

Analyzing Divergence for Nondeterministic Probabilistic Models

Hao Wu^a, Yuxi Fu^{a,*}, Huan Long^a, Xian Xu^b, Wenbo Zhang^c

^a*BASICS, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, China*

^b*East China University of Science and Technology*

^c*Shanghai Ocean University*

Abstract

Branching and weak probabilistic bisimilarities are two well-known notions capturing behavioral equivalence between nondeterministic probabilistic systems. For probabilistic systems, divergence is of major concern. Recently several divergence-sensitive refinements of branching and weak probabilistic bisimilarities have been proposed in the literature. Both the definitions of these equivalences and the techniques to investigate them differ significantly. This paper presents a comprehensive comparative study on divergence-sensitive behavioral equivalence relations that refine the branching and weak probabilistic bisimilarities. Additionally, these equivalence relations are shown to have efficient checking algorithms. The techniques of this paper might be of independent interest in a more general setting.

Keywords: Divergence, Bisimulation, Probabilistic process

1. Introduction

Background and Motivation

In the area of program analysis, probability and nondeterminism have received significant attention in recent years [17, 9, 15]. Many different nondeterministic probabilistic models have been studied from both theoretical and practical perspectives, such as Markov decision processes (MDP) [2, 15, 4], Probabilistic automata (PA) [27, 8, 29], Randomized CCS (RCCS) [18, 36, 34], etc.. For these models, a fundamental question is how to define the behavioral equivalence between probabilistic systems. Variants of equivalence for these nondeterministic probabilistic models have already been studied over the years, including strong bisimulation [22, 32, 5], weak bisimulation [1, 13, 34, 27], branching bisimulation [28, 7, 6, 18], trace equivalence [20] and testing equivalence [22, 35, 14]. Among them probabilistic branching and weak bisimulations are of great importance. Their non-probabilistic versions have been intensively studied in the linear-time branching-time spectrum by van Glabbeek [31]. Traditional branching and weak bisimulations ignore the role of divergence, i.e., an infinite sequence of internal computation steps need not be bisimulated. However,

*Corresponding author

Email address: fu-yx@cs.sjtu.edu.cn (Yuxi Fu)

divergence is crucial in practice as a non-terminating computation could be unintended in many applications. As it turns out, system behaviors become far more complicated when divergence is an issue. Liu et al. [24] have addressed the importance of divergence for non-probabilistic processes in system verification. They put forward divergence-sensitive branching and weak bisimilarities in the non-probabilistic setting, and give equivalent characterizations for them.

As mentioned above, probability adds complexity to the analysis of systems. There have been mainly two ways to capture divergence in the nondeterministic probabilistic models. The first one is defined by the existence of a *divergent ϵ -tree* (roughly, the probabilistic version of state-preserving internal action sequences) [18]. The second one is defined by the reachability to a τ -EC (roughly, the probabilistic version of the internal action cycle) [19]. Although the two concepts are defined in the context of probabilistic branching and weak bisimulations respectively, they are actually independent of specific bisimulation semantics.

We give an example to explain the motivation of our work. In Figure 1, S is the specification of a probabilistic system, and P_1, P_2 are two implementation candidates. We would like to tell whether P_1 and P_2 implement S faithfully. In probabilistic program analysis, *almost-sure termination* [9, 25, 17] is a standard criterion, which requires that a given probabilistic program terminates with probability 1. In this example, if we ignore divergence, it is easily seen that P_1, P_2 and S are pairwise branching (also weak) bisimilar to each other. However, only P_1 and S are almost-surely terminating, whereas P_2 is not almost-surely terminating (as P_2 can reach a state Q_2 that can loop forever). Thus from the point of view of almost-sure termination, P_1 and P_2 are not equivalent, and it is reasonable to say that only P_1 implements S faithfully. Since P_2 can reach a silent cycle whereas S and P_1 cannot, the *exhaustive weak probabilistic bisimilarity* proposed by He et al. [19] distinguishes P_2 from P_1 (and S as well).

Let us take an even closer look at P_2 , and consider the pair of states (P_2, Q_2) . Neither P_2 nor Q_2 is almost-surely terminating, and both can reach the cycle of Q_2 . So they cannot be separated by the exhaustive weak bisimilarity of He et al. [19]. However, their behaviors might appear very different to environments, and from the perspective of observation they ought to be distinguished. Consider the two nondeterministic transitions from Q_2 , one has $\text{tr}_1 = Q_2 \xrightarrow{\tau} Q_2$ and $\text{tr}_2 = Q_2 \xrightarrow{\tau} P_2$. By our understanding of nondeterminism, there is the possibility that tr_1 is repeatedly executed ad infinitum, due to say hardware malfunction. An external observer O can tell P_2 and Q_2 apart by interacting with them. There is a non-zero *probability* that O communicates with P_2 through channel a or b . On the other hand there is a *possibility* that O may never communicate with Q_2 . The distinction between probability and possibility must be maintained in probabilistic nondeterministic models. The subtle difference between P_2 and Q_2 cannot be detected by the τ -EC approach. It can be recognized by the *divergence-sensitive branching bisimilarity* of Fu [18].

Related Work

van Glabbeek et al. [30] explore the equivalence property of *branching bisimilarity with explicit divergence*.




Figure 1: Examples of systems with different divergence behaviors.

Liu et al. [24] show that it is much more difficult to prove the equivalence property of the *weak bisimilarity with explicit divergence*. Instead of giving a direct proof, they get around the difficulty by constructing a new equivalence called *complete weak bisimilarity* and showing that it is the largest weak bisimulation with explicit divergence. A key property for both the branching bisimilarity with explicit divergence and the complete weak bisimilarity is the *stuttering property* [3, 24]. None of these works can be extended to probabilistic models in a straightforward manner. In this work, we will extend results about branching bisimilarity with explicit divergence to the probabilistic models. However, extending the weak bisimilarity with explicit divergence to probabilistic models turns out to be much more complicated. This is because the extra discriminating power introduced by probability makes the equivalent characterization by the complete weak bisimilarity no longer work.

Recently a model-independent approach for studying branching bisimilarity of probabilistic systems has been proposed in [18], along with the conception of divergence-sensitive branching bisimilarity. In [19], the authors have proposed the exhaustive weak probabilistic bisimilarity and showed that it is an equivalence. The exhaustive weak probabilistic bisimilarity is actually a probabilistic version of the complete weak bisimilarity of Liu et al. [24]. It is well-known that branching bisimilarities are strictly finer than weak bisimilarities [33]. Proving this relationship in the probabilistic setting is a challenge. The technical reason is that Fu [18] takes a tree-based characterization for probabilistic transitions whereas He et al. [19] takes the distribution-based characterization.

Quite a few equivalence checking algorithms for the above mentioned equivalences have been studied in the literature. Zhang et al. [36] introduce a polynomial algorithm for checking probabilistic branching bisimilarity, which follows the partition-refinement strategy. Turrini and Hermanns [29] give a delicate polynomial time algorithm for deciding weak probabilistic bisimulation for PA model, significantly improving the previous exponential complexity in [8]. The key technique in [29] is a novel characterization of the weak combined transitions as a linear programming problem. It should be emphasized that Turrini and Hermanns [29] also study the branching version in terms of the so-called *branching combined transition*, which is different from the concepts in [24, 18]. Neither Zhang et al. [36] nor Turrini and Hermanns [29] give consideration to the divergence issue. In the most recent work [19], a polynomial verification algorithm for exhaustive weak probabilistic bisimilarity is proposed that incorporates the partition-refinement algorithm with the inductive

verification approach proposed in [24].

The picture of the divergence-sensitive probabilistic bisimulation equivalences is far from complete. In this paper we focus on the divergence issue in this picture. We shall prove a number of separation results regarding the equivalence relations mentioned above, and carry out algorithmic studies on these equivalences.

Contribution

The main contributions of this paper are stated as follows.

1. We give a comprehensive comparison between variants of the (divergence-sensitive) branching (or weak) bisimulation semantics for probabilistic processes (Theorem 4.6). Particularly we show that the ϵ -tree based branching bisimilarity is finer than the distribution-based weak bisimilarity (Theorem 2.20). We also show that the divergent ϵ -tree property is stronger than the τ -EC property in the branching semantics (Theorem 3.15).
2. We give an efficient verification algorithm for each divergence-sensitive bisimilarity studied in (1). Our polynomial algorithm for the exhaustive weak bisimilarity (\simeq_e) makes use of the so-called maximal τ -EC, which is simpler than the inductive characterization of \approx_e used in the previous work.
3. We also present some novel techniques that could be of independent interest. In establishing Theorem 2.20, we come up with a way to relate distribution-based semantics and ϵ -tree based semantics for probabilistic models. When proving Theorem 3.15, we apply a technical lemma (Lemma 3.12) that builds the connection between τ -EC and divergent ϵ -tree.

Organization

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 summarizes the necessary knowledge about the finite state probabilistic model and two notions of bisimulations. The relationship between the branching and weak bisimilarities for such model is also studied. Section 3 defines two divergence-sensitive branching bisimulation semantics, the branching bisimilarity with explicit divergence and the exhaustive branching bisimilarity, along with the discussion of their relationship. Section 4 builds up a lattice for the variants of the probabilistic bisimilarities. Section 5 gives the equivalence checking algorithms for the divergence-sensitive bisimilarities studied in the paper, all with polynomial time complexity. Section 6 concludes.

2. Preliminaries

We begin by fixing the probabilistic process model of this paper. We then introduce the branching and weak bisimilarities without any consideration of divergence. The technical contribution of this section is a proof of the fact that the branching bisimilarity indeed implies the weak bisimilarity in the randomized CCS

model. This is not a routine exercise since it calls for a comparison of the ϵ -tree based semantics against the distribution-based semantics.

2.1. Background knowledge

2.1.1. Finite state randomized CCS model

Let $Chan$ be the set of channels, ranged over by lowercase letters a, b, c . We use τ to represent the silent action. The set of actions is $Act = Chan \cup \{\tau\}$, ranged over by $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \ell$. Let Act_p be the set $Act \cup \{p\tau \mid 0 < p < 1\}$, ranged over by λ . The grammar of finite state randomized CCS model, $RCCS_{fs}$, is defined as:

$$S, T := \mathbf{0} \mid X \mid \sum_{i \in I} \alpha_i.T_i \mid \bigoplus_{i \in I} p_i\tau.T_i \mid \mu X.T, \quad (*)$$

where the non-empty index set I is finite. In $(*)$, $\mathbf{0}$ is the nil term, X is a process variable, $\sum_{i \in I} \alpha_i.T_i$ is a nondeterministic choice term, $\bigoplus_{i \in I} p_i\tau.T_i$ is a probabilistic choice term, and $\mu X.T$ is a fixpoint term. A trailing $\mathbf{0}$ which appears at the end of a term is often omitted, e.g., $\tau.a$ represents $\tau.a.\mathbf{0}$. Sometimes we will use the infix notation of \sum to specify particular summands in the nondeterministic choice term, writing for example $\sum_{i \in I'} \alpha_i.T_i + \beta.T' + \gamma.T''$. In the probabilistic choice term $\bigoplus_{i \in I} p_i\tau.T_i$, I is a finite set with $|I| \geq 2$, each $p_i \in (0, 1)$ and $\sum_{i \in I} p_i = 1$. As usual, the variable X in $\mu X.T$ is *bound*. A variable in a term is *free* if it is not bound. A term is a *process* if it contains no free variables. We write A, B, C, P, Q for processes. The set of all $RCCS_{fs}$ processes will be denoted by $\mathcal{P}_{RCCS_{fs}}$. The operational semantics of $RCCS_{fs}$ is given by the *labeled transition system* (LTS for short) in Figure 2, where $\lambda \in Act_p$ and the transition relation $\longrightarrow \subseteq \mathcal{P}_{RCCS_{fs}} \times Act_p \times \mathcal{P}_{RCCS_{fs}}$.

$$\frac{}{\sum_{i \in I} \alpha_i.T_i \xrightarrow{\alpha_i} T_i} \quad \frac{}{\bigoplus_{i \in I} p_i\tau.T_i \xrightarrow{p_i\tau} T_i} \quad \frac{T\{\mu X.T/X\} \xrightarrow{\lambda} T'}{\mu X.T \xrightarrow{\lambda} T'}$$

Figure 2: LTS for $RCCS_{fs}$.

For any $A \in \mathcal{P}_{RCCS_{fs}}$, there could be only a finite number of processes reachable from A . The *induced transition graph* of A , denoted by $G_A = (V_A, E_A)$, is a directed labeled graph satisfying that V_A contains all the processes reachable from A , E_A contains all the transitions on V_A and each edge $e_A = (A', A'') \in E_A$ with label $\lambda \in Act_p$ stands for the transition $A' \xrightarrow{\lambda} A''$ in LTS.

Example 2.1. The three probabilistic systems in Figure 1 can be defined as the following $RCCS_{fs}$ processes: $S = \frac{1}{2}\tau.a \oplus \frac{1}{2}\tau.b$, $P_1 = \mu X.(\frac{1}{3}\tau.X \oplus \frac{1}{3}\tau.a \oplus \frac{1}{3}\tau.b)$, $Q_2 = \mu X.(\tau.X + \tau.(\frac{1}{3}\tau.X \oplus \frac{1}{3}\tau.a \oplus \frac{1}{3}\tau.b))$ and $P_2 = \frac{1}{3}\tau.Q_2 \oplus \frac{1}{3}\tau.a \oplus \frac{1}{3}\tau.b$. Figures 1a, 1b and 1c then give the induced transition graph for the $RCCS_{fs}$ process S , P_1 and P_2 , respectively.

Following [18], a collection of probabilistic transitions $\left\{ \bigoplus_{i \in I} p_i\tau.T_i \xrightarrow{p_i\tau} T_i \right\}_{i \in I}$ can be treated as a *collective silent transition*, in notation $\bigoplus_{i \in I} p_i\tau.T_i \xrightarrow{\coprod_{i \in I} p_i\tau} \coprod_{i \in I} T_i$, where the auxiliary notation \coprod is

used to indicate a collection of things. We extend the notation $\prod_{i \in I} p_i \tau$ to fixpoint terms as follows: if $T\{\mu X.T/X\} \xrightarrow{\prod_{i \in I} p_i \tau} \prod_{i \in I} T_i$, then we define $\mu X.T \xrightarrow{\prod_{i \in I} p_i \tau} \prod_{i \in I} T_i$. We give an example as follows.

Example 2.2. Let $T = \frac{1}{3}\tau.X \oplus \frac{2}{3}\tau.\mathbf{0}$ and consider the fixpoint process $P = \mu X.T = \mu X.(\frac{1}{3}\tau.X \oplus \frac{2}{3}\tau.\mathbf{0})$. Let $p_1 = \frac{1}{3}$, $p_2 = \frac{2}{3}$, $T_1 = P$ and $T_2 = \mathbf{0}$, then $T\{P/X\} = \bigoplus_{i \in [2]} p_i \tau.T_i$. Since $T\{P/X\}$ can perform the collective silent transition $T\{P/X\} \xrightarrow{\prod_{i \in [2]} p_i \tau} \prod_{i \in [2]} T_i$, one has $P \xrightarrow{\prod_{i \in [2]} p_i \tau} \prod_{i \in [2]} T_i$.

An *immediate silent transition* of A , denoted by itr_A , is either a non-probabilistic silent transition $A \xrightarrow{\tau} A'$ or a collective silent transition $A \xrightarrow{\prod_{j \in J} q_j \tau} \prod_{j \in J} A_j$ (where $\sum_{j \in J} q_j = 1$). We use $\text{tgt}(\text{itr}_A)$ to denote the *target set* of itr_A , which is defined as $\text{tgt}(A \xrightarrow{\tau} A') = \{A'\}$ and $\text{tgt}(A \xrightarrow{\prod_{j \in J} q_j \tau} \prod_{j \in J} A_j) = \{A_j \mid j \in J\}$.

We will use \mathcal{E} to denote an equivalence and \mathcal{R} to denote a binary relation. We write $A \mathcal{E} B$ for $(A, B) \in \mathcal{E}$ and use $[A]_{\mathcal{E}}$ to denote the equivalence class containing A . For an equivalence \mathcal{E} on $\mathcal{P}_{\text{RCCS}_{fs}}$, the notation $\mathcal{P}_{\text{RCCS}_{fs}}/\mathcal{E}$ stands for the set of equivalence classes defined by \mathcal{E} . Given an equivalence \mathcal{E} on $\mathcal{P}_{\text{RCCS}_{fs}}$, we say that an immediate silent transition $\text{itr} = A \xrightarrow{\tau} A'$ is *state-preserving* if $A' \mathcal{E} A$ and $\text{itr} = A \xrightarrow{\prod_{j \in J} q_j \tau} \prod_{j \in J} A_j$ is state-preserving if $A_j \mathcal{E} A$ for all $j \in J$. An immediate silent transition itr is called *state-changing* if it is not state-preserving.

2.1.2. Branching bisimilarity

Branching bisimilarity for RCCS_{fs} model was proposed by Fu [18]. It is a behavioral equivalence compatible with the classical branching bisimilarity [33]. We start with the definition of ϵ -tree [18]. Intuitively an ϵ -tree is a randomized version of a sequence of state-preserving internal actions. In the following definition, $[k]$ stands for the set $\{1, \dots, k\}$.

Definition 2.3 (ϵ -tree). Let \mathcal{E} be an equivalence on $\mathcal{P}_{\text{RCCS}}$ and $A \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{RCCS}}$ be a process. An ϵ -tree $t_{\mathcal{E}}^A$ of A with regard to \mathcal{E} is a labeled tree such that the following statements are valid.

