


# Active Learning Techniques for Pomset Recognizers

Adrien Pommellet ✉ 

EPITA Research Laboratory (LRE), Paris, France

Amazigh Amrane ✉ 

EPITA Research Laboratory (LRE), Paris, France

Edgar Delaporte ✉

EPITA Research Laboratory (LRE), Paris, France

---

## Abstract

Pomsets are a promising formalism for concurrent programs based on partially ordered sets. Among this class, series-parallel pomsets admit a convenient linear representation and can be recognized by simple algebraic structures known as pomset recognizers. Active learning consists in inferring a formal model of a recognizable language by asking membership and equivalence queries to a minimally adequate teacher (MAT). We improve existing learning algorithms for pomset recognizers by 1. introducing a new counter-example analysis procedure that is in the best case scenario exponentially more efficient than existing methods 2. adapting the state-of-the-art  $L^\lambda$  algorithm to minimize the impact of exceedingly verbose counter-examples and remove redundant queries 3. designing a suitable finite test suite that ensures general equivalence between two pomset recognizers by extending the well-known  $W$ -method.


**2012 ACM Subject Classification** Theory of computation → Formal languages and automata theory

**Keywords and phrases** active learning, concurrency, pomsets

**Digital Object Identifier** 10.4230/LIPIcs.arXiv.2024.1

## 1 Introduction

Finite state automata are a straightforward model for terminating sequential systems. Runs are implicitly described by a *total* order relation: an execution is merely an ordered, linear sequence of events. However, richer structures may be needed for concurrent programs. Indeed, two threads may be acting in parallel, neither of them preceding nor following the other. In this case, runs may be modelled using a *partial* order relation: concurrent events cannot be relatively ordered.



**Figure 1** The series-parallel pomset  $a(b \parallel b)c(ba \parallel bb)$ .

Partially ordered multisets, or *pomsets* [22], can represent executions of a parallel program. We consider in this article the class of *series-parallel* pomsets admitting a linear description made of letters as well as the sequential  $\cdot$  and parallel  $\parallel$  composition operators. Figure 1 displays the Hasse diagram of the pomset  $a(b \parallel b)c(ba \parallel bb)$ . This model is not only richer than linear words, but may also be exponentially more succinct: were we to consider the interleaving semantics on  $n$  parallel threads labelled by  $n$  distinct letters  $a_1, \dots, a_n$ , a single pomset  $a_1 \parallel \dots \parallel a_n$  describes the  $n!$  possible linearized traces of the interwoven threads.

*Active learning* consists in inferring a formal model of a black-box system that can be dynamically queried. Under the *Minimally Adequate Teacher* (MAT) framework, interactions with the black-box system are twofold: *membership queries* that consist in asking whether a given trace can be generated by the system, and *equivalence queries* to determine whether a given automaton (known as the hypothesis) accurately represents all executions of the system, returning a counter-example if the answer is negative.



© Adrien Pommellet, Amazigh Amrane, and Edgar Delaporte;  
licensed under Creative Commons License CC-BY 4.0



Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics  
Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, Dagstuhl Publishing, Germany

One of the earliest active learning algorithms is Angluin’s  $L^*$  [1] for rational languages. It infers the finite set of Myhill-Nerode equivalence classes of the target language by exploring a set of *representatives* of these classes and maintaining a set of *distinguishers* that separates them. Van Heerdt et al. [26] applied  $L^*$  to the class of *recognizable* pomset languages accepted by algebraic structures known as *pomset recognizers*. This extension is made possible by the Myhill-Nerode quotient space of recognizable pomset languages being finite.

However, various improvements have been brought to the original  $L^*$  algorithm over the years. The length  $m$  of a counter-example returned by the MAT being arbitrarily long, it may end up dominating the learning process; Rivest and Schapire [23] therefore introduced an algorithm that infers a new equivalence class in  $\mathcal{O}(\log(m))$  membership queries. Moreover, the use of equivalence queries makes little practical sense as it implies that the MAT knows the very formal model of the system we are trying to infer; Chow [5] thus proved that a finite test suite could subsume equivalence of finite automata, provided a bound on the size of the target model is known beforehand. Finally, new algorithms such as TTT [14],  $L^\#$  [24], or  $L^\lambda$  [13] have been shown to significantly reduce the number of membership queries performed.

Our motivation is adapt and extend these state-of-the-art techniques to the active learning of pomset recognizers. Our new contributions are the following:

- We introduce a new counter-example handling algorithm. Its complexity depends on the depth of the counter-example’s syntactic tree, rather than its number of nodes.
- We extend Howar et al.’s  $L^\lambda$  algorithm [13] to recognizable pomset languages.  $L^\lambda$  has been proven to be competitive with state-of-the-art active learning algorithms for rational languages and maintains a prefix (resp. suffix) closed set of representatives (resp. distinguishers), further reducing the influence of the counter-example’s maximal length.
- We make use of redundancy-free discrimination trees [16], in the sense that we only perform membership queries that contribute to the distinction of states.
- In a similar fashion to Chow’s  $W$ -method [5], we design a finite test suite that can conditionally replace equivalence queries.

## 1.1 Related works

Different classes of pomsets [9, 11, 25] accepted by different automata [8, 17, 20] have been developed in the literature, reflecting various communication models and interpretations of concurrency. Automata over series-parallel pomsets, referred to as *branching automata*, were first introduced by Lodaya and Weil [18, 19], as well as a generalization of regular expressions [17, 20] to pomset languages and a logical characterization [2]. In [15], a different class of automata for pomsets, known as *pomset automata*, was introduced. It was later shown in [3] that branching and pomset automata are effectively equivalent.

From an algebraic perspective, Lodaya and Weil defined *SP-algebras* (from which pomset recognizers are derived): sets equipped with two inner products, one associative, the other associative and commutative. Pomset recognizers may be understood as a special case of deterministic bottom-up tree automata; as a consequence, **(i)** equivalence of pomset recognizers is decidable. Lodaya and Weil proved that languages recognized by SP-algebras **(ii)** adhere to a Myhill-Nerode-like theorem and are also recognized by branching automata, but that **(iii)** the converse does not hold. Van Heerdt et al. [26] further provided a translation of pomset recognizers to pomset automata. Thanks to **i** and **ii**, it is possible to learn pomset recognizers, but the same algorithms do not apply to pomset automata due to **iii**.

The original  $L^*$  active learning algorithm [1] maintains a table structure called an *observation table* that it fills by calling membership queries. The rows of the table help

identify the Myhill-Nerode classes of the target language and their representatives. TTT [14] instead features a *discrimination tree*: this sparser structure has been experimentally shown to reduce the number of queries needed.  $L^\#$  [24] operates directly on a trie that stores membership queries and tries to establish apartness, a constructive form of non-equivalence.  $L^\lambda$  [13] relies on partition refinement; its peculiarity is not adding substrings of counterexamples to the underlying data structure. The last three algorithms have all been shown to be competitive and a net improvement over  $L^*$ . We chose to focus on  $L^\lambda$  thanks to its generic, unifying framework;  $L^\#$ 's prefix-closed trie structure is intrinsically tied to words, hence total orders, and TTT heavily relies on a complex automata-theoretic process to refine its discrimination tree that can seldom be generalized to pomsets.

## 2 Preliminary Definitions

### 2.1 Series-parallel pomsets

We consider a non-empty finite set  $\Sigma$  of *letters* (or *labels*) called the *alphabet*.

► **Definition 1** (Poset). *A partially ordered set or poset  $(A, <, \ell)$  consists of a finite set  $A$  (called the carrier), a strict partial order  $<$  on  $A$ , and a labelling map  $\ell : A \rightarrow \Sigma$ .*

Two posets  $(A, <_A, \ell_A)$  and  $(B, <_B, \ell_B)$  are said to be isomorphic if there exists a bijection between  $A$  and  $B$  preserving ordering and labelling.

► **Definition 2** (Pomset [12]). *A partially ordered multiset or pomset is an equivalence class for the isomorphism relation on posets.*

For convenience's sake, we will treat a representative of such a pomset as if it were the entire class. The empty pomset is denoted  $\varepsilon$ , and the singleton pomset labelled by  $a \in \Sigma$ . We say that a pomset  $\mathfrak{B}$  is a subpomset of  $\mathfrak{A}$  if  $\mathfrak{B}$  can be embedded in  $\mathfrak{A}$ , that is, if there exists an injection from  $B$  to  $A$  preserving labelling and ordering.


Pomsets can be composed sequentially (in a similar fashion to words) or in parallel fashion. Let  $\mathfrak{A} = (A, <_A, \ell_A)$  and  $\mathfrak{B} = (B, <_B, \ell_B)$  be two pomsets such that  $A$  and  $B$  are disjoint (an assumption that applies to the rest of this article).

1. Their *parallel composition*  $\mathfrak{A} \parallel \mathfrak{B}$  is  $(A \cup B, <_A \cup <_B, \ell_A \cup \ell_B)$ . The two pomsets are juxtaposed but cannot be compared.
2. Their *sequential composition* (or concatenation)  $\mathfrak{A} \cdot \mathfrak{B}$  is  $(A \cup B, <_A \cup <_B \cup (A \times B), \ell_A \cup \ell_B)$ . Every element of  $B$  is greater than every element of  $A$ .

Parallel composition is associative and commutative; sequential composition is merely associative. Both operations share  $\varepsilon$  as neutral element.

► **Definition 3** (Series-parallel pomsets). *The set  $\text{SP}(\Sigma)$  of series-parallel pomsets is the smallest set of pomsets containing  $\{\varepsilon\}$  and  $\Sigma$  closed under sequential and parallel composition.*

A pomset  $\mathfrak{A}$  is said to be *N-free* if the pomset  $(\{x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4\}, \{x_1 < x_2, x_3 < x_2, x_3 < x_4\}, \ell)$  for some labelling  $\ell$  is not a subpomset of  $\mathfrak{A}$ . Intuitively, the pattern shown in Figure 2 does not appear in the pomset's Hasse diagram. It is well-known that series-parallel pomsets coincide with N-free pomsets [25].



► **Figure 2** A N pattern.

We denote  $\text{SP}^+(\Sigma) = \text{SP}(\Sigma) \setminus \{\varepsilon\}$ . For the remainder of this paper, we will refer to series-parallel pomsets as merely pomsets.

The set of *syntactic terms* (or simply terms)  $\text{ST}_\Sigma$  over  $\Sigma$  is the set of full binary trees whose inner nodes are labelled by operators in  $\{\cdot, \parallel\}$  and whose leaves are labelled by  $\Sigma \cup \{\varepsilon\}$ . We associate each term with its isomorphic *linear description* obtained by performing a prefix traversal. We may omit the symbol  $\cdot$ , consider that  $\cdot$  has priority over  $\parallel$ , and assume left associativity for syntactic purposes. Intuitively, a term is merely a way to describe a pomset: as an example,  $a(b \parallel b)c(ba \parallel bb)$  represents the pomset of Figure 1.

Due to neutrality, associativity and commutativity properties, several terms may describe the same pomset: as an example,  $a \parallel b = b \parallel a = a \cdot \varepsilon \parallel b$ . Each pomset  $w \in \text{SP}(\Sigma)$  may therefore be associated with a set  $\text{ST}(w) \subseteq \text{ST}_\Sigma$  of syntactically different but semantically equivalent terms whose interpretation in  $\text{SP}(\Sigma)$  is  $w$ . The *depth*  $\delta(w)$  of  $w$  is the minimum of the tree depth function on  $\text{ST}(w)$ . A term in  $\text{ST}(w)$  is said to be *canonical* if its depth is minimal and, assuming  $w \neq \varepsilon$ , it has no leaf labelled by  $\varepsilon$ . Note that canonical terms are not unique:  $\text{ST}(w)$  may contain more than one canonical term.

If  $w \notin \Sigma \cup \{\varepsilon\}$ , given a canonical term of  $w$  such that its root is labelled by  $\circ \in \{\cdot, \parallel\}$  and its left (resp. right) subtree is a term representing pomset  $z_1$  (resp.  $z_2$ ),  $z = z_1 \circ z_2$  is called a *canonical decomposition* of  $z$ . Obviously,  $\delta(z_1) < \delta(z)$  and  $\delta(z_2) < \delta(z)$ . Figure 3 displays a canonical term of  $bc \parallel a$  of depth 2.

The use of terms is a consequence of our counter-example handling algorithm and test suite for equivalence queries that manipulate syntactic trees. Nevertheless, most concepts and algorithms on pomsets outlined in this article still remain term-agnostic.

## 2.2 Pomset recognizers

► **Definition 4** (Bimonoids [4]). *A bimonoid  $(M, \odot, \oplus, e)$  is a set  $M$  equipped with two internal associative operations  $\odot$  and  $\oplus$ ,  $\oplus$  being commutative as well, and a neutral element  $e$  common to  $\odot$  and  $\oplus$ .*

These constraints define a *variety* of bimonoids, that is, a class of algebraic structures satisfying the same behaviour (as defined by various equations encoding associativity, commutativity, etc.). Note that there is no distributivity property. The set  $\text{SP}(\Sigma)$  endowed with  $\cdot, \parallel$  and the neutral element  $\varepsilon$  is a bimonoid.

A set  $A$  *generates* a bimonoid  $(M, \odot, \oplus, e)$  if  $A \subseteq M$  and any element of  $M \setminus \{e\}$  can be obtained by inductively applying  $\odot$  and  $\oplus$  to  $A$ . Moreover,  $A$  *freely generates*  $M$  if any element of  $M \setminus \{e\}$  admits a unique (up to commutativity and associativity) decomposition according to  $A \setminus \{e\}$ ,  $\odot$ , and  $\oplus$ .

