($\sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{HJ}}$), which in turn is a special case of forward-backward (Kleisli) simulation ($\sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{FB}}$, Definition 2.14). Comparison of all these notions (observed in [7]) is as depicted above; it follows from Theorem 2.15 that all these simulation notions are sound with respect to language inclusion.


We note that language inclusion between finite $\mathcal{S}_{+, \times}$ -weighted automata is known to be undecidable [24] while language equivalence can be determined in polynomial time [29]. The former undecidability result may account for the fact that there does not seem to be many proof methods for probabilistic/quantitative language inclusion. For example,

probabilistic simulation in [30] is possibilistic simulation between systems with both probabilistic and nondeterministic choice and not a quantitative notion like in the current study.

We also note that given finite-state $\mathcal{S}_{+, \times}$ -weighted automata \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} , if $\mathcal{A} \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{F}} \mathcal{B}$ or not is decidable: existence of a solution X of the linear constraints in Definition 3.4 can be reduced to linear programming (LP) problems, and the latter are known to be decidable. The same applies to $\sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{B}}$ too.

Probabilistic systems are commonly modeled using the monad \mathcal{D} (see (2))—with an explicit *normalization* condition $\sum_x d(x) \leq 1$ —instead of $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{S}_{+, \times}}$. However there is no need to impose normalization on simulations: sometimes only “non-normalized” simulation matrices are found and they are still sound. Here is such an example.

Example 5.1 The following $\mathcal{S}_{+, \times}$ -weighted automata exhibit $L(\mathcal{A}) \sqsubseteq L(\mathcal{B})$. Neither forward nor backward Kleisli simulation (in the categorical sense of Definition 2.14) exists between them as long as we represent the automata \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} as $(\mathcal{D}, 1 + \Sigma \times (_))$ -systems. However Kleisli simulations (forward and backward) are found once we represent \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} as $(\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{S}}, 1 + \Sigma \times (_))$ -systems.



Indeed, the only matrix X that is a forward simulation (Definition 3.4) is $X = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$, and the only backward simulation matrix is $X = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 2 \end{pmatrix}$. Neither of these satisfies the normalization condition imposed on the subdistribution monad \mathcal{D} .

Remark 5.2 (language equivalence vs. language inclusion) Because of the undecidability of language *inclusion* between $\mathcal{S}_{+, \times}$ -weighted automata [24], a proof method for language inclusion that is computationally tractable—such as our current one via forward/backward simulation matrices whose existence is in PTIME—is naturally incomplete. In contrast, several complete methods for language *equivalence* have been introduced for various kinds of weighted automata, including the aforementioned one in [29] for $\mathcal{S}_{+, \times}$ -weighted automata.

In [31], quantitative bisimulation that is complete with respect to the language equivalence is defined for \mathbb{R} -weighted automata. Differently from a classical definition [32] where bisimulation is defined as a *relation*, the bisimulation notion in [31] is defined as a *subspace* of a certain vector space, using that \mathbb{R} is not only a semiring but also a *field*. The definition of bisimulation in [31] is almost the same as the one in [33], except for minor relaxations. Furthermore, the notion in [31] turns out to be an instance of the

coalgebraic (Aczel-Mendler) definition of bisimulation in [34] by spans.¹ Using the linear algebraic characterization of bisimulation in [31], a partition refinement-based algorithm for calculating the largest bisimulation is given in [31].

Another definition of quantitative bisimulation is found in [27]. The bisimulation in [27] is defined as a matrix, in a similar manner to the simulation $\sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{F}}$ in the current paper. More concretely, the bisimulation in [27] is defined as a matrix X that satisfies certain equations, that are obtained by replacing the inequalities in (5) of Definition 3.4 with equalities. In [27] the authors go on to introduce the notion of *properness* of a semiring. A semiring \mathcal{S} is called *proper* when: the weighted automata exhibit language equivalence if and only if two \mathcal{S} -weighted automata are connected by a finite-length chain of bisimulations. Properness implies decidability of language equivalence (on the condition that the addition, the multiplication and the order relation of \mathcal{S} are all computable): existence of a finite-length chain of bisimulations is semidecidable, hence so is language equivalence by properness, on the one hand; on the other hand it is not hard to see that the complement problem of language equivalence is semidecidable too. Some examples and counterexamples of proper semirings are given in [27]: for example, the semiring \mathbb{N} of natural numbers and the semiring \mathbb{Z} of integers are both proper, while $\mathcal{S}_{\max, +}$ is not.

A method other than bisimulation towards complete checking of quantitative language equivalence is given in [35]. There, for automata weighted with elements in a *Noetherian semiring*, sound and complete axiomatizations (in the style of equational logic) of weighted language equivalence are presented. It is known that Noetherian semirings form a strict subclass of proper semirings [27]: the semiring \mathbb{Z} is a Noetherian semiring and hence a proper semiring, while \mathbb{N} is a proper semiring [27] but not a Noetherian semiring [35]. It is shown in [35] that we can translate a state of a Noetherian semiring-weighted automaton to an algebraic term for such equational reasoning.

5.2. Algorithms

The following algorithm `pt_langincl_fwd` checks language inclusion between $\mathcal{S}_{+, \times}$ -weighted automata by searching for a forward simulation matrix. This algorithm uses three algorithms—`pt_simulation_fwd`, `pt_FPE` and `pt_BPE` that we describe later—as sub-algorithms.

Algorithm 5.3 (`pt_langincl_fwd`) **Input:** A pair of $\mathcal{S}_{+, \times}$ -weighted automata \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} . **Output:** “Yes” if the language inclusion between \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} is witnessed by a forward simulation matrix.

Procedure: This algorithm alternatively applies FPE and BPE (by the algorithms `pt_FPE` and `pt_BPE`) and transforms \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} . After each transformation it runs the algorithm `pt_simulation_fwd` to search for a forward simulation matrix. In each the iteration, the parameter P for `pt_FPE` and `pt_BPE` are set appropriately (see the description of our implementation below).

The behavior of the above algorithm `pt_langincl_fwd` is as follows: when it terminates then we can conclude (by Corollary 3.7 and Theorem 4.3) that language indeed inclusion holds between the automata given as input; in particular, its sub-algorithm

¹ This is pointed out by one of the reviewers. Therefore the seemingly surprising completeness result in [31], of bisimulations against language equivalence, is no wonder: here the language equivalence is coalgebraic bisimilarity, much like for deterministic automata as $2 \times (_)^{\Sigma}$ -coalgebras.

`pt_simulation_fwd` is sound and complete with respect to existence of a forward simulation matrix; but, sometimes, even if language inclusion does hold the algorithm `pt_langincl_fwd` may not terminate (Example 4.7); and finally, in case language inclusion does not hold the algorithm `pt_langincl_fwd` does not terminate. To account for the last case we can use a straightforward semi-decision procedure for the complement of language inclusion.

The algorithm `pt_langincl_bwd` that tries to find a backward simulation matrix is given similarly, by replacing the sub-algorithm `pt_simulation_fwd` with `pt_simulation_bwd` that searches for a backward simulation, and switching the automata to which FPE (or BPE) is applied (cf. (9)).

Now let us turn to the sub-algorithms. The algorithms `pt_FPE` and `pt_BPE` that apply FPE and BPE are straightforward. We only present `pt_FPE`; the other one `pt_BPE` for BPE is similar.

Algorithm 5.4 (pt_FPE) Input: An $\mathcal{S}_{+, \times}$ -weighted automaton \mathcal{A} and a subset P of the state space.

Output: An $\mathcal{S}_{+, \times}$ -weighted automaton $\mathcal{A}_{\text{FPE}, P}$.

Procedure: We follow Definition 4.2 and construct $\mathcal{A}_{\text{FPE}, P}$.

Finally we describe the algorithm `pt_simulation_fwd` that searches for a forward simulation matrix between $\mathcal{S}_{+, \times}$ -weighted automata (`pt_simulation_bwd` for searching for a backward simulation matrix is similar).

Algorithm 5.5 (pt_simulation_fwd) Input: A pair of $\mathcal{S}_{+, \times}$ -weighted automata \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} .

Output: A forward simulation matrix X from \mathcal{A} to \mathcal{B} if such X exists, and “No” otherwise.

Procedure: This algorithm first transforms the constraints (5) in Definition 3.4 into an inequality $A\mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{b}$. Then it solves a linear programming problem whose constraint and objective function are set to $A\mathbf{x} \leq \mathbf{b}$ and 0, respectively. If a feasible solution is found, then the algorithm outputs the solution. Otherwise it outputs “No.”

For solving a linear programming problem our algorithm uses the *simplex method*—its worst-case time complexity is known to be exponential [36]. It is known that there are methods that run in polynomial time (e.g. Karmarkar’s method [37]), though it is also known that practically, the simplex method is efficient on average [38].

We also note that the matrix A in Algorithm 5.5 is sparse because of the way the different constraints in Definition 3.4 are combined. It has $n + anm + m$ rows, nm columns and at most $2nm + a(n^2m + nm^2)$ nonzero entries.

5.3. Implementation, Experiments and Discussions

Our implementation consists of two components: `+ \times -sim` and `+ \times -PE`. Both of them are available in [12].

- The program `+ \times -sim` (in C++) implements `pt_simulation_fwd` and `pt_simulation_bwd` in the above. It uses *glpk* [39] as a linear programming solver.

param.		\mathcal{A}_P		\mathcal{A}_S		$ \Sigma $	direction, fwd./bwd.	time (sec)	space (GB)
G	S	#st.	#tr.	#st.	#tr.				
2	8	578	1522	130	642	11	$\mathcal{A}_P \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{F}} \mathcal{A}_S$	1.02	0.30
							$\mathcal{A}_P \sqsupseteq_{\mathbf{B}} \mathcal{A}_S$	1.00	0.30
2	10	1102	2982	202	1202	13	$\mathcal{A}_P \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{F}} \mathcal{A}_S$	5.37	1.04
							$\mathcal{A}_P \sqsupseteq_{\mathbf{B}} \mathcal{A}_S$	5.30	1.05
2	12	1874	5162	290	2018	15	$\mathcal{A}_P \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{F}} \mathcal{A}_S$	22.21	2.91
							$\mathcal{A}_P \sqsupseteq_{\mathbf{B}} \mathcal{A}_S$	21.99	2.94
2	14	2942	8206	394	3138	17	$\mathcal{A}_P \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{F}} \mathcal{A}_S$	76.71	6.86
							$\mathcal{A}_P \sqsupseteq_{\mathbf{B}} \mathcal{A}_S$	76.03	6.94
2	16	4354	12258	514	4610	19	$\mathcal{A}_P \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{F}} \mathcal{A}_S$	232.67	13.01
							$\mathcal{A}_P \sqsupseteq_{\mathbf{B}} \mathcal{A}_S$	231.33	13.20
3	8	1923	7107	243	2163	20	$\mathcal{A}_P \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{F}} \mathcal{A}_S$	25.51	3.33
							$\mathcal{A}_P \sqsupseteq_{\mathbf{B}} \mathcal{A}_S$	25.35	3.36
3	10	3803	14323	383	4183	24	$\mathcal{A}_P \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{F}} \mathcal{A}_S$	167.68	12.21
							$\mathcal{A}_P \sqsupseteq_{\mathbf{B}} \mathcal{A}_S$	166.86	12.27
4	6	1636	7468	196	1924	23	$\mathcal{A}_P \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{F}} \mathcal{A}_S$	17.58	2.61
							$\mathcal{A}_P \sqsupseteq_{\mathbf{B}} \mathcal{A}_S$	17.34	2.64
4	8	4052	19076	356	4580	29	$\mathcal{A}_P \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{F}} \mathcal{A}_S$	210.09	13.13
							$\mathcal{A}_P \sqsupseteq_{\mathbf{B}} \mathcal{A}_S$	212.58	13.12

Table 1: Results for the grades protocol [29]

- The program $+\times$ -PE (in OCaml) implements `pt.FPE` and `pt.BPE` in the above. It takes an automaton \mathcal{A} and $d \in \mathbb{N}$ as input, and returns $\mathcal{A}_{\text{FPE}, P}$ (or $\mathcal{A}_{\text{BPE}, P}$, by choice). Here P is chosen, by heuristics, to be $P = \{x \mid x \xrightarrow{d} \dots \rightarrow \checkmark\}$ (or $P = \{x \mid \bullet \xrightarrow{d} \dots \rightarrow x\}$, respectively).

The two programs are alternately applied to the given automaton, for $d = 1, 2, \dots$, each time incrementing the parameter d for $+\times$ -PE. The experiments were on a MacBook Pro laptop with a Core i5 processor (2.6 GHz, 2 cores) and 16 GB RAM.