- Each node of $t_{\mathcal{E}}^A$ is labeled by an element of $[A]_{\mathcal{E}}$, and each edge is labeled by an element of $(0, 1]$. The root of $t_{\mathcal{E}}^A$ is labeled by A .
- If a node labeled B has only one child B' , then $B \xrightarrow{\tau} B'$ and the edge from B to B' is labeled 1.
- If a node labeled B has k children B_1, \dots, B_k and each edge from B to B_i is labeled p_i , then $B \xrightarrow{\prod_{i \in [k]} p_i \tau} \prod_{i \in [k]} B_i$.

Example 2.4. Let $P_3 = \mu X.(\frac{1}{2}\tau.(a + \tau.X) \oplus \frac{1}{2}\tau.(b + \tau.X))$ and $\mathcal{E}_3 = \{\{P_3, a + \tau.P_3, b + \tau.P_3\}, \{\mathbf{0}\}\}$. The diagrams in Figure 3a describe two possible ϵ -trees of P_3 with regard to \mathcal{E}_3 . Let $P_4 = \mu X.(\frac{1}{3}\tau.X \oplus \frac{2}{3}\tau.(\frac{1}{2}\tau.X \oplus \frac{1}{4}\tau.a \oplus \frac{1}{4}\tau.b))$, $Q_4 = \frac{1}{2}\tau.P_4 \oplus \frac{1}{4}\tau.a \oplus \frac{1}{4}\tau.b$ and $\mathcal{E}_4 = \{\{P_4, Q_4\}, \{a\}, \{b\}, \{\mathbf{0}\}\}$. An infinite ϵ -tree of P_4 with regard to \mathcal{E}_4 is given in Figure 3b.




Figure 3: Examples of ϵ -tree.

Note that though in Figure 3 all nodes with the same label have the same children, this is not a necessary requirement for the ϵ -trees. As another example, consider the processes $P_1 = \mu X.(\tau.\tau.X + \tau.(\mu Y.(\tau.Y)))$, $P_2 = \tau.P_1$, $P_3 = \mu Y.(\tau.Y)$ and the equivalence $\mathcal{E} = \{\{P_1, P_2, P_3\}\}$. The sequence $P_1 \xrightarrow{\tau} P_2 \xrightarrow{\tau} P_1 \xrightarrow{\tau} P_3$ forms a finite ϵ -tree of P_1 with regard to \mathcal{E} , while the two nodes with the same label P_1 in the tree have different children.

An ϵ -tree $t_{\mathcal{E}}^A$ of A with regard to \mathcal{E} is called *maximal* if there is no other ϵ -tree $(t')_{\mathcal{E}}^A$ such that $t_{\mathcal{E}}^A$ is a proper subtree of $(t')_{\mathcal{E}}^A$. For a tree t , a *branch* is either a finite path from its root to a leaf or an infinite path. To a finite path π , we will use $\pi(i)$ to denote the label of the i -th edge in π and use $|\pi|$ to denote the length of π . The probability $P(\pi)$ of a finite path π is $\prod_{i \leq |\pi|} \pi(i)$. The *convergence probability* of $t_{\mathcal{E}}^A$ is then defined by $P^c(t_{\mathcal{E}}^A) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} P_k(t_{\mathcal{E}}^A)$, where

$$P_k(t_{\mathcal{E}}^A) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum \{P(\pi) \mid \pi \text{ is a finite branch in } t_{\mathcal{E}}^A \text{ such that } |\pi| \leq k\}.$$

Definition 2.5 (Regular and divergent ϵ -tree). An ϵ -tree $t_{\mathcal{E}}^A$ is *regular* if $P^c(t_{\mathcal{E}}^A) = 1$; it is *divergent* if $P^c(t_{\mathcal{E}}^A) = 0$.

We then give the definition of ℓ -transition.

Definition 2.6 (ℓ -transition). Suppose $\mathcal{B} \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{RCCS}}/\mathcal{E}$ and $(\ell \in \text{Chan}) \vee (\ell = \tau \wedge \mathcal{B} \neq [A]_{\mathcal{E}})$. We say that there is an ℓ -transition from A to \mathcal{B} with regard to \mathcal{E} , written $A \rightsquigarrow_{\mathcal{E}}^{\ell} \mathcal{B}$, if there exists a regular ϵ -tree $t_{\mathcal{E}}^A$ such that $L \xrightarrow{\ell} L' \in \mathcal{B}$ for every leaf L of $t_{\mathcal{E}}^A$.

Example 2.7. Consider the process P_3 and equivalence \mathcal{E}_3 in Example 2.4. The two ϵ -trees in Figure 3a induce the ℓ -transitions $P_3 \rightsquigarrow_{\mathcal{E}_3}^b [\mathbf{0}]_{\mathcal{E}_3}$ and $P_3 \rightsquigarrow_{\mathcal{E}_3}^a [\mathbf{0}]_{\mathcal{E}_3}$.

State-changing probabilistic silent actions are characterized by q -transitions in [18]. Intuitively q -transitions capture the idea that after some state-preserving internal actions, every derived process can

evolve into some new equivalence class with the same conditional probability q .

Suppose $L \xrightarrow{\prod_{i \in [k]} p_i \tau} \prod_{i \in [k]} L_i$ and some L_i falls into an equivalence class $\mathcal{B} \neq [L]_{\mathcal{E}}$. Define

$$\mathbf{P} \left(L \xrightarrow{\prod_{i \in [k]} p_i \tau} \mathcal{B} \right) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{i \in [k], L_i \in \mathcal{B}} p_i$$

The *normalized probability* is defined as the conditional probability of leaving $[L]_{\mathcal{E}}$ to \mathcal{B} , i.e.,

$$\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{E}} \left(L \xrightarrow{\prod_{i \in [k]} p_i \tau} \mathcal{B} \right) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{P} \left(L \xrightarrow{\prod_{i \in [k]} p_i \tau} \mathcal{B} \right) / \left(1 - \mathbf{P} \left(L \xrightarrow{\prod_{i \in [k]} p_i \tau} [L]_{\mathcal{E}} \right) \right).$$

Definition 2.8 (q -transition). Suppose $\mathcal{B} \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{RCCS}}/\mathcal{E}$ and $\mathcal{B} \neq [A]_{\mathcal{E}}$. We say that there is a q -transition from A to \mathcal{B} with regard to \mathcal{E} , written $A \rightsquigarrow_{\mathcal{E}}^q \mathcal{B}$, if there exists a regular ϵ -tree $t_{\mathcal{E}}^A$ satisfying $L \xrightarrow{\prod_{i \in [k]} p_i \tau} \prod_{i \in [k]} L_i$ and $\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{E}} \left(L \xrightarrow{\prod_{i \in [k]} p_i \tau} \mathcal{B} \right) = q$ for every leaf L of $t_{\mathcal{E}}^A$.

Example 2.9. Consider the processes P_4, Q_4 and equivalence \mathcal{E}_4 in Example 2.4. The ϵ -tree in Figure 3b induces the q -transition $P_4 \rightsquigarrow_{\mathcal{E}_4}^{1/2} [a]_{\mathcal{E}_4}$ ($P_4 \rightsquigarrow_{\mathcal{E}_4}^{1/2} [b]_{\mathcal{E}_4}$ resp.), where $\frac{1}{2} = \frac{1}{4}/(1 - \frac{1}{2})$ is the normalized probability of leaving $[Q_4]_{\mathcal{E}_4}$ to $[a]_{\mathcal{E}_4}$ ($[b]_{\mathcal{E}_4}$ resp.).

Definition 2.10 (Branching bisimulation). An equivalence \mathcal{E} on $\mathcal{P}_{\text{RCCS}_{fs}}$ is a *branching bisimulation* if, whenever $(A, B) \in \mathcal{E}$, then for all $\mathcal{C} \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{RCCS}}/\mathcal{E}$ it holds that:

1. If $A \rightsquigarrow_{\mathcal{E}}^{\ell} \mathcal{C}$ and $(\ell \in \text{Chan}) \vee (\ell = \tau \wedge \mathcal{C} \neq [A]_{\mathcal{E}})$, then $B \rightsquigarrow_{\mathcal{E}}^{\ell} \mathcal{C}$.
2. If $A \rightsquigarrow_{\mathcal{E}}^q \mathcal{C}$ such that $\mathcal{C} \neq [A]_{\mathcal{E}}$, then $B \rightsquigarrow_{\mathcal{E}}^q \mathcal{C}$.

We write $A \simeq B$ if there is a branching bisimulation \mathcal{E} such that $(A, B) \in \mathcal{E}$.

For a relation \mathcal{E} on $\mathcal{P}_{\text{RCCS}_{fs}}$, we write \mathcal{E}^* for its equivalence closure.

Lemma 2.11 ([18]). *If $\{\mathcal{E}_i\}_{i \in I}$ is a collection of branching bisimulations, then $\mathcal{E} = (\bigcup_{i \in I} \mathcal{E}_i)^*$ is also a branching bisimulation.*

Theorem 2.12. *The relation \simeq is an equivalence relation, and it is the largest branching bisimulation.*

Lemma 2.13 ([36]). *The equivalence \simeq is decidable in polynomial time.*

2.1.3. Weak bisimilarity

We start by recalling the necessary notions for defining the weak bisimilarity for RCCS_{fs} . A probabilistic distribution over a countable set S is a function $\rho : S \rightarrow [0, 1]$ such that $\sum_{A \in S} \rho(A) = 1$. We denote by $\text{Distr}(S)$ the set of probabilistic distributions over S . For $S' \subseteq S$, we define $\rho(S') = \sum_{A \in S'} \rho(A)$. We use δ_A to denote the *Dirac* distributions, defined by $\delta_A(A) = 1$ and $\delta_A(A') = 0$ for all $A' \neq A$. The *support* of a probabilistic distribution ρ , denoted by $\text{Supp}(\rho)$, is the set $\{A \mid \rho(A) > 0\}$. For a distribution with finite

support, we also write $\rho = \{(A : \rho(A)) \mid A \in \text{Supp}(\rho)\}$ to enumerate the probability associated with each element of $\text{Supp}(\rho)$. Given a countable set of distributions $\{\rho_i \in \text{Distr}(S)\}_{i \in I}$ and a countable set of real numbers $\{c_i \in [0, 1]\}_{i \in I}$ such that $\sum_{i \in I} c_i = 1$, we say that ρ is the *convex combination* of $\{\rho_i\}_{i \in I}$ according to $\{c_i\}_{i \in I}$, denoted by $\sum_{i \in I} c_i \cdot \rho_i$, if for each $A \in S$, $\rho(A) = \sum_{i \in I} c_i \cdot \rho_i(A)$.

To define the weak bisimilarity in RCCS_{fs} , we need to introduce a *probabilistic labeled transition system* (pLTS for short). The system is defined in Figure 4, where $\beta \in \text{Act}$ and the probabilistic transition relation $\longrightarrow \subseteq \mathcal{P}_{\text{RCCS}_{fs}} \times \text{Act} \times \text{Distr}(\mathcal{P}_{\text{RCCS}_{fs}})$. Although we use the same symbol \longrightarrow for the LTS and pLTS rules, its meaning should be clear from the context.

$$\frac{}{\sum_{i \in I} \alpha_i \cdot T_i \xrightarrow{\alpha_i} \delta_{T_i}} \quad \frac{}{\bigoplus_{i \in I} p_i \tau \cdot T_i \xrightarrow{\tau} \{T_i : p_i\}_{i \in I}} \quad \frac{T\{\mu X.T/X\} \xrightarrow{\beta} \rho}{\mu X.T \xrightarrow{\beta} \rho}$$

Figure 4: pLTS for RCCS_{fs} .

Let $\text{Tr} = \{(A, \alpha, \rho) \mid A \xrightarrow{\alpha} \rho \text{ can be derived in the pLTS}\}$ be the set of transitions. For a transition $\text{tr} = (A, \alpha, \rho)$, we denote by $\text{src}(\text{tr})$ the source process A , by $\text{act}(\text{tr})$ the action α , and by ρ_{tr} the evolved distribution ρ . Let $\text{Tr}(\alpha) = \{\text{tr} \in \text{Tr} \mid \text{act}(\text{tr}) = \alpha\}$. An *execution fragment* of some process A_0 is a finite or infinite sequence of alternating states and actions $\omega = A_0 \alpha_0 A_1 \alpha_1 A_2 \alpha_2 \cdots$ such that $A_i \xrightarrow{\alpha_i} \rho_i$ and $\rho_i(A_{i+1}) > 0$. If ω is finite, we denote by $\text{last}(\omega)$ the last state of ω . We denote by $\text{frags}^*(A)$ and $\text{frags}(A)$ the set of finite and all execution fragments of A , respectively. Given $\alpha \in \text{Act}$, we define $\widehat{\alpha} = \alpha$ if $\alpha \in \text{Chan}$, and $\widehat{\alpha} = \epsilon$ (the empty string) if $\alpha = \tau$. The *trace* of an execution fragment ω is the sub-sequence of external actions of ω , i.e., $\text{trace}(\omega) = \widehat{\alpha}_0 \widehat{\alpha}_1 \widehat{\alpha}_2 \cdots$.

In [29], the notion of *scheduler* is used to resolve non-determinism. To a process A , a scheduler is a function $\sigma : \text{frags}^*(A) \rightarrow \text{Distr}(\text{Tr} \cup \{\perp\})$ such that for each $\omega \in \text{frags}^*(A)$, $\sigma(\omega) \in \text{Distr}(\{\text{tr} \in \text{Tr} \mid \text{src}(\text{tr}) = \text{last}(\omega)\} \cup \{\perp\})$. Intuitively a scheduler specifies a distribution over possible next transitions starting from state $\text{last}(\omega)$. If a scheduler takes the special value \perp , it chooses no further transition and terminates. We call a scheduler (of A) *Dirac* if for each $\omega \in \text{frags}^*(A)$, $\sigma(\omega) = \delta_{\text{tr}}$ for some $\text{tr} \in \text{Tr}$ or $\sigma(\omega) = \delta_{\perp}$. A scheduler σ and a process A induce a probability distribution $\rho_{\sigma, A}$ over finite execution fragments as follows. The basic measurable events are the *cones* of finite execution fragments, where the cone of ω is defined by $C_\omega = \{\omega' \in \text{frags}(A) \mid \omega \text{ is a prefix of } \omega'\}$. The probability $\rho_{\sigma, A}$ of a cone C_ω is defined recursively as follows:

$$\rho_{\sigma, A}(C_\omega) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } \omega = A, \\ 0, & \text{if } \omega = B \text{ for a process } B \neq A, \\ \rho_{\sigma, A}(C_{\omega'}) \cdot \sum_{\text{tr} \in \text{Tr}(\alpha)} \sigma(\omega')(\text{tr}) \cdot \rho_{\text{tr}}(B), & \text{if } \omega = \omega' \alpha B. \end{cases}$$

Finally, for any $\omega \in \text{frags}^*(A)$, $\rho_{\sigma, A}(\omega)$ is defined as $\rho_{\sigma, A}(\omega) = \rho_{\sigma, A}(C_\omega) \cdot \sigma(\omega)(\perp)$, where $\sigma(\omega)(\perp)$ is the probability of choosing no further transition (i.e., terminating) after ω .

The next definition of weak combined transition is standard [27, 29]. The fact that state A can weakly transfer to distribution ρ by executing an observable action α is defined as follows: if there exists a scheduler σ , from A by doing α and finite number of silent actions following σ , the probability of the final state being B equals $\rho(B)$.

Definition 2.14 (Weak combined transition). Given a process $A \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{RCCS}_{fs}}$, an action $\alpha \in \text{Act}$ and a distribution $\rho \in \text{Distr}(\mathcal{P}_{\text{RCCS}_{fs}})$. We say that there is a *weak combined transition* from A to ρ labeled by α , denoted by $A \xrightarrow{\alpha}_c \rho$, if there exists a scheduler σ such that the following holds for the induced distribution $\rho_{\sigma,A}$:

1. $\rho_{\sigma,A}(\text{frags}^*(A)) = 1$.
2. For each $\omega \in \text{frags}^*(A)$, if $\rho_{\sigma,A}(\omega) > 0$ then $\text{trace}(\omega) = \hat{\alpha}$.
3. For each process B , $\rho_{\sigma,A}\{\omega \in \text{frags}^*(A) \mid \text{last}(\omega) = B\} = \rho(B)$.

Definition 2.15 (Lifting [16, 12]). Given a binary relation $\mathcal{R} \subseteq X \times Y$. The lifting of \mathcal{R} is the relation $\mathcal{R}^\dagger \subseteq \text{Distr}(X) \times \text{Distr}(Y)$ satisfying that $(\rho_X, \rho_Y) \in \mathcal{R}^\dagger$ iff $\rho_X = \sum_{i \in I} p_i x_i$ and $\rho_Y = \sum_{i \in I} p_i y_i$ such that $(x_i, y_i) \in \mathcal{R}$ for each $i \in I$.

It has also been shown by Turrini and Hermanns [29] that if \mathcal{E} is an equivalence relation on a set X , then $(\rho_1, \rho_2) \in \mathcal{E}^\dagger$ iff for each $\mathcal{C} \in X/\mathcal{E}$, $\rho_1(\mathcal{C}) = \rho_2(\mathcal{C})$. Now for an equivalence \mathcal{E} , we often use $\rho_1 =_{\mathcal{E}} \rho_2$ to denote that $(\rho_1, \rho_2) \in \mathcal{E}^\dagger$.

The next definition resembles the traditional conception for probabilistic automata [27].