► **Theorem 5** (Freeness of  $\text{SP}(\Sigma)$  [4]).  *$(\text{SP}(\Sigma), \cdot, \parallel, \varepsilon)$  is freely generated by  $\Sigma$  in the variety of bimonoids.*

In particular, all the  $\varepsilon$ -free terms of the same pomset are equivalent up to commutativity and associativity: as an example, the terms  $a \parallel bc$  and  $bc \parallel a$  describe the same pomset, and no other  $\varepsilon$ -free term exists.

We rely on bimonoids to recognize languages of SP-pomsets. As is customary, we define homomorphisms of bimonoids as mappings between two bimonoids preserving identity and both internal operations. Note that,  $\text{SP}(\Sigma)$  being freely generated by  $\Sigma$ , any function  $i: \Sigma \rightarrow M$  for some bimonoid  $(M, \odot, \oplus, e)$  can be (inductively) extended in a unique way to a bimonoid homomorphism  $i^\# : \text{SP}(\Sigma) \rightarrow M$  so that for all  $a \in \Sigma$ ,  $i^\#(a) = i(a)$  and  $i^\#(\varepsilon) = e$ . This leads to the following definition of a pomset recognizer [26].

► **Definition 6** (Pomset recognizer). *The tuple  $\mathcal{R} = (M, \odot, \oplus, e, i, F)$  is said to be a pomset recognizer (PR) on  $\Sigma$  if  $(M, \odot, \oplus, e)$  is a finite bimonoid,  $i: \Sigma \rightarrow M$ , and  $F \subseteq M$ . The carrier  $M$  is also called the set of states of  $\mathcal{R}$ . The language of  $\mathcal{R}$ , denoted  $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{R})$ , is the set  $\{w \in \text{SP}(\Sigma) \mid i^\#(w) \in F\}$ . Finally, we introduce the predicate  $\mathcal{R}(u) = "i^\#(u) \in F"$ .*

PRs act as bottom-up deterministic finite tree automata on terms: each letter in  $\Sigma$  has an image in a set of states  $M$ , that we combine by using the images  $\odot$  and  $\oplus$  of the operators  $\cdot$  and  $\parallel$ . Due to the freeness of  $\text{SP}(\Sigma)$  and  $i^\#$  being a homomorphism, we can apply PRs to pomsets, as  $i^\#(t)$  always return the same result, regardless of the term  $t \in \text{ST}(w)$  chosen.

► **Definition 7** (Recognizable pomset languages). *A set (or language)  $L \subseteq \text{SP}(\Sigma)$  is said to be recognizable if there exists a PR  $\mathcal{R}$  such that  $L = \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{R})$ .*


► **Example 8.** Let  $L$  be the language containing singleton  $c$  and every pomset  $(a \parallel bu)$  where  $u \in L$ , i.e.  $L = \{c, a \parallel (bc), a \parallel (b(a \parallel (bc))), \dots\}$ . This language is accepted by the PR  $\mathcal{R} = (M, \odot, \oplus, e, i, F)$  where  $M = \{r_a, r_b, r_c, r_{bc}, r_0, e\}$ ,  $i(x) = r_x$  for  $x \in \{a, b, c\}$ ,  $F = \{r_c\}$ , and  $\oplus$  and  $\odot$  are such that  $r_b \odot r_c = r_{bc}$ ,  $r_a \oplus r_{bc} = r_c$ ,  $e$  is the neutral element for both operations, and all the other possible products return  $r_0$ .

► **Definition 9** (Equivalence). *Two PRs  $\mathcal{R}_1$  and  $\mathcal{R}_2$  on a common alphabet  $\Sigma$  are equivalent if  $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{R}_1) = \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{R}_2)$ .*


We define the set of *evaluation trees*  $\text{ET}_{\mathcal{R}}(w)$  of a pomset  $w$  in a PR  $\mathcal{R} = (M, \odot, \oplus, e, i, F)$  by relabelling the nodes of  $w$ 's terms in  $\text{ST}(w)$  with states of  $\mathcal{R}$  inductively:

- If node  $\iota$  is labelled with  $x \in \Sigma \cup \{\varepsilon\}$  in  $\text{ST}(w)$ , then we relabel it with  $i_{\mathcal{R}}^\#(x)$  instead.
- If node  $\iota$  is labelled with  $\circ \in \{\cdot, \parallel\}$  and its left (resp. right) subtree represents pomset  $w_1$  (resp.  $w_2$ ) and  $m_1 = i_{\mathcal{R}}^\#(w_1)$  (resp.  $m_2 = i_{\mathcal{R}}^\#(w_2)$ ), then we relabel it with state  $i_{\mathcal{R}}^\#(m_1 \circ_{\mathcal{R}} m_2)$  instead for the appropriate  $\circ_{\mathcal{R}} \in \{\odot, \oplus\}$ .

Figure 4 displays an evaluation tree expliciting the computation performed by pomset recognizer  $\mathcal{R}$  of Example 8 on pomset  $bc \parallel a$ .



■ **Figure 3** A canonical term of  $bc \parallel a$ .



■ **Figure 4** An evaluation tree of  $bc \parallel a$ .

## 2.3 Contexts

► **Definition 10** (Multi-contexts). *For  $m \in \mathbb{N}^*$ , let  $\Xi = \{\square_1, \dots, \square_m\}$  be a set of  $m$  distinct letters such that  $\Xi \cap \Sigma = \emptyset$ . The set of  $m$ -contexts  $C_m(\Sigma)$  is the subset of  $\text{SP}(\Sigma \cup \Xi)$  of pomsets containing exactly one element labelled by  $\square_j$  for all  $j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ .*

Given  $c \in C_m(\Sigma)$  and  $w_1, \dots, w_m \in \text{SP}(\Sigma)$ , we denote by  $c[w_1, \dots, w_m]$  the pomset where  $\square_j$  has been replaced by  $w_j$ . Intuitively, a  $m$ -context is a pomset pattern featuring  $\square_j$  placeholder symbols that can be replaced by pomsets. We write  $\text{SP}(\Sigma) = C_0(\Sigma)$ .

We simply call 1-contexts *contexts*, and always denote their placeholder symbol  $\square$ . Pomset contexts are called  $\square$ -terms in [17, 18, 19, 20], but the symbol  $\xi$  is used instead of  $\square$ . Given

$c_1, c_2 \in C_1(\Sigma)$ ,  $c_1[c_2] \in C_1(\Sigma)$  stands for the context obtained by replacing  $\square$  with  $c_2$  in  $c_1$ .  $c_2$  is then said to be a *subcontext* of  $c_1[c_2]$ . For  $w \in \text{SP}(\Sigma)$ , a *split* of  $w$  is a pair  $(c, z) \in C_1(\Sigma) \times \text{SP}(\Sigma)$  such that  $w = c[z]$ . Note that  $z$  is a subpomset of  $w$ . Finally, given  $C \subseteq C_1(\Sigma)$  and  $A \subseteq \text{SP}(\Sigma) \cup C_1(\Sigma)$ , we define the set  $C[A] = \{c[z] \mid c \in C, z \in A\}$ .

Given a pomset recognizer  $\mathcal{R} = (M, \odot, \oplus, e, i, F)$ , note that  $\mathcal{R}(w_1) = \mathcal{R}(w_2)$  does not imply that for all  $c \in C_1(\Sigma)$ ,  $\mathcal{R}(c[w_1]) = \mathcal{R}(c[w_2])$ . Indeed, it might be that  $i^\#(w_1), i^\#(w_2) \in F$  but  $i^\#(w_1) \neq i^\#(w_2)$ :  $w_1$  and  $w_2$  lead to different accepting states, thus potentially yielding a different result whenever inserted in  $c$  then evaluated in  $\mathcal{R}$ . As a consequence,  $i^\#(c[w_1])$  may differ from  $i^\#(c[w_2])$ . However, the following result holds:

► **Lemma 11** (Freeness of PRs [26, Lem. 29]). *For all  $w_1, w_2 \in \text{SP}(\Sigma)$ , if  $i^\#(w_1) = i^\#(w_2)$ , then for all  $c \in C_1(\Sigma)$ ,  $i^\#(c[w_1]) = i^\#(c[w_2])$ .*

## 2.4 A Myhill-Nerode theorem

Let  $L \subseteq \text{SP}(\Sigma)$  and  $u, v \in \text{SP}(\Sigma)$ .  $u \sim_L v$  if for all  $c \in C_1(\Sigma)$ ,  $c[u] \in L \iff c[v] \in L$ . The relation  $\sim_L$  is an equivalence relation; we say that it is a *congruence* relation on  $\text{SP}(\Sigma)$  if it is preserved by  $\cdot$  and  $\parallel$ .  $[w]_{\sim_L}$  stands for the equivalence class of  $w$  in the quotient space  $\text{SP}(\Sigma)/\sim_L$  of  $\text{SP}(\Sigma)$  w.r.t.  $\sim_L$ . It induces a syntactic homomorphism  $\text{SP}(\Sigma) \rightarrow \text{SP}(\Sigma)/\sim_L$  and there exists a Myhill-Nerode characterization of recognizable languages of  $\text{SP}(\Sigma)$ :

► **Theorem 12** (Characterizing recognizable languages [19]).  *$L$  is recognizable if and only if  $\sim_L$  is a congruence relation of finite index.*

Let  $w_1, w_2 \in \text{SP}(\Sigma)$ . Given a pomset language  $L$ , we say that  $c \in C_1(\Sigma)$  is a *distinguishing context* in  $L$  for  $w_1$  and  $w_2$  if  $c[w_1] \in L \iff c[w_2] \notin L$ , that is, one of  $c[w_1]$  and  $c[w_2]$  is in  $L$  while the other is not. If we assume  $L$  is recognized by a pomset recognizer  $\mathcal{R}$ , this necessarily implies that  $m_1 = i^\#(c[w_1]) \neq m_2 = i^\#(c[w_2])$ : one state must be in  $F$  while the other is not. We then say that  $c$  *distinguishes* the states  $m_1$  and  $m_2$ . If there is no such  $c$ , we say that  $m_1$  (resp.  $w_1$ ) and  $m_2$  (resp.  $w_2$ ) are *indistinguishable*.

► **Definition 13** (Reachable and minimal pomset recognizers). *A pomset recognizer  $\mathcal{R} = (M, \odot, \oplus, 1, i, F)$  is said to be reachable if, for all  $m \in M$ , there exists  $w \in \text{SP}(\Sigma)$  such that  $i^\#(w) = m$ ;  $w$  is said to be an access sequence of  $m$ .*

*Moreover, it is minimal if it is reachable and for all  $w_1, w_2 \in \text{SP}(\Sigma)$  such that  $i^\#(w_1) \neq i^\#(w_2)$ , there exists  $c \in C_1(\Sigma)$  such that  $\mathcal{R}(c[w_1]) \neq \mathcal{R}(c[w_2])$ .*

Intuitively,  $\mathcal{R}$  is minimal if any pair of states in  $M$  can always be distinguished by some context. If  $L$  is recognizable,  $\sim_L$  induces an obvious minimal recognizer  $\mathcal{R}_L = (\text{SP}(\Sigma)/\sim_L, \cdot, \parallel, [\varepsilon]_{\sim_L}, i_L, F_L)$  such that  $\forall a \in \Sigma$ ,  $i_L(a) = [a]_{\sim_L}$  and  $F_L = \{[w]_{\sim_L} \in \text{SP}(\Sigma)/\sim_L \mid w \in L\}$ .

## 3 An Introduction to Active Learning

### 3.1 The active learning framework

Consider a recognizable pomset language  $L$  on an alphabet  $\Sigma$ . Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be a minimal PR called the *model* such that  $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{M}) = L$ . *Active learning* is a cooperative game between a learner and a *minimally adequate teacher* (MAT). It consists for the learner in computing a minimal pomset recognizer for  $L$  by asking two types of queries on  $L$  to the MAT:

**Membership queries.** Given  $w \in \text{SP}(\Sigma)$ , does  $w \in L$ , i.e. what is  $\mathcal{M}(w)$ ?

**Equivalence queries** Given a pomset recognizer  $\mathcal{H}$  (called the hypothesis) on  $\Sigma$ , does  $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}) = L = \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{M})$ ? If it does not, return a *counter-example*  $w \in \text{SP}(\Sigma)$  such that  $\mathcal{H}(w) \neq \mathcal{M}(w)$ .

The ability to infer the model  $\mathcal{M}$  stems from Theorem 12. Active learning algorithms compute an *under-approximation*  $\sim_{\mathcal{H}}$  of  $\sim_L = \sim_{\mathcal{M}}$  such that  $w_1 \not\sim_{\mathcal{H}} w_2 \implies w_1 \not\sim_L w_2$ . To do so, they maintain a finite set  $S$  of pomsets and a finite set  $\mathcal{C}$  of contexts. Each pair of elements of  $S$  is distinguished by at least one element of  $\mathcal{C}$ , thus bearing witness to the existence of at least  $|S|$  equivalence classes of  $\sim_L$ , the set  $S$  being their representatives.

Obviously,  $w_1 \sim_{\mathcal{H}} w_2 \implies w_1 \sim_L w_2$  may not hold if the hypothesis is too coarse, thus,  $\mathcal{H}$  may have to be refined several times. Nevertheless, each refinement increases the number of equivalence classes of  $\sim_L$  distinguished by  $\sim_{\mathcal{H}}$ , until the classes of  $\sim_{\mathcal{H}}$  are exactly the classes of  $\sim_L$ , at which point  $\sim_{\mathcal{H}} = \sim_{\mathcal{M}} = \sim_L$  and  $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}) = \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{M}) = L$ .