5.3.1. Grades Protocol

The *grades protocol* is introduced in [29] and is used there as a benchmark: the protocol and its specification are expressed as probabilistic programs P and S ; they are then translated into (purely) probabilistic automata \mathcal{A}_P and \mathcal{A}_S by a game semantics-based tool APEX [40]. By establishing $L(\mathcal{A}_P) = L(\mathcal{A}_S)$, the protocol is shown to exhibit the same behaviors as the specification—hence is verified. The grades protocol aims to calculate the summation of grades of students without revealing each individual’s grade. The protocol has two parameters G and S . Here, G is the number of grades (i.e. the set of grades is $\{0, 1, \dots, G - 1\}$) and S is the number of students.

In our experiment we proved $L(\mathcal{A}_P) = L(\mathcal{A}_S)$ by establishing two-way language inclusion (\sqsubseteq and \sqsupseteq). The results are shown in Table. 1. For all the choices of parameters G and S , our program $+\times$ -sim was able to establish, without applying $+\times$ -PE: $\mathcal{A}_P \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{F}} \mathcal{A}_S$ (but not $\sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{B}}$) for the \sqsubseteq direction; and $\mathcal{A}_P \sqsupseteq_{\mathbf{B}} \mathcal{A}_S$ (but not $\sqsupseteq_{\mathbf{F}}$) for the \sqsupseteq direction. In

param.			\mathcal{A}_P		\mathcal{A}_S		$ \Sigma $	direction fwd./bwd.	time (sec)	space (GB)	d
n	c	p_f	#st.	#tr.	#st.	#tr.					
5	1	$\frac{9}{10}$	7	44	7	56	18	$\mathcal{A}_P \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{F}} \mathcal{A}_S$	0.10	0.02	2
								$\mathcal{A}_P \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{B}} \mathcal{A}_S$	0.04	0.01	2
7	1	$\frac{3}{4}$	9	88	9	118	26	$\mathcal{A}_P \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{F}} \mathcal{A}_S$	0.59	0.14	2
								$\mathcal{A}_P \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{B}} \mathcal{A}_S$	0.05	0.01	2
10	2	$\frac{4}{5}$	12	224	12	280	54	$\mathcal{A}_P \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{F}} \mathcal{A}_S$	42.63	3.86	2
								$\mathcal{A}_P \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{B}} \mathcal{A}_S$	0.07	0.01	2
20	6	$\frac{4}{5}$	22	1514	22	1696	238	$\mathcal{A}_P \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{F}} \mathcal{A}_S$	T/O		
								$\mathcal{A}_P \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{B}} \mathcal{A}_S$	0.84	0.20	2
30	10	$\frac{4}{5}$	32	4732	32	5112	550	$\mathcal{A}_P \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{F}} \mathcal{A}_S$	S/O		
								$\mathcal{A}_P \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{B}} \mathcal{A}_S$	6.17	1.44	2
40	14	$\frac{4}{5}$	42	10742	42	11392	990	$\mathcal{A}_P \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{F}} \mathcal{A}_S$	S/O		
								$\mathcal{A}_P \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{B}} \mathcal{A}_S$	30.70	6.07	2
50	17	$\frac{4}{5}$	52	20504	52	21560	1494	$\mathcal{A}_P \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{F}} \mathcal{A}_S$	S/O		
								$\mathcal{A}_P \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{B}} \mathcal{A}_S$	102.89	13.64	2

Table 2: Results for the Crowds protocol

the table, #st. and #tr. denote the numbers of states and transitions, respectively, and $|\Sigma|$ is the size of the alphabet. All these numbers are determined by APEX.

The table indicates that space is a bigger problem for our approach than time. In [29] four algorithms for checking language *equivalence* between $\mathcal{S}_{+, \times}$ -weighted automata are implemented and compared: two are deterministic [41, 42] and the other two are randomized [29]. These algorithms can process bigger problem instances (e.g. $G = 2, S = 100$ in ca. 10 sec) and, in comparison, the results in Table 1 are far from impressive. Note however that our algorithm is for language *inclusion*—an undecidable problem, unlike language *equivalence* that is in \mathbf{P} , see Section 5.1—and hence is more general.

5.3.2. Crowds Protocol

Our second experiment calls for checking language *inclusion*, making the algorithms studied in [29] unapplicable. We verified some instances of the *Crowds protocol* [2] against a quantitative anonymity specification called *probable innocence* [43]. We used a general trace-based verification method in [3] for probable innocence: language inclusion $L(\mathcal{A}_P) \sqsubseteq L(\mathcal{A}_S)$, from the model \mathcal{A}_P of a protocol in question to \mathcal{A}_P 's suitable modification \mathcal{A}_S , guarantees probable innocence.

The Crowds protocol has parameters n, c and p_f . In fact, for this specific protocol, a sufficient condition for probable innocence is known [2] (namely $n \geq \frac{p_f}{p_f - 1/2}(c + 1)$); we used parameters that satisfy this condition. We implemented a small program that takes a choice of n, c, p_f and generates an automaton \mathcal{A}_P ; it is then passed to another program that generates \mathcal{A}_S .

The results are in Table 2. For each problem instance we tried both $\sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{F}}$ and $\sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{B}}$. The last column shows the final value of the parameter d for $+\times$ -PE—i.e. how many times partial execution (Section 4) was applied.

The entry “S/O” designates that $+\times$ -PE was killed because of stack overflow caused by an oversized automaton. “T/O” means that alternate application of $+\times$ -sim and $+\times$ -

PEdid not terminate within a time limit (one hour).

We observe that backward simulation matrices were much faster to be found than forward ones. This seems to result from the shapes of the automata for this specific problem; after all it is an advantage of our forward and backward approach that we can try two different directions and use the faster one. Space consumption seems again serious.

6. Simulation Matrices for $\mathcal{S}_{\text{max},+}$ -Weighted Automata

In this section we discuss $\mathcal{S}_{\text{max},+}$ -weighted automata, in which weights are understood as (best-case) profit or (worst-case) cost (see Example 2.2). Such automata are studied in [8] (called *Sum-automata* there). In fact we observe that their notion of simulation—formulated in game-theoretic terms and hence called *G-simulation* here—coincides with the notion of forward simulation matrix. This observation—that is presented in Section 6.1—follows from the game-theoretic characterization in [20] of linear inequalities in $\mathcal{S}_{\text{max},+}$. In Section 6.3 our implementation is presented.

6.1. G-Simulation by Forward Simulation Matrices

In this section we restrict to finite-state automata. In this case we can dispose of the weight ∞ , and have $[-\infty, \infty)$ as the domain of weights (see Example 2.2).

What we shall call *G-simulation* is introduced in [8]. G-simulation is originally introduced to witness inclusion between weighted languages over *infinite-length words* $\Sigma^\omega \rightarrow [-\infty, \infty)$. It is easy to adapt the definition to the current setting of *finite-length words* $\Sigma^* \rightarrow [-\infty, \infty)$; the adaptation is concerned with termination \checkmark .

Definition 6.1 ($\sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{G}}$) Let $\mathcal{A} = (Q_{\mathcal{A}}, \Sigma, M_{\mathcal{A}}, \alpha_{\mathcal{A}}, \beta_{\mathcal{A}})$ and $\mathcal{B} = (Q_{\mathcal{B}}, \Sigma, M_{\mathcal{B}}, \alpha_{\mathcal{B}}, \beta_{\mathcal{B}})$ be finite-state $\mathcal{S}_{\text{max},+}$ -weighted automata. A *finite simulation game* from \mathcal{A} to \mathcal{B} is played by two players called *Challenger* and *Simulator*: a *strategy for Challenger* is a pair $(\rho_1 : 1 \rightarrow Q_{\mathcal{A}}, \tau_1 : (Q_{\mathcal{A}} \times Q_{\mathcal{B}}) \times (\Sigma \times Q_{\mathcal{A}} \times Q_{\mathcal{B}})^* \rightarrow 1 + \Sigma \times Q_{\mathcal{A}})$ of functions; and a *strategy for Simulator* is a pair $(\rho_2 : Q_{\mathcal{A}} \rightarrow Q_{\mathcal{B}}, \tau_2 : (Q_{\mathcal{A}} \times Q_{\mathcal{B}}) \times (\Sigma \times Q_{\mathcal{A}} \times Q_{\mathcal{B}})^* \times \Sigma \times Q_{\mathcal{A}} \rightarrow Q_{\mathcal{B}})$.

A pair $(p_0 a_1 \dots a_n p_n, q_0 a_1 \dots a_n q_n)$ of runs on \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} is called the *outcome of strategies* (ρ_1, τ_1) and (ρ_2, τ_2) if:

- $\rho_1(\bullet) = p_0$ and $\rho_2(p_0) = q_0$ where \bullet is the unique element of the domain of ρ_1 .
- $\tau_1((p_0, q_0)(a_1, p_1, q_1) \dots (a_i, p_i, q_i)) = (a_{i+1}, p_{i+1})$ for each $i \in [0, n-1]$.
- $\tau_2((p_0, q_0)(a_1, p_1, q_1) \dots (a_i, p_i, q_i), (a_{i+1}, p_{i+1})) = q_{i+1}$ for each $i \in [0, n-1]$.
- $\tau_1((p_0, q_0)(a_1, p_1, q_1) \dots (a_n, p_n, q_n)) = \checkmark$.

A strategy (ρ_1, τ_1) for Challenger is *winning* if for any strategy (ρ_2, τ_2) for Simulator, their outcome (r_1, r_2) exists and it satisfies $L(\mathcal{A})(r_1) > L(\mathcal{B})(r_2)$. Here the weight $L(\mathcal{A})(r)$ of a run r is defined in the obvious way, exploiting the structure of the semiring $\mathcal{S}_{\text{max},+}$.

Finally, we write $\mathcal{A} \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{G}} \mathcal{B}$ if there is no winning strategy for Challenger.

Theorem 6.2 Let \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} be finite-state $\mathcal{S}_{\text{max},+}$ -weighted automata. Assume that \mathcal{A} has no trap states, that is, every state has a path to \checkmark whose weight is not $-\infty$. Then, $\mathcal{A} \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{F}} \mathcal{B}$ if and only if $\mathcal{A} \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{G}} \mathcal{B}$.

The extra assumption can be easily enforced by eliminating trap states through backward reachability check. This does not change the (finite) weighted language.

The proof of Theorem 6.2 is sketched as follows. We first reduce G-simulation (between the original automata \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} on finite words) to G-simulation $\sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{G}}^{\text{Limavg}}$ between *Limavg automata*, the original setting in [8] with infinite words. This reduction (that is the first equivalence below) allows us to exploit the characterization in [8] of G-simulation in terms of a *mean payoff game*, yielding the second equivalence below.

$$\mathcal{A} \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{G}} \mathcal{B} \iff \mathcal{A}^{\text{Limavg}} \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{G}}^{\text{Limavg}} \mathcal{B}^{\text{Limavg}} \iff \text{Max wins in } \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}^{\text{Limavg}}, \mathcal{B}^{\text{Limavg}}}^{\mathbf{G}} . \quad (10)$$

Conversely, starting from $\mathcal{A} \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{F}} \mathcal{B}$, we use the fundamental result in [20] that characterizes feasibility of inequalities in $\mathcal{S}_{\text{max},+}$ in terms of mean payoff games.

$$\mathcal{A} \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{F}} \mathcal{B} \iff \text{a certain linear inequality is feasible} \iff \text{Max wins in } \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}}^{\mathbf{F}} . \quad (11)$$

Finally, we observe that the mean payoff games $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}^{\text{Limavg}}, \mathcal{B}^{\text{Limavg}}}^{\mathbf{G}}$ in (10) and $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}}^{\mathbf{F}}$ in (11) are in fact the same, establishing $\mathcal{A} \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{F}} \mathcal{B}$ if and only if $\mathcal{A} \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{G}} \mathcal{B}$.

In what follows we introduce necessary definitions and lemmas, eventually leading to the proof of Theorem 6.2.

Definition 6.3 (Limavg automaton) A *Limavg automaton* $\mathcal{C} = (Q, \Sigma, M, q_0)$ consists of a finite state space Q , a finite alphabet Σ , transition matrices $M : \Sigma \rightarrow [-\infty, \infty)^{Q \times Q}$, and the initial state $q_0 \in Q$.

For an infinite word $w = a_0 a_1 \dots \in \Sigma^\omega$, the automaton \mathcal{C} assigns a value $L(\mathcal{C})(w)$ that is calculated by $L(\mathcal{C})(w) = \sup_{q_0 q_1 \dots \in Q^\omega} \liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=0}^N M(a_i)_{q_i, q_{i+1}}$.