Definition 2.16 (Weak bisimulation). An equivalence \mathcal{E} on $\mathcal{P}_{\text{RCCS}_{fs}}$ is a *weak bisimulation* if, for all $(A, B) \in \mathcal{E}$, if $A \xrightarrow{\alpha}_c \rho_A$, then there exists ρ_B such that $B \xrightarrow{\alpha}_c \rho_B$ and $\rho_A \mathcal{E}^\dagger \rho_B$.

We write $A \approx B$ if there is a weak bisimulation \mathcal{E} such that $(A, B) \in \mathcal{E}$.

Theorem 2.17 ([29]). \approx is an equivalence relation, and it is the largest weak bisimulation.

2.2. The comparison of branching and weak bisimulation semantics

The comparison between branching and weak semantics for probabilistic models is not trivial because their definitions are quite different. To establish the containment relationship between them, we need to find a way to relate ϵ -trees with probability distributions. To this end, we start by proving some technical lemmas. Lemma 2.18 states that given a bunch of distributions with the same conditional probability of leaving some $[A]_{\mathcal{E}}$ for any other equivalence class \mathcal{C} , the convex combination of these distributions will not change the corresponding conditional probability.

Lemma 2.18. *Given a process A and an equivalence \mathcal{E} on $\mathcal{P}_{\text{RCCS}_{fs}}$. Let $\{\rho_i\}_{i \in I}$ be a countable set of distributions rendering true the followings for all $i \in I$:*

- $\rho_i([A]_{\mathcal{E}}) = p_i < 1$.
- For all equivalence class $\mathcal{C} \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{RCCS}}/\mathcal{E}$ and $\mathcal{C} \neq [A]_{\mathcal{E}}$, the conditional probability $\rho_{i|A}(\mathcal{C})$ is a constant $q_{\mathcal{C}}$, where $\rho_{i|A}(\mathcal{C}) = \rho_i(\mathcal{C})/(1 - \rho_i([A]_{\mathcal{E}}))$.

Then for any convex combination $\rho = \sum_{i \in I} c_i \rho_i$ of $\{\rho_i\}_{i \in I}$ according to $\{c_i\}_{i \in I}$, we have $\rho([A]_{\mathcal{E}}) < 1$ and $\rho_{i|A}(\mathcal{C}) = q_{\mathcal{C}}$ for all $\mathcal{C} \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{RCCS}}/\mathcal{E}$ and $\mathcal{C} \neq [A]_{\mathcal{E}}$.

Proof. By putting all processes in the same equivalence classes together, we can represent each distribution ρ_i as $p_i \cdot [A]_{\mathcal{E}} + \sum_{j \in J_i} (p_{ij} \cdot [A_j]_{\mathcal{E}})$, where J_i is a finite index set and $[A]_{\mathcal{E}}, \{[A_j]_{\mathcal{E}}\}_{j \in J_i}$ are all different equivalence classes (we reuse the addition sign to stand for the combination of distributions over equivalent classes with respect to \mathcal{E}). Now, by the assumption of the lemma, we have

- (1) $\forall i \in I : J_i = J$ for some constant index set J ;
- (2) $\forall i \in I : p_i < 1$ and $p_i + \sum_{j \in J} p_{ij} = 1$;
- (3) $\forall i \in I, j \in J : p_{ij}/(1 - p_i) = q_j$, where q_j is a constant for each fixed j ;
- (4) $\sum_{j \in J} q_j = 1$.

Then each convex combination $\rho = \sum_{i \in I} c_i \rho_i$ can be represented by $\sum_{i \in I} c_i (p_i \cdot [A]_{\mathcal{E}} + \sum_{j \in J} p_{ij} \cdot [A_j]_{\mathcal{E}}) = (\sum_{i \in I} c_i p_i) \cdot [A]_{\mathcal{E}} + \sum_{j \in J} (\sum_{i \in I} c_i p_{ij}) \cdot [A_j]_{\mathcal{E}}$.

Let $r = \sum_{i \in I} c_i p_i$ be the probability $\rho([A]_{\mathcal{E}})$, then $r < 1$ follows from (2) and $\sum_{i \in I} c_i = 1$. Since the conditional probability $\rho_{i|A}([A_j]_{\mathcal{E}}) = \sum_{i \in I} c_i p_{ij}/(1 - r)$, we only need to show that $\sum_{i \in I} c_i p_{ij}/(1 - r) = q_j$ holds for all $j \in J$. In fact, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i \in I} c_i p_{ij} &= \sum_{i \in I} c_i (q_j (1 - p_i)) \quad (\text{by (3)}) \\ &= q_j \left(\sum_{i \in I} c_i (1 - p_i) \right) = q_j \left(\sum_{i \in I} c_i - \sum_{i \in I} c_i p_i \right) = q_j (1 - r) \quad (\text{by the definition of } r) \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof. \square

Given two distributions ρ, ρ' with the same conditional probability of leaving $[A]_{\mathcal{E}}$ to any other equivalence class \mathcal{C} , the following lemma shows that if a process B enables a weak combined transition $B \xrightarrow{\alpha}_c \rho$, then it also enables another weak combined transition $B \xrightarrow{\alpha}_c \rho''$ for some ρ'' such that ρ'' is related to ρ' via lifting.

Lemma 2.19. *Given a process A and an equivalence \mathcal{E} on $\mathcal{P}_{\text{RCCS}_{fs}}$. Let $\rho, \rho' \in \text{Distr}(\mathcal{P}_{\text{RCCS}_{fs}})$ be two distributions rendering true the followings:*

1. $\rho([A]_{\mathcal{E}}) < 1$ and $\rho'([A]_{\mathcal{E}}) < 1$;

2. For all equivalence class $\mathcal{C} \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{RCCS}}/\mathcal{E}$ and $\mathcal{C} \neq [A]_{\mathcal{E}}$, the conditional probability $\rho_{\perp A}(\mathcal{C}) = \rho'_{\perp A}(\mathcal{C})$, where $\rho_{\perp A}(\mathcal{C}) = \rho(\mathcal{C})/(1 - \rho([A]_{\mathcal{E}}))$.

For any process $B \in [A]_{\mathcal{E}}$, if $B \xrightarrow{\alpha}_c \rho$, then $B \xrightarrow{\alpha}_c \rho''$ for some ρ'' such that $\rho' \mathcal{E}^{\dagger} \rho''$.

Proof. By a similar argument as in the proof of Lemma 2.18, we can assume that $\rho =_{\mathcal{E}} p \cdot [A]_{\mathcal{E}} + \sum_{i \in I} (p_i \cdot [A_i]_{\mathcal{E}})$ and $\rho' =_{\mathcal{E}} q \cdot [A]_{\mathcal{E}} + \sum_{i \in I} (q_i \cdot [A_i]_{\mathcal{E}})$, where I is a finite index set and $[A]_{\mathcal{E}}, \{[A_i]_{\mathcal{E}}\}_{i \in I}$ are pairwise different equivalence classes. Moreover, the conditional probability $p_i/(1 - p) = q_i/(1 - q)$ holds for all $i \in I$.

Now suppose the weak combined transition $B \xrightarrow{\alpha}_c \rho$ is induced by scheduler σ , we then construct a scheduler σ'' that induces $B \xrightarrow{\alpha}_c \rho''$ and $\rho' \mathcal{E}^{\dagger} \rho''$ as follows: Let $c = (1 - q)/(1 - p)$ and σ_{\perp} be the scheduler choosing no transitions, i.e., $\sigma_{\perp}(B) = \perp$; scheduler σ'' will behave as σ with probability c and behave as σ_{\perp} with probability $1 - c$. Since σ_{\perp} induces the distribution δ_B and $B \in [A]_{\mathcal{E}}$, the induced distribution by σ'' would be $\rho'' = c\rho + (1 - c)\delta_B =_{\mathcal{E}} c(p \cdot [A]_{\mathcal{E}} + \sum_{i \in I} p_i \cdot [A_i]_{\mathcal{E}}) + (1 - c)(1 \cdot [A]_{\mathcal{E}})$. By simple calculation, we can find that the last one equals $q \cdot [A]_{\mathcal{E}} + \sum_{i \in I} q_i \cdot [A_i]_{\mathcal{E}} =_{\mathcal{E}} \rho'$. \square

With the above preparation, we can prove that branching bisimilarity implies weak bisimilarity (Theorem 2.20). This result is important in that it is the first time that these two bisimilarities (based on ϵ -tree and distribution, respectively) are compared in the setting of probabilistic models.

Theorem 2.20 ($\simeq \subseteq \approx$). *If \mathcal{E} is a branching bisimulation, then \mathcal{E} is a weak bisimulation.*

Proof. Let \mathcal{E} be a branching bisimulation. Suppose $(A, B) \in \mathcal{E}$ and $A \xrightarrow{\alpha} \rho_A$, according to Definition 2.16, we need to show that there exists ρ_B such that $B \xrightarrow{\alpha}_c \rho_B$ and $\rho_A \mathcal{E}^{\dagger} \rho_B$. We focus on the most difficult case, i.e., $\alpha = \tau$ and there exists $A' \in \text{Supp}(\rho_A)$ such that $(A, A') \notin \mathcal{E}$.

Now assume that $\rho_A = p \cdot [A]_{\mathcal{E}} + \sum_{i \in I} (p_i \cdot [A_i]_{\mathcal{E}})$, where $p < 1$, $\sum_{i \in I} p_i = 1 - p$, and $[A]_{\mathcal{E}}, \{[A_i]_{\mathcal{E}}\}_{i \in I}$ are pairwise different equivalence classes. Since $(A, B) \in \mathcal{E}$ and \mathcal{E} is a branching bisimulation, $B \rightsquigarrow_{\mathcal{E}} \xrightarrow{q_i} [A_i]_{\mathcal{E}}$ for all $i \in I$, where $q_i = p_i/(1 - p)$. According to Definition 2.8, there exists a regular ϵ -tree $t_{\mathcal{E}}^B$ satisfying that for every leaf L of $t_{\mathcal{E}}^B$, $L \xrightarrow{\prod_{j \in J} r_j^{\tau}} \prod_{j \in J} M_j$ and $\text{P}_{\mathcal{E}} \left(L \xrightarrow{\prod_{j \in J} r_j^{\tau}} [A_i]_{\mathcal{E}} \right) = q_i$ for all $i \in I$. Let $\{L_k\}_{k \in K}$ be the countable set of leaves in the tree $t_{\mathcal{E}}^B$ and c_k be the probability of the path from B to L_k in $t_{\mathcal{E}}^B$. Since $t_{\mathcal{E}}^B$ is a regular tree, $\sum_{k \in K} c_k = 1$. Let ρ_k be the induced probability distribution of the transition $L_k \xrightarrow{\prod_{j \in J} r_j^{\tau}} \prod_{j \in J} M_j$. Then we can see that the regular ϵ -tree $t_{\mathcal{E}}^B$ induces a Dirac scheduler σ and a distribution $\rho = \sum_{k \in K} c_k \rho_k$ such that $B \xrightarrow{\tau}_c \rho$. Since $\rho_k([A]_{\mathcal{E}}) < 1$ and $\rho_{k \perp A}([A_i]_{\mathcal{E}}) = q_i$ hold for all $k \in K$ and $i \in I$, according to Lemma 2.18, we have $\rho([A]_{\mathcal{E}}) < 1$ and $\rho_{\perp A}([A_i]_{\mathcal{E}}) = q_i$ for all $i \in I$. Now since $B \xrightarrow{\tau}_c \rho$, by Lemma 2.19, there exists a distribution ρ_B such that $B \xrightarrow{\tau}_c \rho_B$ and $\rho_A \mathcal{E}^{\dagger} \rho_B$. So we are done. \square

At the end of this part, we want to mention that there are some other bisimilarities based on similar notion of ϵ -tree or probabilistic distribution in the literature. For example, the *probabilistic weak bisimilarity*

proposed in [34] relies on the notion of *weak ϵ -tree* while the *branching probabilistic bisimilarity* defined in [29] is based on probabilistic distribution. The techniques developed in this subsection should be helpful in establishing the relationship among them and the branching (weak) bisimilarities defined in this paper.

3. Divergence in probabilistic branching bisimulation semantics

In this section we turn to the issue of divergence. We propose two bisimulation relations that interpret divergence with varying strength. The first one, branching bisimulation with explicit divergence (Definition 3.2), is a probabilistic extension of the equivalence studied in [24]. The second one, exhaustive branching bisimulation (Definition 3.9), is an instructive graph-based equivalence that extends the complete branching bisimulation in [24]. A similar equivalence is also used in [19] to characterize divergence-sensitive weak bisimulation. The relationship among these equivalence relations will be discussed in Section 4.

3.1. Branching bisimilarity with explicit divergence

Following Definition 2.5, for an equivalence relation \mathcal{E} on $\mathcal{P}_{\text{RCCS}_{fs}}$, a process A is divergent with respect to \mathcal{E} , denoted by $A \uparrow_{\mathcal{E}}$, if there exists a divergent ϵ -tree $t_{\mathcal{E}}^A$ of A with regard to \mathcal{E} . We use $A \not\uparrow_{\mathcal{E}}$ to mean that A is not divergent with respect to \mathcal{E} .

Definition 3.1 (Divergent ϵ -tree preserving). Let \mathcal{E} be an equivalence on $\mathcal{P}_{\text{RCCS}_{fs}}$. \mathcal{E} is *divergent ϵ -tree preserving* if for all $(A, B) \in \mathcal{E}$ the following holds: $A \uparrow_{\mathcal{E}}$ if and only if $B \uparrow_{\mathcal{E}}$.

The following definition is an extension of the corresponding notion proposed by van Glabbeek et al. [30] for $\mathcal{P}_{\text{RCCS}_{fs}}$.

Definition 3.2 (Branching bisimulation with explicit divergence). Let \mathcal{E} be an equivalence on $\mathcal{P}_{\text{RCCS}_{fs}}$. \mathcal{E} is called a *branching bisimulation with explicit divergence* if \mathcal{E} is a branching bisimulation and divergent ϵ -tree preserving.

We write $A \simeq^{\Delta} B$ if there is a branching bisimulation with explicit divergence \mathcal{E} such that $(A, B) \in \mathcal{E}$.

Similar to the non-probabilistic situation [24, 30], the requirement of divergent ϵ -tree preserving makes it non-trivial to prove that \simeq^{Δ} is indeed the largest branching bisimulation with explicit divergence. In [18], the divergence-sensitivity of \simeq^{Δ} is given as Lemma 4.1 without proof. However, it should be pointed out that the original statement of this lemma is not correct in our setting. More specifically, the lemma can be rephrased in our language as ‘If $\{\mathcal{E}_i\}_{i \in I}$ is a collection of divergent ϵ -tree preserving equivalences, then $\mathcal{E} = (\bigcup_{i \in I} \mathcal{E}_i)^*$ is also a divergent ϵ -tree preserving equivalence’. There is a simple counterexample to this statement. Let $A_1 = \tau.\mathbf{0}$, $A_2 = \mathbf{0}$, $B_1 = \mu X.(\tau.\tau.\tau.X)$, $B_2 = \tau.\tau.B_1$ and $B_3 = \tau.B_1$. Consider the equivalence $\mathcal{E}_1 = \{\{A_1, B_1, B_2\}, \{B_3\}, \{A_2\}\}$ and $\mathcal{E}_2 = \{\{B_1, B_2, B_3\}, \{A_1\}, \{A_2\}\}$. It is not hard to check that both \mathcal{E}_1 and \mathcal{E}_2 are divergent ϵ -tree preserving. Yet the equivalence $\mathcal{E} = (\mathcal{E}_1 \cup \mathcal{E}_2)^* = \{\{A_1, B_1, B_2, B_3\}, \{A_2\}\}$ is not

divergent ϵ -tree preserving, as $A_1 \not\uparrow_{\mathcal{E}}$ and $B_1 \uparrow_{\mathcal{E}}$ hold for the pair $(A_1, B_1) \in \mathcal{E}$. The key issue here is that \mathcal{E}_1 is not a *branching* bisimulation, as the ℓ -transition $A_1 \rightsquigarrow_{\mathcal{E}_1} \xrightarrow{\tau} [A_2]_{\mathcal{E}_1}$ cannot be bisimulated by B_1 . We find that the requirement of branching bisimulation is necessary for achieving the divergent ϵ -tree preserving property. Then we need the following technical lemma, a probabilistic generalization of the corresponding result in [30].

Lemma 3.3. *If $\{\mathcal{E}_i\}_{i \in I}$ is a collection of branching bisimulation with explicit divergence, then $\mathcal{E} = (\bigcup_{i \in I} \mathcal{E}_i)^*$ is also a branching bisimulation with explicit divergence.*

Proof. Since each \mathcal{E}_i is a branching bisimulation, by Lemma 2.11, \mathcal{E} is also a branching bisimulation. It suffices to show that for each $i \in I$ and $(A, B) \in \mathcal{E}_i \subseteq \mathcal{E}$, the following divergence-sensitive property holds: if $A \uparrow_{\mathcal{E}}$ then $B \uparrow_{\mathcal{E}}$. It should be emphasized that the pair (A, B) is in \mathcal{E}_i , while the divergence property is required with regard to \mathcal{E} . Suppose $A \uparrow_{\mathcal{E}}$, then there exists a divergent ϵ -tree $t_{\mathcal{E}}^A$ of A with regard to \mathcal{E} . We will construct a divergent ϵ -tree $t_{\mathcal{E}}^B$ of B with regard to \mathcal{E} by induction on the structure of $t_{\mathcal{E}}^A$. There are two cases.