## 3.2 Common structures and invariants

### 3.2.1 Data structures.

We maintain a finite set  $S$  of pomsets called the set of *representatives* or *access sequences*, meant to store the representatives of  $\sim_L$ 's equivalence classes. By design,  $S$  will be closed by the subpomset operation and contain the empty pomset  $\varepsilon$ . We also introduce the *frontier* set  $S^+ = (\Sigma \cup \{u \circ v \mid \circ \in \{\cdot, \parallel\}, u, v \in S\}) \setminus S$  that contains combinations of elements of  $S$  and single letters: its purpose is to infer the internal operations  $\cdot_{\mathcal{M}}$  and  $\parallel_{\mathcal{M}}$  of the model.

A *pack of components*  $\mathcal{B} = \{B_1, \dots, B_m\}$  partitions  $S \cup S^+$  in such a manner each component contains at least one  $s \in S$ . For  $s \in S \cup S^+$ ,  $\mathcal{B}_s$  stands for the only component of  $\mathcal{B}$   $s$  belongs to. Given  $B \in \mathcal{B}$ ,  $\alpha_{\mathcal{B}}(B) = S \cap B$  is called the set of *access sequences* of  $B$ . For  $s \in S \cup S^+$ , we define  $\alpha_{\mathcal{B}}(s) = \alpha_{\mathcal{B}}(\mathcal{B}_s)$ .  $\mathcal{B}$  under-approximates the classes of  $\sim_{\mathcal{M}}$ .

Finally, we maintain a *discrimination tree*  $\mathcal{D}$ : it is a full binary tree, its inner nodes being labelled by contexts in  $C_1(\Sigma)$ , and its leaves, either unlabelled or labelled by a component of  $\mathcal{B}$  in such a fashion  $\mathcal{D}$ 's set of labelled leaves is in bijection with  $\mathcal{B}$ . In particular,  $\mathcal{D}$ 's root is labelled by  $\square$ . The labels of  $\mathcal{D}$ 's inner nodes form a set of contexts  $\mathcal{C}$ . Given  $B \in \mathcal{B}$ ,  $\mathcal{C}_B$  is defined as the set of contexts that appear along the branch that runs from the root of  $\mathcal{D}$  to the leaf labelled by  $B$ . In particular, note that for all  $B \in \mathcal{B}$ ,  $\square \in \mathcal{C}_B$ .  $\mathcal{D}$ 's use is to posit which class of  $\mathcal{B}$  a pomset belongs to.

### 3.2.2 Operations and invariants.

For any pomset  $w \in \text{SP}(\Sigma)$ , we define the *sifting* operation of  $w$  through  $\mathcal{D}$ : starting at the root of  $\mathcal{D}$ , at every node labelled by a context  $c$  of  $\mathcal{D}$  we branch to the right (resp. left) child if  $c[w] \in L$  (resp.  $c[w] \notin L$ ). We iterate this procedure until a leaf is reached: the matching component  $B \in \mathcal{B}$  is the result of the sifting operation. We define  $\mathcal{D}(w) = B$ . Note that  $\mathcal{D}(w)$  may be undefined if  $w$  is sifted into an unlabelled leaf. Thus,  $\mathcal{D}$  can be viewed as a partial function  $\text{SP}(\Sigma) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ . Sifting requires a number of membership queries bounded by the height of  $\mathcal{D}$ . Intuitively, the discrimination tree is used to classify pomsets: pomsets that behave similarly w.r.t. the finite set of distinguishing contexts  $\mathcal{C}_B$  are lumped into the same component  $B \in \mathcal{B}$ .

► **Property 14.** *By design, the learning algorithm maintains the following invariants:*

1. For any  $s \in S \cup S^+$ ,  $\mathcal{D}(s) = \mathcal{B}_s$ .
2. For any  $B \in \mathcal{B}$ ,  $s_1, s_2 \in B$ ,  $c \in \mathcal{C}_B$ ,  $\mathcal{M}(c[s_1]) = \mathcal{M}(c[s_2])$ .

3. Let  $B_1, B_2 \in \mathcal{B}$  such that  $B_1 \neq B_2$ ; then for any  $s_1 \in B_1$ ,  $s_2 \in B_2$ , there exists  $c \in \mathcal{C}_{B_1} \cap \mathcal{C}_{B_2}$  such that  $\mathcal{M}(c[s_1]) \neq \mathcal{M}(c[s_2])$ ;  $c$  labels  $B_1$  and  $B_2$ 's deepest common ancestor in  $\mathcal{D}$ .
4. Let  $\sim_{\mathcal{B}}$  be the equivalence relation on  $S \cup S^+$  inferred from the partition  $\mathcal{B}$ . Then it is an under-approximation of  $\sim_L$  on  $S \cup S^+$ :  $\forall s_1, s_2 \in S \cup S^+$ ,  $s_1 \not\sim_{\mathcal{B}} s_2 \implies s_1 \not\sim_L s_2$ . As a consequence,  $|\mathcal{B}| \leq |\text{SP}(\Sigma)/\sim_L|$ .

For  $w \in \text{SP}(\Sigma)$ , if  $\mathcal{D}(w)$  is defined, we write  $\mathcal{B}_w = \mathcal{D}(w)$ . Thanks to Invariant 1, this notation doesn't invalidate the previous notation  $\mathcal{B}_s$  for  $s \in S \cup S^+$ .

### 3.3 Building the hypothesis

#### 3.3.1 Properties of the partition.

$\mathcal{B}$  is said to be *consistent* if for any  $B_1, B_2 \in \mathcal{B}$ ,  $u_1, v_1 \in \alpha_{\mathcal{B}}(B_1)$ ,  $u_2, v_2 \in \alpha_{\mathcal{B}}(B_2)$ , and  $\circ \in \{\cdot, \parallel\}$ ,  $u_1 \circ u_2$  and  $v_1 \circ v_2$  belong to the same component of  $\mathcal{B}$ . Intuitively, no matter the representatives of  $B_1$  and  $B_2$  we consider, their composition will belong to the same component. Moreover,  $\mathcal{B}$  is  *$\circ$ -associative* for  $\circ \in \{\cdot, \parallel\}$  if for any  $s_1, s_2, s_3 \in S$  and  $s_l \in \alpha_{\mathcal{B}}(s_1 \circ s_2)$ ,  $s_r \in \alpha_{\mathcal{B}}(s_2 \circ s_3)$ ,  $\mathcal{B}_{s_1 \circ s_3} = \mathcal{B}_{s_1 \circ s_r}$ . Finally,  $\mathcal{B}$  is said to be *sharp* if for any  $B \in \mathcal{B}$ ,  $|S \cap B| = 1$ .

Thus, we can extend the operators  $\cdot$  and  $\parallel$  to components of  $\mathcal{B}$ , and the resulting laws will be internal and associative. Finally, for any  $B \in \mathcal{B}$ , since  $\square \in \mathcal{C}_B$  and for any  $u \in B$ ,  $\square[u] = u$ ,  $\mathcal{M}$  is constant on  $B$ : this shared value is written  $\mathcal{M}(B)$ .

#### 3.3.2 Defining the hypothesis.

If  $\mathcal{B}$  is *consistent*,  *$\cdot$ -associative*, and  *$\parallel$ -associative*, then we design the hypothesis  $\mathcal{H} = (H, \cdot_{\mathcal{H}}, \parallel_{\mathcal{H}}, e_{\mathcal{H}}, i_{\mathcal{H}}, F_{\mathcal{H}})$  as follows:

- $H = \mathcal{B}$ .  $\mathcal{H}$ 's states are the postulated equivalence classes of  $\sim_L$ .
- Given  $u, v \in S$ , since  $\mathcal{B}$  is *consistent*, we can define  $\mathcal{B}_u \cdot_{\mathcal{H}} \mathcal{B}_v = \mathcal{B}_{u \cdot v}$  (resp.  $\mathcal{B}_u \parallel_{\mathcal{H}} \mathcal{B}_v = \mathcal{B}_{u \parallel v}$ ). We use  $S^+$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  to build  $\mathcal{H}$ 's internal operations.
- $e_{\mathcal{H}} = \mathcal{B}_{\epsilon}$ . The neutral element is the class of the empty pomset.
- Given  $a \in \Sigma$ ,  $i_{\mathcal{H}}(a) = \mathcal{B}_a$ . We rely on  $\Sigma \subseteq S \cup S^+$  to build a pomset homomorphism.
- $F_{\mathcal{H}} = \{B \in \mathcal{B} \mid \mathcal{M}(B) = 1\}$ . A component is accepting if its members are accepted by  $\mathcal{M}$ .  $F_{\mathcal{H}}$  corresponds to the leaves of  $\mathcal{D}$  belonging to its right subtree.

For  $w \in \text{SP}(\Sigma)$ , we define the component  $\mathcal{B}_w = i_{\mathcal{H}}^{\#}(w)$   $w$  evaluates to in  $\mathcal{H}$  and its set of access sequences  $\alpha_{\mathcal{H}}(w) = \alpha_{\mathcal{B}}(\mathcal{B}_w)$ . As proven later in Lemma 19, this notation is compatible with the earlier definition of  $\mathcal{B}_w$  for  $w \in S \cup S^+$ . By design of  $\mathcal{H}$ , freeness of pomset recognizers, and consistency of  $\mathcal{B}$ , the hypothesis handles pomsets and their access sequences similarly:

► **Property 15** (Substitution by access sequences).  $\forall c \in \mathcal{C}_1(\Sigma)$ ,  $\forall w \in \text{SP}(\Sigma)$ ,  $\forall p \in \alpha_{\mathcal{H}}(w)$ ,  $\mathcal{H}(c[w]) = \mathcal{H}(c[p])$  and  $i_{\mathcal{H}}^{\#}(c[w]) = i_{\mathcal{H}}^{\#}(c[p])$ .

#### 3.3.3 Compatibility of the hypothesis.

Given a set  $X \subseteq \text{SP}(\Sigma)$  of pomsets, hypothesis  $\mathcal{H}$  is  *$X$ -compatible* if for any  $w \in X$ ,  $\mathcal{H}(w) = \mathcal{M}(w)$ .  $\mathcal{H}$  is said to be *compatible* with  $\mathcal{B}$  if it is compatible with  $\bigcup_{B \in \mathcal{B}} \{c[s] \mid s \in B, c \in \mathcal{C}_B\}$ .

Active learning algorithms such as TTT [14],  $L^{\#}$  [24], or van Heerdt et al.'s adaptation of  $L^*$  [26] to pomset recognizers may not always immediately result in a compatible hypothesis.



However, incompatibilities provide a ‘free’ counter-example  $c[s]$  such that  $\mathcal{H}(c[s]) \neq \mathcal{M}(c[s])$  without requiring an extra membership or equivalence query. We should therefore guarantee that  $\mathcal{H}$  is compatible with  $\mathcal{B}$  before submitting an equivalence query.

### 3.4 Handling counter-examples

The Rivest-Schapire counter-example handling method on finite words consists in studying all the possible splits  $w = u \cdot a \cdot v$ ,  $a \in \Sigma$ , of a counter-example  $w \in \Sigma^+$ , then trying to find one such that the hypothesis and the model agree on the input  $p' \cdot v$  where  $p' \in \alpha_{\mathcal{H}}(u \cdot a)$  but disagree on  $p \cdot a \cdot v$  where  $p \in \alpha_{\mathcal{H}}(u)$ , thus proving that the successor of state  $\mathcal{B}_p$  in the hypothesis has been incorrectly identified as  $\mathcal{B}_{p'}$ , suffix  $v$  being witness to this error.

Intuitively, replacing a prefix  $u$  of  $w$  by its access sequence  $p$  is akin to feeding  $u$  to the hypothesis, then letting either the model or the hypothesis handle the rest of the computation, iterating on all possible splits until the algorithm witnesses the model and hypothesis no longer being in agreement. This change of behaviour, called a *breaking point*, yields a distinguishing suffix and a further refinement of the partition  $\mathcal{B}$  and its matching hypothesis.

Extending breaking points to pomsets is non-trivial due to the branching nature of terms. Assume that  $\mathcal{B}$  is a consistent, associative partition from which a hypothesis  $\mathcal{H}$  is inferred. We define breaking points w.r.t. canonical decomposition:

► **Definition 16** (Agreement). *Given  $c \in C_1(\Sigma)$  and  $z \in \text{SP}(\Sigma)$ , we define the agreement predicate  $\mathcal{A}(c, z) = “\forall p \in \alpha_{\mathcal{H}}(z), \mathcal{H}(c[p]) = \mathcal{M}(c[p])”$ .*

► **Definition 17** (Breaking point). *Given a counter-example  $w \in \text{SP}(\Sigma)^+$  such that  $\mathcal{H}(w) \neq \mathcal{M}(w)$ , and a split  $(c, z)$  of  $w$  such that  $\mathcal{A}(c, z) = 1$ , a (left) breaking point is either:*

- the pair  $(c, z)$  if  $z \in \Sigma$ ;
- a quadruplet  $(c, \circ, z_1, z_2)$  where  $\circ \in \{\cdot, \parallel\}$ ,  $z_1, z_2 \in \text{SP}^+(\Sigma)$ ,  $z = z_1 \circ z_2$  is a canonical decomposition of  $z$ , and  $\mathcal{A}(c[\square \circ z_2], z_1) = 0$ .