Lemma 6.4 *Given an $\mathcal{S}_{\text{max},+}$ -weighted automaton $\mathcal{C} = (Q, \Sigma, M, \alpha, \beta)$, we define a *Limavg automaton* $\mathcal{C}^{\text{Limavg}} = (Q^{\text{Limavg}}, \Sigma^{\text{Limavg}}, M^{\text{Limavg}}, \star)$ by*

$$\begin{aligned} Q^{\text{Limavg}} &= Q + \{\star\}, \\ \Sigma^{\text{Limavg}} &= \Sigma + \{?\} + \{!\}, \text{ and} \\ M^{\text{Limavg}}(a)_{x,y} &= \begin{cases} M(a)_{x,y} & (a \in \Sigma, x, y \neq \star) \\ \alpha_y & (a = ?, x = \star) \\ \beta_x & (a = !, y = \star) \\ -\infty & (\text{otherwise}). \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Let $\mathcal{A} = (Q_{\mathcal{A}}, \Sigma, M_{\mathcal{A}}, \alpha_{\mathcal{A}}, \beta_{\mathcal{A}})$ and $\mathcal{B} = (Q_{\mathcal{B}}, \Sigma, M_{\mathcal{B}}, \alpha_{\mathcal{B}}, \beta_{\mathcal{B}})$ be $\mathcal{S}_{\text{max},+}$ -weighted automata; assume further that \mathcal{A} has no trap states. Then we have

$$\mathcal{A} \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{G}} \mathcal{B} \iff \mathcal{A}^{\text{Limavg}} \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{G}}^{\text{Limavg}} \mathcal{B}^{\text{Limavg}} . \quad \square$$

Intuitively, the automaton $\mathcal{C}^{\text{Limavg}}$ is obtained from \mathcal{C} by connecting the initial and final states of \mathcal{C} . More concretely, we add a new state \star that represents both the initial and final state in \mathcal{C} , add transitions from \star to states in \mathcal{C} according to the initial vector α , and add transitions from states in \mathcal{C} to \star according to the final vector β .

The proof of the lemma is technical and deferred to Appendix Appendix A.1. The basic idea is as follows. A winning strategy for the (finite) game for $\mathcal{A} \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{G}} \mathcal{B}$ yields that

for the other (infinite) game, by repeating the strategy. The other direction is similar, except that trap states call for special care.

We shall now describe the second equivalence in (10). The notion of mean payoff game is from [44].

Definition 6.5 (mean payoff game) A weighted bipartite graph $\mathcal{G} = (Q_{\text{Min}}, Q_{\text{Max}}, q_I, E, \gamma)$ consists of a set Q_{Min} of states for Min, a set Q_{Max} of states for Max, the initial state $q_I \in Q_{\text{Min}}$, a set $E = Q_{\text{Min}} \times Q_{\text{Max}} + Q_{\text{Max}} \times Q_{\text{Min}}$ of edges, and a weight function $\gamma : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$.

A mean payoff game is a game played by two players Min and Max on a weighted bipartite graph \mathcal{G} . A strategy for Min is a function $\tau_{\text{Min}} : (Q_{\text{Min}} \times Q_{\text{Max}})^* \times Q_{\text{Min}} \rightarrow Q_{\text{Max}}$ and a strategy for Max is a function $\tau_{\text{Max}} : (Q_{\text{Min}} \times Q_{\text{Max}})^+ \rightarrow Q_{\text{Min}}$. An infinite run $p_0 q_0 p_1 q_1 \dots$ on \mathcal{G} (here $p_i \in Q_{\text{Min}}$ and $q_i \in Q_{\text{Max}}$) is the outcome of strategies τ_{Min} and τ_{Max} if $p_0 = q_I$ and for any $i \geq 1$, $\tau_{\text{Min}}(p_0 q_0 \dots q_{i-1} p_i) = q_i$ and $\tau_{\text{Max}}(p_0 q_0 \dots p_i q_i) = p_{i+1}$. A strategy τ_{Max} for Max is winning if for any strategy τ_{Min} for Min, their outcome $r_0 r_1 r_2 r_3 \dots$ satisfies $\liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=0}^N (\gamma(r_i, r_{i+1})) \geq 0$.

Lemma 6.6 ([8]) Let $\mathcal{E} = (Q_{\mathcal{E}}, \Sigma, M_{\mathcal{E}}, q_{\mathcal{E}}^0)$ and $\mathcal{F} = (Q_{\mathcal{F}}, \Sigma, M_{\mathcal{F}}, q_{\mathcal{F}}^0)$ be Limavg automata. We have $\mathcal{E} \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{G}} \mathcal{F}$ if and only if Max wins in the mean payoff game $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F}}$, where the game $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{F}} = (Q_{\text{Min}}, Q_{\text{Max}}, q_I, E, \gamma)$ is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{\text{Min}} &= Q_{\mathcal{E}} \times Q_{\mathcal{F}} \ , \quad Q_{\text{Max}} = Q_{\mathcal{E}} \times Q_{\mathcal{F}} \times \Sigma \ , \quad q_I = (q_{\mathcal{E}}^0, q_{\mathcal{F}}^0) \ , \\ E &= \{((p, q), (p', q, a)) \mid M_{\mathcal{E}}(a)_{p,p'} \neq -\infty\} + \{((p, q, a), (p, q')) \mid M_{\mathcal{F}}(a)_{q,q'} \neq -\infty\} \ , \\ \gamma((p, q), (p', q, a)) &= -M_{\mathcal{E}}(a)_{p,p'} \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma((p, q, a), (p, q')) = M_{\mathcal{F}}(a)_{q,q'} \ . \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

We turn to the equivalences in (11). The following proposition is interesting for its own sake, characterizing $\sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{F}}$ for $\mathcal{S}_{\text{max},+}$ -weighted automata in terms of mean payoff games. We crucially rely on a result in [20].

Proposition 6.7 For a pair of $\mathcal{S}_{\text{max},+}$ -weighted automata \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} , there exists a mean payoff game $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}}^{\mathbf{F}}$ such that: $\mathcal{A} \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{F}} \mathcal{B}$ if and only if Max wins in $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}}^{\mathbf{F}}$.

PROOF. Let $\mathcal{A} = (Q_{\mathcal{A}}, \Sigma, M_{\mathcal{A}}, \alpha_{\mathcal{A}}, \beta_{\mathcal{A}})$ and $\mathcal{B} = (Q_{\mathcal{B}}, \Sigma, M_{\mathcal{B}}, \alpha_{\mathcal{B}}, \beta_{\mathcal{B}})$. By Definition 3.4, a forward simulation matrix from \mathcal{A} to \mathcal{B} is a matrix $X \in \mathcal{S}_{\text{max},+}^{Q_{\mathcal{B}} \times Q_{\mathcal{A}}}$ that satisfies

$$\alpha_{\mathcal{A}} \leq \alpha_{\mathcal{B}} X \ \wedge \ \forall a \in \Sigma. X M_{\mathcal{A}}(a) \leq M_{\mathcal{B}}(a) X \ \wedge \ X \beta_{\mathcal{A}} \leq \beta_{\mathcal{B}} \ . \quad (12)$$

The result in [20] reduces:

- existence of a nontrivial (i.e. not $-\infty$) solution of a linear inequality $A\mathbf{x} \leq B\mathbf{x}$, where A, B are matrices over $\mathcal{S}_{\text{max},+}$ and \mathbf{x} is a column vector of variables, to
- a mean payoff game.

We therefore need to transform (12) into the format $A\mathbf{x} \leq B\mathbf{x}$. In particular, $\alpha_{\mathcal{A}}$ and $\beta_{\mathcal{B}}$ on both ends of (12) should be taken care of.

We shall prove that: there exists a matrix X that satisfies (12), if and only if, there exist $x_{\star, \star} \in \mathcal{S}_{\text{max},+}$ and $X' \in \mathcal{S}_{\text{max},+}^{Q_{\mathcal{B}} \times Q_{\mathcal{A}}}$ that satisfy $x_{\star, \star} \neq -\infty$ and

$$x_{\star, \star} \alpha_{\mathcal{A}} \leq \alpha_{\mathcal{B}} X' \ \wedge \ \forall a \in \Sigma. X' M_{\mathcal{A}}(a) \leq M_{\mathcal{B}}(a) X' \ \wedge \ X' \beta_{\mathcal{A}} \leq x_{\star, \star} \beta_{\mathcal{B}} \ . \quad (13)$$

Note here that $x_{\star,\star}\alpha_{\mathcal{A}}$ denotes the vector $\alpha_{\mathcal{A}}$ multiplied by the scalar $x_{\star,\star}$. Here “multiplication” is by the semiring multiplication of $\mathcal{S}_{\text{max},+}$, that is, addition of real numbers.

Indeed, if X satisfying (12) exists, then $x_{\star,\star} = 0$ and $X' = X$ satisfy (13). Conversely, if $x_{\star,\star} \in \mathcal{S}_{\text{max},+}$ (where $x_{\star,\star} \neq -\infty$) and $X' \in \mathcal{S}_{\text{max},+}^{Q_{\mathcal{B}} \times Q_{\mathcal{A}}}$ satisfy (13), then $X \in \mathcal{S}_{\text{max},+}^{Q_{\mathcal{B}} \times Q_{\mathcal{A}}}$ defined by $X_{q,p} = X'_{q,p} - x_{\star,\star}$ satisfies (12). Here $-x_{\star,\star}$ denotes subtraction of the real number $x_{\star,\star}$. It is well-defined and constitutes the inverse of (semiring-)multiplication by $x_{\star,\star}$, since $x_{\star,\star} \neq -\infty$.

It is straightforward to translate (13) into the format $\mathbf{Ax} \leq \mathbf{Bx}$. Then applying the result [20] yields the following mean payoff game, Max’s winning in which is equivalent to the feasibility of (13), hence to that of (12).

The game is played on a graph $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B}}^{\mathbf{F}} = (Q_{\text{Min}}^{\mathbf{F}}, Q_{\text{Max}}^{\mathbf{F}}, q_I^{\mathbf{F}}, E^{\mathbf{F}}, \gamma^{\mathbf{F}})$, where

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{\text{Min}}^{\mathbf{F}} &= \{x_{\star,\star}\} + \{x_{q,p} \mid q \in Q_{\mathcal{B}}, p \in Q_{\mathcal{A}}\}, \\ Q_{\text{Max}}^{\mathbf{F}} &= Q_{\mathcal{A}} + \Sigma \times Q_{\mathcal{B}} \times Q_{\mathcal{A}} + Q_{\mathcal{B}}, \\ q_I^{\mathbf{F}} &= x_{\star,\star} \\ E^{\mathbf{F}} &= E_1^{\mathbf{F}} + E_2^{\mathbf{F}} \text{ where } E_1^{\mathbf{F}} \subseteq Q_{\text{Min}}^{\mathbf{F}} \times Q_{\text{Max}}^{\mathbf{F}}, E_2^{\mathbf{F}} \subseteq Q_{\text{Max}}^{\mathbf{F}} \times Q_{\text{Min}}^{\mathbf{F}} \text{ and} \\ E_1^{\mathbf{F}} &= \{(x_{\star,\star}, p) \mid (\alpha_{\mathcal{A}})_p \neq -\infty\} + \{(x_{q,p}, (a, q, p')) \mid M_{\mathcal{A}}(a)_{p,p'} \neq -\infty\} \\ &\quad + \{(x_{q,p}, q) \mid (\beta_{\mathcal{A}})_p \neq -\infty\} \\ E_2^{\mathbf{F}} &= \{(p, x_{q,p}) \mid (\alpha_{\mathcal{B}})_q \neq -\infty\} + \{(a, q, p), x_{q',p}\} \mid M_{\mathcal{B}}(a)_{q,q'} \neq -\infty\} \\ &\quad + \{(q, x_{\star,\star}) \mid (\beta_{\mathcal{B}})_q \neq -\infty\}, \\ \gamma^{\mathbf{F}}(x_{\star,\star}, p) &= -(\alpha_{\mathcal{A}})_p, \quad \gamma^{\mathbf{F}}(x_{q,p}, (a, q, p')) = -M_{\mathcal{A}}(a)_{p,p'}, \quad \gamma^{\mathbf{F}}(x_{q,p}, q) = -(\beta_{\mathcal{A}})_p \\ \gamma^{\mathbf{F}}(p, x_{q,p}) &= (\alpha_{\mathcal{B}})_q, \quad \gamma^{\mathbf{F}}((a, q, p), x_{q',p}) = M_{\mathcal{B}}(a)_{q,q'}, \quad \gamma^{\mathbf{F}}(q, x_{\star,\star}) = (\beta_{\mathcal{B}})_q. \end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof. \square

Finally, we bridge the rightmost conditions in (10–11) and prove Theorem 6.2.

PROOF OF THEOREM 6.2. Let $\mathcal{A} = (Q_{\mathcal{A}}, \Sigma, M_{\mathcal{A}}, \alpha_{\mathcal{A}}, \beta_{\mathcal{A}})$ and $\mathcal{B} = (Q_{\mathcal{B}}, \Sigma, M_{\mathcal{B}}, \alpha_{\mathcal{B}}, \beta_{\mathcal{B}})$.