- $t_{\mathcal{E}}^A$ is an ϵ -tree of A with regard to \mathcal{E}_i . In this case, all nodes in tree $t_{\mathcal{E}}^A$ belong to $[A]_{\mathcal{E}_i}$, therefore $A \uparrow_{\mathcal{E}_i}$. As \mathcal{E}_i is a branching bisimulation with explicit divergence, we have $B \uparrow_{\mathcal{E}_i}$, which implies a divergent ϵ -tree $t_{\mathcal{E}}^B$ of B with regard to \mathcal{E} .
- $t_{\mathcal{E}}^A$ is not an ϵ -tree of A with regard to \mathcal{E}_i . In this case, there exist some nodes in tree $t_{\mathcal{E}}^A$ which do not belong to $[A]_{\mathcal{E}_i}$. We only consider the case that A has multiple children (the case of having only one child is similar and easier). Assume that A has k children A^1, \dots, A^k with the corresponding edges labeled by p_1, \dots, p_k respectively. In other words, $A \xrightarrow{\prod_{j \in [k]} p_j} \prod_{j \in [k]} A^j$. There are two sub-cases:
 - i) $A^j \mathcal{E}_i A$ for all $j \in [k]$, i.e., $A \xrightarrow{\prod_{j \in [k]} p_j} \prod_{j \in [k]} A^j$ is state-preserving. Since \mathcal{E}_i is an equivalence and $A \mathcal{E}_i B$, we have $A^j \mathcal{E}_i B$ for all $j \in [k]$. Thus we can continue to construct $t_{\mathcal{E}}^B$ by structural induction on the divergent ϵ -tree of A^1 .
 - ii) $A^j \not\in [A]_{\mathcal{E}_i}$ for some $j \in [k]$, i.e., $A \xrightarrow{\prod_{j \in [k]} p_j} \prod_{j \in [k]} A^j$ is state-changing. Suppose without loss of generality that $A^1 \not\in [A]_{\mathcal{E}_i}$. Let $q = \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{E}_i} \left(A \xrightarrow{\prod_{j \in [k]} p_j} [A^1]_{\mathcal{E}_i} \right)$. Then $B \rightsquigarrow_{\mathcal{E}_i} \xrightarrow{q} [A^1]_{\mathcal{E}_i}$ follows from the fact that \mathcal{E}_i is a branching bisimulation. The q -transition consists of a regular ϵ -tree $t'_{\mathcal{E}_i}$ of B with regard to \mathcal{E}_i and, for each leaf B'' of $t'_{\mathcal{E}_i}$, there exists a collective transition $B'' \xrightarrow{\prod_{j' \in [k']} r_{j'}} \prod_{j' \in [k']} B^{j'}$ such that the normalized probability $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{E}_i} \left(B'' \xrightarrow{\prod_{j' \in [k']} r_{j'}} [A^1]_{\mathcal{E}_i} \right) = q$. For every process $B^{j'} \in [A^1]_{\mathcal{E}_i}$, we continue to construct an ϵ -tree of $B^{j'}$ by structural induction on the divergent ϵ -tree of A^1 . According to our construction, we have $B'' \mathcal{E}_i B$ and $B^{j'} \mathcal{E}_i A^1$. By assumption, we have $A \mathcal{E}_i B$ and $A \mathcal{E}_i A^1$. For \mathcal{E}_i and \mathcal{E} are equivalence, we can get $B'' \mathcal{E}_i B \mathcal{E}_i A \mathcal{E}_i A^1 \mathcal{E}_i B^{j'}$. As $\mathcal{E}_i \subseteq \mathcal{E}$, we can further get that $B \mathcal{E} B'' \mathcal{E} B^{j'}$. In other words, $B^{j'}$ is indeed a node in $t_{\mathcal{E}}^B$.

We now prove that the above constructed $t_{\mathcal{E}}^B$ is a divergent ϵ -tree. Two cases are possible. In the first case, A can go through infinite state-changing transitions with regard to \mathcal{E}_i and never reach any ϵ -tree with regard to \mathcal{E}_i . Since each state-changing transition cannot be bisimulated vacuously in **ii**), we see that the constructed $t_{\mathcal{E}}^B$ is a divergent tree in this case. In the second case, A will reach an ϵ -tree $(t')_{\mathcal{E}_i}^{A'}$ of some A' with regard to \mathcal{E}_i (where A' is a node in $t_{\mathcal{E}}^A$) after finite state-preserving transitions with regard to \mathcal{E}_i . In this case, since $(t')_{\mathcal{E}_i}^{A'}$ is a divergent ϵ -tree, we have $A' \uparrow_{\mathcal{E}_i}$. According to the above construction procedure, there exists a process B' in $t_{\mathcal{E}}^B$ satisfying that $A' \mathcal{E}_i B'$. Since \mathcal{E}_i is a branching bisimulation with explicit divergence, we have $B' \uparrow_{\mathcal{E}_i}$. Therefore the constructed $t_{\mathcal{E}}^B$ is also a divergent tree in this case. \square

Theorem 3.4 then follows directly from Lemma 3.3.

Theorem 3.4. *The relation \simeq^{Δ} is an equivalence, and it is the largest branching bisimulation with explicit divergence.*

For any $A, B \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{RCCS}_{fs}}$, an efficient procedure for verifying the validity of $A \simeq^{\Delta} B$ is useful in application. However Lemma 2.13 does not directly imply a polynomial algorithm for \simeq^{Δ} . Given a process A and an equivalence \mathcal{E} , the naive strategy to check $A \uparrow_{\mathcal{E}}$ is to enumerate all ϵ -trees and verify if any of them is divergent. But in the worst case this would imply that an exponential number of trees must be checked. A smarter strategy (Algorithm 1) will be defined later.

3.2. Exhaustive branching bisimilarity

In [24], the concept of *divergence set* is proposed to define the so-called complete weak bisimilarity, giving rise to an alternative characterization of weak bisimilarity with explicit divergence in the non-probabilistic scenario. In [19], a similar concept, *end component*, is introduced for probabilistic processes, based on which the authors defined exhaustive weak probabilistic bisimulations. The basic idea behind these definitions is that they consider a process to be divergent if it can *reach* a silent circle in finitely many silent steps. Next we extend the concept to probabilistic branching bisimulation. We show that unlike in the non-probabilistic case, the extension produces a bisimilarity strictly coarser than \simeq^{Δ} . We start by introducing some concepts.

Definition 3.5 (τ -EC). Given a process $B \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{RCCS}_{fs}}$. Let $G_B = (V_B, E_B)$ be the induced transition graph of B . A τ -EC (of B), denoted by $\text{ec} = (V_{\text{ec}}, E_{\text{ec}})$, is a subgraph of G_B satisfying:

1. $\text{ec} = (V_{\text{ec}}, E_{\text{ec}})$ is strongly connected;
2. All edges in E_{ec} are restricted to be labeled with τ or $p\tau$ (where $p \in (0, 1)$);
3. If there is an edge $e' = (C, C') \in E_{\text{ec}}$ with label $q\tau$, then there must exist some collective silent transition $C \xrightarrow{\prod_{i \in I} p_i \tau} \prod_{i \in I} C_i$ such that $q = p_k$ and $C' = C_k$ for some $k \in I$. Moreover, for all $i \in I$, the edge $e_i = (C, C_i) \in E_{\text{ec}}$ and labeled by $p_i \tau$.

Given a process $B' \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{RCCS}_{fs}}$, we write $B' \circ_{\text{ec}}$ to denote that B' is in the τ -EC labeled as ec .

Intuitively speaking, τ -EC is a strongly connected graph which contains only silent transitions and is closed under probabilistic silent transitions.

For two given τ -ECs, we will need to relate them under some equivalence \mathcal{E} . Definition 3.6 promotes the relation \mathcal{E} between nodes (in τ -EC) to a relation between τ -ECs.

Definition 3.6 (Related τ -EC). Given an equivalence \mathcal{E} , and two τ -ECs $\text{ec}_1 = (V_{\text{ec}_1}, E_{\text{ec}_1})$ and $\text{ec}_2 = (V_{\text{ec}_2}, E_{\text{ec}_2})$. We say ec_1 is related to ec_2 with regard to \mathcal{E} , denoted by $\text{ec}_1 \mathcal{E}^\dagger \text{ec}_2$, iff for all $B \in V_{\text{ec}_2}$ there exists $A \in V_{\text{ec}_1}$ with $(A, B) \in \mathcal{E}$.

Remark 3.7. The notion of *related τ -EC* is actually a generalization of the corresponding requirement used in the definition of *complete weak bisimulation* (Definition 2.8, [24]). The asymmetric requirement in Definition 3.6 is necessary for the correctness of Theorem 3.10.

Given two processes A, B and let G_A be the induced transition graph of A , we use $A \Longrightarrow B$ to stand for that B can be reached from A in G_A through a sequence of edges labeled with τ or $p\tau$ (where $p \in (0, 1)$). We use $A \Rightarrow_{\text{ec}}$ to denote that there exists A' such that $A \Rightarrow A'$ and $A' \circ_{\text{ec}}$. Before giving the exhaustive branching bisimulation for $\mathcal{P}_{\text{RCCS}_{fs}}$, we need the following definition that characterizes the divergence-sensitive property with regard to τ -EC.

Definition 3.8 (τ -EC invariant). Let \mathcal{E} be an equivalence on $\mathcal{P}_{\text{RCCS}_{fs}}$. \mathcal{E} is *τ -EC invariant* if for all $(A, B) \in \mathcal{E}$ the following holds: whenever $A \Rightarrow_{\text{ec}_1}$, then $B \Rightarrow_{\text{ec}_2}$ for some τ -EC ec_2 such that $\text{ec}_1 \mathcal{E}^\dagger \text{ec}_2$.

Definition 3.9 (Exhaustive branching bisimulation). Let \mathcal{E} be an equivalence on $\mathcal{P}_{\text{RCCS}_{fs}}$. \mathcal{E} is called an *exhaustive branching bisimulation* if \mathcal{E} is a branching bisimulation and τ -EC invariant.

We write $A \simeq_e B$ if $(A, B) \in \mathcal{E}$ for some exhaustive branching bisimulation \mathcal{E} .

Theorem 3.10. \simeq_e is an equivalence relation, and it is the largest exhaustive branching bisimulation.

Proof. Similar to the proof in [24]. We can show that if $\{\mathcal{E}_i\}_{i \in I}$ is a collection of exhaustive branching bisimulation, then so is $\mathcal{E} = (\bigcup_{i \in I} \mathcal{E}_i)^*$. \square

We note that \simeq^Δ and \simeq_e treat divergence in different ways. In \simeq^Δ , a process A is divergent if and only if it can diverge with probability 1 (i.e., there exists a divergent ϵ -tree of A). In contrast, in \simeq_e , a process B is divergent if it can diverge with any non-zero probability (i.e., B can reach some τ -EC). Here we prove that \simeq^Δ implies \simeq_e (Theorem 3.15). The strictness of the implication will be shown in Example 4.4.

Remark 3.11. One may consider defining a finer notion of bisimilarity by requiring that the probability of reaching two related τ -ECs to be the same for two bisimilar processes. Actually a similar method has been taken to define *probabilistic applicative bisimulation* for the probabilistic λ -calculus [10]. However, this idea

does not work directly in our setting. Consider the following RCCS_{f_s} processes: $P = \tau.P_1 + \tau.P_2$, where $P_1 = \frac{1}{2}\tau.a \oplus \frac{1}{2}\tau.\Omega$, $P_2 = \frac{1}{3}\tau.b \oplus \frac{2}{3}\tau.\Omega$, and $\Omega = \mu X.(\tau.X)$ is an always divergent process. As the first step from P is a nondeterministic choice between P_1 and P_2 , we cannot simply say that P diverge with probability $\frac{1}{2}$ or $\frac{2}{3}$. The reason why such definition does work in the probabilistic λ -calculus model is the absence of nondeterminism. That is to say, given a probabilistic λ -term, the induced probabilistic distribution by applying some specific reduction strategy (such as call-by-value or call-by-name strategy) is unique. This is also the reason why *schedulers* [29] have been used to resolve non-determinism for nondeterministic probabilistic models.

The following lemma states that for any two nodes A, B from a τ -EC, we can construct a regular ϵ -tree whose root is A and every leaf is B .

Lemma 3.12. *Given a τ -EC $\text{ec} = (V_{\text{ec}}, E_{\text{ec}})$, let $\mathcal{E} = V_{\text{ec}} \times V_{\text{ec}}$. If $A, B \in V_{\text{ec}}$, then there exists a regular ϵ -tree $t_{\mathcal{E}}^A$ of A with regard to \mathcal{E} such that all leaves of $t_{\mathcal{E}}^A$ are labeled by B .*

Proof. As V_{ec} is a finite set, for any two nodes $A, B \in V_{\text{ec}}$, let $V_{\text{ec}} \setminus \{B\} = \{A_i \mid i \in I\}$ where I is a finite index set. Surely $A \in \{A_i \mid i \in I\}$. As ec is strongly connected, we use π_i to denote the shortest path from $A_i (i \in I)$ to B . We also use $(t_0)_{\mathcal{E}}^{A_i}$ to stand for the minimal (finite) ϵ -tree induced by π_i . We will inductively (starting from $(t_0)_{\mathcal{E}}^A$) build a regular tree whose leaves are all B .

For any tree t , we use $\text{P}^{\neq B}(t)$ to denote the probability of all finite path in t that does not end with B . Again by strongly connected property, $\forall i \in I, p_i = \text{P}^{\neq B}((t_0)_{\mathcal{E}}^{A_i}) < 1$. Let $p = \max_{i \in I} \{p_i\}$, $p < 1$. We then inductively build a sequence of ϵ -trees $\{(t_n)_{\mathcal{E}}^A\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of A with regard to \mathcal{E} as follows:

For each $n \geq 0$, $(t_{n+1})_{\mathcal{E}}^A$ is obtained from $(t_n)_{\mathcal{E}}^A$ by replacing every leaf $A_i \neq B$ by the tree $(t_0)_{\mathcal{E}}^{A_i}$.

We next show that $\text{P}^{\neq B}((t_n)_{\mathcal{E}}^A) \leq p^n$ holds for all $n \geq 0$ by induction on n .

- The base case $n = 0$ holds trivially.
- For the induction step, suppose $\text{P}^{\neq B}((t_n)_{\mathcal{E}}^A) \leq p^n$:

For any leaf $A_i \neq B$ in $(t_n)_{\mathcal{E}}^A$, let $(\pi_n)_i$ be the path from A to A_i in $(t_n)_{\mathcal{E}}^A$. Then we have $\text{P}^{\neq B}((t_{n+1})_{\mathcal{E}}^A) = \sum_{i \in I} \left(\text{P}((\pi_n)_i) \cdot \text{P}^{\neq B}((t_0)_{\mathcal{E}}^{A_i}) \right) \leq \sum_{i \in I} \text{P}((\pi_n)_i) \cdot p = p \cdot (\text{P}^{\neq B}((t_n)_{\mathcal{E}}^A)) \leq p \cdot p^n = p^{n+1}$, as desired.

To the set of all branches of $(t_n)_{\mathcal{E}}^A$, either they end with leaf B , or the probability of the rest (i.e., $\text{P}^{\neq B}((t_n)_{\mathcal{E}}^A)$) is upper-bounded by p^n , and can be replaced further. Thus when n approaches infinity, the convergence probability of the ϵ -tree $(t_{\infty})_{\mathcal{E}}^A$ is 0. By Definition 2.5, $(t_{\infty})_{\mathcal{E}}^A$ is a regular ϵ -tree of A with regard to \mathcal{E} whose all leaves are B . □

The following lemma shows that any two processes on τ -EC are branching bisimilar with explicit divergence.

Lemma 3.13. *Given a τ -EC $\text{ec} = (V_{\text{ec}}, E_{\text{ec}})$, and suppose $A, B \in V_{\text{ec}}$. Then $A \simeq^\Delta B$.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{E} = V_{\text{ec}} \times V_{\text{ec}}$ and $\mathcal{E}' = (\mathcal{E} \cup \simeq^\Delta)^*$. We only need to show that \mathcal{E}' is a branching bisimulation with explicit divergence. Since each node $A \in V_{\text{ec}}$ satisfies that $A \uparrow_{\mathcal{E}}$, it is not hard to see that \mathcal{E}' is divergent ϵ -tree preserving. Next we prove that \mathcal{E}' is a branching bisimulation.

Consider any pair $(A, B) \in \mathcal{E}$. The ℓ -transition $B \rightsquigarrow_{\mathcal{E}} \mathcal{B}$ of B consists of a regular ϵ -tree $t_{\mathcal{E}}^B$ of B satisfying that $L \xrightarrow{\ell} L' \in \mathcal{B}$ for every leaf L of $t_{\mathcal{E}}^B$. According to Lemma 3.12, there exists a regular ϵ -tree $t_{\mathcal{E}}^A$ of A with regard to \mathcal{E} whose leaves are all B . By replacing all leaves B with $t_{\mathcal{E}}^B$ in $t_{\mathcal{E}}^A$, we obtain a new ϵ -tree $(t')_{\mathcal{E}}^A$ of A satisfying that $L \xrightarrow{\ell} L' \in \mathcal{B}$ for every leaf L of $(t')_{\mathcal{E}}^A$. We then verify the regularity of $(t')_{\mathcal{E}}^A$. Given any $\delta \in (0, 1)$, since $t_{\mathcal{E}}^A$ and $t_{\mathcal{E}}^B$ are two regular ϵ -trees, there exists two numbers M_δ and N_δ such that $1 - P_{M_\delta}(t_{\mathcal{E}}^A) < \delta/2$ and $1 - P_{N_\delta}(t_{\mathcal{E}}^B) < \delta/2$. Since the ϵ -tree $(t')_{\mathcal{E}}^A$ is obtained from $t_{\mathcal{E}}^A$ by replacing all leaves B in $t_{\mathcal{E}}^A$ with $t_{\mathcal{E}}^B$, we have

$$1 - P_{M_\delta + N_\delta}((t')_{\mathcal{E}}^A) < (1 - P_{M_\delta}(t_{\mathcal{E}}^A)) + P_{M_\delta}(t_{\mathcal{E}}^A) \cdot (1 - P_{N_\delta}(t_{\mathcal{E}}^B)) < \delta/2 + 1 \cdot \delta/2 = \delta.$$

Therefore $(t')_{\mathcal{E}}^A$ is a regular ϵ -tree. Now we see that the ℓ -transition $B \rightsquigarrow_{\mathcal{E}} \mathcal{B}$ is bisimulated by $A \rightsquigarrow_{\mathcal{E}} \mathcal{B}$. The case for q -transition is similar and thus omitted. \square

For any process A in a τ -EC, a Dirac scheduler σ_A of A induces a divergent tree of A , Lemma 3.13 further ensures every node in the tree is in the same equivalence class with respect to \simeq^Δ , then we have the following.