We seek a split  $(c, z)$  of  $w$  such that there exists  $p \in S^+ \cap \mathcal{B}_z$ , for any  $p' \in \alpha_{\mathcal{H}}(z)$ ,  $\mathcal{M}(c[p']) \neq \mathcal{M}(c[p])$  as it guarantees that  $p$  belongs to another class of  $\sim_L$  than the current elements of  $S$ , resulting in a refinement of  $\mathcal{B}_z$ . Unlike the Rivest-Schapire decomposition, we may however not directly be able to infer a distinguishing context from every breaking point. Indeed, given a breaking point  $(c, \circ, z_1, z_2)$ , while  $c$  distinguishes  $p_1 \circ z_2$  for some  $p_1 \in \alpha_{\mathcal{H}}(z_1)$  from any  $p' \in \alpha_{\mathcal{H}}(z)$ ,  $p_1 \circ z_2$  may not belong to  $S^+$ . Nevertheless, Algorithm 5 can alter an original counter-example  $w$  until a breaking point can be used to infer a new class and a refinement. We call such a breaking point *effective*.

## 4 Adapting the $L^\lambda$ Algorithm

We detail here the various components of the  $L^\lambda$  active learning algorithm, some of them being somewhat data agnostic, others being peculiar to pomset languages.

### 4.1 Expanding components

Algorithm 1 inserts a new pomset  $w$  belonging to the frontier  $S^+$  or equal to  $\varepsilon$  into the set  $S$  of access sequences then updates  $S^+$  by exploring  $w$ ’s successors (i.e. the pomsets that we can build by combining  $w$  with another element of  $S$ ) and using  $\mathcal{D}$  to sift them into the existing partition  $\mathcal{B}$ .

■ **Algorithm 1**  $\text{Expand}(w)$  where  $w \in S^+$  or  $w = \varepsilon$  if  $\mathcal{B} = \emptyset$

---

```

1:  $S \leftarrow S \cup \{w\}$ 
2: for  $p \in \{w\} \cup \{p' \circ w, w \circ p' \mid \circ \in \{\cdot, \parallel\}, p' \in S\} \cup \Sigma$  do
3:   if  $p$  does not belong to any class of  $\mathcal{B}$  then
4:      $B \leftarrow \mathcal{D}(p)$ 
5:     if  $B$  is defined then
6:        $B \leftarrow B \cup \{p\}$ 
7:     else
8:        $B_p \leftarrow \{p\}$ 
9:        $\mathcal{B} \leftarrow \mathcal{B} \cup \{B_p\}$ 
10:       $\text{UpdateTreeLeaf}(\mathcal{D}, p, B_p)$ 
11:       $\text{Expand}(p)$ 

```

---

By design, building a PR requires sorting the letters of  $\Sigma$  into  $\mathcal{B}$ , hence Line 2, despite elements of  $\Sigma$  not being successors of  $w$ . However, we only insert them once, during the very first call. Expanding a pomset may result in a new class being created if the leaf  $p$  sifted into is unlabelled. Indeed,  $\mathcal{D}$  initially consists of a root labelled by the identity context  $\square$  and two children that have yet to be labelled by components of  $\mathcal{B}$  due to  $S \cup S^+$  being empty. Either leaf may even end up not being labelled at all if the PR is trivial (i.e. has language  $\text{SP}(\Sigma)$  or  $\emptyset$ ). Thus, if a pomset  $p$  is sifted into an unlabelled leaf, Lines 7 to 11 result in a new class  $B_p$  being created and  $\mathcal{D}$  being updated by labelling said leaf with  $B_p$ .

## 4.2 Refining components

Algorithm 2 refines a component  $B$  into two new components  $B_0$  and  $B_1$ , assuming a context  $c$  distinguishes two access sequences of  $B$ .  $S$ ,  $\mathcal{B}$  and  $\mathcal{D}$  are updated accordingly. Lines 5 and 6 guarantee that the new components have at least one access sequence in  $S$ . Line 4 consists in replacing leaf  $B$  of the discrimination tree  $\mathcal{D}$  with an inner node labelled by  $c$  whose left (resp. right) child is a new leaf labelled by  $B_0$  (resp.  $B_1$ ).

■ **Algorithm 2**  $\text{Refine}(B, c)$  where  $B \in \mathcal{B}$ ,  $c \in C_1(\Sigma)$ , and  $\exists z_1, z_2 \in B$ ,  $\mathcal{M}(c[z_1]) \neq \mathcal{M}(c[z_2])$

---

```

1:  $B_0 \leftarrow \{w \in B \mid \mathcal{M}(c[w]) = 0\}$ 
2:  $B_1 \leftarrow \{w \in B \mid \mathcal{M}(c[w]) = 1\}$ 
3:  $\mathcal{B} \leftarrow (\mathcal{B} \setminus \{B\}) \cup \{B_0, B_1\}$ 
4:  $\text{RefineTree}(\mathcal{D}, B, c, B_0, B_1)$ 
5: if  $S \cap B_0 = \emptyset$  then  $\text{Expand}(p_0)$  for some  $p_0 \in B_0$ 
6: if  $S \cap B_1 = \emptyset$  then  $\text{Expand}(p_1)$  for some  $p_1 \in B_1$ 

```

---

Algorithm 3 refines partition  $\mathcal{B}$  whenever it encounters a consistency issue, e.g. class  $B$  contains two representatives  $p_1$  and  $p_2$  such that  $p_1 \circ p$  and  $p_2 \circ p$  in  $S \cup S^+$  do not belong to the same class. This inconsistency yields a context  $c[\square \circ p]$  that distinguishes  $p_1$  and  $p_2$ , where  $c \in \mathcal{C}$  is the label of the deepest common ancestor in  $\mathcal{D}$  of  $p_1 \circ p$  and  $p_2 \circ p$ . This algorithm returns Boolean  $\top$  if and only if  $\mathcal{B}$  was already consistent in the first place. It could also be that  $p \circ p_1$  and  $p \circ p_2$  do not belong to the same class, resulting in a distinguishing context  $c[p \circ \square]$ : we omit this case here for brevity's sake.

---

**Algorithm 3** MakeConsistent()
 

---

```

1: already_consistent ← ⊤
2: while ∃o ∈ {·, ||}, ∃B ∈ ℬ, ∃p1, p2 ∈ αB(B), ∃p ∈ S, D(p1 ∘ p) ≠ D(p2 ∘ p) do
3:   Let c ∈ ℭ be such that M(c[p1 ∘ p]) ≠ M(c[p2 ∘ p]).
4:   Refine(B, c[□ ∘ p])
5:   already_consistent ← ⊥
6: return already_consistent

```

---

Algorithm 4 refines partition  $\mathcal{B}$  whenever it encounters an associativity issue: if  $(s_1 \circ s_2) \circ s_3$  and  $s_l \circ s_3$  do not behave similarly, as witnessed by the deepest common ancestor  $c \in \mathcal{C}$  in  $\mathcal{D}$  of  $s_1 \circ s_r$  and  $s_l \circ s_3$ , since  $s_1 \circ s_2 \in S^+$  and  $s_l \in S$  both belong to a same class  $B$ , the context  $c[\square \circ s_3]$  refines  $B$ . A similar test is performed to detect right associativity issues. This algorithm returns Boolean  $\top$  if and only if  $\mathcal{B}$  was already associative in the first place.

---

**Algorithm 4** MakeAssoc()
 

---

```

1: already_assoc ← ⊤
2: while ∃o ∈ {·, ||}, ∃s1, s2, s3 ∈ S, ∃sl ∈ αB(s1 ∘ s2), ∃sr ∈ αB(s2 ∘ s3), D(s1 ∘ sr) ≠
   D(sl ∘ s3) do
3:   Let c ∈ ℭ be such that M(c[s1 ∘ sr]) ≠ M(c[sl ∘ s3]).
4:   Let p ∈ αB(s1 ∘ s2 ∘ s3).
5:   query ← M(c[p])
6:   if M(c[sl ∘ s3]) ≠ query then
7:     Refine(ℬs1 ∘ s2, c[□ ∘ s3])
8:   else
9:     Refine(ℬs2 ∘ s3, c[s1 ∘ □])
10:  already_assoc ← ⊥
11: return already_assoc

```

---

### 4.3 Using counter-examples to identify new components

Algorithm 5 is an important contribution as it differs from existing counter-example handling algorithms on finite words and pomsets. Its arguments are a context  $c$  and a pomset  $z$  such that  $w = c[z]$  is a counter-example. It returns a context  $c'$  and a pomset  $p$  belonging to the frontier such that  $c'$  distinguishes  $p$  from all the existing access sequences of  $\mathcal{B}_p$ .

- Line 1 handles the base case: if  $z$  is a letter, we can trivially infer a distinguishing context and a new representative. Property 23 guarantees that, by the time the algorithm reaches a leaf, it is indeed a breaking point.
- Lines 3 to 4 consist in inductively finding a breaking point along the leftmost branch of a canonical term  $t$  of  $w$ . By Property 23, such a breaking point always exists. Figure 5 displays how the algorithm explores  $t \in \text{ST}(c[z])$ : if  $\iota$  is the insertion point of  $z$  in  $t$ , let  $\mu$  and  $\nu$  be the children of  $\iota$ . The exponent of each node stands for the local value of predicate  $\mathcal{A}(c^x, z^x)$  for  $x \in \{\iota, \mu, \nu\}$ , where  $(c^x, z^x)$  stands for the split of  $w$  induced by node  $x$ . Here,  $(c, \circ, z_1, z_2)$  is a breaking point. If it is not the case, the algorithm inductively explores the (purple) leftmost sub-branch rooted in  $\mu$  instead.
- Lines 6 to 7 determine whether a refinement can be inferred from this breaking point. Our intuition is that witnessing a conflict when the left branch is replaced by an access

■ **Algorithm 5** FindEBP( $c, z$ ) where  $c \in C_1(\Sigma)$ ,  $z \in \text{SP}^+(\Sigma)$ ,  $\mathcal{H}(c[z]) \neq \mathcal{M}(c[z])$  and  $\mathcal{A}(c, z) = 1$

---

```


1: if  $z \in \Sigma$  then return  $(c, z)$ 
2: else if  $z = z_1 \circ z_2$  is a canonical decomposition of  $z$  then
3:   if  $\mathcal{A}(c[\square \circ z_2], z_1)$  then
4:     return FindEBP( $c[\square \circ z_2], z_1$ )
5:   else
6:     Let  $p_1 \in \alpha_{\mathcal{H}}(z_1)$  be such that  $\mathcal{H}(c[p_1 \circ z_2]) \neq \mathcal{M}(c[p_1 \circ z_2])$ .
7:     if  $\mathcal{A}(c[p_1 \circ \square], z_2)$  then
8:       return FindEBP( $c[p_1 \circ \square], z_2$ )
9:     else
10:      Let  $p_2 \in \alpha_{\mathcal{H}}(z_2)$  be such that  $\mathcal{H}(c[p_1 \circ p_2]) \neq \mathcal{M}(c[p_1 \circ p_2])$ .
11:      return  $(c, p_1 \circ p_2)$ 
    
```

---


sequence  $p_1$  is not enough; we need to check if feeding both branches to the hypothesis still result in a conflict.

- If it does (Lines 10 to 11), then  $c$  distinguishes  $p_1 \circ p_2$  for some  $p_1 \in \alpha_{\mathcal{H}}(z_1)$ ,  $p_2 \in \alpha_{\mathcal{H}}(z_2)$  from any access sequence in  $\alpha_{\mathcal{H}}(p_1 \circ p_2)$ . Then the algorithm returns  $c$  and  $p_1 \circ p_2$ .
- Otherwise, the algorithm no longer explores the leftmost branch rooted in  $\iota$ . Line 8 instead replaces  $z_1$  with an access sequence  $p_1$  and restarts the exploration process from  $\nu$ , as shown by Figure 6. The pre-condition is respected, as  $c[p_1 \circ z_2]$  is still a counter-example due to  $\mathcal{A}(c_w^\mu, z_w^\mu) = 0$  by definition of breaking points.

By Theorem 24, Algorithm 5 ends and does return a context  $c'$  that distinguishes a representative  $p$  of a new component from the access sequences of its previous component. Due to each inductive call descending deeper into the term, we can intuit that Algorithm 5 performs at most  $\mathcal{O}(\delta(z))$  inductive calls.



■ **Figure 5** A breaking point along a branch of a counter-example  $c[z]$ .



■ **Figure 6** Replacing the left branch by its access sequence and switching to its sibling.

#### 4.4 Inducing a refinement

Algorithm 6 characterizes  $L^\lambda$ : it relies on Algorithm 5 to find a representative of a new component  $p$  and a matching distinguishing context  $c$ , but does **not** use  $c$  to immediately refine  $\mathcal{B}_p$ . Indeed,  $c$  is of arbitrary size, being inferred from an arbitrarily long counter-example; an overly large context in  $\mathcal{C}$  would weight down future membership queries.

Instead, it merely expands  $p$  (Line 5) and relies only on Algorithms 3 and 4 to refine  $\mathcal{B}$  and  $\mathcal{H}$  (Lines 6 and 7), therefore keeping  $\mathcal{C}$  closed by Property 21. Fixing a consistency defect may result in an associativity defect appearing and vice versa, hence the loop.

Should a lack of associativity or consistency defects prevents a new component for  $p$  from being refined, Algorithm 6 also adds  $c[p]$  and  $c[p']$  to a counter-example pool  $\mathcal{E}$  it maintains (Line 4) for any representative  $p' \in \alpha_{\mathcal{H}}(p)$  in order to guarantee that  $p$  and  $p'$  are eventually distinguished (see Property 28). By Theorem 27, this loop eventually depletes  $\mathcal{E}$  and ends.