By Lemma 6.4 and Lemma 6.6, $\mathcal{A} \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{G}} \mathcal{B}$ is equivalent to existence of a winning strategy for Max in the mean payoff game played on a graph $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}^{\text{Limavg}}, \mathcal{B}^{\text{Limavg}}}^{\mathbf{G}} = (Q_{\text{Min}}^{\mathbf{G}}, Q_{\text{Max}}^{\mathbf{G}}, q_I^{\mathbf{G}}, E^{\mathbf{G}}, \gamma^{\mathbf{G}})$. It is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{\text{Min}}^{\mathbf{G}} &= (\{\star\} + Q_{\mathcal{A}}) \times (\{\star\} + Q_{\mathcal{B}}), \\ Q_{\text{Max}}^{\mathbf{G}} &= (\{\star\} + Q_{\mathcal{A}}) \times (\{\star\} + Q_{\mathcal{B}}) \times (\{?\} + \{!\} + \Sigma), \\ q_I^{\mathbf{G}} &= (\star, \star), \\ E &= E_1^{\mathbf{G}} + E_2^{\mathbf{G}} \text{ s.t. } E_1^{\mathbf{G}} \subseteq Q_{\text{Min}}^{\mathbf{G}} \times Q_{\text{Max}}^{\mathbf{G}}, E_2^{\mathbf{G}} \subseteq Q_{\text{Max}}^{\mathbf{G}} \times Q_{\text{Min}}^{\mathbf{G}} \text{ and} \\ E_1^{\mathbf{G}} &= \{((\star, \star), (p, \star, ?)) \mid (\alpha_{\mathcal{A}})_p \neq -\infty\} + \{((p, q), (p', q, a)) \mid M_{\mathcal{A}}(a)_{p,p'} \neq -\infty\} \\ &\quad + \{((p, q), (\star, q, !)) \mid (\beta_{\mathcal{A}})_p \neq -\infty\} \\ E_2^{\mathbf{G}} &= \{((p, \star, ?), (p, q)) \mid (\alpha_{\mathcal{B}})_q \neq -\infty\} + \{((p, q, a), (p, q')) \mid M_{\mathcal{B}}(a)_{q,q'} \neq -\infty\} \\ &\quad + \{((\star, q, !), (\star, \star)) \mid (\beta_{\mathcal{B}})_q \neq -\infty\}, \\ \gamma^{\mathbf{G}}((\star, \star), (p, \star, ?)) &= -(\alpha_{\mathcal{A}})_p, \quad \gamma^{\mathbf{G}}((p, q), (p', q, a)) = -M_{\mathcal{A}}(a)_{p,p'}, \quad \gamma^{\mathbf{G}}((p, q), (\star, q, !)) = -(\beta_{\mathcal{A}})_p \\ \gamma^{\mathbf{G}}((p, \star, ?), (p, q)) &= (\alpha_{\mathcal{B}})_q, \quad \gamma^{\mathbf{G}}((p, q, a), (p, q')) = M_{\mathcal{B}}(a)_{q,q'}, \quad \gamma^{\mathbf{G}}((\star, q, !), (\star, \star)) = (\beta_{\mathcal{B}})_q. \end{aligned}$$

It is not hard to see that the last graph $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}^{\text{Limavg}}, \mathcal{B}^{\text{Limavg}}}^{\text{G}}$ is equivalent to $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}}^{\text{F}}$ in Proposition 6.7: the former has extra states but they are all unreachable. \square

Remark 6.8 (complexity) The decision problem of mean payoff games is known to be in $\text{NP} \cap \text{co-NP}$ [45]; it has a pseudo polynomial-time algorithm, too [45]. By [20] this problem is equivalent to the feasibility problem of linear inequalities in $\mathcal{S}_{\text{max},+}$. For the latter problem, the algorithm proposed in [21] (for solving linear equalities) can be utilized; this algorithm is shown in [46] to be superpolynomial. These results give upper bounds for the complexity of $\sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{F}}$ and $\sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{G}}$, by Theorem 6.2 and the subsequent lemmas.

Similarly to $\mathcal{S}_{+, \times}$ -weighted automata, language inclusion between $\mathcal{S}_{\text{max},+}$ -weighted automata is known to be undecidable [26]. We note that, by Theorem 6.2, applying FPE or BPE (Section 4) increases the likelihood of $\sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{G}}$ (in the sense of Theorem 4.4). We additionally note that, by exploiting symmetry of forward and backward simulation matrices (Remark 3.5), we could define “backward G-simulation” as a variation of Definition 6.1.

6.2. Algorithms

We can give, much like in Section 5.2, an algorithm `mp_langincl_fwd` that tries to establish language inclusion between two $\mathcal{S}_{\text{max},+}$ -weighted automata. The algorithms `mp_FPE` and `mp_BPE` that apply FPE and BPE, respectively, are the same as in Section 5.2. The only difference is in the algorithm `mp_simulation_fwd` that searches for a forward simulation matrix between $\mathcal{S}_{\text{max},+}$ -weighted automata.

Algorithm 6.9 (mp_simulation_fwd) Input: A pair of $\mathcal{S}_{\text{max},+}$ -weighted automata \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} .

Output: A forward simulation matrix X from \mathcal{A} to \mathcal{B} if such X exists, and “No” otherwise.

Procedure: This algorithm first transforms the constraints (5) in Definition 3.4 into an inequality $A\mathbf{x} \leq B\mathbf{x}$, which in turn is made into a linear *equality* $A'\mathbf{x}' = B'\mathbf{x}'$ by adding slack variables that absorb the difference between the left hand side and the right hand side (note that this trick depends on the choice of the semiring $\mathcal{S}_{\text{max},+}$). The last equality is solved by the algorithm in [21]. If a solution is found by the algorithm in [21], then the found solution is output. Otherwise, “No” is output.

The algorithm in [21] is known not to be a polynomial-time algorithm [46].

Similarly we can obtain an algorithm `mp_langincl_bwd` that tries to establish language inclusion by searching for a *backward* simulation matrix. It uses an algorithm `mp_simulation_bwd` that searches for a backward simulation matrix—the latter is similar to `mp_simulation_fwd` and relies on the algorithm in [21].

6.3. Implementation, Experiments and Discussions

We implemented two programs: `max+-sim` and `max+-PE`. Both of them are available in [12].

- The program `max+-sim` executes `mp_simulation_fwd` or `mp_simulation_bwd` in the previous section. Since we did not find actual software available, we implemented (in C++) the algorithm in [21] (for solving $\mathcal{S}_{\text{max},+}$ -linear equalities) as part of the program `max+-sim`.




Figure 3: Time and max space consumption for max+-sim

- max+-PExecutes mp_FPEor mp_BPEin the previous section. It is as in Section 5. It simply uses the whole state space as the parameter P .

Experiments were done on a MacBook Pro laptop with a Core i5 processor (2.6 GHz, 2 cores) and 16 GB RAM. There we faced a difficulty of finding a benchmark example: although small examples are not hard to come up with by human efforts, we could not find a good example that has parameters (like G, S in Table 1) and allows for experiments with problem instances of a varying size.

We therefore ran max+-simfor:

- the problem if $\mathcal{A} \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{F}} \mathcal{A}$ for randomly generated \mathcal{A} , and
- the problem if $\mathcal{A} \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{F}} \mathcal{B}$ for randomly generated \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} ,

and measured time and memory consumption. Although the answers are known by construction (positive for the former, and almost surely negative for the latter), actual calculation via linear inequality constraints gives us an idea about resource consumption of our simulation-based method when it is applied to real-world problems.

The outcome is as shown in Figure 3. The parameter p is the probability with which an a -transition exists given a source state, a target state, and a character $a \in \Sigma$. Its weight is chosen from $\{0, 1, \dots, 16\}$ subject to the uniform distribution. “Same” means checking $\mathcal{A} \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{F}} \mathcal{A}$ and “difference” means checking $\mathcal{A} \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{F}} \mathcal{B}$ (see above). The two problem settings resulted in comparable performance.

We observe that space consumption is not so big a problem as in the $\mathcal{S}_{+, \times}$ case (Section 5.3). Somehow unexpectedly, there is no big performance gap between the sparse case ($p = 0.1$) and the dense case ($p = 0.9$); in fact the sparse case consumes slightly more memory. Consumption of both time and space grows faster than linearly, which poses a question about the scalability of our approach. That said, our current implementation of the algorithm in [21] leaves a lot of room for further optimization: one possibility is use of dynamic programming (DP). After all, it is an advantage of our approach that a simulation problem is reduced to linear inequality constraints, a subject of extensive research efforts (cf. Section 5.1 and Section 6.1).

7. Matrix Simulation for Polynomial Functors

In the previous sections, we concentrated our attention on matrix simulations for weighted (word) automata. They are special cases of (T, F) -systems where T is a multiset monad over some semiring and $F = 1 + \Sigma \times (_)$. However, according to the general theory developed in [6, 5], Kleisli simulation can be defined and its soundness can be proved for more general (T, F) -systems.

In this section, we generalize the functor F from $1 + \Sigma \times (_)$ (that we have been using) to an arbitrary polynomial functor:

$$F ::= (_) \mid \Sigma \mid F_1 \times F_2 \mid \prod_{i \in I} F_i. \quad (14)$$

Such a generalized (T, F) -system—where T is again a multiset monad—represents a system called a *weighted tree automaton*, whose concrete (not coalgebraic) theory can be found in [13, Chapter 9], for example. Here, the choice of F determines the shape of trees to which the automaton assigns a weight.

This section is organized as follows. In Section 7.1 we build on [5] and introduce the notion of forward partial execution (FPE) on the coalgebraic level of abstraction. We also prove its correctness (soundness and adequacy); the overall coalgebraic theory (i.e. the one in [5] augmented with FPE) generalizes the one in Section 4 for weighted (word) automata. The abstract theory thus obtained is applied in Section 7.2 to weighted tree automata—i.e. (T, F) -systems with T being a multiset monad and F being a polynomial functor. Much like for word automata, Kleisli simulations for tree automata are represented by matrices, subject however to *nonlinear* inequality constraints. Finally in Section 7.4 our proof-of-concept implementation is presented.

7.1. Forward Partial Execution, Categorically

Definition 7.1 (FPE, categorically) *Forward partial execution* (FPE) for (T, F) -systems is a transformation that takes: a (T, F) -system $\mathcal{X} = (X, s : \{\bullet\} \rightarrow X, c : X \rightarrow FX)$ and a parameter $X_1 \subseteq X$ as input; and returns a (T, F) -system $\mathcal{X}_{\text{FPE}, X_1}$.

The outcome $\mathcal{X}_{\text{FPE}, X_1}$ is defined as follows. Let c_1 and c_2 be the domain restrictions of c to X_1 and X_2 , respectively, via the coprojections $\kappa_i : X_i \rightarrow X$. That is explicitly:

$$c_1 = c \odot \kappa_1 : X_1 \rightarrow FX \quad \text{and} \quad c_2 = c \odot \kappa_2 : X_2 \rightarrow FX,$$

where \odot denotes composition of Kleisli arrows (Definition 2.9). We define $X_2 = X \setminus X_1$ (hence $X = X_1 + X_2$); the system $\mathcal{X}_{\text{FPE}, X_1}$ is now given by

$$\mathcal{X}_{\text{FPE}, X_1} = \left(\begin{array}{l} F(X) + X_2, \\ \{\bullet\} \xrightarrow{s} X_1 + X_2 \xrightarrow{c_1 + \text{id}} F(X) + X_2, \\ F(X) + X_2 \xrightarrow{[\text{id}, c_2]} F(X_1 + X_2) \xrightarrow{\overline{F}(c_1 + \text{id})} F(F(X) + X_2) \end{array} \right).$$

Here $\overline{F} : \mathcal{Kl}(T) \rightarrow \mathcal{Kl}(T)$ is the canonical lifting of $F : \mathbf{Sets} \rightarrow \mathbf{Sets}$ (see [16] for a concrete definition).

For the last categorical generalization of FPE, we shall establish its correctness—soundness, adequacy and monotonicity—much like in Section 4.3.