Corollary 3.14. *Given a τ -EC $\text{ec} = (V_{\text{ec}}, E_{\text{ec}})$, and suppose $A \in V_{\text{ec}}$. Then $A \uparrow_{\simeq^\Delta}$.*

Theorem 3.15 ($\simeq^\Delta \subseteq \simeq_e$). *The equivalence \simeq^Δ is an exhaustive branching bisimulation.*

Proof. Suppose $(A, B) \in \simeq^\Delta$ and $A \Rightarrow \circ_{\text{ec}_1}$. We need to show that there exists some ec_2 such that $B \Rightarrow \circ_{\text{ec}_2}$ and $\text{ec}_1 (\simeq^\Delta)^\ddagger \text{ec}_2$. By assumption there exists A' such that $A \Rightarrow A'$ and $A' \circ_{\text{ec}_1}$. Since $(A, B) \in \simeq^\Delta$ and \simeq^Δ is a branching bisimulation, we can show that there exists B' such that $B \Rightarrow B'$ and $(A', B') \in \simeq^\Delta$ by induction on the path from A to A' . Since $A' \circ_{\text{ec}_1}$, by Corollary 3.14, there exists a divergent ϵ -tree of A' with respect to \simeq^Δ . Since $(A', B') \in \simeq^\Delta$, there exists a divergent ϵ -tree $t_{\simeq^\Delta}^{B'}$ of B' with respect to \simeq^Δ . Due to the second property of ECs presented in Theorem 3.2 in [11], from B' any path in the tree $t_{\simeq^\Delta}^{B'}$ will end up with probability one in a τ -EC. Arbitrarily choose one of these τ -ECs ec_2 , then there exists B'' such that $B' \Rightarrow B''$ and $B'' \circ_{\text{ec}_2}$. Now for any $B''' \in S_{\text{ec}_2}$, since B''' is in the ϵ -tree $t_{\simeq^\Delta}^{B'}$, we have $B''' \simeq^\Delta B' \simeq^\Delta A'$. Therefore $\text{ec}_1 (\simeq^\Delta)^\ddagger \text{ec}_2$. Putting together the above analysis, we have $B \Rightarrow B' \Rightarrow B''$ such that $B'' \circ_{\text{ec}_2}$ and $\text{ec}_1 (\simeq^\Delta)^\ddagger \text{ec}_2$. \square

4. Variations on divergence-sensitive bisimulations

In this section, we study the relationship between several divergence-sensitive branching and weak bisimilarities. Previously, two such bisimilarities were proposed in [18] and [19], respectively. A comparative study

of these two equivalences has not been carried out. We will show that probability plus divergence bring extra separation power to the model.

A remark on the divergence-sensitivity in the framework of weak bisimulation semantics is called for.

Remark 4.1. A natural definition of *weak bisimulation with explicit divergence* could be: Let \mathcal{E} be an equivalence on $\mathcal{P}_{\text{RCCS}_{fs}}$, \mathcal{E} is called a *weak bisimulation with explicit divergence* if \mathcal{E} is a weak bisimulation and divergent ϵ -tree preserving. We write $A \approx^\Delta B$ if there is a weak bisimulation with explicit divergence \mathcal{E} such that $(A, B) \in \mathcal{E}$.

Although the above definition is straightforward, it is challenging to justify that \approx^Δ is the largest weak bisimulation with explicit divergence. So far we are not able to prove that it is an equivalence. The proof for Lemma 3.3 does not apply here, for probabilistic weak bisimulation does not have the stuttering property, which prevents us from constructing ϵ -trees. Neither can we take the strategy in [24] for non-probabilistic weak bisimulation with explicit divergence. Example 4.4 gives a counterexample of $\approx_e = \approx^\Delta$. We leave the justification of \approx^Δ as an open problem.

The following τ -EC based divergence-sensitivity of weak bisimulation is due to [19].

Definition 4.2 (Exhaustive weak bisimulation). Let \mathcal{E} be an equivalence on $\mathcal{P}_{\text{RCCS}_{fs}}$. The relation \mathcal{E} is called an *exhaustive weak bisimulation* if \mathcal{E} is a weak bisimulation and τ -EC invariant.

We write $A \approx_e B$ if $(A, B) \in \mathcal{E}$ for some exhaustive weak bisimulation \mathcal{E} .

Theorem 4.3 ([19]). *The relation \approx_e is an equivalence, and it is the largest exhaustive weak bisimulation.*

We give two representative examples to highlight the differences between these bisimilarities. For any process $A \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{RCCS}_{fs}}$ and equivalence \mathcal{E} on $\mathcal{P}_{\text{RCCS}_{fs}}$, let $G_A = (V_A, E_A)$ be the induced transition graph of A . From now on, we will often abbreviate V_A/\mathcal{E} as \mathcal{E} for clarity.

Example 4.4. Let $B_1 = \mu X.(\tau.X + \tau.(\frac{1}{3}\tau.X \oplus \frac{1}{3}\tau.a \oplus \frac{1}{3}\tau.b))$ and $A_1 = \frac{1}{3}\tau.B_1 \oplus \frac{1}{3}\tau.a \oplus \frac{1}{3}\tau.b$. The induced transition graph of A_1 is depicted in Figure 5a. Now consider the equivalence $\mathcal{E} = \{\{A_1, B_1\}, \{a\}, \{b\}, \{\mathbf{0}\}\}$. The following facts can be easily checked.

1. \mathcal{E} is the largest weak bisimulation and the largest branching bisimulation. That is $\approx = \simeq = \mathcal{E}$. To see that \mathcal{E} is a branching bisimulation, only note that the q -transition $A_1 \rightsquigarrow_{\mathcal{E}}^{1/2} [a]_{\mathcal{E}}$ of A_1 (where $\frac{1}{2} = \frac{1}{3}/(1 - \frac{1}{3})$ is the conditional probability of leaving $[A_1]_{\mathcal{E}}$ to $[a]_{\mathcal{E}}$) can be bisimulated by the transition $B_1 \xrightarrow{\tau} A_1 \rightsquigarrow_{\mathcal{E}}^{1/2} [a]_{\mathcal{E}}$ of B_1 . Here since $(A_1, B_1) \in \mathcal{E}$, by sticking the regular ϵ -tree of A_1 to the edge $B_1 \xrightarrow{\tau} A_1$, it then forms a regular ϵ -tree of B_1 and then induces a q -transition of B_1 .
2. \mathcal{E} is an exhaustive branching bisimulation. We see that both A_1 and B_1 can only reach the τ -EC $\text{ec}_{B_1} = (B_1, \{B_1 \xrightarrow{\tau} B_1\})$ and thus satisfy the divergence requirement.

3. \mathcal{E} is not a weak bisimulation with explicit divergence, since for the pair $(A_1, B_1) \in \mathcal{E}$, $A_1 \not\Downarrow_{\mathcal{E}}$ whereas $B_1 \uparrow_{\mathcal{E}}$.

Since $\simeq_e \subseteq \simeq = \mathcal{E}$ and \mathcal{E} is an exhaustive branching bisimulation, we have $\simeq_e = \mathcal{E}$. Together with the fact $\simeq_e \subseteq \approx_e \subseteq \approx$, we derive that $\approx_e = \mathcal{E}$. Since $\approx^\Delta \subseteq \approx = \mathcal{E}$ and \mathcal{E} is not a weak bisimulation with explicit divergence, we have $\approx^\Delta = \{\{A_1\}, \{B_1\}, \{a\}, \{b\}, \{\mathbf{0}\}\}$. Combining the fact that $\simeq^\Delta \subseteq \approx^\Delta$, we obtain $\simeq^\Delta = \{\{A_1\}, \{B_1\}, \{a\}, \{b\}, \{\mathbf{0}\}\}$. Now we see that $A_1 \simeq_e B_1$ yet $A_1 \not\approx^\Delta B_1$ and $A_1 \approx_e B_1$ yet $A_1 \not\approx^\Delta B_1$.

Example 4.5. Let $C_2 = \mathbf{0}$, $B_2 = \mu X.(\tau.X + \tau.C_2)$ and $A_2 = \frac{1}{2}\tau.B_2 \oplus \frac{1}{2}\tau.C_2$. The induced transition graph of A_2 is depicted in Figure 5b. It is not hard to see that the coarsest relation $\{\{A_2, B_2, C_2\}\}$ is a branching bisimulation, thus $\approx = \simeq = \{\{A_2, B_2, C_2\}\}$. Since both A_2 and B_2 can reach the only τ -EC $\text{ec}_{B_2} = (B_2, \{B_2 \xrightarrow{\tau} B_2\})$ while C_2 cannot, any equivalence \mathcal{E} satisfying $(A_2, C_2) \in \mathcal{E}$ or $(B_2, C_2) \in \mathcal{E}$ cannot be an exhaustive weak bisimulation. Now let $\mathcal{E}' = \{\{A_2, B_2\}, \{C_2\}\}$, then we have $\approx_e \subseteq \mathcal{E}'$. We can further verify the following facts.

1. \mathcal{E}' is an exhaustive weak bisimulation. It is not hard to see that \mathcal{E}' satisfies the divergence condition with respect to τ -EC. Then we only need to show that \mathcal{E}' is a weak bisimulation. Now consider the following two transitions tr_{A_2} and tr_{B_2} for pair $(A_2, B_2) \in \mathcal{E}'$.

- $\text{tr}_{A_2} = A_2 \xrightarrow{\tau} \{(B_2 : \frac{1}{2}), (C_2 : \frac{1}{2})\}$. Then the matched weak combined transition $B_2 \xrightarrow{\tau}_c \{(B_2 : \frac{1}{2}), (C_2 : \frac{1}{2})\}$ for B_2 is induced by the following scheduler:

$$\sigma_{B_2} = \begin{cases} \{(B_2 \xrightarrow{\tau} \delta_{B_2 : \frac{1}{2}}), (B_2 \xrightarrow{\tau} \delta_{C_2 : \frac{1}{2}})\}, & \text{if } \omega = B_2, \\ \delta_{\perp}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

- $\text{tr}_{B_2} = B_2 \xrightarrow{\tau} \delta_{C_2}$. Then the matched weak combined transition $A_2 \xrightarrow{\tau}_c \delta_{C_2}$ for A_2 is induced by the following scheduler:

$$\sigma_{A_2} = \begin{cases} \delta_{\text{tr}_{A_2}}, & \text{if } \omega = A_2, \\ \delta_{\text{tr}_{B_2}}, & \text{if } \omega = A_2\tau B_2, \\ \delta_{\perp}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

2. \mathcal{E}' is not an exhaustive branching bisimulation. In fact, we will show that it is not a branching bisimulation. Since the ℓ -transition $B_2 \xrightarrow{\tau} [C_2]_{\mathcal{E}'}$ for B_2 cannot be bisimulated by A_2 (for A_2 cannot perform any ℓ -transition), we see that the pair $(A_2, B_2) \in \mathcal{E}'$ violates the branching bisimulation conditions.

Since $\approx_e \subseteq \mathcal{E}'$ and \mathcal{E}' is an exhaustive weak bisimulation, we have $\approx_e = \mathcal{E}'$. Since $\simeq_e \subseteq \approx_e$ and \mathcal{E}' is not an exhaustive branching bisimulation, we have $\simeq_e = \{\{A_2\}, \{B_2\}, \{C_2\}\}$. Since $\simeq^\Delta \subseteq \simeq_e$, we have $\simeq^\Delta = \{\{A_2\}, \{B_2\}, \{C_2\}\}$. Now we see that although $A_2 \approx B_2$ and $A_2 \simeq B_2$ hold, $A_2 \approx_e B_2$ but $A_2 \not\approx_e B_2$.




Figure 5: Counterexamples of the inclusion relationship.

Lattice among variants of branching and weak bisimilarities for RCCS_{f_s} model can be summarized by the following theorem. A more visual presentation of the theorem is given in Figure 6.

Theorem 4.6. *The relationship between \simeq^Δ , \simeq_e , \simeq , \approx_e and \approx is summarized as follows.*

1. $\simeq^\Delta \subsetneq \simeq_e \subsetneq \simeq$ and $\approx_e \subsetneq \approx$;
2. $\simeq \subsetneq \approx$, $\simeq_e \subsetneq \approx_e$ and $\approx_e \not\subseteq \not\subseteq \approx_e$.

Proof. (1) $\simeq^\Delta \subseteq \simeq_e$ follows from Theorem 3.15 while $\simeq_e \subseteq \simeq$ and $\approx_e \subseteq \approx$ are by definition. The strictness is witnessed by the pair (A_1, B_1) given in Figure 5a and (B_2, C_2) given in Figure 5b.

(2) By Theorem 2.20, we have $\simeq \subseteq \approx$. We conclude that $\simeq_e \subseteq \approx_e$ by noticing that the definition of τ -EC invariant is independent of the requirement of bisimulation. The processes $A_3 = \tau.a + a + b$ and $B_3 = \tau.a + b$ witness the strictness of the subset relations. For one thing, we can show that $\mathcal{E} = \{\{A_3, B_3\}, \{a\}, \{b\}, \{\mathbf{0}\}\}$ is an exhaustive weak bisimulation, which implies that $A_3 \approx_e B_3$. For another thing, since $A_3 \neq \mathbf{0}$, the ℓ -transition $A_3 \rightsquigarrow_{\simeq}^a [\mathbf{0}]_{\simeq}$ cannot be bisimulated by any ℓ -transition of B_3 . Thus $A_3 \not\approx_e B_3$. The inclusions $\simeq_e \subseteq \approx_e$ and $\simeq \subseteq \approx$ are strict since $A_3 \approx_e B_3$ yet $A_3 \not\approx_e B_3$, and $A_3 \approx B_3$ yet $A_3 \not\approx B_3$. The pair (A_2, B_2) in Figure 5b is also a non-trivial example for $\simeq_e \subsetneq \approx_e$, and (A_3, B_3) is also an evidence for the strictness of $\approx_e \not\subseteq \simeq$. Finally the pair (B_2, C_2) in Figure 5b shows that $\simeq \not\subseteq \approx_e$. \square

We end this part by summarizing the results in Figure 6, where the arrow from one bisimilarity to the other means that the former bisimilarity is strictly finer than the latter one. Solid arrows are new results of this paper while the dotted arrow is a result from [19].




Figure 6: Divergence-sensitive bisimulation lattice (Theorem 4.6).

5. Efficient equivalence checking algorithms

In this section, we provide polynomial time verification algorithms for all the bisimilarities presented in this work. Particularly for \approx_e , we improve known results for divergence-sensitive weak bisimilarity in [19] by giving a more direct algorithm based on maximal end components. An overview of the algorithmic results is given in Table 1.

5.1. Algorithm for deciding branching bisimilarity with explicit divergence

Given a process A and an equivalence \mathcal{E} , the number of maximal ϵ -trees of A with regard to \mathcal{E} could be exponentially many. However, the existence of a divergent ϵ -tree can be checked in polynomial time by the procedure `DetDivTree` given in Algorithm 1. In what follows, we will use \setminus for set difference, and $/$ for relation quotient. The ϵ -graph of A with regard to \mathcal{E} [36], denoted by $G_A^\mathcal{E} = (V_A^\mathcal{E}, E_A^\mathcal{E})$, is a subgraph of G_A (where G_A is the induced transition graph of A) satisfying that $V_A^\mathcal{E}$ contains all processes reachable from A by state-preserving immediate silent transitions and $E_A^\mathcal{E}$ contains all the corresponding transition edges. A node in $G_A^\mathcal{E}$ is called a *sink node* if its out degree is 0.

Intuitively speaking, the procedure `DetDivTree`(A, \mathcal{E}) starts with the set of sink nodes in ϵ -graph $G_A^\mathcal{E} = (V_A^\mathcal{E}, E_A^\mathcal{E})$, then iteratively constructs the set $\{A' \in V_A^\mathcal{E} \mid A' \not\ll \mathcal{E}\}$. For a better understanding of `DetDivTree`, we use an example to explain how it works.