■ **Algorithm 6** `HandleCE( $w$ )` where  $w \in \text{SP}^+(\Sigma)$  is such that  $\mathcal{H}(w) \neq \mathcal{M}(w)$

---

```

1:  $\mathcal{E} \leftarrow \{w\}$ 
2: while  $\exists u \in \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{M}(u) \neq \mathcal{H}(u)$  do
3:    $(c, p) \leftarrow \text{FindEBP}(\square, u)$ 
4:    $\mathcal{E} \leftarrow \mathcal{E} \cup \{c[p]\} \cup \{c[p'] \mid p' \in \alpha_{\mathcal{H}}(p)\}$ 
5:   Expand( $p$ )
6:   repeat
7:     until MakeConsistent()  $\wedge$  MakeAssoc()
8:    $\mathcal{H} \leftarrow \text{BuildHypothesis}(S, \mathcal{B})$ 

```

---

## 4.5 The main loop

Algorithm 7 first initializes the pack of components  $\mathcal{B}$  and the hypothesis  $\mathcal{H}$  by expanding the empty pomset  $\varepsilon$ . There are no consistency and associativity defects to fix that early due to the first iteration of  $\mathcal{B}$  having at most two classes.

It then submits  $\mathcal{H}$  to the teacher. If the equivalence query returns a counter-example  $w$ , it then proceeds to apply Algorithm 6 to identify new components and refine  $\mathcal{H}$  accordingly. Otherwise, a model  $\mathcal{H}$  equivalent to  $\mathcal{M}$  has been learnt and the algorithm returns  $\mathcal{H}$ .

Lines 6 and 7 guarantee that  $\mathcal{H}$  is compatible before submitting an equivalence query. Note that this compatibility test is free (although the counter-example handling is obviously not) due to the membership query  $\mathcal{M}(c[s])$  having already been performed during either the sifting of  $s$  through  $\mathcal{D}$  or the refinement of  $\mathcal{B}_s$ .

■ **Algorithm 7** `Learn()`

---

```

1:  $S, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{D} \leftarrow \emptyset, \emptyset, \text{Tree}(\square)$ 
2: Expand( $\varepsilon$ )
3:  $\mathcal{H} \leftarrow \text{BuildHypothesis}(S, \mathcal{B})$ 
4: while  $\exists w \in \text{SP}(\Sigma), \mathcal{H}(w) \neq \mathcal{M}(w)$  do
5:   HandleCE( $w$ )
6:   while  $\exists B \in \mathcal{B}, \exists s \in B, \exists c \in \mathcal{C}_B, \mathcal{H}(c[s]) \neq \mathcal{M}(c[s])$  do
7:     HandleCE( $c[s]$ )
8: return  $\mathcal{H}$ 

```

---

## 5 Termination, Correctness, and Complexity

### 5.1 Properties of the hypothesis

$L^\lambda$  [13] on finite automata maintains a prefix-closed set of access sequences and a suffix-closed set of distinguishing suffixes. We show that similar results hold on pomsets as well.

► **Property 18** (Closedness of access sequences).  *$S$  is subpomset-closed.*

**Proof.** With the exception of  $\varepsilon$ , new elements of  $S$  are only ever added by promoting elements of  $S^+$  (Line 11 of Algorithm 1, Lines 5 and 6 of Algorithm 2, Line 5 of Algorithm 6);  $S^+$  itself is inductively defined as the union of  $\Sigma$  and the composition of elements of  $S$ . ◀

Similarly,  $S \cup S^+$  is subpomset-closed. We show below that an associative, consistent, and compatible  $(\mathcal{B}, S, \mathcal{D})$  induces a minimal hypothesis  $\mathcal{H}$ .

► **Lemma 19** (Reachability of the hypothesis). *An associative, consistent  $(\mathcal{B}, S, \mathcal{D})$  induces a hypothesis  $\mathcal{H}$  such that: 1.  $i_{\mathcal{H}}^{\#}(s) = \mathcal{B}_s$  for all  $s \in S \cup S^+$ , 2.  $\mathcal{H}$  is reachable.*

**Proof.**  $S \cup S^+$  being subpomset closed, we can rely on a proof by induction on  $s$  to prove that for any  $s \in S \cup S^+$ ,  $i_{\mathcal{H}}^{\#}(s) = \mathcal{B}_s$ .

**Base case.**  $i_{\mathcal{H}}^{\#}(\varepsilon) = i_{\mathcal{H}}(\varepsilon) = e_{\mathcal{H}} = \mathcal{B}_{\varepsilon}$  and, for any  $a \in \Sigma$ ,  $i_{\mathcal{H}}^{\#}(a) = i_{\mathcal{H}}(a) = \mathcal{B}_a$  by definition of the hypothesis  $\mathcal{H}$ .

**Inductive case.** Now, let  $s_1 \circ s_2 \in S \cup S^+$  for some  $\circ \in \{\cdot, \parallel\}$ ;  $S \cup S^+$  being subpomset-closed,  $s_1, s_2 \in S \cup S^+$ . By induction hypothesis,  $i_{\mathcal{H}}^{\#}(s_i) = \mathcal{B}_{s_i}$  for  $i \in \{1, 2\}$ . Then  $i_{\mathcal{H}}^{\#}(s_1 \circ s_2) = i_{\mathcal{H}}^{\#}(s_1) \circ_{\mathcal{H}} i_{\mathcal{H}}^{\#}(s_2) = \mathcal{B}_{s_1} \circ_{\mathcal{H}} \mathcal{B}_{s_2} = \mathcal{B}_{s_1 \circ s_2}$  by definition of  $\mathcal{H}$  and consistency of  $\mathcal{B}$ . Thus 1. holds.

2. is a direct consequence of  $i_{\mathcal{H}}^{\#}(s) = \mathcal{B}_s$  for any  $s \in S$ . ◀

► **Lemma 20** (Partial compatibility). *An associative, consistent  $(\mathcal{B}, S, \mathcal{D})$  induces a  $(S \cup S^+)$ -compatible hypothesis  $\mathcal{H}$ .*

**Proof.** By Lemma 19, for any  $s \in S \cup S^+$ ,  $i_{\mathcal{H}}^{\#}(s) = \mathcal{B}_s$ . By definition of  $\mathcal{H}$ ,  $\mathcal{H}(s) = 1 \iff i_{\mathcal{H}}^{\#}(s) \in F_{\mathcal{H}} \iff \mathcal{B}_s \in F_{\mathcal{H}} \iff \forall s' \in \mathcal{B}_s, \mathcal{M}(s') = 1$ . Thus,  $\mathcal{H}(s) = \mathcal{M}(s)$ . ◀

► **Property 21** (Closedness of distinguishing contexts).  *$\mathcal{C}$  is such that, for any  $c \in \mathcal{C}$ , either  $c = \square$  or there exist  $c' \in \mathcal{C}$ ,  $s \in S \setminus \{\varepsilon\}$ , and  $\circ \in \{\cdot, \parallel\}$  such that  $c = c'[\square \circ s]$  or  $c = c'[s \circ \square]$ .*

**Proof.** 7 With the exception of  $\square$ , new elements of  $\mathcal{C}$  are only ever added by Line 4 of Algorithm 3 or Lines 7 and 9 of Algorithm 4; both additions follow the desired pattern. ◀

► **Theorem 22** (Minimality). *Given a hypothesis  $\mathcal{H}$  induced from an associative, consistent  $(\mathcal{B}, S, \mathcal{D})$ , if  $\mathcal{H}$  is compatible, then it is minimal.*

**Proof.** First, by Lemma 19, we know that  $\mathcal{H}$  is reachable. Let  $B_1, B_2 \in \mathcal{B}$  be such that  $B_1 \neq B_2$ . By Invariant 3 of Property 14, there exist  $c \in \mathcal{C}_{B_1} \cap \mathcal{C}_{B_2}$ ,  $s_1 \in B_1$ ,  $s_2 \in B_2$ ,  $\mathcal{M}(c[s_1]) \neq \mathcal{M}(c[s_2])$ .  $\mathcal{H}$  being compatible,  $\mathcal{H}(c[s_1]) = \mathcal{M}(c[s_1])$  and  $\mathcal{H}(c[s_2]) = \mathcal{M}(c[s_2])$ . Thus,  $\mathcal{H}(c[s_1]) \neq \mathcal{H}(c[s_2])$ .  $\mathcal{H}$  is therefore minimal. ◀

## 5.2 Using counter-examples to identify new components

We assume in this section that  $\mathcal{B}$  is a consistent, associative partition from which a hypothesis  $\mathcal{H}$  is inferred. We first prove that a breaking point can always be found on the leftmost branch of every term of a counter-example, that is, the branch Algorithm 5 focuses on. This branch choice is arbitrary: indeed, the proof of Property 23 can be applied to any branch. This breaking point may not be effective, i.e. resulting in a new component being discovered.

► **Property 23.** *Given a counter-example  $w \in \text{SP}^+(\Sigma)$  such that  $\mathcal{H}(w) \neq \mathcal{M}(w)$ , given a split  $(c, z)$  of  $w$  such that  $\mathcal{A}(c, z) = 1$ , there exists a breaking point  $(c', z')$  or  $(c', \circ, z_1, z_2)$  such that  $c$  is a subcontext of  $c'$  and either  $w = c'[z']$  or  $w = c'[z_1 \circ z_2]$ .*

**Proof.** There exists a sequence  $(c_0, z_0), \dots, (c_k, z_k)$  of splits of  $w$  such that  $(c_0, z_0) = (c, z)$ ,  $z_k \in \Sigma$ , and for all  $j \in \{0, \dots, k-1\}$ ,  $c_{j+1} = c_j[\square \circ_j z'_j]$  for some  $\circ_j \in \{\cdot, \parallel\}$  and  $z'_j \in \text{SP}^+(\Sigma)$ . Intuitively, we explore the leftmost sub-branch of a term of  $\text{ST}(z)$  and the resulting splits of  $w$  until we reach a leaf. We define the Booleans  $\mathcal{A}_j = \mathcal{A}(c_j, z_j)$  for  $j \in \{0, \dots, k\}$ . By hypothesis,  $\mathcal{A}_0 = 1$ . Assume that  $\exists j \in \{0, \dots, k\}$ ,  $\mathcal{A}_j = 0$ . Therefore, there exists  $u \in \{0, \dots, j\}$ ,  $\mathcal{A}_u = 1$  but  $\mathcal{A}_{u+1} = 0$ , and  $(c_u, \circ_u, z_{u+1}, z'_u)$  is a breaking point by definition. If no such  $u$  exists, then  $\mathcal{A}_k = 1$  and the split  $(c_k, b_k)$  is a breaking point.  $\blacktriangleleft$

The following theorem is one of our main results: it states that from a counter-example, by looking for breaking points, we can find a representative  $p$  of a new component that is distinguished by a context  $c'$  from any other representative  $p'$  of its current component.

► **Theorem 24** (Correction and termination of Algorithm 5). *Given  $c \in C_1(\Sigma)$  and  $z \in \text{SP}^+(\Sigma)$  such that  $\mathcal{H}(c[z]) \neq \mathcal{M}(c[z])$  and  $\mathcal{A}(c, z) = 1$ ,  $\text{FindEBP}(c, z)$  terminates and returns a pair  $(c', p) \in C_1(\Sigma) \times S^+$  such that  $\forall p' \in \alpha_{\mathcal{H}}(p)$ ,  $\mathcal{M}(c'[p]) \neq \mathcal{M}(c'[p'])$ .*

**Proof.** We prove this theorem by induction on the depth  $\delta(z)$  of the pomset  $z$ .

**Base case.** If  $\delta(z) = 0$ ,  $z \in \Sigma$  and  $z \in S \cup S^+$  by definition of  $S^+$ . Due to  $\mathcal{A}(c, z) = 1$ , for any  $p' \in \alpha_{\mathcal{H}}(z)$ ,  $\mathcal{H}(c[p']) = \mathcal{M}(c[p'])$ ; but  $\mathcal{H}(c[z]) \neq \mathcal{M}(c[z])$  by hypothesis; as a direct consequence,  $z \notin \alpha_{\mathcal{H}}(z)$ , hence  $z \notin S$ , thus  $z \in S^+$ . Moreover,  $\mathcal{M}(c[z]) \neq \mathcal{M}(c[p'])$ . The base case therefore holds for  $c' = c$  and  $p = z$ .

**Inductive case.** Assume that  $\delta(z) = m + 1$  for some  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  and that the theorem holds for smaller depths. Consider a canonical decomposition  $z = z_1 \circ z_2$ .

As long as  $(c, \circ, z_1, z_2)$  is not a breaking point, Algorithm 5 inductively calls  $\text{FindEBP}(c[\square \circ z_2], z_1)$  (Lines 3 and 4). By Property 23, one will be found eventually; we assume w.l.o.g. that  $(c, \circ, z_1, z_2)$  is a breaking point, as shown by Figure 5.

By Definition 17, for any  $p' \in \alpha_{\mathcal{H}}(z)$ ,  $\mathcal{H}(c[p']) = \mathcal{M}(c[p'])$  (i) and there exists  $p_1 \in \alpha_{\mathcal{H}}(z_1)$ ,  $\mathcal{H}(c[p_1 \circ z_2]) \neq \mathcal{M}(c[p_1 \circ z_2])$  (ii). Let us consider one such  $p_1$ . We perform a case disjunction on predicate  $\mathcal{A}(c[p_1 \circ \square], z_2)$  (iii).