Theorem 7.2 (soundness of categorical FPE) *Let X_1 and Y_1 be arbitrary subsets of the state spaces of \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} , respectively. Each of the following implies $\text{tr}(\mathcal{X}) \sqsubseteq \text{tr}(\mathcal{Y})$.*

1. $\mathcal{X}_{\text{FPE}, X_1} \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{F}} \mathcal{Y}$
2. $\mathcal{X} \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{B}} \mathcal{Y}_{\text{FPE}, Y_1}$ □

Theorem 7.3 (adequacy of categorical FPE) *Let X_1 and Y_1 be arbitrary subsets of the state spaces of \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} , respectively. We have:*

1. $\mathcal{X} \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{F}} \mathcal{Y} \Rightarrow \mathcal{X}_{\text{FPE}, X_1} \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{F}} \mathcal{Y}$
2. $\mathcal{X} \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{B}} \mathcal{Y} \Rightarrow \mathcal{X} \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{B}} \mathcal{Y}_{\text{FPE}, Y_1}$ □

The last two theorems are immediate consequences of the following lemma. The last is a categorical generalization of Lemma 4.5.

Lemma 7.4 *For each subset X_1 of the state space of \mathcal{X} , we have:*

1. $\mathcal{X} \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{B}} \mathcal{X}_{\text{FPE}, X_1}$
2. $\mathcal{X}_{\text{FPE}, X_1} \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{F}} \mathcal{X}$

PROOF. 1. We define $g : X_1 + X_2 \rightarrow F(X) + X_2$ by $g = c_1 + \text{id}$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{F}(g) \odot c &= \overline{F}(c_1 + \text{id}) \odot [c_1, c_2] \\ &= \overline{F}(c_1 + \text{id}) \odot [\text{id}, c_2] \odot (c_1 + \text{id}) \\ &= (\overline{F}(c_1 + \text{id}) \odot [\text{id}, c_2]) \odot g , \\ g \odot s &= (c_1 + \text{id}) \odot s . \end{aligned}$$

Note here that $\overline{F}(c_1 + \text{id}) \odot [\text{id}, c_2]$ is the dynamics of the system $\mathcal{X}_{\text{FPE}, X_1}$. The above equalities witness that g indeed satisfies the inequalities required in the definition of backward Kleisli simulation, a generalization of Definition 2.14 that is found in [5]. Hence g is a backward simulation from \mathcal{X} to \mathcal{X}_{FPE} .

The item 2. is proved similarly: the same g that we used in the proof of the item 1. is shown to be a forward simulation from \mathcal{X}_{FPE} to \mathcal{X} . □

Finally, we present a monotonicity result. It generalizes Proposition 4.6.

Proposition 7.5 (monotonicity of categorical FPE) *Assume $X_1 \subseteq X'_1$ and $X_2 \subseteq X'_2$. We have:*

1. $\mathcal{X}_{\text{FPE}, X_1} \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{F}} \mathcal{Y} \Rightarrow \mathcal{X}_{\text{FPE}, X'_1} \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{F}} \mathcal{Y}$
2. $\mathcal{X} \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{B}} \mathcal{Y}_{\text{FPE}, Y_2} \Rightarrow \mathcal{X} \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{B}} \mathcal{Y}_{\text{FPE}, Y'_2}$ □

Categorical formalization of BPE is still open—it seems that BPE in Section 4 exists somewhat coincidentally, for the specific functor $F = 1 + \Sigma \times (_)$ for which an opposite automaton is canonically defined (cf. Remark 3.5).

7.2. Matrix Simulations for Weighted Tree Automata

Here we exploit the general theory we have just obtained (by augmenting [5] with FPE). We shall apply it to a class of systems that is more general than what we have been dealing with in the previous sections (namely weighted (word) automata). Specifically, we use the same monads for T but allow arbitrary polynomial functors for F . Such systems are naturally identified with *weighted tree automata*, where a finite-depth tree, instead of a finite word, gets a weight assigned.

We first define the notion of tree.

Definition 7.6 A *ranked alphabet* is a family $\Sigma = (\Sigma_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of countable sets that are indexed by natural numbers called *arities*.

The set $\text{Tree}(\Sigma)$ of (finite-depth) *trees* over a ranked alphabet Σ is defined in the obvious way. Concretely, $\text{Tree}(\Sigma)$ is the smallest set such that: for each $a \in \Sigma_n$, $t_0, t_1, \dots, t_{n-1} \in \text{Tree}(\Sigma)$ implies $a(t_0, t_1, \dots, t_{n-1}) \in \text{Tree}(\Sigma)$.

We introduce weighted tree automata, firstly in concrete terms.

Definition 7.7 (\mathcal{S} -weighted tree automaton, weighted tree language) Let $\mathcal{S} = (S, +_{\mathcal{S}}, 0_{\mathcal{S}}, \times_{\mathcal{S}}, 1_{\mathcal{S}}, \square)$ be a commutative cppo-semiring. An *\mathcal{S} -weighted tree automaton* is a quadruple $\mathcal{A} = (Q, \Sigma, M, \alpha)$ consisting of a countable state space Q , a ranked alphabet $\Sigma = (\Sigma_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, transition matrices $M(a) \in \mathcal{S}^{Q \times Q^n}$ for each $a \in \Sigma_n$, and the initial row vector $\alpha \in \mathcal{S}^Q$.

An \mathcal{S} -weighted tree automaton $\mathcal{A} = (Q, \Sigma, M, \alpha)$ yields a *weighted tree language* $L(\mathcal{A}) : \text{Tree}(\Sigma) \rightarrow S$. It is defined by $L(\mathcal{A})(t) = \alpha \cdot \Phi(t)$ —the product of a row vector α and a column vector $\Phi(t)$ —where $\Phi : \text{Tree}(\Sigma) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}^Q$ is defined as follows, by induction on the depth of trees.

$$\Phi(a(t_0, t_1, \dots, t_{n-1})) = M(a)(\Phi(t_0) \otimes \Phi(t_1) \otimes \dots \otimes \Phi(t_{n-1})) \quad \text{for each } a \in \Sigma_n.$$

The final column vector β in Definition 2.3 do not appear here; transition matrices $M(a)$ for $a \in \Sigma_0$ play the corresponding role.

The way weighted tree automata in the above operate can be understood in two different modes—a *top-down* one and a *bottom-up* one. In the top-down mode, we regard the automaton as one that reads the input tree from the root towards the leaves with its input head being split in its course; while in the bottom-up mode, the automaton reads the input tree in the opposite direction with its input head merged in its course.

It is known that these two modes define different languages for *deterministic* tree automata [47]. However, for nondeterministic tree automata as well as weighted ones, they define the same languages (of finite-depth trees).

Language inclusion between two \mathcal{S} -weighted tree automata is defined similarly to the case with \mathcal{S} -weighted automata.

Definition 7.8 (language inclusion) Let \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} be \mathcal{S} -weighted tree automata. We say the language of \mathcal{A} is *included* in the language of \mathcal{B} and write $L(\mathcal{A}) \sqsubseteq L(\mathcal{B})$ if, for all $t \in \text{Tree}(\Sigma)$, $L(\mathcal{A})(t) \sqsubseteq L(\mathcal{B})(t)$.

Similarly to \mathcal{S} -weighted (word) automata (see Proposition 2.8), \mathcal{S} -weighted tree automata are instances of (T, F) -systems.

Definition 7.9 (the functor F_Σ) It is standard that a ranked alphabet Σ gives rise to a polynomial functor. It is given as follows and is denoted by F_Σ .

$$F_\Sigma = \coprod_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \Sigma_n \times (_)^n \quad : \quad \mathbf{Sets} \longrightarrow \mathbf{Sets} .$$

Proposition 7.10 (weighted tree automata as (T, F) -systems) Let \mathcal{S} be a commutative cppo-semiring. An \mathcal{S} -weighted tree automaton $\mathcal{A} = (Q, (\Sigma_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}, M, \alpha)$ gives rise to an $(\mathcal{M}_\mathcal{S}, F_\Sigma)$ -system $\mathcal{X}_\mathcal{A} = (Q, s_\mathcal{A}, c_\mathcal{A})$ defined as follows. The function $s_\mathcal{A}: \{\bullet\} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_\mathcal{S}Q$ is given by $s_\mathcal{A}(\bullet)(x) = \alpha_x$; and $c_\mathcal{A}: Q \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_\mathcal{S}(F_\Sigma Q)$ is given by

$$c_\mathcal{A}(x)(a, (y_0, y_1, \dots, y_{n-1})) = M(a)_{x, (y_0, y_1, \dots, y_{n-1})}$$

where $a \in \Sigma_n$. □

The last identification allows us to apply the general results in [5, 6] to weighted tree automata. One of the results characterizes *coalgebraic trace semantics* by a final coalgebra in the Kleisli category $\mathcal{Kl}(\mathcal{M}_\mathcal{S})$; it is easy to see that, for weighted tree automata, coalgebraic trace semantics is nothing but the weighted tree language concretely defined in Definition 7.7.

The notions of forward and backward Kleisli simulation is defined in [5] in categorical terms; and a (categorical) proof of their soundness against coalgebraic trace semantics is presented. Much like in the previous sections, we shall now characterize Kleisli simulations for weighted tree automata by matrices; their soundness then follows from the above mentioned categorical proof.

The following lemma is a generalization of Lemma 3.3. It introduces the matrix representation of the action of the functor F_Σ on Kleisli arrows.

Lemma 7.11 Let $f : A \rightarrow B$ be a Kleisli arrow in $\mathcal{Kl}(\mathcal{M}_\mathcal{S})$ and M_f be its matrix representation (see Definition 3.1). Then the matrix representation $M_{\overline{F_\Sigma}f}$ of the arrow $\overline{F_\Sigma}f$ is given by

$$\bigoplus_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (I_{\Sigma_n} \otimes M_f^{\otimes n}) \in \mathcal{S}^{(F_\Sigma A) \times (F_\Sigma B)} . \quad (15)$$

Here, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $X_n \in \mathcal{S}^{A_n \times B_n}$, $(\bigoplus_{n \in \mathbb{N}} X_n) \in \mathcal{S}^{(\coprod_{n \in \mathbb{N}} A_n) \times (\coprod_{n \in \mathbb{N}} B_n)}$ is defined by

$$\left(\bigoplus_{n \in \mathbb{N}} X_n \right)_{x,y} = \begin{cases} (X_n)_{x,y} & (x \in A_n, y \in B_n) \\ 0 & (\text{otherwise}) \end{cases}$$

that is a generalization of the binary operation \oplus . The matrix $X^{\otimes n}$ is defined by

$$X^{\otimes n} = \underbrace{X \otimes X \otimes \dots \otimes X}_n . \quad \square$$

We note that the matrix in (15) is equivalently expressed as $\bigoplus_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \underbrace{(M_f^{\otimes n} \oplus M_f^{\otimes n} \oplus \dots \oplus M_f^{\otimes n})}_{|\Sigma_n|}$.

In what follows, Definition 7.12 and Theorem 7.13 are parallel to Definition 3.4 and Corollary 3.7, respectively.

Definition 7.12 (simulation matrix) Let $\mathcal{A} = (Q_{\mathcal{A}}, \Sigma, M_{\mathcal{A}}, \alpha_{\mathcal{A}})$ and $\mathcal{B} = (Q_{\mathcal{B}}, \Sigma, M_{\mathcal{B}}, \alpha_{\mathcal{B}})$ be \mathcal{S} -weighted tree automata.

- A matrix $X \in S^{Q_{\mathcal{B}} \times Q_{\mathcal{A}}}$ is a *forward simulation matrix* from \mathcal{A} to \mathcal{B} if

$$\alpha_{\mathcal{A}} \sqsubseteq \alpha_{\mathcal{B}} X \quad , \quad \text{and} \quad X \cdot M_{\mathcal{A}}(a) \sqsubseteq M_{\mathcal{B}}(a) \cdot (X^{\otimes n}) \quad \text{for any } n \in \mathbb{N} \text{ and } a \in \Sigma_n.$$
- A matrix $X \in S^{Q_{\mathcal{A}} \times Q_{\mathcal{B}}}$ is a *backward simulation matrix* from \mathcal{A} to \mathcal{B} if

$$\alpha_{\mathcal{A}} X \sqsubseteq \alpha_{\mathcal{B}} \quad , \quad \text{and} \quad M_{\mathcal{A}}(a) \cdot (X^{\otimes n}) \sqsubseteq X \cdot M_{\mathcal{B}}(a) \quad \text{for any } n \in \mathbb{N} \text{ and } a \in \Sigma_n.$$

Similarly to the case of semiring weighted automata, we write $\mathcal{A} \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{F}} \mathcal{B}$ and $\mathcal{A} \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{B}} \mathcal{B}$ if there exists a forward and backward matrix simulation from \mathcal{A} to \mathcal{B} , respectively.