Example 5.1. Let $A = \mu X.(\frac{1}{2}\tau.(\tau.X + \tau.\mathbf{0}) \oplus \frac{1}{2}\tau.(\frac{1}{2}\tau.\mathbf{0} \oplus \frac{1}{2}\tau.(\mu Y.\tau.Y)))$, $B = \tau.A + \tau.\mathbf{0}$ and \simeq be the branching bisimilarity. The ϵ -graph $G_B^\simeq = (S_B^\simeq, T_B^\simeq)$ of B with regard to \simeq is shown in Figure 7a, where $s_0 = B$, $s_1 = A$, $s_2 = \frac{1}{2}\tau.\mathbf{0} \oplus \frac{1}{2}\tau.(\mu Y.\tau.Y)$, $s_3 = \mathbf{0}$ and $s_4 = \mu Y.\tau.Y$. Procedure `DetDivTree`(B, \simeq) works as following:

1. Procedure `CompEpsGraph`(B, \simeq) computes the ϵ -graph $G_B^\simeq = (S_B^\simeq, T_B^\simeq)$ and `Sink`((S_B^\simeq, T_B^\simeq)) returns the set of sink nodes in G_B^\simeq . Thus $\mathcal{L}_{ndiv}^0 = \{s_3\}$ and $\mathcal{L}_{und}^0 = \{s_0, s_1, s_2, s_4\}$.
2. In the first iteration of the **do-while** loop, we add all processes $B' \in \mathcal{L}_{und}^0$ satisfying that $tgt(\text{itr}) \cap \mathcal{L}_{ndiv}^0 \neq \emptyset$ for all immediate silent transitions itr of B' into the set \mathcal{L}_{ndiv}^1 . Then we have
 - $\mathcal{L}_{ndiv}^1 = \mathcal{L}_{ndiv}^0 \cup \{s_2\}$, $\mathcal{L}_{und}^1 = \{s_0, s_1, s_4\}$ and $\text{toCon} = \mathbf{T}$.
3. Similarly, in the second and third iterations of the **do-while** loop, we have
 - $\mathcal{L}_{ndiv}^2 = \mathcal{L}_{ndiv}^1 \cup \{s_1\}$, $\mathcal{L}_{und}^2 = \{s_0, s_4\}$ and $\text{toCon} = \mathbf{T}$.
 - $\mathcal{L}_{ndiv}^3 = \mathcal{L}_{ndiv}^2 \cup \{s_0\}$, $\mathcal{L}_{und}^3 = \{s_4\}$ and $\text{toCon} = \mathbf{T}$.
4. In the fourth iteration of the **do-while** loop, there does not exist any process $B' \in \mathcal{L}_{und}^3$ satisfying that $tgt(\text{itr}) \cap \mathcal{L}_{ndiv}^3 \neq \emptyset$ for all collective transitions itr of B' . Then the loop terminates, and we have

- $\mathcal{L}_{ndiv}^4 = \mathcal{L}_{ndiv}^3, \mathcal{L}_{und}^4 = \{s_4\}$ and $toCon = \mathbf{F}$.

5. For the final $\mathcal{L}_{ndiv}^4 = \{s_3, s_2, s_1, s_0\}$, we depict the result in Figure 7b, where the four nodes in red are non-divergent, only the one in blue is divergent as it has a divergent ϵ -tree $t_{\simeq}^{s_4}$ with respect to \simeq . As $B = s_0 \in \mathcal{L}_{ndiv}^4$, we have $B \not\Downarrow_{\simeq}$.

Algorithm 1: DetDivTree /* checking the existence of divergent ϵ -tree of A with regard to \mathcal{E} */

```

Input :  $A, \mathcal{E}$ 
Output:  $isDiv \in \{\mathbf{T}, \mathbf{F}\}$ 
1  $(V, E) \leftarrow \text{CompEpsGraph}(A, \mathcal{E})$  /* Computes the  $\epsilon$ -graph  $G_A^{\mathcal{E}} = (V_A^{\mathcal{E}}, E_A^{\mathcal{E}})$  */
2  $\mathcal{L}_{ndiv} \leftarrow \text{Sink}((V, E)), \mathcal{L}_{und} \leftarrow V \setminus \mathcal{L}_{ndiv}$  /* Sink returns the sink nodes in  $(V, E)$  */
3 do
4    $toCon \leftarrow \mathbf{F}$ 
5   for  $B \in \mathcal{L}_{und}$  do
6      $nonDiv \leftarrow \mathbf{T}$ 
7     for  $(B, B') \in E$  with label  $\tau$  do
8       if  $B' \in \mathcal{L}_{und}$  then
9          $nonDiv \leftarrow \mathbf{F}$ 
10        end if
11      end for
12      for  $(B, B') \in E$  with label  $p\tau$  do
13        if all  $B \xrightarrow{q\tau} B''$  satisfying that  $B'' \in \mathcal{L}_{und}$  then
14           $nonDiv \leftarrow \mathbf{F}$ 
15          end if
16        end for
17        if  $nonDiv = \mathbf{T}$  then
18           $toCon \leftarrow \mathbf{T}, \mathcal{L}_{ndiv} \leftarrow \mathcal{L}_{ndiv} \cup \{B\}, \mathcal{L}_{und} \leftarrow \mathcal{L}_{und} \setminus \{B\}$ 
19          end if
20        end for
21 while  $toCon = \mathbf{T}$ 
22 if  $A \in \mathcal{L}_{ndiv}$  then
23    $isDiv \leftarrow \mathbf{F}$ 
24 else
25    $isDiv \leftarrow \mathbf{T}$ 
26 end if
27 return  $isDiv$ 

```

The correctness of DetDivTree is proven in the following proposition.

Proposition 5.2. *Given an equivalence \mathcal{E} on $\mathcal{P}_{\text{RCCS}_{f_s}}$ and a process $A \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{RCCS}_{f_s}}$. Then $A \Downarrow_{\mathcal{E}}$ if and only if the procedure DetDivTree(A, \mathcal{E}) returns \mathbf{F} .*

Proof. Let \mathcal{L}_{ndiv}^i be the set \mathcal{L}_{ndiv} at the end of i -th iteration of the **do-while** loop. The **do-while** loop always terminates, as the $(i + 1)$ -th iteration proceeds iff in i -th iteration the set \mathcal{L}_{ndiv}^i gets strictly larger,




Figure 7: The procedure of $\text{DetDivTree}(B, \simeq)$.

while it is always true that $\mathcal{L}_{ndiv}^i \subseteq V_A^\mathcal{E}$. Let n be the number of iterations of the **do-while** loop. For correctness, it will be sufficient to show that $A \not\sim_\mathcal{E}$ iff $A \in \mathcal{L}_{ndiv}^n$.

(\Leftarrow) We prove that $\forall B \in \mathcal{L}_{ndiv}^i : B \not\sim_\mathcal{E}$ holds for all $0 \leq i \leq n$ by induction on i .

- (*Base case*). $\forall B \in \mathcal{L}_{ndiv}^0 : B \not\sim_\mathcal{E}$ holds trivially for $\mathcal{L}_{ndiv}^0 = \text{Sink}((V_A^\mathcal{E}, E_A^\mathcal{E}))$ is just the set of nodes that cannot perform any silent action.
- (*Induction step*). Assume that $\forall B \in \mathcal{L}_{ndiv}^i : B \not\sim_\mathcal{E}$. We need to show that $\forall B \in \mathcal{L}_{ndiv}^{i+1} : B \not\sim_\mathcal{E}$.

To \mathcal{L}_{ndiv}^{i+1} , the case $B \in \mathcal{L}_{ndiv}^i$ holds by induction. For any $B \in \mathcal{L}_{ndiv}^{i+1} \setminus \mathcal{L}_{ndiv}^i$, according to our algorithm, there could be two cases: if $(B, B'') \in E_A^\mathcal{E}$ with label τ for some B'' , then $B'' \in \mathcal{L}_{ndiv}^i$; if $(B, B') \in E_A^\mathcal{E}$ with label $p\tau$ for some B' , then there exists $B \xrightarrow{q\tau} B''$ with $B'' \in \mathcal{L}_{ndiv}^i$. Now any ϵ -tree $t_B^\mathcal{E}$ of B with regard to \mathcal{E} will go through a process $B'' \in \mathcal{L}_{ndiv}^i$. By inductive hypothesis, $B'' \not\sim_\mathcal{E}$ holds, from which it follows that there does not exist any divergent ϵ tree of B . Thus $B \not\sim_\mathcal{E}$ for all $B \in \mathcal{L}_{ndiv}^{i+1}$.

(\Rightarrow) We prove this direction by contradiction. Suppose there exists some A such that $A \not\sim_\mathcal{E}$ and $A \notin \mathcal{L}_{ndiv}^n$. Since $A \not\sim_\mathcal{E}$, any maximal ϵ -tree t of A must have some intermediate nodes $A' \notin \mathcal{L}_{ndiv}^n$ satisfying that some children A'' of A' in the tree belong to the set \mathcal{L}_{ndiv}^n , for otherwise the tree would be divergent. Since $A' \notin \mathcal{L}_{ndiv}^n$, there exists some $\text{itr}_{A'}$ of A' such that $\text{tgt}(\text{itr}_{A'}) \subseteq V_A^\mathcal{E} \setminus \mathcal{L}_{ndiv}^n$. Replacing all such transitions from A' to A'' by the immediate silent transition $\text{itr}_{A'}$ in tree t , we can obtain a divergent ϵ -tree t' of A (since all processes in $V_A^\mathcal{E} \setminus \mathcal{L}_{ndiv}^n$ can perform state-preserving internal actions), which contradicts the assumption that $A \not\sim_\mathcal{E}$. \square

Algorithm 2 gives the main algorithm for deciding whether two processes are branching bisimilar with explicit divergence. Here we follow the classical *partition-refinement* framework [26, 21]. The procedure $\text{DivBranBisim}(A, B)$ initializes set R as the disjoint union of processes reachable from A and B . Then it iteratively constructs the set $\mathcal{E} = R / \simeq^\Delta$ (i.e., the set of equivalence classes of R under \simeq^Δ), starting with the coarsest partition $\mathcal{E}_{ini} = \{R\}$ and refining it until the refined partition satisfies the definition of branching bisimulation with explicit divergence.

At the beginning of each iteration, the procedure $\text{Quotient}(\mathcal{E}_{ini})$ is invoked to extract the largest branching bisimulation \mathcal{E} contained in \mathcal{E}_{ini} . Procedure $\text{FindDivSplit}(\mathcal{E})$ (given as Algorithm 3) then checks whether there is a pair of processes $(P, Q) \in \mathcal{E}$ that violates the divergent ϵ -tree preserving condition, i.e., $P \uparrow_{\mathcal{E}}$ and $Q \not\uparrow_{\mathcal{E}}$, or $P \not\uparrow_{\mathcal{E}}$ and $Q \uparrow_{\mathcal{E}}$. If there is, the discriminating information, i.e., P (also called *divergence splitter*), is returned. Procedure DivRefine (given as Algorithm 4) then splits the equivalence class $[P]_{\mathcal{E}}$ into two new equivalence classes \mathcal{C}_{div} and \mathcal{C}_{ndiv} according to the splitter P identified by FindDivSplit . More specifically, \mathcal{C}_{div} contains all processes $P' \in [P]_{\mathcal{E}}$ satisfying $P' \uparrow_{\mathcal{E}}$, while \mathcal{C}_{ndiv} contains all processes $P'' \in [P]_{\mathcal{E}}$ satisfying $P'' \not\uparrow_{\mathcal{E}}$. When the iteration terminates, the resulting partition \mathcal{E} is $R \setminus \simeq^{\Delta}$. Then checking whether $A \simeq^{\Delta} B$ is equivalent to checking whether $(A, B) \in \mathcal{E}$.

Algorithm 2: DivBranBisim /* checking whether $A \simeq^{\Delta} B$ */

```

Input :  $A, B$ 
Output:  $b \in \{\mathbf{T}, \mathbf{F}\}$ 
1  $R \leftarrow \text{Reach}(A) \uplus \text{Reach}(B)$  /*  $\text{Reach}(P)$  returns the set of processes reachable from  $P$  */
2  $\mathcal{E}_{ini} \leftarrow \{R\}, toCon \leftarrow \mathbf{T}$ 
3 do
4    $\mathcal{E} \leftarrow \text{Quotient}(\mathcal{E}_{ini})$ 
5   /*  $\text{Quotient}(\mathcal{E}_{ini})$  computes the largest branching bisimulation contained in  $\mathcal{E}_{ini}$  */
6    $(divSen, P) \leftarrow \text{FindDivSplit}(\mathcal{E})$ 
7   /*  $\text{FindDivSplit}(\mathcal{E})$  checks whether there is a divergence splitter  $P$  of  $\mathcal{E}$  */
8   if  $divSen = \mathbf{T}$  then
9      $toCon \leftarrow \mathbf{F}$ 
10  else
11     $\mathcal{E}_{ini} \leftarrow \text{DivRefine}(\mathcal{E}, P)$ 
12    /*  $\text{DivRefine}(\mathcal{E}, P)$  refines  $\mathcal{E}$  according to the splitter  $P$  identified by  $\text{FindDivSplit}(\mathcal{E})$  */
13  end if
14 while  $toCon = \mathbf{T}$ 
15 /* when the do-while loop terminates,  $\mathcal{E} = R / \simeq^{\Delta}$  */
16 if  $(A, B) \in \mathcal{E}$  then
17   return  $\mathbf{T}$ 
18 else
19   return  $\mathbf{F}$ 
20 end if

```

The following lemma shows that if two processes have different divergence properties with respect to an equivalence coarser than \simeq^{Δ} , then they will keep such distinction for \simeq^{Δ} .

Lemma 5.3. *Given an equivalence \mathcal{E} on $\mathcal{P}_{\text{RCCS}_{f_s}}$ satisfying that $\simeq^{\Delta} \subseteq \mathcal{E}$ and two processes $A, B \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{RCCS}_{f_s}}$. If $A \uparrow_{\mathcal{E}}$ and $B \not\uparrow_{\mathcal{E}}$, then $(A, B) \notin \simeq^{\Delta}$.*

Proof. We prove this lemma by contradiction. Assume that $(A, B) \in \simeq^{\Delta}$. Since $A \uparrow_{\mathcal{E}}$, there exists a

Algorithm 3: FindDivSplit	Algorithm 4: DivRefine
Input : \mathcal{E} Output : $(divSen, P) \in \{(\mathbf{T}, \perp), (\mathbf{F}, P)\}$ 1 $divSen \leftarrow \mathbf{T}$ 2 for $(P, Q) \in \mathcal{E}$ do 3 $isDivP \leftarrow \text{DetDivTree}(P, \mathcal{E})$ 4 $isDivQ \leftarrow \text{DetDivTree}(Q, \mathcal{E})$ 5 if $isDivP \neq isDivQ$ then 6 $divSen \leftarrow \mathbf{F}$ 7 return $(divSen, P)$ 8 end if 9 end for 10 return $(divSen, \perp)$	Input : \mathcal{E}, P Output : \mathcal{E}_{ref} 1 $\mathcal{C}_{div} \leftarrow \emptyset, \mathcal{C}_{ndiv} \leftarrow \emptyset$ 2 for $Q \in [P]_{\mathcal{E}}$ do 3 $isDiv \leftarrow \text{DetDivTree}(Q, \mathcal{E})$ 4 if $isDiv = \mathbf{T}$ then 5 $\mathcal{C}_{div} \leftarrow \mathcal{C}_{div} \cup \{Q\}$ 6 else 7 $\mathcal{C}_{ndiv} \leftarrow \mathcal{C}_{ndiv} \cup \{Q\}$ 8 end if 9 end for 10 $\mathcal{E}_{ref} \leftarrow \mathcal{E} \setminus \{[P]_{\mathcal{E}}\} \cup \{\mathcal{C}_{div}, \mathcal{C}_{ndiv}\}$ 11 return \mathcal{E}_{ref}

divergent ϵ -tree $t_{\mathcal{E}}^A$ of A with regard to \mathcal{E} . Since $\simeq^{\Delta} \subseteq \mathcal{E}$ and \simeq^{Δ} is a branching bisimulation with explicit divergence, by a similar argument as in the proof of Lemma 3.3, we can construct a divergent ϵ -tree $t_{\mathcal{E}}^B$ of B with regard to \mathcal{E} by induction on the structure of $t_{\mathcal{E}}^A$. Thus we have $B \uparrow_{\mathcal{E}}$, which leads to a contradiction. \square

The real challenge in designing an efficient algorithm for the branching bisimilarity with explicit divergence is to do with correctness. Here Lemma 5.3 plays a key role in the correctness proof (Theorem 5.4) of the partition-refinement algorithm (Algorithm 2). Lemma 5.3 is a new result highly related to the notion of *divergent ϵ -tree preserving*, which we have not seen mentioned in the literature. More importantly, the proof of Lemma 5.3 heavily relies on the new technique developed in the proof of Lemma 3.3.

Theorem 5.4 (Correctness). *Given two processes $A, B \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{RCCS}_{fs}}$, the procedure $\text{DivBranBisim}(A, B)$ returns \mathbf{T} if and only if $A \simeq^{\Delta} B$.*

Proof. To the procedure $\text{DivBranBisim}(A, B)$, let \mathcal{E}_i (resp. $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{E}_i)$, $(\mathcal{E}_{ini})_i$) be the current value of \mathcal{E} (resp. $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{E})$, \mathcal{E}_{ini}) at the end of the i -th iteration of the **do-while** loop. It is not hard to show that all \mathcal{E}_i are equivalence relations by induction. We then prove that $\simeq^{\Delta} \subseteq \mathcal{E}_i \subseteq (\mathcal{E}_{ini})_{i-1}$ holds for all $i \geq 1$ by induction on i .

- (*Base case*). We need to show that $\simeq^{\Delta} \subseteq \mathcal{E}_1 \subseteq (\mathcal{E}_{ini})_0$.

$\mathcal{E}_1 \subseteq (\mathcal{E}_{ini})_0$ holds trivially for $(\mathcal{E}_{ini})_0 = \{R\}$. As $\mathcal{E}_1 = \text{Quotient}((\mathcal{E}_{ini})_0) = (\mathcal{E}_{ini})_0 / \simeq$ is the set of equivalence classes of $(\mathcal{E}_{ini})_0$ under \simeq (the branching bisimilarity), $\simeq^{\Delta} \subseteq \simeq = \mathcal{E}_1$.