**$\mathcal{A}(c[p_1 \circ \square], z_2)$  is false.** Let  $p_2 \in \alpha_{\mathcal{H}}(z_2)$  such that  $\mathcal{H}(c[p_1 \circ p_2]) \neq \mathcal{M}(c[p_1 \circ p_2])$ . By Property 15, for any  $p' \in \alpha_{\mathcal{H}}(z)$ ,  $\mathcal{H}(c[p']) = \mathcal{H}(c[p_1 \circ p_2])$ . By i,  $\mathcal{M}(c[p_1 \circ p_2]) \neq \mathcal{M}(c[p'])$  (iv). Let  $p = p_1 \circ p_2 \in S \cup S^+$  and  $c' = c$ . By Property 15,  $\alpha_{\mathcal{H}}(z) = \alpha_{\mathcal{H}}(p)$ . Therefore, by iv,  $p \notin \alpha_{\mathcal{H}}(p)$ , hence  $p \notin S$  and  $p \in S^+$ . The theorem holds.

**$\mathcal{A}(c[p_1 \circ \square], z_2)$  is true.** iii holds. Moreover, by ii,  $c[p_1 \circ \square][z_2]$  is a counter-example. Finally,  $\delta(z_2) < \delta(z)$  due to  $z_1 \circ z_2$  being a canonical decomposition of  $z$ . We can apply the induction hypothesis to  $\text{FindEBP}(c[p_1 \circ \square], z_2)$ , and the theorem holds.

By induction and case disjunction, we have proven that the theorem holds.  $\blacktriangleleft$

► **Corollary 25.** *Given a counter-example  $w \in \text{SP}(\Sigma)$  such that  $\mathcal{H}(w) \neq \mathcal{M}(w)$ , a call to  $\text{FindEBP}(\square, w)$  returns a pair  $(c', p) \in C_1(\Sigma) \times S^+$  such that for any  $p' \in S$ ,  $p \not\sim_L p'$ .*

**Proof.** By Lemma 20,  $\forall p \in \alpha_{\mathcal{H}}(w)$ ,  $\mathcal{H}(p) = \mathcal{M}(p)$ . Thus,  $\mathcal{A}(\square, w) = 1$ . We can therefore apply Algorithm 5 to  $(\square, w)$  and by Theorem 24,  $\text{FindEBP}(\square, w)$  returns a pair  $(c, p) \in C_1(\Sigma) \times S^+$  such that for any  $p' \in \alpha_{\mathcal{H}}(p)$ ,  $\mathcal{M}(c[p]) \neq \mathcal{M}(c[p'])$ . Moreover, by Invariant 3 of Property 14, for any  $p' \in S \setminus \alpha_{\mathcal{H}}(p)$ , there exists  $c' \in \mathcal{C}$  such that  $\mathcal{M}(c'[p]) \neq \mathcal{M}(c'[p'])$ .  $\blacktriangleleft$

### 5.3 Termination and correction of the refinement process

► **Lemma 26.** *Algorithms 3 and 4 1. terminate and 2. induce a refinement if they return  $\perp$ .*

**Proof.** Each iteration of either algorithm's main loop leads to a refinement and increases the size  $|B|$  of the pack of components. But by Invariant 4 of Property 14,  $|B| \leq |\text{SP}(\Sigma)/\sim_L|$ , thus these loops must end and **1.** holds.

**2.** trivially holds: if the main loop is executed at least once, the call to **Refine** will increase  $|B|$  and the algorithm will return  $\perp$  instead of  $\top$ . ◀

► **Theorem 27.** *Algorithm 6 1. terminates and 2. induces a refinement of  $\mathcal{B}$ .*

**Proof.** If **MakeConsistent**()  $\wedge$  **MakeAssoc**() is false, then at least one new class is added to  $\mathcal{B}$ . But  $|\mathcal{B}| \leq |\text{SP}(\Sigma)/\sim_L|$  by Invariant 4 of Property 14. Lines 6 and 7 therefore terminate.

Moreover, assume by contradiction that Algorithm 6 doesn't terminate. For any counter-example  $w$ , by Corollary 25, a call to **FindEBP**( $\square, w$ ) returns a pomset  $p$  that is  $\sim_L$ -distinguished from all the other existing elements of  $S$ ; then  $p$  is then immediately added to  $S$  (Line 5). Thus, there would exist an infinite sequence of pomsets distinguished pairwise by  $\sim_L$ . But  $\text{SP}(\Sigma)/\sim_L$  is finite by Theorem 12, hence a contradiction. **1.** therefore holds.

Finally, if Algorithm 6 doesn't induce a refinement then it doesn't terminate:  $\mathcal{H}$  is not updated and  $\mathcal{H}(w) \neq \mathcal{M}(w)$  still holds. Thus, **2.** holds. ◀

A component of  $\mathcal{B}$  may at some point feature more than one access sequence if Algorithm 6 inserts a new representative that cannot be immediately separated from its original class by an inconsistency or an associativity defect. Nevertheless, it remains a temporary issue:

► **Property 28.** *Algorithm 6 terminates with  $\mathcal{B}$  being sharp.*

**Proof.** Until Line 3 of Algorithm 7,  $\mathcal{B}$  is trivially sharp. Assume by contradiction that  $\mathcal{B}$  ceases being sharp after some terminating call to Algorithm 6. Let  $\mathcal{H}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  be respectively the last hypothesis (Line 8) and the last pack of components inferred by this call. If  $\mathcal{B}$  is not sharp, by definition, there exist  $B \in \mathcal{B}$ ,  $p_1, p_2 \in \alpha_B(B)$ ,  $p_1 \neq p_2$  and  $p_2$  has been added to  $S$  by the algorithm after  $p_1$ . By Theorem 24, there exists  $c \in C_1(\Sigma)$  such that  $\mathcal{M}(c[p_1]) \neq \mathcal{M}(c[p_2])$  (**i**), and both  $c[p_1]$  and  $c[p_2]$  have been added to  $\mathcal{E}$  (Line 4).

By Property 15, since  $p_1$  and  $p_2$  belong to the same class  $B$ ,  $\mathcal{H}(c[p_1]) = \mathcal{H}(c[p_2])$  (**ii**). By **i** and **ii** either  $\mathcal{H}(c[p_1]) \neq \mathcal{M}(c[p_1])$  or  $\mathcal{H}(c[p_2]) \neq \mathcal{M}(c[p_2])$ . Thus, there still exists a counter-example in the pool  $\mathcal{E}$ , the loop condition in Line 2 is still verified and  $\mathcal{B}$  can't be the last pack of components inferred as this new iteration of the loop will result in  $\mathcal{B}$  being updated (Line 5). By contradiction, the property holds. ◀

► **Theorem 29** (Correctness of  $L^\lambda$ ). *Algorithm 7 1. terminates and 2. returns a PR  $\mathcal{H}$  such that  $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}) = L$ .*

**Proof.** By Theorem 27, each call to **HandleCE** Line 5 always yields a refinement, i.e. increases  $|\mathcal{B}|$ , hence  $|\text{SP}(\Sigma)/\sim_{\mathcal{H}}|$ . But by Invariant 4 of Property 14,  $|\mathcal{B}| \leq |\text{SP}(\Sigma)/\sim_L|$ , thus there can be only a finite number of calls to **HandleCE**, and the algorithm terminates. **1.** holds.

**2.** obviously follows: consider the hypothesis  $\mathcal{H}$  returned. Assume that  $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}) \neq L$ ; then  $\exists w \in \text{SP}(\Sigma)$ ,  $\mathcal{H}(w) \neq \mathcal{M}(w)$ . But the loop Line 4 should not have ended and should have instead lead to a further refinement of  $\mathcal{H}$ . By contradiction,  $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}) = L$ . ◀



## 5.4 Complexity analysis

Let  $|M| = n$  be the size of the target minimal pomset recognizer  $\mathcal{M}$ ,  $k = |\Sigma|$  the size of the alphabet,  $m$  and  $d$  the maximal size and depth of counter-examples returned by the MAT. We conduct a comparative theoretical analysis of query and symbol complexities, comparing our algorithm to the  $L^*$  adaptation of [26].

### 5.4.1 Query complexity

#### 5.4.1.1 Building the pack of components.

Due to each element of  $S$  being eventually distinguished from all the others,  $|S| \leq n$  and  $|S^+| \leq n^2 + k$ . In a similar fashion, new elements are only ever added to  $\mathcal{C}$  when they result in a new class being added to  $\mathcal{B}$ , thus  $|\mathcal{C}| \leq n$ .

We build the pack of components by sifting every element of  $S$  and  $S^+$  through  $\mathcal{D}$ . The worst-case scenario arises when  $\mathcal{D}$  is a linear tree of depth  $n - 1$ : sifting a pomset may then require up to  $n - 1$  membership requests. Computing  $\mathcal{B}$  then results in  $\mathcal{O}(n^3 + k \cdot n)$  membership queries. In the best case scenario,  $\mathcal{D}$  is a complete binary tree of depth  $\lceil \log_2(n) \rceil$ : we then perform  $\mathcal{O}(\log_2(n) \cdot n^2 + k \cdot \log_2(n))$  membership queries.

Both cases are similar to  $L^*$ , whose set of distinguishing contexts is of size  $\lceil \log_2(n) \rceil$  in a best case scenario, and  $n$  in the worst case scenario. A predictable result, due to the same property holding for finite automata.

#### 5.4.1.2 Handling counter-examples.

As a secondary result of the proof of Theorem 24, given a counter-example  $w$ ,  $\text{FindEBP}(\square, w)$  performs at most  $d$  recursive calls. If we assume  $\mathcal{B}$  is sharp, each call asks only two membership queries (Lines 3 and 7). In that case,  $\text{FindEBP}(\square, w)$  only requires  $\mathcal{O}(d)$  membership queries.

Let us compare  $\text{FindEBP}$  to the function  $\text{HCE}$  outlined in [26] that instead relies on a prefix traversal of a term of a counter-example instead of exploring a single branch on the fly.  $\text{HCE}$  performs at most  $\mathcal{O}(m)$  membership queries. Thus, the closer to a perfect binary tree the term of  $w$  considered, the more  $\text{FindEBP}$  outperforms  $\text{HCE}$ : the former will perform at most  $\mathcal{O}(\log_2(m))$  queries and the latter,  $\mathcal{O}(m)$ . However, if instead canonical terms are linear trees, then  $d = \Theta(m)$  and both algorithms perform  $\mathcal{O}(m)$  queries.

In the context of the  $L^\lambda$  algorithm, while executing Algorithm 6,  $\mathcal{B}$  may not be sharp and a component may feature up to  $n$  access sequences. Computing the agreement predicates on Lines 6 and 10 therefore requires  $\mathcal{O}(n)$  membership queries. Thus,  $\text{FindEBP}(\square, w)$  finds a new component in  $\mathcal{O}(n \cdot d)$  membership queries in the worst case scenario.

Rivest-Schapiro's method [23] for finite words identifies a breaking point in a counter-example  $w$  by performing a binary search over the totally ordered set of prefixes of  $w$ , achieving logarithmic complexity w.r.t. the length of  $w$ . However, it is worth noting that, for series-parallel pomsets, the set of subpomsets of a counter-example  $w$  forms a partial order that prevents us from searching for a breaking point dichotomically.

#### 5.4.1.3 Total number of queries.

In both cases, the number of equivalence queries is bounded by  $n$ : in the worst case scenario, each counter-example results in only one component being added to  $\mathcal{B}$ . Finally, our algorithm performs at most  $\mathcal{O}(n^3 + k \cdot n + d \cdot n^2)$  membership queries, whereas [26]'s adaptation of  $L^*$  performs at most  $\mathcal{O}(n^3 + k \cdot n + m \cdot n)$ . Were we to replace  $\text{HCE}$  with  $\text{FindEBP}$ ,  $L^*$  would require  $\mathcal{O}(n^3 + k \cdot n + d \cdot n)$  membership queries at most instead.

Theoretically,  $L^\lambda$ 's delayed refinements may burden the counter-example handling process and lead to higher query complexity than  $L^*$ ; it has however been shown by Howar et al. [13] that  $L^\lambda$  is competitive with state-of-the-art active learning algorithms for rational languages and therefore outperforms  $L^*$  due to delayed refinements being rare. It remains to be seen if such an observation holds for recognizable pomset languages.

## 5.4.2 Symbol complexity

Estimating the symbol complexity of an active learning algorithm is of great practical use. Merely bounding the number of queries overlooks the fact that the actual execution time of membership queries depends on the size of the input.

### 5.4.2.1 A study of representatives and contexts.

Let us estimate the size of  $S$ 's greatest access sequence: in the worst case scenario, the  $i+1$ -th representative  $s_{i+1} \in S^+$  added to  $S$  is the composition of two copies of the current largest element  $s_i$  of  $S \setminus \{\varepsilon\}$  for  $1 \leq i < n$ . Thus,  $|s_{i+1}| = 2 \cdot |s_i| + 1$  and trivially,  $|s_n| = \mathcal{O}(2^n)$ . For any  $s \in S \cup S^+$ ,  $|s| = \mathcal{O}(2^n)$ . An identical property holds for [26]'s adaptation of  $L^*$ .

The same is not true of  $\mathcal{C}$ . Let us estimate the size of  $\mathcal{C}$ 's greatest context: in the worst case scenario, the  $i+1$ -th context  $c_{i+1}$  added to  $\mathcal{C}$  is of the form  $c_i[\square \circ s]$  where  $s \in S$  and  $c_i$  is the current largest element of  $\mathcal{C}$  for  $1 < i < n$ , hence  $|c_{i+1}| \leq |c_i| + 1 + |s|$ . Trivially,  $|c_n| = \mathcal{O}(n \cdot 2^n)$ . Thus, for any  $c \in \mathcal{C}$ ,  $|c| = \mathcal{O}(n \cdot 2^n)$ . In  $L^*$ 'case, distinguishing contexts are directly extracted from the counter-examples and for any  $c \in \mathcal{C}$ ,  $|c| = \mathcal{O}(m)$ .