Theorem 7.13 (soundness) *Let \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} be \mathcal{S} -weighted tree automata. Existence of a forward or backward simulation matrix from \mathcal{A} to \mathcal{B} —i.e. $\mathcal{A} \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{F}} \mathcal{B}$ or $\mathcal{A} \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{B}} \mathcal{B}$ —witnesses language inclusion $L(\mathcal{A}) \sqsubseteq L(\mathcal{B})$.*

PROOF. Simulation matrices in Definition 7.12 coincide with Kleisli simulations in the general theory of [5]. The latter is sound with respect to coalgebraic trace semantics [5, 6]; and the last coincides with the weighted tree language in Definition 7.7. \square

We note that, differently from matrix simulations for semiring weighted automata (Definition 3.4), the inequalities in Definition 7.12 are not necessarily linear. For example,

$$X^{\otimes 2} = \begin{pmatrix} \vdots & & \\ \cdots & \boxed{x_{i,j} X} & \cdots \\ \vdots & & \end{pmatrix}.$$

This nonlinearity poses an algorithmic challenge: many known algorithms for feasibility of inequalities are restricted to linear ones. See Section 7.4 for further discussions.

In the remainder of this section, we present a concrete definition of forward partial execution for weighted tree automata. It is an instance of Definition 7.1. Its soundness, adequacy and monotonicity follow from the general results in Section 7.1.

Definition 7.14 (FPE for weighted tree automata) *Forward partial execution (FPE)* is transformation of a weighted tree automata such that: given an \mathcal{S} -weighted tree automaton $\mathcal{A} = (Q, \Sigma, M, \alpha)$ where $\Sigma = (\Sigma_n)_n$, and a parameter $P \subseteq Q$, the resulting automaton $\mathcal{A}_{\text{FPE}, P} = (Q', \Sigma, M', \alpha')$ is as follows. It has a state space

$$Q' = \{(a, (y_0, y_1, \dots, y_{n-1})) \mid a \in \Sigma_n, \exists x \in P. M(a)_{x, (y_0, y_1, \dots, y_{n-1})} \neq 0_{\mathcal{S}}\} + (Q \setminus P) \quad , \quad (16)$$

that replaces each state $x \in P$ with its one-step behaviors $(a, (y_0, y_1, \dots, y_{n-1}))$ as new states. As for the transition matrices M' ,

$$\begin{aligned} M'(a)_{(a, (x_0, \dots, x_{n-1})), ((a_0, (y_0^0, \dots, y_{m_0-1}^0)), \dots, (a_{n-1}, (y_0^{n-1}, \dots, y_{m_{n-1}-1}^{n-1})))} &= \prod_{i=0}^{n-1} M(a_i)_{x_i, (y_0^i, \dots, y_{m_i-1}^i)} \\ M'(a)_{(a, (x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{n-1})), (x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{n-1})} &= 1_S \\ M'(a)_{x, ((a_0, (y_0^0, \dots, y_{m_0-1}^0)), \dots, (a_{n-1}, (y_0^{n-1}, \dots, y_{m_{n-1}-1}^{n-1})))} & \\ &= \left(M(a) \cdot \left(\bigotimes_{i=0}^{n-1} M(a_i) \right) \right)_{x, ((y_0^0, \dots, y_{m_0-1}^0), \dots, (y_0^{n-1}, \dots, y_{m_{n-1}-1}^{n-1}))} \\ M'(a)_{x,y} &= M(a)_{x,y} \end{aligned}$$

where $a \in \Sigma_n$, $a_i \in \Sigma_{m_i}$, and $x, x_i, y_j^i \in Q$. For all the other cases we define $M'(a)_{u,v} = 0_S$. As for the initial vector α' , the definition is shown below.

$$\alpha'_{(a, (x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}))} = (\alpha M(a))_{(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1})}, \quad \alpha'_x = \alpha_x$$

We do not yet have a good definition of backward partial execution for weighted tree automata, probably for the reason that we argued at the end of Section 7.1.

7.3. Algorithms

The algorithm `pttree_simulation_fwd` that searches for a forward simulation matrix between $\mathcal{S}_{+, \times}$ -weighted tree automata is as follows.

Algorithm 7.15 (`pttree_simulation_fwd`) **Input:** A pair of $\mathcal{S}_{+, \times}$ -weighted tree automata \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} .

Output: A forward simulation matrix X from \mathcal{A} to \mathcal{B} if such X exists, and “No” otherwise.

Procedure: For the input automata \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} , this algorithm first combines the constraints in Definition 7.12 into a system of (possibly nonlinear) polynomial inequalities, and then solves them. If a solution is found, then the algorithm outputs the solution and it outputs “No” otherwise.

Let us discuss the size of the system of inequalities to be solved. Assume that our goal is to establish $\mathcal{A} \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{F}} \mathcal{B}$. Let n be the number of states of \mathcal{A} and m be that of \mathcal{B} . (In case our goal is $\mathcal{A} \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{B}} \mathcal{B}$ we swap n and m .) Let d be the maximum arity in the ranked alphabet Σ . Then the number of inequality constraints is at most $\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} |\Sigma_k| \cdot m \cdot n^k$; and the degree of each polynomial inequality constraint is at most d .

The algorithm `pttree_simulation_bwd` that searches for a backward simulation matrix is similar.

7.4. Implementation, Experiments and Discussions

A program `+x-treesim`, in OCaml, implements the algorithms `pttree_simulation_fwd` and `pttree_simulation_bwd` in the previous section. The program is available in [12]. In our implementation polynomial inequality constraints are solved with the `FindInstance` function of *Mathematica* [48].

Experiments were done on a MacBook Pro laptop with a Core i5 processor (2.6 GHz, 2 cores) and 16 GB RAM. In our experiments we let the program `+×-treesim` try to establish $\mathcal{A} \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{F}} \mathcal{A}$ (or $\mathcal{A} \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{B}} \mathcal{A}$) for a randomly generated tree automaton \mathcal{A} .

Our current implementation turned out to be far from scalable: for the maximum arity $d = 2, 3$ and an automaton \mathcal{A} with several states and transitions, the program barely manages to establish the goal; it becomes hopeless for bigger problem instances. This is in a sense as we expected: use of a general purpose algorithm like `FindInstance` in *Mathematica* would never be a performance advantage; in fact, `FindInstance` tends to abort after tens of seconds, consuming a few MBs of memory, for reasons that we cannot know. An obvious alternative is to use special purpose algorithms—like the ones that are known in the field of convex optimization. This is left as future work.

8. Related Work

Throughout this paper, we followed the framework in [6] that uses Kleisli categories to coalgebraically capture finite trace semantics of weighted automata and weighted tree automata. In [49], a different approach to coalgebraic finite trace semantics is introduced where, instead of Kleisli categories, *Eilenberg-Moore categories* are used. Another coalgebraic approach to weighted tree automata—that is based on Stone-type dualities—is found in [50]. Very roughly the *Stone-duality approach* in [50] is similar to the *Kleisli approach* in the current paper, in that a single trace (that is a word or a tree) is thought of as a logical formula. The *Eilenberg-Moore approach* in [49] comes in quite a different flavor—it depends crucially on the *generalized determinization* construction. The latter is categorically formulated for the first time in [51] and studied further on e.g. in [52].

One clear advantage of the Kleisli approach (and hence of the Stone-duality approach, possibly) is that it generalizes smoothly to the theory of (possibly) infinite traces and simulations, such as in ω -automata as opposed to ordinary automata. This advantage is witnessed in our recent work [53], where forward and backward Kleisli simulations are shown to be sound (under certain minor conditions) with respect to the inclusion of infinite trace semantics. This soundness works both for the nondeterministic and probabilistic settings—the latter calls for measurable structures in the setting of infinite traces—suggesting the versatility of the Kleisli approach.

Such generalization to (possibly) infinite traces seems unlikely for the Eilenberg-Moore approach to coalgebraic (finite) traces: the Eilenberg-Moore approach is essentially via determinization; and, as is well-known, for Büchi automata nondeterminism strictly increases expressive power. That being said, focusing on finite traces, it seems possible to exploit the *algebraic* and *syntactic* nature of the Eilenberg-Moore approach in the problem domain of language inclusion.² More specifically, the Eilenberg-Moore approach (and generalized determinization) has a close tie to the theory of *generalized regular expressions* that is recently studied extensively (see e.g. [54, 35] and very recent [55]). This resulted in a sound and complete axiomatization of language *equivalence* for automata weighted with a certain class of semiring [35] (see also Remark 5.2); it is conceivable that a generalization of this deductive framework to language *inclusion*, by replacing equalities with inequalities, is possible. Such an “Eilenberg-Moore approach”

²This is based on a comment by one of the reviewers, for which we are grateful.

to language inclusion would form a *deductive* alternative to our current approach where we use matrices and continuous optimization (in the form of LP). Another potential advantage of the Eilenberg-Moore approach is that it does not need the ω -cpo structures that we need for the Kleisli approach, and hence can accommodate some semirings that our framework does not.

(Bi)simulation notions and (weighted) language equivalence/inclusion for quantitative systems have been an active research topic in the field of formal verification and concurrency. Some related work in this direction has already been discussed in the earlier sections, including [25, 8, 30, 29, 24]. See also Remark 5.2. Moreover, works like [28, 5, 3, 56] take a categorical/coalgebraic approach.

Use of matrices as witnesses of quantitative language equivalence/inclusion is in fact not uncommon. The rest of this section is devoted to the discussion of such works, and their comparison to the current work. Overall, the current work is distinguished in the following aspects.

- The categorical backend of Kleisli simulation that allows clean theoretical developments. The latter include: the duality between forward and backward simulation; a general soundness proof; and generalization to tree automata (Section 7).
- Our simulations witness language *inclusion*, a problem that is harder than language *equivalence* (see Section 5.1).
- Forward/backward partial execution (Section 4) that enhances effectivity of the approach by matrix simulations.
- Actual implementation of the algorithms and experiments.

In [9], a notion called *conjugacy* between semiring weighted (word) automata is introduced. It is an equivalence notion—it is a special case of $\sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{F}}$ in the current work, with the inequalities in Definition 3.4 replaced with equalities. The notion of conjugacy comes with “completeness”: assuming that the weight semiring is so-called a *division ring*, two automata are equivalent if and only if they are connected by some finite chain of conjugacies.

The notion of *simulation* in [27] is essentially the same as conjugacy in [9] (it is therefore an equivalence notion unlike the name). A simulation in [27] witnesses language equivalence. In [27] a semiring \mathcal{S} is called *proper* when: two \mathcal{S} -weighted automata are language equivalent if and only if they are connected by a finite chain of simulations. The authors go on to study proper semirings: they present a necessary condition for a semiring to be proper, and an example that is not proper (namely $\mathcal{S}_{\max,+}$).

The results in [27] have been extended to weighted *tree* automata in [10]. Their simulation is a special case of ours (Definition 7.12) where inequalities are replaced with equalities; soundness with respect to tree language equivalence is proved; and completeness of a combined simulation (with an intermediate automaton, much like in our $\sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{BF}}$ and $\sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{FB}}$) is shown, under some assumptions.

Unlike the work discussed in the above, the works [11, 57, 58] study simulations given by matrices in the context of *fuzzy automata*. Here simulation is an oriented notion and witnesses language inclusion (instead of language equivalence); its definition is essentially the same as ours (Definition 3.4). A principal difference between [11] and the current work is in the domain of weights: in [11] it is a structure called *residuated lattice*.

Algorithmic aspects of the simulation notion in [11] is pursued in [57], where an algorithm for computing the greatest simulation is presented. Their algorithm works for a general residuated lattice, unlike ours where linear inequalities are solved in semiring-specific manners.

These results in [11, 57] are adapted in [58] to automata weighted in a *semiring* (instead of a residuated lattice)—although some assumptions are imposed on a semiring and this makes the semiring $\mathcal{S}_{+, \times}$ unqualified.

9. Conclusions and Future Work

We introduced simulation matrices for weighted automata. While they are instances of (categorical) Kleisli simulations, their concrete presentation by matrices and linear inequalities yields concrete algorithms for simulation-based quantitative verification. Generalization to weighted tree automata follows immediately from the categorical theory behind, too, although linearity is lost in general.

There are some directions in which the current matrix-based simulation framework can be further generalized. Our idea of $\mathcal{S}_{+, \times}$ -weighted automata was that they are probabilistic systems; when we wish to accommodate uncountable state spaces (for which discrete probabilities are hardly meaningful), we would need suitable measure theoretic machinery. In the context of the current work of traces and simulations, this will involve replacing **Sets** with **Meas** (the category of measurable sets and measurable functions), and matrix multiplication with Lebesgue integration. Trace semantics for probabilistic automata in **Meas** has been studied e.g. in [59, 60].

In fact, use of **Meas** as a base category becomes necessary if we consider *infinite* trace semantics—i.e. a language of accepted infinite words—even if a state space is countable (i.e. discrete). This is simply because the set Σ^ω of all infinite words is not countable. We are currently working on the soundness of matrix simulations against languages of infinite words; details will be presented in another venue.