- (*Induction step*). Assume that $\simeq^{\Delta} \subseteq \mathcal{E}_i \subseteq (\mathcal{E}_{ini})_{i-1}$, we need to show that $\simeq^{\Delta} \subseteq \mathcal{E}_{i+1} \subseteq (\mathcal{E}_{ini})_i$.

We consider the i -th iteration of the **do-while** loop first. Function $\text{FindDivSplit}(\mathcal{E}_i)$ returns $(divSen, A)$, where $divSen$ is the flag that indicates whether \mathcal{E}_i is a branching bisimulation with explicit divergence

and A is the found splitter. If $\text{divSen} = \mathbf{T}$, then $(\mathcal{E}_{ini})_i = (\mathcal{E}_{ini})_{i-1}$ holds. By inductive hypothesis we have $\simeq^\Delta \subseteq (\mathcal{E}_{ini})_{i-1}$, which implies that $\simeq^\Delta \subseteq (\mathcal{E}_{ini})_i$. If $\text{divSen} = \mathbf{F}$, then $(\mathcal{E}_{ini})_i \subsetneq \mathcal{E}_i$. Then consider any pair (A, B) deleted by DivRefine , i.e., $(A, B) \in \mathcal{E}_i \setminus (\mathcal{E}_{ini})_i$. According to the definition of DivRefine , such pair (A, B) must violate the divergence condition, and we may assume that $A \uparrow_{\mathcal{E}_i}$ and $B \not\uparrow_{\mathcal{E}_i}$. Since $\simeq^\Delta \subseteq \mathcal{E}_i$, $(A, B) \notin \simeq^\Delta$ follows from Lemma 5.3. Now we see that none of the pairs deleted by DivRefine belongs to \simeq^Δ , which leads to $\simeq^\Delta \subseteq (\mathcal{E}_{ini})_i$. We then consider the $(i+1)$ -th iteration of the **do-while** loop. Since the result of $\text{Quotient}((\mathcal{E}_{ini})_i)$ is a refinement of $(\mathcal{E}_{ini})_i$, we have $\mathcal{E}_{i+1} = \text{Quotient}((\mathcal{E}_{ini})_i) \subseteq (\mathcal{E}_{ini})_i$. Since any pair (A, B) deleted by Quotient must violate the branching bisimulation conditions, we have $(A, B) \notin \simeq^\Delta$. Therefore $\simeq^\Delta \subseteq \mathcal{E}_{i+1}$.

The **do-while** loop in procedure $\text{DivBranBisim}(A, B)$ proceeds to $(i+1)$ -th iteration iff the flag $\text{divSen} = \mathbf{F}$ after i -th iteration, or equivalently iff $\mathcal{E}_{i+1} \subsetneq \mathcal{E}_i$. Now we have that $\mathcal{E}_0 \supseteq \mathcal{E}_1 \supseteq \dots \supseteq \mathcal{E}_i \supseteq \dots$. In the light of the facts that $\simeq^\Delta \subseteq \mathcal{E}_i$ holds for all $i \geq 0$ and that all \mathcal{E}_i are finite sets, the chain $\{\mathcal{E}_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ must end up with some \mathcal{E}_n satisfying $\simeq^\Delta \subseteq \mathcal{E}_n$, which assures the termination of $\text{DivBranBisim}(A, B)$. Now since the **do-while** loop terminates in n -th iteration, it must be the case that any pair $(A, B) \in \mathcal{E}_n$ satisfies both branching bisimulation and divergence-sensitive conditions. By definition, \mathcal{E}_n is a branching bisimulation with explicit divergence and $\mathcal{E}_n \subseteq \simeq^\Delta$. Combining the fact $\simeq^\Delta \subseteq \mathcal{E}_n$ and $\mathcal{E}_n \subseteq \simeq^\Delta$, we conclude that $\simeq^\Delta = \mathcal{E}_n$. Now it should be clear that $A \simeq^\Delta B$ iff $(A, B) \in \mathcal{E}_n$ iff the procedure $\text{DivBranBisim}(A, B)$ returns \mathbf{T} . \square

Proposition 5.5 (Complexity). *Let N be the number of processes reachable from A and B . The algorithm $\text{DivBranBisim}(A, B)$ runs in polynomial time with respect to N .*

Proof. As is shown in the proof of Theorem 5.4, $\mathcal{E}_{i+1} \subsetneq \mathcal{E}_i$ holds for all $i < n$, where n is the number of iterations of the **do-while** loop in procedure $\text{DivBranBisim}(A, B)$. Now it is easy to see that $n \leq |\mathcal{E}_0| \leq N^2$. Let $Q(N)$ be the complexity of Quotient , which is shown to be polynomial in N in [36]. For procedure $\text{FindDivSplit}(\mathcal{E})$, the **for** loop can run for no more than $|\mathcal{E}| = \mathcal{O}(N^2)$ times. For procedure $\text{DetDivTree}(A, \mathcal{E})$, the outer **do-while** loop can repeat for no more than $|V_A^\mathcal{E}| \leq N$ times; the loop body detects all the state-preserving transitions in the ϵ -graph $(V_A^\mathcal{E}, E_A^\mathcal{E})$, which leads to $\mathcal{O}(N^2)$ complexity; thus the time complexity for DetDivTree is $\mathcal{O}(N^3)$. Therefore the time complexity for $\text{FindDivSplit}(\mathcal{E})$ is $\mathcal{O}(N^5)$. Similarly, we can show that the time complexity for DivRefine is $\mathcal{O}(N^4)$. Thus the overall complexity of the algorithm $\text{DivBranBisim}(A, B)$ is $\mathcal{O}(N^2(Q(N) + N^5 + N^4)) = \mathcal{O}(N^2 \cdot Q(N) + N^7)$, i.e., polynomial in N . \square

5.2. Algorithm for deciding exhaustive branching bisimilarity

In this part, we focus on the decision algorithm for \simeq_e . We start with the following definition.

Definition 5.6 (Maximal τ -EC). Suppose $B \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{RCCS}_{fs}}$, and let $G_B = (V_B, E_B)$ be the induced transition graph of B , where V_B is the set of all processes reachable from B . A τ -EC $\text{ec} = (V, E)$ of B is called *maximal*

if there is no other τ -EC $ec' = (V', E')$ such that $(V, E) \subsetneq (V', E')$. We usually use $mec = (V, E)$ to denote a maximal τ -EC.

Algorithm 5: CompMec /* compute the set of maximal τ -ECs MEC_A of A */

```

Input :  $A$ 
Output:  $MEC_A$ 
1  $(V, E) \leftarrow \text{CompTauGraph}(A)$  /* compute the induced  $\tau$ -graph  $G_A^\tau = (V_A^\tau, E_A^\tau)$  */
2  $MEC_A \leftarrow \emptyset, \mathcal{L}_{und} \leftarrow \{(V, E)\}$ 
3 do
4    $toCon \leftarrow \mathbf{F}$ 
5   for  $(V', E') \in \mathcal{L}_{und}$  do
6      $scc \leftarrow \text{CompScc}((V', E'))$ 
7     /* compute the set of strongly connected components  $scc$  for graph  $(V', E')$  */
8     for  $(V'', E'') \in scc$  do
9        $isChange \leftarrow \mathbf{F}, E_{new} \leftarrow E''$ 
10      for  $B \in V''$  do
11        for  $(B, C) \in E''$  with label  $p\tau$  do
12          if there exists some  $D$  such that  $(B, D) \notin E''$  with label  $q\tau$  then
13            /* if  $B \xrightarrow{q\tau} D$  violates  $\tau$ -EC condition, then updates  $E_{new}$  */
14             $isChange \leftarrow \mathbf{T}, toCon \leftarrow \mathbf{T}, E_{new} = E_{new} \setminus \{(B, C)\}$ 
15          end if
16        end for
17      end for
18      if  $isChange = \mathbf{F}$  then
19         $MEC_A \leftarrow MEC_A \cup \{(V'', E'')\}$  /* add  $\tau$ -EC  $(V'', E'')$  to  $MEC_A$  */
20      else
21         $\mathcal{L}_{und} \leftarrow \mathcal{L}_{und} \cup \{(V'', E_{new})\}$  /* update the set of undecided graphs */
22      end if
23    end for
24  end for
25   $\mathcal{L}_{und} \leftarrow \mathcal{L}_{und} \setminus \{(V', E')\}$ 
26 while  $toCon = \mathbf{T}$ 
27 return  $MEC_A$ 

```

Definition 5.7 (Maximal τ -EC invariant). Let \mathcal{E} be an equivalence on $\mathcal{P}_{\text{RCCS}_{fs}}$. \mathcal{E} is *maximal τ -EC invariant* if for all $(A, B) \in \mathcal{E}$ the following holds: whenever $A \Rightarrow_{\text{mec}_1}$ for a maximal τ -EC mec_1 , then $B \Rightarrow_{\text{mec}_2}$ for some maximal τ -EC mec_2 such that $\text{mec}_1 \mathcal{E}^\dagger \text{mec}_2$.

The connection between τ -EC invariant and maximal τ -EC invariant can be stated in the following lemma. Its proof relies on the simple observation: each maximal τ -EC is itself a τ -EC and each τ -EC is contained in some maximal τ -EC.

Lemma 5.8. *Let \mathcal{E} be an equivalence on $\mathcal{P}_{\text{RCCS}_{fs}}$. \mathcal{E} is τ -EC invariant iff it is maximal τ -EC invariant.*

With the help of Lemma 5.8, the correctness of the following proposition should be clear.

Proposition 5.9. *An equivalence \mathcal{E} on $\mathcal{P}_{\text{RCCS}_{fs}}$ is an exhaustive weak bisimulation iff \mathcal{E} is a weak bisimulation and maximal τ -EC invariant.*

Proposition 5.9 allows us to focus on maximal τ -ECs (rather than all τ -ECs). Although the number of τ -ECs reachable from a process A could be exponentially many, the number of *maximal* τ -ECs is upper bounded by $|\text{Reach}_\tau(A)|$, where $\text{Reach}_\tau(A)$ is the set of processes reachable from A through internal actions.

The *induced τ -graph* of A , denoted by $G_A^\tau = (V_A^\tau, E_A^\tau)$, is a subgraph of G_A (where G_A is the induced transition graph of A) satisfying that V_A^τ contains all processes reachable from A through internal actions and E_A^τ contains all the corresponding transition edges. Now the set of maximal τ -ECs of A , denoted by MEC_A , can be computed by Algorithm 5, which is an adaption of Algorithm 3.1 of [11] in our setting and runs in polynomial time. Intuitively speaking, in each iteration of **CompMec**, it first computes the strongly connected components of the graph and then removes those probabilistic transitions that do not satisfy the requirement of τ -EC.

The main algorithm for deciding \simeq_e is given in Algorithm 6. Procedure **ExhBranBisim**(A, B) is similar to the one in Algorithm 2 for \simeq^Δ , we only explain the difference here. **FindMecSplit**(\mathcal{E}) (given as Algorithm 7) checks whether there is a pair of processes $(P, Q) \in \mathcal{E}$ that violates the (maximal) τ -EC invariant condition, i.e., $P \Rightarrow_{\text{mec}}$ and there does not exist any mec' such that $Q \Rightarrow_{\text{mec}'}$ and $\text{mec} \mathcal{E}^\ddagger \text{mec}'$ (or vice versa). If there is, then the discriminating evidence (P, mec) (also called *mec splitter*) is returned. Procedure **MecRefine** (given as Algorithm 8) then splits the equivalence class $[P]_\mathcal{E}$ into two new equivalence classes \mathcal{C}_T and \mathcal{C}_F according to the splitter (P, mec) returned by **FindMecSplit**. More specifically, \mathcal{C}_T contains all processes $P' \in [P]_\mathcal{E}$ that can arrive at a related maximal τ -EC of mec , while \mathcal{C}_F contains all processes $P'' \in [P]_\mathcal{E}$ that cannot.

Theorem 5.10 (Correctness). *Given two processes $A, B \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{RCCS}_{fs}}$, **ExhBranBisim**(A, B) returns **T** if and only if $A \simeq_e B$.*

Proof. The proof is similar to the one for Theorem 5.4 and is also carried out by induction. Here we only give a sketch to show the correctness of the procedure **MecRefine**. For any pair (A, B) deleted by **MecRefine** in i -th iteration, i.e., $(A, B) \in \mathcal{E}_i \setminus (\mathcal{E}_{ini})_i$, according to the construction of **MecRefine**, (A, B) violates the divergence condition. Suppose without loss of generality that $A \Rightarrow_{\text{mec}}$ and there does not exist any mec' such that $B \Rightarrow_{\text{mec}'}$ and $\text{mec} (\mathcal{E}_i)^\ddagger \text{mec}'$. Meanwhile, by induction hypothesis we have $\simeq_e \subseteq \mathcal{E}_i$, which implies that there does not exist any mec'' such that $B \Rightarrow_{\text{mec}''}$ and $\text{mec} (\simeq_e)^\ddagger \text{mec}''$. Thus $(A, B) \notin \simeq_e$. This shows that no pairs deleted by **MecRefine** belong to \simeq_e . It can also be verified easily that all such pair (A, B) are removed by the algorithm. \square

Algorithm 6: ExhBranBisim /* decide whether $A \simeq_e B$ */

```
Input :  $A, B$ 
Output:  $b \in \{\mathbf{T}, \mathbf{F}\}$ 
1  $R \leftarrow \text{Reach}(A) \uplus \text{Reach}(B)$  /*  $\text{Reach}(P)$  returns the set of processes reachable from  $P$  */
2  $\mathcal{E}_{ini} \leftarrow \{R\}, toCon \leftarrow \mathbf{T}$ 
3 do
4    $\mathcal{E} \leftarrow \text{Quotient}(\mathcal{E}_{ini})$ 
5   /*  $\text{Quotient}(\mathcal{E}_{ini})$  computes the largest branching bisimulation contained in  $\mathcal{E}_{ini}$  */
6    $(divSen, (P, mec)) \leftarrow \text{FindMecSplit}(\mathcal{E})$ 
7   /*  $\text{FindMecSplit}(\mathcal{E})$  checks whether there is a mec splitter  $(P, mec)$  of  $\mathcal{E}$  */
8   if  $divSen = \mathbf{T}$  then
9     |  $toCon \leftarrow \mathbf{F}$ 
10  else
11    |  $\mathcal{E}_{ini} \leftarrow \text{MecRefine}(\mathcal{E}, (P, mec))$ 
12    | /*  $\text{MecRefine}(\mathcal{E}, (P, mec))$  refines  $\mathcal{E}$  according to the splitter  $(P, mec)$  identified by
13    |  $\text{FindMecSplit}(\mathcal{E})$  */
14  end if
15 while  $toCon = \mathbf{T}$ 
16 /* when the do-while loop terminates,  $\mathcal{E} = R / \simeq_e$  */
17 if  $(A, B) \in \mathcal{E}$  then
18   | return  $\mathbf{T}$ 
19 else
20   | return  $\mathbf{F}$ 
21 end if
```

Example 5.11. Figure 8 depicts two probabilistic systems with initial states A_1 and A_3 , respectively. Now consider the execution process of $\text{ExhBranBisim}(A_1, A_3)$.

1. $(\mathcal{E}_{ini})_0 \leftarrow R = \{A_1, B_1, A_3, B_3, C_3, a, b, \mathbf{0}\}$.

2. In the first iteration of the **do-while** loop:

(a) $\mathcal{E}_1 \leftarrow \text{Quotient}((\mathcal{E}_{ini})_0) = (\mathcal{E}_{ini})_0 / \simeq = \{\{A_1, B_1, A_3, B_3, C_3\}, \{a\}, \{b\}, \{\mathbf{0}\}\}$.

(b) $(divSen, (D, mec)) \leftarrow \text{FindMecSplit}(\mathcal{E}_1) = (\mathbf{T}, (\perp, \perp))$. Here procedure FindMecSplit will invoke the subroutine CompMec to obtain the set of maximal τ -ECs. We take $\text{CompMec}(A_3)$ as an example. The procedure starts by computing the set of strongly connected components, which is the set marked in blue in Figure 8b. Then it removes those probabilistic transitions which do not satisfy the requirement of τ -EC and repeat the process until the final set of maximal τ -ECs (marked in red in Figure 8b) is obtained. It is not hard to see that A_1 and A_2 can reach equivalent (maximal) τ -ECs.

(c) $toCon \leftarrow \mathbf{F}$.