### 5.4.2.2 Total symbol complexity.

In order to build its observation table,  $L^*$  thus requires  $\mathcal{O}((2^n + m) \cdot n^3 + k \cdot m \cdot n)$  symbols, while  $L^\lambda$  takes  $\mathcal{O}(2^n \cdot n^4 + k \cdot 2^n \cdot n^2)$  symbols to build  $\mathcal{B}$ . Moreover, each membership query performed by FindEBP and HCE alike takes up to  $\mathcal{O}(m + d \cdot 2^n)$  symbols, the worst case scenario being a right linear tree such that  $d$  branches have to be replaced by their access sequences. FindEBP performs  $\mathcal{O}(d \cdot n^2)$  membership queries, whereas HCE performs  $\mathcal{O}(m \cdot n)$ . Thus, the total symbol complexity of  $L^*$  is  $\mathcal{O}((2^n + m) \cdot n^3 + k \cdot m \cdot n + m \cdot n \cdot (m + d \cdot 2^n))$ , and the symbol complexity of  $L^\lambda$  is  $\mathcal{O}(2^n \cdot n^4 + k \cdot 2^n \cdot n^2 + d \cdot n^2 \cdot (m + d \cdot 2^n))$ .

It is therefore worth pointing out that  $L^\lambda$ 's symbol complexity here does not depend on  $m$  with the unavoidable exception of the counter-example handling procedure. Due to  $m$  being arbitrary large, should  $m = \Omega(n \cdot 2^n)$ , then the extra symbols carried by the needlessly large distinguishing contexts directly inferred from counter-examples will burden every further membership query performed by  $L^*$  to extend its observation table.

## 6 Generating Test Suites for Equivalence Queries

The use of equivalence queries in active learning algorithms is paradoxical: we are striving to infer a formal model from a black box yet our method requires that we compare the hypotheses we submit to the very model we are trying to learn. Practically speaking, we can only rely on membership queries.

We remedy this issue by designing a suitable finite test suite ensuring general equivalence between two pomsets recognizers. Naturally, this is not possible in the general case. However, we assume that the size of the model is bounded w.r.t. to the hypothesis we submit. This test suite extends to recognizable languages of series-parallel pomsets the  $W$ -method [5] originally applied to finite state machines accepting words.

► **Definition 30** (Equivalence on a test suite). *Let  $Z \subseteq \text{SP}(\Sigma)$ . Two pomset recognizers  $\mathcal{R}_1$  and  $\mathcal{R}_2$  are said to be  $Z$ -equivalent, written  $\mathcal{H} \equiv_Z \mathcal{M}$ , if for any  $z \in Z$ ,  $\mathcal{H}(z) = \mathcal{M}(z)$ .*

We will in this section consider a hypothesis  $\mathcal{H} = (H, \cdot_{\mathcal{H}}, \|\mathcal{H}, e_{\mathcal{H}}, i_{\mathcal{H}}^{\sharp}, F_{\mathcal{H}})$  and a model  $\mathcal{M} = (M, \cdot_{\mathcal{M}}, \|\mathcal{M}, e_{\mathcal{M}}, i_{\mathcal{M}}^{\sharp}, F_{\mathcal{M}})$  sharing the same alphabet such that  $\mathcal{H}$  and  $\mathcal{M}$  are minimal,  $|H| = n$ , and we know a bound  $k$  such that  $0 \leq |M| - |H| \leq k$ .

## 6.1 Computing a state cover

The active learning algorithm computes a set of pomsets (the representatives) that reach every state of the hypothesis built, and a set of contexts that distinguish these states. We provide a generic definition of these notions:

► **Definition 31** (State cover). *A set  $P \subseteq \text{SP}(\Sigma)$  is a state cover of a reachable pomset recognizer  $\mathcal{R} = (R, \odot, \oplus, e, i, F)$  if  $\varepsilon \in P$  and every  $r \in R$  admits an access sequence  $p \in P$ .*

► **Definition 32** (Characterisation set). *A set of contexts  $W \subseteq C_1(\Sigma)$  is a characterization set of a pomset recognizer  $\mathcal{R} = (R, \odot, \oplus, e, i, F)$  if  $\square \in W$  and for any  $r_1, r_2 \in R$ , if  $r_1$  and  $r_2$  are distinguishable, then  $\exists c \in W, \mathcal{R}(c[r_1]) \neq \mathcal{R}(c[r_2])$ .*

The definitions of minimality and characterisation sets result in the following property:

► **Property 33.** *Given a minimal pomset recognizer  $\mathcal{R} = (R, \odot, \oplus, e, i, F)$ , a characterization set  $W$  of  $P$ , and two states  $r_1, r_2 \in R$ , if for any  $c \in W, \mathcal{R}(c[r_1]) = \mathcal{R}(c[r_2])$ , then  $r_1 = r_2$ .*

The first step of the  $W$ -method consists in designing a state cover of the unknown model  $\mathcal{M}$  that extends a known state cover of the hypothesis  $\mathcal{H}$  by relying on the bound  $k$  we postulated and our knowledge that states distinguished in  $\mathcal{H}$  are still distinguished in  $\mathcal{M}$ .


► **Definition 34** (Extending a state cover.). *Let  $P$  be a state cover of  $\mathcal{H}$ . We introduce the set  $L_i^P = \{c[p] \mid m \in \mathbb{N}, c \in C_m(\Sigma), \delta(c) \leq i, p \in P^m\}$ .*

Intuitively,  $L_i^P$  consists of all pomsets obtained by inserting access sequences of  $P$  in a multi-context of height equal to or smaller than  $i$ .


► **Theorem 35.** *Let  $P$  be a state cover of  $\mathcal{H}$  and  $W$  a characterisation set of  $\mathcal{H}$  such that  $\mathcal{H} \equiv_{W[P]} \mathcal{M}$ . Then  $L_k^P$  is a state cover of  $\mathcal{M}$ .*

**Proof.** Let us first prove that  $P$  covers at least  $n$  distinguishable states of  $\mathcal{M}$  (i). Indeed, consider two distinguishable states  $h_1$  and  $h_2$  among the  $n$  states of  $\mathcal{H}$ . Let  $p_1$  (resp.  $p_2$ ) be an access sequence of  $h_1$  (resp.  $h_2$ ) in  $P$ .  $W$  being a characterisation set of  $\mathcal{H}$ ,  $\exists c \in W, \mathcal{H}(c[p_1]) \neq \mathcal{H}(c[p_2])$ . But  $\mathcal{H} \equiv_{W[P]} \mathcal{M}$  and  $c[p_1], c[p_2] \in W[P]$ , therefore  $\mathcal{M}(c[p_1]) \neq \mathcal{M}(c[p_2])$ ; states  $i_{\mathcal{M}}^{\sharp}(p_1), i_{\mathcal{M}}^{\sharp}(p_2)$  are distinguished in  $\mathcal{M}$  and **i** holds.

Consider a state  $q \in M$  and an access sequence  $w$  of  $q$  in  $\mathcal{M}$ . Let us prove that there exists an access sequence  $w'$  of  $q$  and an evaluation tree  $\tau' \in \text{ET}_{\mathcal{M}}(w')$  that admits no repetition of states along any branch (ii). Assume that such a repetition occurs in an evaluation tree  $\tau$  of  $w$ , as shown in Figure 7: then there exist two contexts  $c_1, c_2 \in C_1(\Sigma)$ , a pomset  $z \in \text{SP}(\Sigma)$ , and a state  $q' \in M$  such that  $w = c_1[c_2[z]]$  and  $q' = i_{\mathcal{M}}^{\sharp}(z) = i_{\mathcal{M}}^{\sharp}(c_2[z])$ . Let  $w' = c_1[z]$ . Then  $i_{\mathcal{M}}^{\sharp}(w') = i_{\mathcal{M}}^{\sharp}(c_1[z]) = i_{\mathcal{M}}^{\sharp}(c_1[c_2[z]]) = i_{\mathcal{M}}^{\sharp}(w)$  by Lemma 11, and we can remove at least one repetition from the branches of  $\tau$ , as shown in Figure 8. Repeating this procedure yields an execution tree without repetitions along its branches that evaluates to  $q$ ; **ii** holds.




■ **Figure 7** An evaluation tree  $\tau$  of  $w$ .




■ **Figure 8** A factorized tree  $\tau'$  of  $w'$ .

By **ii**, consider an access sequence  $w' \in \text{SP}(\Sigma)$  of  $q$  that admits an evaluation tree  $\tau' \in \text{ET}_{\mathcal{M}}(w')$  without repetitions. If a branch of  $\tau'$  is of length at least  $k + 1$ , by applying the pigeonhole principle, then at least one of the  $k + 1$  first states occurring from the root along this branch is covered by  $P$ , due to  $\mathcal{M}$  having  $n + k$  states and  $P$  covering at least  $n$  states by **i**, leaving at most  $k$  states uncovered by  $P$ .

More formally, as displayed in Figure 9, there exist  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ , a multi-context  $c \in C_m(\Sigma)$ , and  $z_1, \dots, z_m \in \text{SP}(\Sigma)$  such that  $\delta(c) \leq k$ ,  $w' = c[z_1, \dots, z_m]$  and for any  $j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ , state  $i_{\mathcal{M}}^{\#}(z_j) = q_j$  is covered by  $P$ . Let  $p_j \in P$  be an access sequence of  $q_j$  in  $\mathcal{M}$ , that is,  $i_{\mathcal{M}}^{\#}(p_j) = q_j$ . Then consider  $p = c[p_1, \dots, p_m]$ , as shown in Figure 10. By design,  $p \in L_k^P$ , and by Lemma 11,  $i_{\mathcal{M}}^{\#}(p) = i_{\mathcal{M}}^{\#}(w') = q$ . Thus, every state of  $\mathcal{M}$  is covered by  $L_k^P$ , and this set is therefore a state cover of  $\mathcal{M}$ . ◀



■ **Figure 9** Finding states covered by  $P$  in an evaluation tree  $\tau'$  of  $w'$ .



■ **Figure 10** Inserting  $P$ 's access sequences in  $\tau'$  to create a new access sequence  $p$ .

## 6.2 Exhaustivity of the test suite

Our goal is to design a *complete* test suite  $Z$ , i.e. such that  $Z$ -equivalence must imply full equivalence of  $\mathcal{H}$  and  $\mathcal{M}$ , assuming naturally that the hypotheses we have made earlier in this section hold. To do so, we will use a proof inspired by Moerman's [21] that relies on bisimulation. We first define this notion in a similar fashion to finite automata:

► **Definition 36** (Bisimulation relation). *A bisimulation relation  $\sim$  between two pomset recognizers  $\mathcal{R}_1 = (R_1, \odot_1, \oplus_1, e_1, i_1, F_1)$  and  $\mathcal{R}_2 = (R_2, \odot_2, \oplus_2, e_2, i_2, F_2)$  is a binary relation  $R_1 \times R_2$  such that:*

1.  $r_1 \sim r_2$  implies that  $r_1 \in F_1 \iff r_2 \in F_2$ .
2.  $r_1 \sim r_2$  and  $r'_1 \sim r'_2$  implies that  $r_1 \circ_1 r_2 \sim r'_1 \circ_2 r'_2$  for  $\circ \in \{\odot, \oplus\}$ .

► **Lemma 37.** *Given a bisimulation relation  $\sim$  between  $\mathcal{R}_1$  and  $\mathcal{R}_2$ , if  $\mathcal{R}_1$  and  $\mathcal{R}_2$  share the same alphabet  $\Sigma$ , the same neutral element  $e$ , and for any  $x \in \Sigma \cup \{e\}$ ,  $i_{\mathcal{R}_1}^\#(x) \sim i_{\mathcal{R}_2}^\#(x)$ , then  $\mathcal{R}_1$  and  $\mathcal{R}_2$  are equivalent.*

**Proof.** We use a simple proof by induction on  $\text{SP}(\Sigma)$  that relies on the freeness of  $\text{SP}(\Sigma)$  and the resulting inductive nature of the computations performed by pomset recognizers. ◀

Our goal is to use  $P$  and  $W$  to design a test suite  $Z$  such that  $Z$ -equivalence induces a bisimulation relation.

► **Theorem 38.** *Let  $P$  be a state cover of  $\mathcal{H}$ ,  $W$  be a characterisation set of  $\mathcal{H}$ ,  $L = L_k^P$ ,  $L' = L_{k+1}^P$ , and  $Z = W[L']$ . We introduce the binary relation  $\sim$  on  $H \times M$ :*

$$\sim = \{(i_{\mathcal{H}}^\#(l), i_{\mathcal{M}}^\#(l)) \mid l \in L\}$$

*If  $\mathcal{H}$  and  $\mathcal{M}$  are  $Z$ -equivalent, then  $\sim$  is a bisimulation relation.*

**Proof.** Note that  $W[P] \subseteq Z$ .  $\mathcal{H}$  and  $\mathcal{M}$  being  $Z$ -equivalent, they are also  $W[P]$ -equivalent and by Theorem 35  $L$  is a state cover of  $\mathcal{M}$ . Let us prove that  $\sim$  is a bisimulation relation.