As we mentioned in Section 8, there are other approaches [49, 50] to coalgebraic trace semantics than the approach that we followed in this paper. In Section 8 we briefly discussed about the relationship to them and potential research directions. Working out their details is future work.

Further generalization of the current theory will be concerned with acceptance conditions that are unique to infinite words. An example is the Büchi acceptance condition, for which a simulation notion (for the nondeterministic setting) has been studied in [61]. A coalgebraic generalization of the simulation in [61] and derivation of definitions of simulations for systems like probabilistic Büchi automata [62] are interesting future work.

Finally, further optimization of our implementation is obvious future work. Existing techniques for optimizing (bi)simulation (e.g. up-to techniques [63] whose coalgebraic characterization is studied in [64]) are expected to be useful for this purpose.

Acknowledgments

Thanks are due to Andrzej Murawski, Shota Nakagawa and the anonymous referees (for the conference version and the current extended version) for useful discussions and comments; and to Björn Wachter for the user support of the tool APEX. The authors are

supported by: Grants-in-Aid No. 24680001 & 15KT0012, JSPS; and Support Program for Researchers Traveling Abroad (No. 2014.1.2.099), International Information Science Foundation, Japan.

Appendix A. Omitted Proofs

Appendix A.1. Proof of Lem. 6.4

PROOF. We prove the contraposition of each direction.

Assume that $\mathcal{A} \not\sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{G}} \mathcal{B}$, i.e. there exists a winning strategy (ρ_1, τ_1) for Challenger in a finite simulation game played on \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} . Then a strategy that repeats ρ_1 and τ_1 is a winning strategy for Challenger in an infinite simulation game played on $\mathcal{A}^{\text{Limavg}}$ and $\mathcal{B}^{\text{Limavg}}$. Hence $\mathcal{A}^{\text{Limavg}} \not\sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{G}}^{\text{Limavg}} \mathcal{B}^{\text{Limavg}}$.

Conversely, assume $\mathcal{A}^{\text{Limavg}} \not\sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{G}}^{\text{Limavg}} \mathcal{B}^{\text{Limavg}}$. Then there exists a winning strategy τ_1^∞ for Challenger in an infinite simulation game played on $\mathcal{A}^{\text{Limavg}}$ and $\mathcal{B}^{\text{Limavg}}$. By [44], without loss of generality, we may assume that τ_1^∞ is a positional strategy; i.e. the value of $\tau_1^\infty((p_0, q_0)(a_1, p_1, q_1) \dots (a_i, p_i, q_i))$ only depends on p_i and q_i .

One might hope to use τ_1^∞ itself as Challenger's winning strategy for the finite game for $\mathcal{A} \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{G}} \mathcal{B}$. This does not work in general, since a resulting run may not come back to \star . Modification of τ_1^∞ to force to visit \star may make the strategy less advantageous. We shall show that such modification is nevertheless feasible, by finding an upper bound r for "the disadvantage that results from visiting \star ." In the infinite game for $\mathcal{A}^{\text{Limavg}} \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{G}}^{\text{Limavg}} \mathcal{B}^{\text{Limavg}}$, a winning strategy can always additionally "save" the advantage r ; and it will be spent to visit \star .

To each $x \in Q_{\mathcal{A}}$ we shall choose and assign an *exit path* π_x . Specifically, by the assumption that \mathcal{A} has no trap states, each state $x \in Q_{\mathcal{A}}$ has a finite path $\pi_x = x b_{x,1} u_{x,1} b_{x,2} \dots b_{x,m(x)} u_{x,m(x)}$ in \mathcal{A} that "reaches the final state," that is, the path satisfies

$$M_{\mathcal{A}}(b_{x,1})_{x,u_{x,1}} + M_{\mathcal{A}}(b_{x,2})_{u_{x,1},u_{x,2}} + \dots + M_{\mathcal{A}}(b_{x,m(x)})_{u_{x,m(x)-1},u_{x,m(x)}} + (\beta_{\mathcal{A}})_{u_{x,m(x)}} \neq -\infty.$$

Within the path π_x , the advantages that Simulator can make are bounded: this follows from the assumptions that no weight in \mathcal{B} is ∞ , and that \mathcal{B} is finite state (so that there are only finitely many choices of an initial state). Since there are only finitely many $x \in Q_{\mathcal{A}}$, we can take a global upper bound $r \in \mathbb{R}$. To summarize, the real number r is chosen so that: for each $x \in Q_{\mathcal{A}}$, for the choice of an exit path $\pi_x = x b_{x,1} u_{x,1} b_{x,2} \dots b_{x,m(x)} u_{x,m(x)}$ as described above, and for each path $\pi = y b_{x,1} y_1 b_{x,2} \dots b_{x,m(x)} y_{m(x)}$ in \mathcal{B} on the same word $b_{x,1} b_{x,2} \dots b_{x,m(x)}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & M_{\mathcal{A}}(b_{x,1})_{x,u_{x,1}} + M_{\mathcal{A}}(b_{x,2})_{u_{x,1},u_{x,2}} + \dots + M_{\mathcal{A}}(b_{x,m(x)})_{u_{x,m(x)-1},u_{x,m(x)}} + (\beta_{\mathcal{A}})_{u_{x,m(x)}} + r \\ & > M_{\mathcal{B}}(b_{x,1})_{y,y_1} + M_{\mathcal{B}}(b_{x,2})_{y_1,y_2} + \dots + M_{\mathcal{B}}(b_{x,m(x)})_{y_{m(x)-1},y_{m(x)}} + (\beta_{\mathcal{B}})_{y_{m(x)}}. \end{aligned} \tag{A.1}$$

Using this $r \in \mathbb{R}$ ("an upper bound for the cost of visiting \star "), we shall construct a strategy $(\rho'_1 : 1 \rightarrow Q_{\mathcal{A}}, \tau'_1 : (Q_{\mathcal{A}} \times Q_{\mathcal{B}}) \times (\Sigma \times Q_{\mathcal{A}} \times Q_{\mathcal{B}})^* \rightarrow 1 + \Sigma \times Q_{\mathcal{A}})$ for Challenger in the finite simulation game for $\mathcal{A} \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{G}} \mathcal{B}$ as follows. For a pair of runs $R = (p_0 a_1 \dots a_i p_i, q_0 a_1 \dots a_i q_i)$ on \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} , we define the accumulated weights $S_{\mathcal{A}}^R$ and $S_{\mathcal{B}}^R$ by

$$S_{\mathcal{A}}^R = (\alpha_{\mathcal{A}})_{p_0} + M_{\mathcal{A}}(a_1)_{p_0,p_1} + \dots + M_{\mathcal{A}}(a_i)_{p_{i-1},p_i} \quad \text{and} \quad S_{\mathcal{B}}^R = (\alpha_{\mathcal{B}})_{q_0} + M_{\mathcal{B}}(a_1)_{q_0,q_1} + \dots + M_{\mathcal{B}}(a_i)_{q_{i-1},q_i}.$$

While $S_{\mathcal{A}}^R \leq S_{\mathcal{B}}^R + r$ (i.e. the saving is not enough for the cost of visiting \star), ρ'_1 and τ'_1 are defined as follows. They do essentially the same thing as τ_1^∞ does, except that τ'_1

terminates when \star is visited.

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho'_1(\bullet) &= \tau_1^\infty((\star, \star)) \\
\tau'_1((p_0, q_0)(a_1, p_1, q_1) \dots (a_i, p_i, q_i)) & \\
&= \begin{cases} \checkmark & (\tau_1^\infty((p_0, q_0)(a_1, p_1, q_1) \dots (a_i, p_i, q_i)) = (!, \star)) \\ \tau_1^\infty((p_0, q_0)(a_1, p_1, q_1) \dots (a_i, p_i, q_i)) & \text{(otherwise).} \end{cases} \tag{A.2}
\end{aligned}$$

Assume that $S_{\mathcal{A}}^R > S_{\mathcal{B}}^R + r$ is satisfied at a certain stage, say at the state $p_n \in Q_{\mathcal{A}}$ for the first time. After that, τ'_1 is defined for each $1 \leq j \leq m(p_n)$ by:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\tau'_1((p_0, q_0)(a_1, p_1, q_1) \dots (a_n, p_n, q_n)(b_{p_n,1}, u_{p_n,1}, y_1) \dots (b_{p_n,j}, u_{p_n,j}, y_j)) \\
&= \begin{cases} (b_{p_n,j+1}, u_{p_n,j+1}) & (j < m(p_n)) \\ \checkmark & (j = m(p_n)) \end{cases} \tag{A.3}
\end{aligned}$$

where $\pi_{p_n} = p_n b_{p_n,1} u_{p_n,1} b_{p_n,2} \dots b_{p_n,m(p_n)} u_{p_n,m(p_n)}$ is the exit path for p_n that we have fixed in the above. Here τ'_1 is headed to the exit along π_{p_n} , no matter what Simulator's move y_j is.

It remains to show that the strategy (ρ'_1, τ'_1) of Challenger's is winning in the finite game for $\mathcal{A} \sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{G}} \mathcal{B}$. In the case where the clause (A.3) is never invoked, we must have that $\tau_1^\infty((p_0, q_0)(a_1, p_1, q_1) \dots (a_i, p_i, q_i)) = (!, \star)$ holds for some i . At such i Challenger must have an accumulated weight that is strictly bigger than Simulator does: by the assumption that τ_1^∞ is positional, the strategy τ_1^∞ will just repeat what it has done, and it will not win unless it is winning so far.

Finally, in the case where the clause (A.3) is invoked, the advantage that Simulator makes between the time $n + 1$ and $n + m(p_n)$ is at most r by the definition of r . This does not eat up the "saving" r .

Therefore we have shown that $\mathcal{A} \not\sqsubseteq_{\mathbf{G}} \mathcal{B}$. This concludes the proof. \square

References

References

- [1] N. Urabe, I. Hasuo, Generic forward and backward simulations III: quantitative simulations by matrices, in: P. Baldan, D. Gorla (Eds.), CONCUR 2014 - Concurrency Theory - 25th International Conference, CONCUR 2014, Rome, Italy, September 2-5, 2014. Proceedings, volume 8704 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, Springer, 2014, pp. 451–466. URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-44584-6_31. doi:doi:10.1007/978-3-662-44584-6_31.
- [2] M. K. Reiter, A. D. Rubin, Crowds: Anonymity for web transactions, *ACM Trans. Inf. Syst. Secur.* 1 (1998) 66–92.
- [3] I. Hasuo, Y. Kawabe, H. Sakurada, Probabilistic anonymity via coalgebraic simulations, *Theor. Comput. Sci.* 411 (2010) 2239–2259.
- [4] N. A. Lynch, F. W. Vaandrager, Forward and backward simulations: I. Untimed systems, *Inf. Comput.* 121 (1995) 214–233.
- [5] I. Hasuo, Generic forward and backward simulations, in: C. Baier, H. Hermanns (Eds.), CONCUR, volume 4137 of *Lect. Notes Comp. Sci.*, Springer, 2006, pp. 406–420.
- [6] I. Hasuo, B. Jacobs, A. Sokolova, Generic trace semantics via coinduction, *Logical Methods in Computer Science* 3 (2007). URL: [http://dx.doi.org/10.2168/LMCS-3\(4:11\)2007](http://dx.doi.org/10.2168/LMCS-3(4:11)2007). doi:10.2168/LMCS-3(4:11)2007.