Algorithm 7: FindMecSplit

```

Input :  $\mathcal{E}$ 
Output:  $(divSen, (P, ec)) \in \{(\mathbf{T}, (\perp, \perp)), (\mathbf{F}, (P, mec))\}$ 
1  $divSen \leftarrow \mathbf{T}$ 
2 for  $(P, Q) \in \mathcal{E}$  do
3    $MEC_P \leftarrow \text{CompMec}(P)$ 
4   for  $mec \in MEC_P$  do
5     if  $P \Rightarrow \circ_{mec}$  then
6        $MEC_Q \leftarrow \text{CompMec}(Q)$ 
7       for  $mec' \in MEC_Q$  do
8         if  $Q \Rightarrow \circ_{mec'}$  and  $mec \mathcal{E}^\ddagger mec'$  then
9            $\text{/* nothing changes */}$ 
10          else
11             $divSen \leftarrow \mathbf{F}$ 
12            return  $(divSen, (P, mec))$ 
13          end if
14        end for
15      end if
16    end for
17     $MEC_Q \leftarrow \text{CompMec}(Q)$ 
18    for  $mec \in MEC_Q$  do
19       $\text{\{the symmetric statements as from line 5 to line 15\}}$ 
20    end for
21 end for
22 return  $(divSen, (\perp, \perp))$ 

```

Algorithm 8: MecRefine

```

Input :  $\mathcal{E}, (P, mec)$ 
Output:  $\mathcal{E}_{ref}$ 
1  $\mathcal{C}_T \leftarrow \emptyset, \mathcal{C}_F \leftarrow \emptyset$ 
2 for  $Q \in [P]_{\mathcal{E}}$  do
3    $MEC_Q \leftarrow \text{CompMec}(Q)$ 
4   for  $mec \in MEC_Q$  do
5     if  $Q \Rightarrow \circ_{mec}$  and
6        $mec \mathcal{E}^\ddagger mec'$  then
7        $\mathcal{C}_T \leftarrow \mathcal{C}_T \cup \{Q\}$ 
8     else
9        $\mathcal{C}_F \leftarrow \mathcal{C}_F \cup \{Q\}$ 
10    end if
11  end for
12  $\mathcal{E}_{ref} \leftarrow \mathcal{E} \setminus \{[P]_{\mathcal{E}}\} \cup \{\mathcal{C}_T, \mathcal{C}_F\}$ 
13 return  $\mathcal{E}_{ref}$ 

```

3. The final partition $\mathcal{E}_1 = \{\{A_1, B_1, A_3, B_3, C_3\}, \{a\}, \{b\}, \{\mathbf{0}\}\}$ computes the relation R/ \simeq_e . Since $(A_1, A_3) \in \mathcal{E}_1$, we conclude that these two systems are exhaustive branching bisimilar.

Proposition 5.12 (Complexity). *Let N be the number of processes reachable from A and B . The algorithm $\text{ExhBranBisim}(A, B)$ runs in polynomial time with respect to N .*

Proof. As is shown in the proof of Theorem 5.10, $\mathcal{E}_{i+1} \subsetneq \mathcal{E}_i$ holds for all $i < n$, where n is the number of iterations of the **do-while** loop in procedure $\text{ExhBranBisim}(A, B)$. Now it is easy to see that $n \leq |\mathcal{E}_0| \leq N^2$. Let $Q(N)$ be the complexity of the procedure Quotient , which is shown to be polynomial in N in [36]. For procedure $\text{FindMecSplit}(\mathcal{E})$, the **for** loop at lines 2-21 can run no more than $|\mathcal{E}| = \mathcal{O}(N^2)$ times; since $|MEC_A|, |MEC_B| \leq N$, both the **for** loop at lines 4-16 and line 7-14 can repeat for no more than $\mathcal{O}(N)$ times. Let $S(N)$ be the complexity of the procedure CompMec , which is shown to be polynomial in N in [11]. Therefore, the time complexity for $\text{FindMecSplit}(\mathcal{E})$ is $\mathcal{O}(N^3 \cdot S(N))$. Similarly, we can show that the time complexity for MecRefine is $\mathcal{O}(N \cdot S(N))$. Thus the overall complexity of the algorithm $\text{ExhBranBisim}(A, B)$



$$\begin{aligned}
\text{(a) } B_1 &= \mu X.(\tau.X + \tau.(\frac{1}{3}\tau.X \oplus \frac{1}{3}\tau.a \oplus \frac{1}{3}\tau.b)), & \text{(b) } B_3 &= \mu X.(\tau.X + \tau.(\mu Y.(\tau.Y + \tau.(\frac{1}{2}\tau.X \oplus \frac{1}{4}\tau.a \oplus \frac{1}{4}\tau.b))))), \\
A_1 &= \frac{1}{3}\tau.B_1 \oplus \frac{1}{3}\tau.a \oplus \frac{1}{3}\tau.b. & C_3 &= \mu Z.(\tau.Z + \tau.(\frac{1}{2}\tau.B_3 \oplus \frac{1}{4}\tau.a \oplus \frac{1}{4}\tau.b)), \\
& & A_3 &= \frac{1}{2}\tau.B_3 \oplus \frac{1}{4}\tau.a \oplus \frac{1}{4}\tau.b.
\end{aligned}$$

Figure 8: Example to illustrate Algorithm ExhBranBisim.

is $\mathcal{O}(N^2(Q(N) + N^3 \cdot S(N) + N \cdot S(N))) = \mathcal{O}(N^2 \cdot Q(N) + N^5 \cdot S(N))$, which is polynomial in N . \square

5.3. Algorithm for deciding exhaustive weak bisimilarity

In this part, we extend the results for checking exhaustive branching bisimilarity to the weak case. The readers will notice an advantage of our way in handling divergence: as the concept of τ -EC is actually independent of bisimilarities, it brings extra convenience for algorithmic re-usability. We first recall a classical result.

Lemma 5.13 ([29]). *The relation \approx is decidable in polynomial time.*

As mentioned in Section 1, He et al. [19] take the *inductive verification method* for algorithm design. More specifically, instead of directly verifying exhaustive weak bisimilarity (by using τ -EC), they prove the coincidence of \approx_e and the so-called *inductive weak probabilistic bisimilarity* and give an algorithm for the latter equivalence. The reason for this detour, as mentioned in [19], is that there could be an exponential number of τ -ECs in the transition graph. However, as we use *maximal* τ -EC in Definition 5.6, there could be only a polynomial number of maximal τ -ECs, because two different maximal τ -EC must be disjoint from each other. Compared with the inductive verification approach, maximal τ -EC is a concept for graphs and thus independent of the bisimilarities. Therefore, we can reuse Algorithm 5 directly. All we need to do is to replace the Quotient function with the analogue WeakQuotient function for weak bisimilarity in Algorithm 6. Then we will obtain a polynomial algorithm ExhWeakBisim for exhaustive weak bisimilarity.

Proposition 5.14 (Complexity). *Let N be the number of processes reachable from A and B . The algorithm ExhWeakBisim(A, B) runs in polynomial time with respect to N .*

We end this section by summarizing the algorithmic results in Table 1.

Bisimilarity	\simeq^Δ	\simeq_e	\approx_e
Algorithm	Proposition 5.5	Proposition 5.12	[19], Proposition 5.14

Table 1: Polynomial algorithms for bisimilarities.

6. Conclusion and future work

The probabilistic process theory has been studied for over three decades. From early on it has been realized that the key issue is to reconcile the incompatibility between the probabilistic choice and the nondeterministic choice. Models, equivalence relations and investigating tools have been proposed that address the issue. A rich theory of distribution-based equivalence is now available [27, 12, 29], and a model independent theory of probabilistic process theory has been shown to enjoy the congruence property [18].

A difficult topic in the classical process theory is to do with divergence. Intensive studies on this issue have revealed that a comprehensive understanding of divergence is crucial if one hopes to place the classical process theory on a firmer foundation [30, 24]. In the probabilistic scenario, the issue of divergence becomes urgent once the basic observational theory of the probabilistic processes has been settled. It is the opinion of the present authors that studies on the divergence issue in the probabilistic models are still on its early stage, and further research can definitely improve our understanding of the probabilistic models. Based upon the previous work [24, 18, 19], we have conducted in this paper a systematic study on the (divergence-sensitive) branching and weak bisimilarities for the RCCS_{fs} model. We have explored two distinct methods to handling divergence, i.e., by the existence of divergent ϵ -trees (roughly, divergent with probability 1) or by the reachability of related τ -ECs (roughly, divergent with any non-zero probability). We have established a lattice over these bisimilarities (see Figure 6) and showed that divergent ϵ -tree preserving property is stronger than τ -EC invariant property. And finally, we have provided efficient checking algorithms for all the divergence-sensitive bisimilarities in the lattice, as summarized in Table 1.

Having done the work reported in this paper, we feel that the role of divergence need be further clarified in several accounts. Here are two possible directions for future investigation. Firstly, similar to van Glabbeek’s famous linear time-branching time spectrum, it would be valuable to give a comprehensive comparative study on other process semantics for probabilistic models with divergence. Notice that when divergence is defined independent of bisimulations (such as by τ -EC), the algorithms of this paper can be reused. It would also be interesting to generalize our approach to other popular nondeterministic probabilistic models such as MDP [2, 15, 4], PA [27, 8, 29], and the like. Notice that the technique for relating the ϵ -trees and the distributions is actually independent of models. Secondly complete axiomatization systems are available for the divergence-sensitive branching bisimulations of CCS_{fs} [23] in the absence of probability, and also for the branching bisimulations of RCCS_{fs} [36] in the absence of divergence. A challenging issue is about sound and complete axiomatizations for the divergence-sensitive branching (or weak) bisimulations for RCCS_{fs} .

Declaration of competing interest

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

Data availability

No data was used for the research described in the article.

Acknowledgment

We thank BASICS members for their instructive discussions and feedbacks. The support from the National Natural Science Foundation of China (62072299, 62102243) is acknowledged.

References

- [1] Christel Baier and Holger Hermanns. 1997. Weak Bisimulation for Fully Probabilistic Processes. In *Computer Aided Verification (Lecture Notes in Computer Science)*, Orna Grumberg (Ed.). Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 119–130. https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-63166-6_14
- [2] Christel Baier and Joost-Pieter Katoen. 2008. *Principles of Model Checking*. The MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- [3] Twan Basten. 1996. Branching Bisimilarity Is an Equivalence Indeed! *Inform. Process. Lett.* 58, 3 (1996), 141–147. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0020-0190\(96\)00034-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0020-0190(96)00034-8)
- [4] Tomáš Brázdil, Václav Brožek, Vojtěch Forejt, and Antonín Kučera. 2008. Reachability in Recursive Markov Decision Processes. *Information and Computation* 206, 5 (2008), 520–537. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ic.2007.09.002>
- [5] Valentina Castiglioni, Daniel Gebler, and Simone Tini. 2016. Modal Decomposition on Nondeterministic Probabilistic Processes. In *27th International Conference on Concurrency Theory (CONCUR 2016) (Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs), Vol. 59)*, Josée Desharnais and Radha Jagadeesan (Eds.). Schloss Dagstuhl–Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik, Dagstuhl, Germany, 36:1–36:15. <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.CONCUR.2016.36>
- [6] Valentina Castiglioni and Simone Tini. 2020. Probabilistic Divide & Congruence: Branching Bisimilarity. *Theoretical Computer Science* 802 (2020), 147–196. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tcs.2019.09.037>
- [7] Valentina Castiglioni and Simone Tini. 2020. Raiders of the Lost Equivalence: Probabilistic Branching Bisimilarity. *Inform. Process. Lett.* 159–160 (2020), 105947. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ipl.2020.105947>
- [8] Stefano Cattani and Roberto Segala. 2002. Decision Algorithms for Probabilistic Bisimulation*. In *CONCUR 2002 — Concurrency Theory (Lecture Notes in Computer Science)*, Luboš Brim, Mojmir Křetínský, Antonín Kučera, and Petr Jančar (Eds.). Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 371–386. https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-45694-5_25
- [9] Krishnendu Chatterjee and Hongfei Fu. 2017. Termination of Nondeterministic Recursive Probabilistic Programs. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1701.02944> arXiv:1701.02944 [cs]
- [10] Ugo Dal Lago, Davide Sangiorgi, and Michele Alberti. 2014. On Coinductive Equivalences for Higher-Order Probabilistic Functional Programs. In *Proceedings of the 41st ACM SIGPLAN-SIGACT Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages (POPL '14)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 297–308. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2535838.2535872>
- [11] Luca de Alfaro. 1998. *Formal Verification of Probabilistic Systems*. Thesis. Stanford University.

- [12] Yuxin Deng. 2014. *Semantics of Probabilistic Processes*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-45198-4>
- [13] Yuxin Deng and Catuscia Palamidessi. 2007. Axiomatizations for Probabilistic Finite-State Behaviors. *Theoretical Computer Science* 373, 1 (2007), 92–114. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tcs.2006.12.008>
- [14] Yuxin Deng, Rob van Glabbeek, Matthew Hennessy, and Carroll Morgan. 2009. Testing Finitary Probabilistic Processes. In *CONCUR 2009 - Concurrency Theory (Lecture Notes in Computer Science)*, Mario Bravetti and Gianluigi Zavattaro (Eds.). Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 274–288. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-04081-8_19
- [15] Kousha Etessami and Mihalis Yannakakis. 2015. Recursive Markov Decision Processes and Recursive Stochastic Games. *J. ACM* 62, 2 (2015), 11:1–11:69. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2699431>
- [16] Yuan Feng, Runyao Duan, and Mingsheng Ying. 2011. Bisimulation for Quantum Processes. In *Proceedings of the 38th Annual ACM SIGPLAN-SIGACT Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages (POPL '11)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 523–534. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1926385.1926446>
- [17] Hongfei Fu and Krishnendu Chatterjee. 2019. Termination of Nondeterministic Probabilistic Programs. In *Verification, Model Checking, and Abstract Interpretation (Lecture Notes in Computer Science)*, Constantin Enea and Ruzica Piskac (Eds.). Springer International Publishing, Cham, 468–490. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-11245-5_22
- [18] Yuxi Fu. 2021. Model Independent Approach to Probabilistic Models. *Theoretical Computer Science* 869 (2021), 181–194. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tcs.2021.04.001>
- [19] Kangli He, Hengyang Wu, and Yixiang Chen. 2023. On Divergence-Sensitive Weak Probabilistic Bisimilarity. *Information and Computation* 292 (2023), 105033. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ic.2023.105033>
- [20] Chi-Chang Jou and Scott A. Smolka. 1990. Equivalences, Congruences, and Complete Axiomatizations for Probabilistic Processes. In *CONCUR '90 Theories of Concurrency: Unification and Extension (Lecture Notes in Computer Science)*, J. C. M. Baeten and J. W. Klop (Eds.). Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 367–383. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BFb0039071>
- [21] Paris C. Kanellakis and Scott A. Smolka. 1990. CCS Expressions, Finite State Processes, and Three Problems of Equivalence. *Information and Computation* 86, 1 (1990), 43–68. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0890-5401\(90\)90025-D](https://doi.org/10.1016/0890-5401(90)90025-D)
- [22] K. G. Larsen and A. Skou. 1989. Bisimulation through Probabilistic Testing (Preliminary Report). In *Proceedings of the 16th ACM SIGPLAN-SIGACT Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages (POPL '89)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 344–352. <https://doi.org/10.1145/75277.75307>
- [23] Xinxin Liu and Tingting Yu. 2021. A Complete Axiomatisation for Divergence Preserving Branching Congruence of Finite-State Behaviours. In *Proceedings of the 36th Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (LICS '21)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1109/LICS52264.2021.9470647>
- [24] Xinxin Liu, Tingting Yu, and Wenhui Zhang. 2017. Analyzing Divergence in Bisimulation Semantics. *ACM SIGPLAN Notices* 52, 1 (2017), 735–747. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3093333.3009870>
- [25] Annabelle McIver, Carroll Morgan, Benjamin Lucien Kaminski, and Joost-Pieter Katoen. 2017. A New Proof Rule for Almost-Sure Termination. *Proceedings of the ACM on Programming Languages* 2, POPL (2017), 33:1–33:28. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3158121>
- [26] Robert Paige and Robert E. Tarjan. 1987. Three Partition Refinement Algorithms. *SIAM J. Comput.* 16, 6 (1987), 973–989. <https://doi.org/10.1137/0216062>
- [27] Roberto Segala. 1995. *Modeling and Verification of Randomized Distributed Real-Time Systems*. Thesis. Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- [28] Roberto Segala and Nancy Lynch. 1994. Probabilistic Simulations for Probabilistic Processes. In *CONCUR '94: Concurrency Theory (Lecture Notes in Computer Science)*, Bengt Jonsson and Joachim Parrow (Eds.). Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 481–496. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-48654-1_35
- [29] Andrea Turrini and Holger Hermanns. 2015. Polynomial Time Decision Algorithms for Probabilistic Automata. *Informa-*

- tion and Computation* 244 (2015), 134–171. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ic.2015.07.004>
- [30] Rob van Glabbeek, Bas Luttik, and Nikola Trcka. 2009. Branching Bisimilarity with Explicit Divergence. *Fundamenta Informaticae* 93, 4 (2009), 371–392.
- [31] R. J. van Glabbeek. 1993. The Linear Time — Branching Time Spectrum II. In *CONCUR'93 (Lecture Notes in Computer Science)*, Eike Best (Ed.). Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 66–81. https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-57208-2_6
- [32] R. J. van Glabbeek, S. A. Smolka, and B. Steffen. 1995. Reactive, Generative, and Stratified Models of Probabilistic Processes. *Information and Computation* 121, 1 (1995), 59–80. <https://doi.org/10.1006/inco.1995.1123>
- [33] Rob J. van Glabbeek and W. Peter Weijland. 1996. Branching Time and Abstraction in Bisimulation Semantics. *J. ACM* 43, 3 (1996), 555–600. <https://doi.org/10.1145/233551.233556>
- [34] Hao Wu and Huan Long. 2023. Probabilistic Weak Bisimulation and Axiomatization for Probabilistic Models. *Inform. Process. Lett.* 182 (2023), 106399. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ipl.2023.106399>
- [35] Wang Yi and Kim G. Larsen. 1992. Testing Probabilistic and Nondeterministic Processes. In *Protocol Specification, Testing and Verification, XII*, R. J. Linn and M. Ü. Uyar (Eds.). Elsevier, Amsterdam, 47–61. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-444-89874-6.50010-6>
- [36] Wenbo Zhang, Huan Long, and Xian Xu. 2019. Uniform Random Process Model Revisited. In *Programming Languages and Systems (Lecture Notes in Computer Science)*, Anthony Widjaja Lin (Ed.). Springer International Publishing, Cham, 388–404. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-34175-6_20