1. Let  $(h, m) = (i_{\mathcal{H}}^\#(l), i_{\mathcal{M}}^\#(l)) \in \sim$ . Note that  $\square \in W$  and  $l \in L$ , thus  $l = \square[l] \in Z$  and  $\mathcal{H}(l) = \mathcal{M}(l)$ . Hence,  $h \in F_{\mathcal{H}} \iff m \in F_{\mathcal{M}}$ .
2. Let  $(h_1, m_1) = (i_{\mathcal{H}}^\#(l_1), i_{\mathcal{M}}^\#(l_1)) \in \sim$ ,  $(h_2, m_2) = (i_{\mathcal{H}}^\#(l_2), i_{\mathcal{M}}^\#(l_2)) \in \sim$ , and  $\circ \in \{\cdot, \parallel\}$ . We consider an access sequence  $v \in L$  in  $\mathcal{M}$  for  $l_1 \circ_{\mathcal{M}} l_2$ ; then  $i_{\mathcal{M}}^\#(l_1 \circ l_2) = i_{\mathcal{M}}^\#(v)$  (i). By Property 15,  $\forall c \in W$ ,  $\mathcal{M}(c[l_1 \circ l_2]) = \mathcal{M}(c[v])$  (ii).

Note that  $W[\{v\}] \subseteq Z$ , thus for any  $c \in W$ ,  $\mathcal{H}(c[v]) = \mathcal{M}(c[v])$  (iii).

Moreover,  $l_1 \circ l_2 \in L'$  due to  $l_1, l_2 \in L = L_k^P$  and  $L' = L_{k+1}^P$ . Thus,  $W[\{l_1 \circ l_2\}] \subseteq Z$  and for any  $c \in W$ ,  $\mathcal{H}(c[l_1 \circ l_2]) = \mathcal{M}(c[l_1 \circ l_2])$ . By ii,  $\mathcal{H}(c[l_1 \circ l_2]) = \mathcal{M}(c[v])$  holds (iv).

By iii and iv,  $\forall c \in W$ ,  $\mathcal{H}(c[v]) = \mathcal{H}(c[l_1 \circ l_2])$ . But  $W$  is a characterisation set of  $\mathcal{H}$ , therefore  $i_{\mathcal{H}}^\#(l_1 \circ l_2) = i_{\mathcal{H}}^\#(v)$  (v) by Property 33.

By definition of  $\sim$ ,  $i_{\mathcal{H}}^\#(v) \sim i_{\mathcal{M}}^\#(v)$ . Thus, by i and v,  $i_{\mathcal{H}}^\#(l_1 \circ l_2) \sim i_{\mathcal{M}}^\#(l_1 \circ l_2)$ . This result is not trivial due to  $l_1 \circ l_2$  being an element of  $L'$  but possibly not of  $L$ , hence being excluded from  $\sim$ 's definition. We have thus proven  $h_1 \circ_{\mathcal{H}} h_2 \sim m_1 \circ_{\mathcal{M}} m_2$ .

$\sim$  is therefore a bisimulation relation. ◀

► **Corollary 39.**  *$\mathcal{H}$  and  $\mathcal{M}$  are  $Z$ -equivalent if and only if they are equivalent.*

**Proof.** If  $\mathcal{H}$  and  $\mathcal{M}$  are  $Z$ -equivalent,  $\sim$  is a bisimulation relation by Theorem 38. Moreover, by definition of  $\sim$ ,  $\forall x \in \Sigma \cup \{\varepsilon\}$ , obviously  $i_{\mathcal{H}}^\#(x) \sim i_{\mathcal{M}}^\#(x)$ . By Property 37,  $\mathcal{H}$  and  $\mathcal{M}$  are equivalent. The converse is trivial. ◀

We can infer a state cover  $P$  and a characterisation set  $W$  from  $S$  and  $\mathcal{C}$ , resulting in a practical way to handle equivalence queries assuming bound  $k$  is known.

► **Lemma 40.**  $|L_i^P| = \mathcal{O}(2^{2^i})$ .

**Proof.** Let  $U_i = |L_i^P|$  for  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ . Obviously,  $\lim_{i \rightarrow +\infty} U_i = +\infty$ .

An element  $w$  of  $L_{i+1}^P$  is either an element of  $L_i^P$  or the composition of two elements of  $L_i^P$ . Thus, the inductive equation  $U_{i+1} = \frac{3}{2} \cdot U_i^2 + U_i$  holds (remember that  $\parallel$  commutes).

Consider the sequence  $V_i = \frac{3}{2} \cdot U_i$ . Then  $V_{i+1} = V_i^2 + V_i$ . As a consequence:

$$\log(V_{i+1}) = \log(V_i^2 \cdot (1 + \frac{1}{V_i})) = 2 \cdot \log(V_i) + \log(1 + \frac{1}{V_i})$$

$$0 < \frac{\log(V_{i+1})}{2^{i+1}} - \frac{\log(V_{i+1})}{2^i} < \frac{1}{2^i} \log\left(1 + \frac{1}{V_i}\right) < \frac{1}{2^i \cdot V_i}$$

The series above thus converges. Let  $\gamma$  be its limit. Then:

$$0 < \gamma - \frac{\log(V_i)}{2^i} < \sum_{j=i}^{+\infty} \frac{1}{2^j \cdot V_j} \leq \frac{1}{V_i} \sum_{j=i}^{+\infty} \frac{1}{2^j} = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{2^i \cdot V_i}\right)$$

Finally,  $\log(V_i) = 2^i \cdot \gamma + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{V_i}\right)$ ,  $V_i = \exp(\gamma^{2^i}) \cdot \exp(o(1)) = \mathcal{O}(2^{2^i})$ , and  $U_i = \mathcal{O}(2^{2^i})$ . ◀

As a direct consequence, since  $Z = W[L_{k+1}^P]$ , the following theorem holds:

► **Theorem 41.**  $|Z| = \mathcal{O}(|W| \cdot 2^{2^k})$ .

## 7 Conclusion and Further Developments

In this paper, we have shown that a state-of-the-art active learning algorithm,  $L^\lambda$  [13], could be applied to pomset recognizers. It remains to be seen how its compact data structures (discrimination tree, closed sets of representatives and distinguishers) impact query complexity in practice compared to the original adaptation of  $L^*$  to pomsets [26]. To this end, we are currently working on an implementation that tackles the following issues:

**Representing series-parallel pomsets.** We must settle on a canonical representation of pomsets as binary trees that guarantees minimal depth and prevents duplicate queries.

**Optimizing counter-example handling.** `FindEBP` benefits from the use of canonical terms of minimal depth (ideally, logarithmic w.r.t. the counter-example's size). However, its complexity remains linear if the canonical term is a linear tree. We may therefore try to develop another counter-example handling procedure optimized for linear trees, and dynamically choose a counter-example strategy based on the input term's shape.

**Generating a benchmark.** We must create a test sample of minimal, reachable pomset recognizers. In that regard, SAT-based approaches look promising.

**Testing various scenarios.** In order to assess the efficiency of the various techniques discussed in this article, we need to isolate the impact of **1.** the discrimination tree  $\mathcal{D}$ , **2.** the new counter-example handling procedure `FindEBP`, and **3.**  $L^\lambda$ 's lazy refinement.

We plan on adapting various improvements to the  $W$ -method, such as the  $H$ -method [6], to pomset recognizers. We also want to determine whether `FindEBP` can enhance active learning algorithms for tree languages [7], which inspired [26]'s algorithm in the first place. We also want to explore the *passive learning* problem for pomset samples: given two non-empty sets  $Z^+ \subseteq \text{SP}(\Sigma)$  and  $Z^- \subseteq \text{SP}(\Sigma)$  such that  $Z^+ \cap Z^- = \emptyset$ , find a PR that accepts all the elements of  $Z^+$  and rejects all the elements of  $Z^-$ .

Finally, while both van Heerdt's algorithm [26] and ours learn series-parallel pomsets, some use cases such as producer-consumer systems require modelling pomsets that feature  $N$  patterns. These scenarios can be effectively formalized using *interval pomsets* [9] and *higher-dimensional automata* (HDA) [8]. The extension of Myhill-Nerode's theorem to languages of HDA [10] opens up the possibility of an active learning algorithm for HDA.

---

## References

- 1 Dana Angluin. Learning regular sets from queries and counterexamples. *Inf. Comput.*, 75(2):87–106, 1987.

- 2 Nicolas Bedon. Logic and branching automata. In Krishnendu Chatterjee and Jiri Sgall, editors, *Mathematical Foundations of Computer Science 2013 - 38th International Symposium, MFCS 2013, Klosterneuburg, Austria, August 26-30, 2013. Proceedings*, volume 8087 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 123–134. Springer, 2013.
- 3 Nicolas Bedon. Branching automata and pomset automata. In Mikolaj Bojanczyk and Chandra Chekuri, editors, *41st IARCS Annual Conference on Foundations of Software Technology and Theoretical Computer Science, FSTTCS 2021, December 15-17, 2021, Virtual Conference*, volume 213 of *LIPIcs*, pages 37:1–37:13. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2021.
- 4 S.L. Bloom and Z. Ésik. Free shuffle algebras in language varieties. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 163(1-2):55–98, 1996.
- 5 Tsun S. Chow. Testing software design modeled by finite-state machines. *IEEE Trans. Software Eng.*, 4(3):178–187, 1978.
- 6 Rita Dorofeeva, Khaled El-Fakih, and Nina Yevtushenko. An improved conformance testing method. In Farn Wang, editor, *Formal Techniques for Networked and Distributed Systems - FORTE 2005*, pages 204–218, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2005. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- 7 Frank Drewes and Johanna Högberg. Learning a regular tree language from a teacher. In Zoltán Ésik and Zoltán Fülöp, editors, *Developments in Language Theory, 7th International Conference, DLT 2003, Szeged, Hungary, July 7-11, 2003, Proceedings*, volume 2710 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 279–291. Springer, 2003.
- 8 Uli Fahrenberg, Christian Johansen, Georg Struth, and Krzysztof Ziemiański. A Kleene theorem for higher-dimensional automata. In Bartek Klin, Slawomir Lasota, and Anca Muscholl, editors, *33rd International Conference on Concurrency Theory, CONCUR 2022, September 12-16, 2022, Warsaw, Poland*, volume 243 of *LIPIcs*, pages 29:1–29:18. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2022.
- 9 Uli Fahrenberg, Christian Johansen, Georg Struth, and Krzysztof Ziemiański. Posets with interfaces as a model for concurrency. *Inf. Comput.*, 285(Part):104914, 2022.
- 10 Uli Fahrenberg and Krzysztof Ziemiański. Myhill-nerode theorem for higher-dimensional automata. *Fundam. Informaticae*, 192(3-4):219–259, 2024.
- 11 Peter C. Fishburn. Interval graphs and interval orders. *Discret. Math.*, 55(2):135–149, 1985.
- 12 Jay L. Gischer. The equational theory of pomsets. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 61:199–224, 1988.
- 13 Falk Howar and Bernhard Steffen. Active automata learning as black-box search and lazy partition refinement. In Nils Jansen, Mariëlle Stoelinga, and Petra van den Bos, editors, *A Journey from Process Algebra via Timed Automata to Model Learning - Essays Dedicated to Frits Vaandrager on the Occasion of His 60th Birthday*, volume 13560 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 321–338. Springer, 2022.
- 14 Malte Isberner, Falk Howar, and Bernhard Steffen. The ttt algorithm: A redundancy-free approach to active automata learning. In Borzoo Bonakdarpour and Scott A. Smolka, editors, *Runtime Verification*, pages 307–322, Cham, 2014. Springer International Publishing.
- 15 Tobias Kappé, Paul Brunet, Bas Luttik, Alexandra Silva, and Fabio Zanasi. On series-parallel pomset languages: Rationality, context-freeness and automata. *J. Log. Algebraic Methods Program.*, 103:130–153, 2019.
- 16 M. J. Kearns and U. V. Vazirani. *An Introduction to Computational Learning Theory*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, USA, 1994.
- 17 K. Lodaya and P. Weil. A Kleene iteration for parallelism. In *Foundations of Software Technology and Theoretical Computer Science*, pages 355–366, 1998.
- 18 Kamal Lodaya and Pascal Weil. Series-parallel posets: algebra, automata and languages. In *Annual Symposium on Theoretical Aspects of Computer Science*, pages 555–565. Springer, 1998.
- 19 Kamal Lodaya and Pascal Weil. Series-parallel languages and the bounded-width property. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 237(1-2):347–380, 2000.

- 20 Kamal Lodaya and Pascal Weil. Rationality in algebras with a series operation. *Information and Computation*, 171(2):269–293, 2001.
- 21 Joshua Moerman. *Nominal Techniques and Black Box Testing for Automata Learning*. PhD thesis, Radboud University, 2019.
- 22 Vaughan R. Pratt. Modeling concurrency with partial orders. *Journal of Parallel Programming*, 15(1):33–71, 1986.
- 23 Ronald L. Rivest and Robert E. Schapire. Inference of finite automata using homing sequences. *Inf. Comput.*, 103(2):299–347, 1993.
- 24 Frits Vaandrager, Bharat Garhewal, Jurriaan Rot, and Thorsten Wißmann. A new approach for active automata learning based on apartness. In Dana Fisman and Grigore Rosu, editors, *Tools and Algorithms for the Construction and Analysis of Systems*, pages 223–243, Cham, 2022. Springer International Publishing.
- 25 J. Valdes, R. E. Tarjan, and E. L. Lawler. The recognition of series parallel digraphs. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 11:298–313, 1982.
- 26 Gerco van Heerdt, Tobias Kappé, Jurriaan Rot, and Alexandra Silva. Learning pomset automata. In Stefan Kiefer and Christine Tasson, editors, *Foundations of Software Science and Computation Structures - 24th International Conference, FOSSACS 2021, Held as Part of the European Joint Conferences on Theory and Practice of Software, ETAPS 2021, Luxembourg City, Luxembourg, March 27 - April 1, 2021, Proceedings*, volume 12650 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 510–530. Springer, 2021.