- [7] I. Hasuo, Generic forward and backward simulations II: Probabilistic simulation, in: P. Gastin, F. Laroussinie (Eds.), CONCUR, volume 6269 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, Springer, 2010, pp. 447–461.
- [8] K. Chatterjee, L. Doyen, T. A. Henzinger, Quantitative languages, *ACM Trans. Comput. Log.* 11 (2010). URL: <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/1805950.1805953>. doi:10.1145/1805950.1805953.
- [9] M. Béal, S. Lombardy, J. Sakarovitch, On the equivalence of \mathbb{Z} -automata, in: L. Caires, G. F. Italiano, L. Monteiro, C. Palamidessi, M. Yung (Eds.), *Automata, Languages and Programming*, 32nd International Colloquium, ICALP 2005, Lisbon, Portugal, July 11–15, 2005, Proceedings, volume 3580 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, Springer, 2005, pp. 397–409. doi:10.1007/11523468_33.
- [10] Z. Ésik, A. Maletti, The category of simulations for weighted tree automata, *Int. J. Found. Comput. Sci.* 22 (2011) 1845–1859. doi:10.1142/S0129054111009070.
- [11] M. Ciric, J. Ignjatovic, N. Damljanovic, M. Basic, Bisimulations for fuzzy automata, *Fuzzy Sets and Systems* 186 (2012) 100–139. doi:10.1016/j.fss.2011.07.003.
- [12] N. Urabe, I. Hasuo, Implementations for plus-times semiring weighted automata, max-plus semiring weighted automata, and plus-times semiring weighted tree automata, <http://www.mmm.is.s.u-tokyo.ac.jp/~nurabe/implementations/ptmptree.zip>.
- [13] D. Manfred, K. Werner, V. Heiko, *Handbook of weighted automata*, Springer, 2009.
- [14] J.-E. Pin, Tropical semirings, *Idempotency (Bristol, 1994)* (1998) 50–69.
- [15] M. Droste, P. Gastin, Weighted automata and weighted logics, *Theor. Comput. Sci.* 380 (2007) 69–86.
- [16] B. Jacobs, *Introduction to coalgebra. Towards mathematics of states and observations*, 2012. Draft of a book (ver. 2.0), available online.
- [17] I. Hasuo, B. Jacobs, Context-free languages via coalgebraic trace semantics, in: J. L. Fiadeiro, N. Harman, M. Roggenbach, J. J. M. M. Rutten (Eds.), CALCO, volume 3629 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, Springer, 2005, pp. 213–231.
- [18] S. Abramsky, A. Jung, Domain theory, in: *Handbook of Logic in Computer Science*, Clarendon Press, 1994, pp. 1–168.
- [19] J. Power, D. Turi, A coalgebraic foundation for linear time semantics, *Electr. Notes Theor. Comput. Sci.* 29 (1999) 259–274.
- [20] M. Akian, S. Gaubert, A. E. Guterman, Tropical polyhedra are equivalent to mean payoff games, *International Journal of Algebra and Computation* 22 (2012).
- [21] P. Butkovic, K. Zimmermann, A strongly polynomial algorithm for solving two-sided linear systems in max-algebra, *Discrete Applied Math.* 154 (2006) 437–446.
- [22] J. A. Brzozowski, Canonical regular expressions and minimal state graphs for definite events, *Mathematical theory of Automata* 12 (1962) 529–561.
- [23] F. Bonchi, M. M. Bonsangue, H. H. Hansen, P. Panangaden, J. J. M. M. Rutten, A. Silva, Algebra-coalgebra duality in brzozowski’s minimization algorithm, *ACM Trans. Comput. Log.* 15 (2014) 3. URL: <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/2490818>. doi:10.1145/2490818.
- [24] V. D. Blondel, V. Canterini, Undecidable problems for probabilistic automata of fixed dimension, *Theory Comput. Syst.* 36 (2003) 231–245.
- [25] B. Jonsson, K. G. Larsen, Specification and refinement of probabilistic processes, in: *LICS*, IEEE Computer Society, 1991, pp. 266–277.
- [26] D. Krob, The equality problem for rational series with multiplicities in the tropical semiring is undecidable, in: W. Kuich (Ed.), ICALP, volume 623 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, Springer, 1992, pp. 101–112.
- [27] Z. Ésik, A. Maletti, Simulation vs. equivalence, in: H. R. Arabnia, G. A. Gravvanis, A. M. G. Solo (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 2010 International Conference on Foundations of Computer Science, FCS 2010*, July 12–15, 2010, Las Vegas, Nevada, USA, CSREA Press, 2010, pp. 119–124.
- [28] J. Hughes, B. Jacobs, Simulations in coalgebra, *Theor. Comput. Sci.* 327 (2004) 71–108.
- [29] S. Kiefer, A. S. Murawski, J. Ouaknine, B. Wachter, J. Worrell, Language equivalence for probabilistic automata, in: G. Gopalakrishnan, S. Qadeer (Eds.), CAV, volume 6806 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, Springer, 2011, pp. 526–540.
- [30] C. Baier, H. Hermanns, J.-P. Katoen, Probabilistic weak simulation is decidable in polynomial time, *Inf. Process. Lett.* 89 (2004) 123–130.
- [31] M. Boreale, Weighted bisimulation in linear algebraic form, in: M. Bravetti, G. Zavattaro (Eds.), CONCUR 2009 - Concurrency Theory, 20th International Conference, CONCUR 2009, Bologna, Italy, September 1–4, 2009. Proceedings, volume 5710 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, Springer, 2009, pp. 163–177. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-04081-8>.

- doi:10.1007/978-3-642-04081-8_12.
- [32] D. M. R. Park, Concurrency and automata on infinite sequences, in: P. Deussen (Ed.), *Theoretical Computer Science*, 5th GI-Conference, Karlsruhe, Germany, March 23-25, 1981, Proceedings, volume 104 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, Springer, 1981, pp. 167–183. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BFb0017309>. doi:10.1007/BFb0017309.
- [33] E. W. Stark, On behavior equivalence for probabilistic I/O automata and its relationship to probabilistic bisimulation, *Journal of Automata, Languages and Combinatorics* 8 (2003) 361–395.
- [34] P. Aczel, N. P. Mendler, A final coalgebra theorem, in: D. H. Pitt, D. E. Rydeheard, P. Dybjer, A. M. Pitts, A. Poigné (Eds.), *Category Theory and Computer Science*, Manchester, UK, September 5-8, 1989, Proceedings, volume 389 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, Springer, 1989, pp. 357–365.
- [35] M. M. Bonsangue, S. Milius, A. Silva, Sound and complete axiomatizations of coalgebraic language equivalence, *ACM Trans. Comput. Log.* 14 (2013) 7. URL: <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/2422085.2422092>. doi:10.1145/2422085.2422092.
- [36] V. Klee, G. J. Minty, How good is the simplex algorithm?, in: O. Shisha (Ed.), *Inequalities*, volume III, Academic Press, New York, 1972, pp. 159–175.
- [37] N. Karmarkar, A new polynomial-time algorithm for linear programming, *Combinatorica* 4 (1984) 373–396. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF02579150>. doi:10.1007/BF02579150.
- [38] S. Smale, On the average number of steps of the simplex method of linear programming, *Math. Program.* 27 (1983) 241–262. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF02591902>. doi:10.1007/BF02591902.
- [39] *gnu linear programming kit*, The GNU linear programming kit, <http://www.gnu.org/software/glpk>.
- [40] S. Kiefer, A. S. Murawski, J. Ouaknine, B. Wachter, J. Worrell, Algorithmic probabilistic game semantics—playing games with automata, *Formal Methods in System Design* 43 (2013) 285–312.
- [41] W.-G. Tzeng, A polynomial-time algorithm for the equivalence of probabilistic automata, *SIAM J. Comput.* 21 (1992) 216–227.
- [42] L. Doyen, T. A. Henzinger, J.-F. Raskin, Equivalence of labeled markov chains, *Int. J. Found. Comput. Sci.* 19 (2008) 549–563.
- [43] C. Konstantinos, P. Catuscia, Probable innocence revisited, *Theoretical Computer Science* 367 (2006) 123–138.
- [44] A. Ehrenfeucht, J. Mycielski, Positional strategies for mean payoff games, *International Journal of Game Theory* 8 (1979) 109–113.
- [45] U. Zwick, M. Paterson, The complexity of mean payoff games on graphs, *Theor. Comput. Sci.* 158 (1996) 343–359.
- [46] M. Bezem, R. Nieuwenhuis, E. Rodríguez-Carbonell, Exponential behaviour of the Butkovic-Zimmermann algorithm for solving two-sided linear systems in max-algebra, *Discrete Applied Mathematics* 156 (2008) 3506–3509.
- [47] H. Comon, M. Dauchet, R. Gilleron, C. Löding, F. Jacquemard, D. Lugiez, S. Tison, M. Tommasi, *Tree automata techniques and applications*, Available on: <http://www.grappa.univ-lille3.fr/tata>, 2007. Release October, 12th 2007.
- [48] *mathematica*, *Mathematica*, <http://www.wolfram.com/mathematica/>.
- [49] B. Jacobs, A. Silva, A. Sokolova, Trace semantics via determinization, *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.* 81 (2015) 859–879. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jcss.2014.12.005>. doi:10.1016/j.jcss.2014.12.005.
- [50] B. Klin, J. Rot, Coalgebraic trace semantics via forgetful logics, in: A. M. Pitts (Ed.), *Foundations of Software Science and Computation Structures - 18th International Conference, FoSSaCS 2015, Held as Part of the European Joint Conferences on Theory and Practice of Software, ETAPS 2015, London, UK, April 11-18, 2015. Proceedings*, volume 9034 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, Springer, 2015, pp. 151–166. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-46678-0>. doi:10.1007/978-3-662-46678-0_10.
- [51] F. Bartels, On generalised coinduction and probabilistic specification formats: Distributive laws in coalgebraic modelling, Ph.D. thesis, Free Univ. Amsterdam, 2004.
- [52] J. Adámek, F. Bonchi, M. Hülsbusch, B. König, S. Milius, A. Silva, A coalgebraic perspective on minimization and determinization, in: L. Birkedal (Ed.), *FoSSaCS*, volume 7213 of *Lect. Notes Comp. Sci.*, Springer, 2012, pp. 58–73.
- [53] N. Urabe, I. Hasuo, Coalgebraic infinite traces and kleisli simulations, in: L. S. Moss, P. Sobocinski (Eds.), *6th Conference on Algebra and Coalgebra in Computer Science, CALCO 2015, June 24-26, 2015, Nijmegen, The Netherlands*, volume 35 of *LIPICs*, Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik, 2015, pp. 320–335. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.4230/LIPICs.CALCO.2015.320>.

- doi:10.4230/LIPIcs.CALCO.2015.320.
- [54] M. M. Bonsangue, J. J. M. M. Rutten, A. Silva, An algebra for Kripke polynomial coalgebras, in: *Logic in Computer Science*, IEEE, Computer Science Press, 2009, pp. 49–58.
- [55] D. Kozen, K. Mamouras, D. Petrisan, A. Silva, Nominal Kleene coalgebra, in: M. M. Halldórsson, K. Iwama, N. Kobayashi, B. Speckmann (Eds.), *Automata, Languages, and Programming - 42nd International Colloquium, ICALP 2015, Kyoto, Japan, July 6-10, 2015, Proceedings, Part II*, volume 9135 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, Springer, 2015, pp. 286–298. URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-47666-6_23. doi:10.1007/978-3-662-47666-6_23.
- [56] A. Sokolova, *Coalgebraic Analysis of Probabilistic Systems*, Ph.D. thesis, Techn. Univ. Eindhoven, 2005.
- [57] M. Ciric, J. Ignjatovic, I. Jancic, N. Damljanovic, Computation of the greatest simulations and bisimulations between fuzzy automata, *Fuzzy Sets and Systems* 208 (2012) 22–42. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.fss.2012.05.006>. doi:10.1016/j.fss.2012.05.006.
- [58] N. Damljanovic, M. Ciric, J. Ignjatovic, Bisimulations for weighted automata over an additively idempotent semiring, *Theor. Comput. Sci.* 534 (2014) 86–100. doi:10.1016/j.tcs.2014.02.032.
- [59] C. Cirstea, Maximal traces and path-based coalgebraic temporal logics, *Theor. Comput. Sci.* 412 (2011) 5025–5042.
- [60] H. Kerstan, B. König, Coalgebraic trace semantics for continuous probabilistic transition systems, *Logical Methods in Computer Science* 9 (2013). URL: [http://dx.doi.org/10.2168/LMCS-9\(4:16\)2013](http://dx.doi.org/10.2168/LMCS-9(4:16)2013). doi:10.2168/LMCS-9(4:16)2013.
- [61] K. Etessami, T. Wilke, R. A. Schuller, Fair simulation relations, parity games, and state space reduction for Büchi automata, *SIAM J. Comput.* 34 (2005) 1159–1175.
- [62] C. Baier, M. Größer, Recognizing omega-regular languages with probabilistic automata, in: *20th IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (LICS 2005)*, 26-29 June 2005, Chicago, IL, USA, Proceedings, IEEE Computer Society, 2005, pp. 137–146. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/LICS.2005.41>. doi:10.1109/LICS.2005.41.
- [63] D. Sangiorgi, Beyond bisimulation: The “up-to” techniques, in: F. S. de Boer, M. M. Bonsangue, S. Graf, W. P. de Roever (Eds.), *Formal Methods for Components and Objects*, 4th International Symposium, FMCO 2005, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, November 1-4, 2005, Revised Lectures, volume 4111 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, Springer, 2005, pp. 161–171. URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/11804192_8. doi:10.1007/11804192_8.
- [64] F. Bonchi, D. Petrisan, D. Pous, J. Rot, Coinduction up-to in a fibrational setting, in: T. A. Henzinger, D. Miller (Eds.), *Joint Meeting of the Twenty-Third EACSL Annual Conference on Computer Science Logic (CSL) and the Twenty-Ninth Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (LICS)*, CSL-LICS ’14, Vienna, Austria, July 14 - 18, 2014, ACM, 2014, pp. 20:1–20:9. URL: <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/2603088.2603149>. doi:10.1145/2603088.2603149.